All Middle Boulder Creek Project Comments

Comments Received on Online Comment Form

Adam S. 5/8/2025

My family and our neighbors have been hiking and riding up here for years. Is there a plan to continue to allow recreation in this area? Connecting the Hick's Gulch area to the top via a good, climbing

/descending trail would make access to the public lands adjacent to Nederland a valuable asset for the community. Right now a social trail exists however, it is steep and loose.

Josh S. 5/15/25

Eco-Integrity Alliance opposes the proposed "Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project" on the newly acquired 104-acre Boulder County Open Space property of Tucker Ranch and Elk Draw west of Nederland, Colorado. We also oppose any tree removal in the adjacent 43-acre Roosevelt National Forest parcel. While we don't have a position on activities on the privately-owned Arapaho Ranch, we oppose the use of taxpayer funding for any purposes beyond home hardening and/or defensible space pruning up to 100 feet around structures.

Eco-Integrity Alliance does not believe that Boulder County has met the burden of proof in its claims that the tree removal at Tucker Ranch will address "wildfire risk" and/or "public safety." To the contrary, it appears the County has completely ignored: several hundred peer-reviewed studies by hundreds of scientists concluding that cutting forests to supposedly protect communities from wildfire is often ineffective or even counterproductive; abundant evidence from U.S. Forest Service reports showing the same thing; as well as Boulder County's own 2022 study finding a "lack of clear effectiveness of the treatments at increasing surviving live biomass when exposed to a wildfire," and surmising "partially that the high ground fuel loads and decreased tree density led to increased fire intensity as a result of easier wind movement..."

Any arguments that forests at this upper montane elevation (7,500-9000') are "overcrowded" or "overly dense" due to fire suppression are false and fully refuted by the consensus of peer-reviewed science. Indeed, even the U.S. Forest Service acknowledges that lodgepole pine stands have a fire return interval of 300-600 years.

Additionally, Boulder County's management plan for nearby Caribou Ranch (about 2 miles as the crow flies) reaches the conclusion that "today's forests are within the historical range of variability." The County admits that "regional climate appears to be the most important factor in the large-scale forest fires that influence this area rather than the buildup of fuels" and cautions how "thinning lodgepole pine and spruce-fir forests tends to simplify the forest structure and removes important ecological components."

Aside from the County seeming to disregard any and all science that doesn't promote cutting in the name of wildfire—including its own 2022 study "finding a lack of clear effectiveness" of "fuel reduction" in reducing wildfire severity—Eco-Integrity Alliance has ongoing concerns about the lack of meaningful public engagement for "managing" Tucker Ranch.

Before even discussing the issue with the public, the County had already decided the property would be logged and set a date only six months after its official announcement. A more democratic approach would've been to publicly propose the idea of "fuel reduction" immediately upon the County's acquisition of Tucker Ranch, and then allow comment BEFORE deciding to cut, much less setting a date for the cutting.

Due to Boulder County's ongoing refusal to include the full body of science and public opinion into its taxpayer-funded public lands decision making process, Eco-Integrity Alliance calls for a moratorium on all forest cutting on Open Space lands until this changes.

In conclusion, it's important to understand the larger context of aggressive "fuel reduction" logging at Tucker Ranch. While the ecological and climate value of this local parcel is crucial, the "Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project" is simply one of countless examples of the degradation of public lands across the U.S. in the name of "wildfire."

If the U.S. is going to meet its responsibilities under the Global Biodiversity Framework of protecting 30% of world ecosystems by 2030 and 50% by 2050—as well as CO_2 emissions targets under the Paris Agreement—all federal, state, county, and municipal public lands must be set aside as Biodiversity & Climate Reserves off limits to extraction. If Boulder County, the most progressive County in Colorado (if not the U.S.), not only refuses to protect its existing public lands, but is purchasing new lands to log them, we are rushing headlong into what may be irreversible ecological unraveling.

Diane B. 5/29/25

I am very concerned about Boulder County's plans to thin the forests on the Tucker Open Space property and elsewhere.

I have lived in Eldora for 46 years and have come to understand and love the native ecosystems of our area.

Logging out live old growth trees is very harmful to the forest and to our environment.

The tree cover shades the ground and keeps it cool. Trees produce oxygen that we humans breathe and trees absorb the carbon dioxide that we pollute the air with.

Please leave the habitat that wildlife needs and uses intact. Please do not destroy what so many of us love about the mountains.

Do not turn our forests into ecological wastelands. Please read what I wrote about the lodgepole pine ecosystem for a better understanding of its importance in the natural scheme of nature.

Diane B.

Eldora

Diane B. 5/29/25

THE LODGEPOLE PINE FOREST ECOSYSTEM

By Diane J. B

Lodgepole pine forests cover many acres of the montane zone, sometimes in pure stands and sometimes intermixed with other conifers or aspen. When the lodgepole pine grows alone, it has a beautiful symmetrical shape. When it grows in dense stands, its lower branches die back from lack of sun and its form is that of its name – a tall pole used by Native Americans for their teepees.

