

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/18/2025 2:11:45 AM

First name: Teagen

Last name: Blakey

Organization:

Title:

Comments: There is no reason for this project to be classified under an emergency action. By the USFS's own explanation the current forest composition occurred over decades. A project this big needs to have a full EIS with public comment periods, or at the very least an EA with full public comment periods.

Current science is at best very inconclusive regarding the effects of Forest treatment on fire severity, which is itself composed of multiple variables such as soil burn severity versus tree mortality. What affects one does not necessarily affect the other. And none of this is shown to have a positive affect on preserving human developments in the face of fire. What current science does show is that the most effective treatments involve prescribed fire. No treatments should be considered here which do not involve follow up broadcast burns unless they are POD treatments designed only along boarders.

Roadless areas should only be treated manually to preserve their roadless characteristics. Despite best efforts mechanical roads and tracks are very hard to cover, bar and prevent future use, especially on the PSI. You can not call something restoration if the result of the project is new human recreation, especially motorized, in an area previously devoid of it. Human access is also the main driver of fires with 98% of fires threatening structures to be human caused. The best way to prevent fires is to limit human access into the forest. If you provide the opportunity for recreation and human access further into the forest (intentionally or not) your results will be contrary to your project purpose.

Forest management in old growth stands should be avoided. Part of old growth character is the multi generational stand structure. Removing the understory affects this part of the old growth structure and character. Salvage logging in mature/old growth forests is unacceptable. By definition this allows almost any tree with the potential to be sick to be cut. Once again large snags and dead fall are all part of old growth characteristics and need to be preserved.

There is absolutely no reason to be treating in spruce/fir cover types. These forests may have a high fuel level, but their risk of burning is low due to moisture content and density, which shields it from embers reaching the surface fuel. If you go in and open up these forests you increase the risk of embers entering them and igniting a fire, as well as dry out the fuels. Nothing you do will change how these forests naturally burn, which is intensely.

The Forest Plan was written for a reason with extensive input and review. If a prosed treatment is in conflict with direction in the Forest Plan, especially wildlife habitat, mature/old growth and roadless areas, the Forest Plan should supersede it. It is unacceptable to temporarily or otherwise amend the Forest Plan for actions that would, by the USFS's own admission, cause damage.

Treatment in the Manitou Experimental Forest should not affect ongoing studies that depend on the forest growing along its current trajectory.

Three species listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act would be adversely affected through critical habitat degradation and/or destruction during this project: Mexican Spotted Owl, Preble's meadow jumping mouse, and lynx. These species and habitat must be protected.

Unknown miles of new roads would be built, fragmenting habitat while compacting soil and causing erosion into watersheds. New roads should be avoided, especially in areas designated "roadless".

Lastly weed control should be approached through mechanical and biological means first before any chemicals

are considered.

Thank you for taking these comments into consideration, and offering a full public comment period in the future on more detailed plans.