

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/29/2024 1:36:25 AM

First name: Rachel

Last name: Woita

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for completing the Pole Creek Vegetation Management Project EA, FONSI, and DN, and for this opportunity to object.

It is inappropriate to lump the effects of all mechanical and hand treatments together for scenery, recreation, and roadless. The effects of a thinning project or over story removal are absolutely not the same as a clearcut. Furthermore, your analysis of the effects of prescribed fire and mechanical treatment in the proposed action alternative don't even mention recreation or roadless. Scenery is the only resource mentioned and analyzed.

Clearcuts ruin the scenery whereas, as you say on page 36, "With proper planning, mechanical treatment projects may actually improve scenic integrity objectives." How did you come to this conclusion? There is no way you can say that clearcuts can improve scenic integrity or have the same effects on the recreation experience and the scenic integrity as a thinning project or over story removal. While thinning projects or over story removal may have positive impacts to scenery and/or recreation, clear cuts will result in negative impacts to scenery and recreation.

Clearcuts can ruin the recreation experience as well, especially cross country skiing (i.e., at the Pole Creek Nordic area) where trees are needed to keep the snow from blowing away. The removal of trees has a scouring effect adjacent to the ski area that will make skiing some of those trails impossible for several years.

I urge you to redo the Environmental Impacts section for scenery, recreation, and roadless; split out the clearcuts effects from all other mechanical methods effects; and include analysis of recreation and roadless effects for the proposed action.