

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/15/2023 9:05:56 PM

First name: Susan

Last name: Pearson

Organization:

Title:

Comments:

I appreciate the updated information regarding the proposal for the North Fork Stillaguamish and Deer Creek Watersheds.

I have broadened the lens through which I now look at the proposal partly due to the 2014 Stillaguamish slide tragedy and how quickly "normal" can change and partly due to possible challenges resulting from climate change (some noted in your current draft report).

Of further interest/concern to our geographic area, is the proximity of Glacier Peak. I read with interest a recent news article that noted the USFS was working with geologic specialists, etc., to facilitate the installation additional seismic monitors near Glacier and that it is considered one of the more likely volcanoes to erupt.

During my lifetime, I have greatly enjoyed the outdoors and the Stillaguamish and Deer Creek areas. I first found out about your upcoming proposal through an Everett Herald Article that noted the possibility of a new plan and that plan may include closing or obliterating long-term trails to Higgens Mountain, Myrtle Lake, and Round Mountain. Since that time, I have developed a much more extensive understanding of what may be proposed.

I now feel more strongly than ever that not only should roads and trails not be obliterated, or closed, but that new roads should also not be obliterated once their original mission is completed.

As mentioned previously, an almost instantaneous event can happen that destroys "normal" transportation routes. Snohomish County is now designating regional "islands" or areas where people can be cut off from transportation routes due to slides, earthquakes, flooding, or volcanic activity, to name a few. Darrington and Oso are two of the areas that I know have, more recently, put more emphasis on emergency planning and assessing "escape routes". There is certainly a possibility that bridges across the Stillaguamish, Deer Creek, Sauk, Suiattle, and Skagit could be unpassable-thus creating the "islands". People could be left in a position of needing to "seek higher ground" but the only "higher ground" would need to be the hills in that region. For example, the Swede Haven area could be cut off with the loss of the N. Fork Stilly bridge. The Forest Service road that runs to Segelson area and from there access to Phinney Creek Road and to the Dry Creek area could serve not only as an escape route but a rescue route. Oso and Whitman Road residents would be other examples where destroyed bridges would leave only one option to reach "higher ground". These are not isolated examples but would be true for many in the North Fork/Deer Creek watershed. As such, it is my opinion that these possibilities be considered when considering the road system in these areas.

Your report also notes that the increase in population in the area and the proximity to large cities will likely result in increased demand for recreational opportunities. We are fortunate to have a wide variety of possibilities in our area as you have noted in your draft report. Maintaining what we have plus expanding them with access being enhanced by new access roads for logging, etc., would help meet that need. I do not believe all roads need to be maintained to a "passenger car" level but should have various degrees of accessibility-the exception being "escape and rescue" routes.

I am unsure what areas are being considered for possible beaver colonies but would not want potential beaver ponds to interfere with road accessibility.

Another benefit of keeping more roads and trails open is accessibility for those who like to gather berries from the land. Spur roads that lead to higher elevations or into relatively recently logged areas can often lead to supplies of huckleberries and blackberries. This is especially true for the "youngsters" and the "elders" where rough

terrain and longer distances may be more difficult.

I appreciate learning that suggested closures of Higgins, Myrtle Lake, and Round Mt. trails are no longer being considered. I also appreciate learning that winter sports will continue to be supported.

Regarding Condition-Based Management, I can certainly appreciate that a condition may change that might result in reconsideration of a certain recommendation in a plan. I support having a concrete plan where a certain situation may be reviewed in light of an unforeseen condition. A revision specifically addressing that condition seems more appropriate than plans being open to change without formal revision

Thank you for sharing this draft of the proposal. It may be that further "Alternatives" should be proposed and considered.