

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/22/2023 4:00:00 AM

First name: Beth

Last name: Gardner

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I'd like to comment on the proposed Flathead Fuel Break CE. I apologize this email is one day late but I hope you still accept it.

I only wish to comment on the Good Creek proposals. I am a landowner on Alder Creek. My property is undeveloped and there is no structure to protect from a wildfire. I have mixed feelings about fuel breaks. A few well-placed ones make a lot of sense but I do not want every possible foot of the WUI area to be one big fuel break. I appreciate the need for heterogeneity on the landscape to benefit other natural resources. With that in mind, I strongly support the units most upstream of Good Creek along FSR 60. They make sense. (I'm sorry I cannot specifically comment on any unit numbers since they are not provided in the scoping map, nor was any table provided). I disagree with the proposed unit north of FSR 60 at the confluence with Gergen Creek. How does benefit? This is within the RMZ of Gergen Creek and Good Creek and priority should be given to Perhaps some handwork right by the road to improve egress safety during a wildfire but not sure I understand why the entire unit was proposed.

The proposed small unit on the west corner of where Alder Creek has a confluence Good Creek is an odd one. This unit seems to be too small to have much benefit. A fire moving east along Good Creek drainage should have ample opportunity for fire suppression due to the recently completed Salish Good work. Moreover, a fire that is more uphill (along FSR 2809B) would enter the mature stand that runs on the west side of the Alder Creek drainage, possibly resulting in flame lengths too great to control. Again the small proposed unit seems to be inefficient there.

I propose that a better location would be uphill of FSR 2809B or 2809, along most of the length of it. This area is gentle topography and accessible with roads. It would not need a temporary road. A nicely thinned stand up here should be effective for fire suppression. That way there is no need to treat the mature, denser stand between FSR 2809B and Alder Creek. I think a prescribed burn uphill of the road would be even better, but I recognize that is probably beyond the scope of your CE. I don't know if it is better to conduct fuel work uphill of FSR 2809 or 2809B, that would depend on input from your wildlife biologist.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Beth Gardner