

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/10/2022 9:12:07 PM

First name: Suzanne

Last name: Moulton

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Grasshopper Project. I do not support ANY logging of old growth -or- forests bordering old growth forests at this time. Increasing summertime temperatures and lower amounts of rainfall are making forest recovery impossible, even from the smallest amount of "select" logging - especially at higher altitudes as proposed in this Grasshopper "Restoration" Project.

Prioritize projects that keep our forest canopies intact and covering the land. Maintaining continuous tree canopy is key to shield from hot sun that is continuing to drying out our forest lands. The logging, road building and equipment activities that will create disruption of the forest understory flora (and subsequent compacting of the soil) proposed in this project will further dry out those forest areas, reduce streams and put the greater region at even higher risk of more wildfires.

The title of this plan is misleading. After reviewing the contents and reports, I can not understand why it is called a "restoration project." I urge you to not pursue plans such as these that put our region at risk to more wildfires like those of 2020 (fires which spread faster and more fiercely along the dried out areas of clear cuts and "select" harvested forests.) A wet and undisturbed forest is a safer forest - and reduces the spread & growth of wildfires. This proposal instead increases (!) fire danger, as "shelterwood alternative" technique has a history of high rate of failure - especially when frequent maintenance and prescribed fire are not in the budget & done with extreme diligence.

I have the understanding that the proposal includes a total of nearly 30% of the watershed to be cleared of tree cover (as shown on the Hydrology Report). This is too high an amount, in my opinion, for the forest to maintain a healthy level of moisture (in high summer temperatures we have been experiencing) and will most likely result in no recovery or a decline in the forest flora. In addition, after reviewing satellite images of the area, it seems apparent to me - a person with only a little training in forest ecology - that the area's existing patchwork of clearcut, thinned and narrow corridors of old growth really can't sustain any more logging without eliminating the old growth stands of forest all together.

After reviewing this proposal, it is clear to me that this project's motivation is mainly "to provide timber and other forest products" - and NOT driven by the needs of our communities or sustaining habitat for endangered wildlife. What are our community's needs? Our communities need places to escape the heat, find peace, and find connection as record numbers of people take to the trails during these hard times. We need to support our hospitality and recreation industries by not demolishing the resource on which they depend. The proposal area is not only viewable from & borders the tourist attraction of Badger Creek Wilderness - but proposing to continue to thin that forest and watershed will put a huge portion of our highly popular wilderness areas further into ecological decline.

Let me kindly remind you that recreation (and tourism to see our unique wildlife & forests) bring in more revenue to our state than is possible by all the extraction industries combined. Our forests can produce more revenue for the state from non-destructive recreation and hospitality industries, but your department has not set up adequate programs to tap into this income stream. Ideas just off the top of my head - the US Forest Service could offer "Forest stamps" or "Biodiversity stamps" - purchased like hunting or fishing licenses and could be as collectable as a duck stamp - which would let a wider public show the US Forest Service how much they love a park or an animal and allow them to contribute directly to the US Forest Service like the hunting community does for the ODFW. The US Forest Service could additionally offer local "permits to protect" during certain periods or events to reach revenue goals for trail, forest maintenance and facility projects.

I implore you to create plans that bring your department more revenue from recreation & tourism instead of relying so heavily on archaic logging revenue models. There is a six month waiting list for camping reservations, and each day fills within seconds, at nearly all the facilities around the state. Maybe it's time to review how much a cut Aspira (Reserve America) gets of campground use fees.

Please continue to have meaningful public engagement on this project and please disclose the detailed plans about the proposed additional 17miles of road building to make a complete impact analysis possible.

Thank you for your time,
Suzanne