

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/27/2023 5:04:36 PM

First name: Maya

Last name: Daurio

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a landowner in the burn scar of the Cameron Peak Fire in the Rustic area of the Poudre Canyon, I support the overall objectives of this project to improve forest resilience through the use of tree thinning, pile burning, and prescribed fire. I also support the idea behind a conditions-based approach in order to allow for reflexive responses to what is happening on the ground over the course of the project's life.

I do not, however, support the use of clear cutting as a method to improve forest resilience, as I am unaware of any research that correlates clear cutting with improved forest health. If there are citations in the project documents that support this relationship, they are not easily discoverable, e.g. in the Silviculture and Vegetation Specialist Analysis Report, where clearcutting is extensively discussed but no scholarly evidence provided establishing the relationship between clearcutting and increased forest resilience. The Management Action Cards do not cite any research applicable to this management strategy either.

Some, though not all, areas of the Cameron Peak Fire burn scar are excluded from the footprint of this project area, specifically the entire length of the Poudre Canyon west of Rustic, including my family's property and the Forest Service lands surrounding it. Areas to the north of Highway 14 which are also part of the Cameron Peak Fire burn scar are included in the project scope.

I am unable to find an explanation in project documents for why specific areas have been excluded and others included, if the assumption is that the footprint of the Cameron Peak Fire negates the need for further forest health improvements. Given that the timeline for this project is twenty years, I am concerned about the exclusion of the Poudre Canyon west of Rustic from this project's scope.

As is apparent from the Arrowhead Fire which occurred on March 19, 2023 in areas with a history of both prescribed fire and Cameron Peak Fire activity, the burn scar does not necessarily provide protection from future wildfires or the need to continue wildfire mitigation efforts. The Arrowhead Fire easily jumped the road and the river to establish itself in areas within the Cameron Peak Fire footprint that nevertheless saw no wildfire activity in 2020. The footprint is a mosaic of burned and unburned areas, and I encourage the Forest Service to consider including a conditions-based project management approach to those areas of the Poudre Canyon currently excluded from this proposed project.

Over the course of twenty years, even those areas within the Cameron Peak Fire footprint that were burned over in 2020 will present changing conditions necessitating the need for ongoing diverse forest management strategies aimed at forest resilience. In fact, I cannot think of a landscape more in need of a conditions-based approach responsive to changing conditions on the ground. Why wouldn't the Forest Service take advantage of this opportunity to plan for and help shape a future resilient landscape through identification of areas which currently pose threats to forest health (i.e. through flooding) or will over the course of this project's twenty year scope (i.e. wildfire hazard introduced by fallen trees)?

As another commenter mentioned, given the large number of assets, the tracts of unburned timber, and the significant threats to the watershed (affecting hundreds of thousands of people downstream and in the canyon itself) in the Poudre Canyon from the impacts of wildfire, it is confusing why the area west of Rustic is not included in this plan. I agree with this commenter that 'a more appropriate southern boundary of the project would be an extension southward from approximately Eggers on Hwy 14 down the Pingree Park road to about the Bennett Creek road, then westward toward Crown Point along that road, then connecting back to approximately the point of origin of the Cameron Peak Fire, then northward along Road 103 to intersect with the current boundary' (Mefford).

Thank you for considering my feedback.