Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/10/2023 3:29:47 AM
First name: Nick
Last name: Hershenow
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Midnight Restoration Project. I live right above the Twisp River as it enters the town of Twisp and spend a lot of time in the watershed both on and off Forest, so I have a very personal interest in this project. And I have a bit of relevant 'experiential expertise', as I worked for about 15 years in the field as a hydrologic technician on the Payette Forest in Idaho, some of that time working on watershed restoration projects, BAER surveys, and post-fire timber salvage sale layout.

In general, I support the intent and design of the Midnight Project as I understand it. My main concern, based mainly on what I have read but also on what I have seen of recent Forest Service activity in the area (both logging/thinning projects and fire suppression activity), is that the stated goal of maximizing retention of large trees is not fully served by the proposal as it currently stands. Why does the definition of 'large trees' in the proposal differ (to the detriment of large trees) from the definition in the OWNF Restoration Strategy? We should be consistent in these definitions, and we should remain focused on a primary goal of retaining large trees in resilient stands.

We should also be cautious with 'condition based management' - a concept I do support, but not necessarily as we saw it implemented in recent logging in the Buttermilk area, where it seems that the forest was thinned with a very heavy hand.

Non-commercial and commercial thinning of smaller trees, along with the careful reintroduction of fire, will do much to restore our forests and protect our remaining larger trees. Let's not undo that good by cutting too many of them down.