

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/5/2026 2:17:51 PM

First name: Darlene

Last name: Yan

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear Acting Forest Supervisor,

This is incredibly scary. I've been backpacking Trinity Alps for years now and it's one of the last true wildernesses accessible in the North of the Bay Area. It is beloved not just for its lakes and granite peaks but for its great expanse of trees - trees growing naturally, maintained yes, but this is a completely different scenario.

Commercial logging should NOT happen on wilderness lands for the sake of "community safety". Please see the details below, all of the reasons to not go forward with this are enumerated. This will impact the lands for YEARS if not generations. Don't make the same short-sighted decisions that will result in massive negative impacts as others have. It will take so much time, effort, and money to rectify it afterwards and that is only IF nature can recover. The scars of this move will be literally, scarring.

We are watching this very carefully. Please do the right thing.

Sincerely,

Darlene Yan

7th grade science teacher and mom of 2

I am submitting comments in opposition to the North Trinity County Community Risk Reduction Project. This project proposes commercial logging across thousands of acres of Northern Spotted Owl Critical Habitat, Late Successional Reserves, and includes more than 2,000 acres of logging in Riparian Reserves, in one of the most ecologically significant landscapes in the National Forest System.

These watersheds support over 30 documented NSO territories. The low-elevation forests between Trinity Lake and the Trinity Alps Wilderness represent the last functional stronghold for this endangered species. They provide refuge in the sea of flammable clearcuts surrounding and intertwined with the project area.

What this project describes, at this scale, leaves a forest permanently altered in character and ecological function. Reducing canopy cover, removing large trees over 20 inches, with miles of temporary roads, skid trails, and likely hundreds of clear-cut log landings not a community risk reduction prescription. What would remain is a disturbance footprint that is vast, long-lasting, and wholly inconsistent with forest resiliency by any scientific measure, as seen on Rainier Road.

I urge you to revise the EA around a prescription that is targeted, enforceable, and grounded in science. Protecting communities and protecting wildlife are not mutually exclusive. Treating small-diameter vegetation, limiting harvest to trees under 20 inches, using the existing road system, and maintaining 60 to 80 percent canopy cover would reduce fire risk without dismantling the forest that wildlife depends on.

