

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/4/2023 8:35:12 PM

First name: K

Last name: Davis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am opposed to this plan! Labelling a standard logging project an emergency action is a misuse of government authority. Fire, insects, and disease are markers of any wild forest, not a cause for evading analysis and public participation. An Environmental Assessment (EA) is not enough. An EIS, or Environmental Impact Study, is required to acknowledge and analyze the negative impacts of large-scale extraction projects.

Wildfire cannot be mitigated, controlled, or diminished by logging or thinning. In fact, larger openings can (as a secondary driver) increase fire intensity and rate of spread. This argument was used only ten air miles away, in 2019's Orogrande Community Fuels Reduction Project, in which a 200+ acre fuel break did not stop a wildfire that started west of the project in 2022 after logging was complete. More human infrastructure also increases the likelihood of human-caused ignition which requires home hardening to be prioritized.

This project would accelerate the biodiversity crisis. Protecting rare species requires both high-quality "core" habitat and well-protected "corridors" to travel between. This project knowingly degrades habitat connectivity, which is crucial for rare carnivores like lynx, wolverine, and grizzly bears. In particular, the area offers excellent habitat for fisher, a rare forest-dependent weasel that deserves protection.

It is time that we protect what is left as an urgent priority.