

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/24/2022 3:35:38 AM

First name: Margaret

Last name: Willits

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I repeat some of my comments from scoping that were not apparently considered:

These considerations and weed treatment are important to ensuring the project accomplishes its purpose and need and meets forest plan standards for mitigating weed spread.

Mastication is of particular concern because of the complete removal of canopy. Currently tocalote is in most or all of the areas that were previously masticated that are at lower elevation (Sampson?). And 92% of the known infestations of tocalote, and over 80% (by area) of the occurrences of Italian thistle, yellow starthistle, medusahead grass, blessed milkthistle, and Spanish broom are within the mapped mastication units in this projects.. This points to a very large risk of spread of weeds as apparently happened in the past. I suggest monitoring post mastication and treatment of any weeds that appear to be establishing and spreading.

Fuelbreaks are also a concern for weeds because they are maintained in a more open canopy over a longer period of time. Broom has spread so densely on a fuelbreak on private land on Yankee Hill Road that no longer functions as a fuelbreak. A large infestation of Spanish broom is in one of the conceptual fuelbreaks can could spread even more rapidly if that is opened up and the broom is not treated. Oblong spurge is in that same fuelbreak.

Tracked vehicles can carry a lot of soil and vegetative material and can spread weeds a lot for this reason.

In addition, weeds change quickly. Unless surveys have been done in the last three years, the information is not reliable. The use of EDRR is laudable, but ineffective unless those that are working in the area can identify all the species of weeds including the grasses.