

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/19/2022 11:48:56 AM

First name: Lloyd

Last name: Vivola

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to raise concerns about the Grasshopper Restoration Project EA Draft, not least of all since the imminent threat of global warming and climate disruption are concerns the USFS now seems to recognize in a perfunctory manner. In brief, it is troubling that the Service continues to assess that a local "restoration" action is of insignificant impact in the context of reducing carbon emissions globally while ignoring the cumulative impact of such rationalizations when applied again and again, both in Mt. Hood National Forest and in our national forests across the continent.

Specifically, regarding the EA Draft in question, I am most troubled by the "shelterwood alternative" (Alternative 2) as proposed for the higher elevation forest and the impact this application will have on that forest's relatively shady, cool, moist understory. Harvesting mature trees in this area counters the need to preserve the role that mature, successional forests play in the natural sequestering of carbon. When big trees are removed, they are gone for good however one tries to speculate on long-term trends of climate disruption and the "management" thereof.

Moreover, to the contrary of what the EA assesses, experience informs that "shelterwood" applications which thin a forest canopy often increase, not decrease, the threat of fire during hotter, drier summers. Unless of course, the Service is adequately funded and equipped with a workforce that will provide ongoing, post-action management of the land, including the application of low-intensity, prescribed fires that regulate the newly exposed understory. By what I assess, the current EA calls for "prescribed burns" that are directed only toward those potential fuels which will be left behind as by-products of the project's logging applications.

I am also concerned that the "shelterwood alternative" would remove some 267 acres of suitable Northern Spotted Owl habitat in addition to the 1200 acres of downgraded critical habitat prescribed by the Grasshopper project overall.

Finally, on a technical point regarding the EA protocol timeline. I would expect that the locations of all new logging roads - those deemed temporary or specifically approved for Inventoried Roadless Areas - have been disclosed in a detailed manner. Experience and science-based evidence inform that the incursion of new logging roads seldom fails to fragment and disrupt the natural systems of previously "unmanaged" or "lightly managed" areas and does so in ways that can resonate beyond that designated area's borders. New logging roads are also cited for extending an invitation to further fragmentation and disruption in years to come. Accordingly, the public must have access to the particulars of all new logging roads as planned in order that interested stakeholders can adequately evaluate their potential ecological impact in a timely manner.

Thank you for receiving public comments and for addressing issues that stakeholders raise.