Compared to the dark green of spruce trees, lodgepole pine appears more yellowish or olive green, and from a distance can be distinguished by its color. Its cones remain on the tree long after maturity, turning gray and lining the branches in chain-like fashion. These cones do not open unless exposed to fire, and indeed the lodgepole forest is often called the "fire forest" because lodgepole pine grows in places that are prone to fire. After a fire the lodgepole is well-adapted to sprouting and growing on sites that are subjected to intense solar radiation and extreme winter cold where other trees could not survive. The soils it grows in tend to be gravelly and poorly developed.

Some places where there are extensive lodgepole forests in our area are on West Magnolia (Haul Road), the top of Eldorado Mountain above Eldora, along the North Fork of Middle Boulder Creek west of Eldora and on the Arapaho Ranch. Lodgepole forests are found between 7,500 – 11,500 feet in elevation. They receive most of their precipitation in the winter as snowfall and they shade and hold snow in place till the spring melt, protecting it from scouring winds. The lodgepole forest on Eldorado Mountain above Eldora holds deep snows that are slowly released in seeps and springs running downhill on the north side of Eldora Valley, recharging the aquifer and local wells. Because these areas tend to be flat or gently sloping, they are popular camping areas, well shaded and covered with soft, dry pine needles. They are also wonderful places for cross-country skiing because of the deep winter snow, gentle terrain and protection from wind.

In summer the lodgepole forest is a dry pine forest and the plants that grow in this forest type are specialized to this dry, shady habitat. Many of them flower early in the season, taking advantage of spring and early summer precipitation. There are several orchids that can be found on the forest floor: spotted coralroot, which looks like pink asparagus, the lovely pink fairy slipper and the rare and inconspicuous purple lady's slipper. The wintergreen family is well represented by pippsissewa, one-sided wintergreen and green-flowered wintergreen. In particularly warm, wet summers there can be an abundance of mushrooms in the lodgepole forest, including delectable chanterelles, morelles and one type of bolete. A reddish-brown plant called pinedrops is parasitic on the roots of lodgepole pine. American mistletoe is another parasite that derives all its nutrition from lodgepole, growing on the branches of the tree. Birds eat the mistletoe seeds and disperse them from tree to tree, and if that doesn't work, the mistletoe has the ability to explosively propel its sticky seeds great distances. Several berry producing shrubs growing in the lodgepole forest that are important to wildlife are: common juniper, kinnikinnick, wild rose, huckleberry, buffaloberry, twinberry and elderberry.

The fauna of the lodgepole forest includes the chickaree (pine squirrel), which caches lodgepole cones beneath trees in great middens. The red-backed vole finds pine seeds, berries, and mushrooms to its taste. Snowshoe hares, white in winter, brown in summer, are easily able to maneuver in deep snow and prefer the dense protective forest. They rest by day and are active nocturnally, nibbling the foliage, twigs and bark of trees and shrubs, as well as grasses and forbs. Elk use the lodgepole pine forest in spring and fall as a migration corridor, because it is easily traveled and because the nourishing grass-like elk sedge is green all year long.

If one sits quietly on a log or rock in the forest, it is possible to observe and hear many birds. Blue grouse, large chicken-sized birds, remain high up in lodgepole pine trees, coming down from their roosts to search for berries and insects. They eat pine needles, twigs and buds as is evidenced in their droppings. During the winter they may burrow into the snow for protection from the elements. In the summer they move about between aspen and coniferous habitats. It is quite a thrill to see the male grouse in its courtship display and to hear its distinctive booming as it tries to impress a hen. Once or twice when hiking alone I have found a grouse nest full of speckled eggs concealed under low shrubs and seen a mother grouse with a string of chicks in tow.

Other birds seen frequently in the lodgepole forest are red crossbills with their specialized bills for opening pine cones to get at seeds, tiny ruby-crowned kinglets singing their cheerful “birdie tweet” song, brown creepers and white-breasted nuthatches adroitly climbing up and down the bark of trees searching for insects, yellow-rumped warblers, and sharp-shinned hawks and Cooper’s hawks singling out birds and small mammals for prey. A rarer bird of prey, the northern goshawk also makes its living in the lodgepole forest, flying at tremendous speed after its prey. It requires a large expanse of undisturbed forest to survive, another reason to protect our national forests and parks.

Dave H. 6/4/25

Tucker Open Space and Elk Draw are part of the Arapaho Ranch - Tucker Homestead Critical Wildlife Habitat, as designated in the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan. They are significant concentration areas for wildlife and nodes of high biodiversity. Their most unique components are the sizeable willow carrs and grasslands on the Arapaho Ranch and Tucker Homestead. These are "grocery stores" containing abundant forage, browse, water, small mammals and insects, which provide food for other animals. The immediate surrounding forests are also critical not only for habitat but also provide important hiding and thermal cover.

Subject properties are also on the west side of the Town of Nederland and there is a desire to conduct wildfire mitigation. In my opinion, it is questionable if the mitigation will be successful as the worst fires will be driven by strong west winds. Removing vegetation and other components of the forest (live trees, snags, deadfall and shrubs) tend to simplify the forest structure: high structural diversity and foliage volume have been associated with high avian species diversity. Removal of trees and shrubs can also result in less hiding cover.

The following comments pertain to proposed wildfire mitigation activities to the upper Tucker/Elk Draw area:

- Because of the Critical Wildlife Habitat designation, there should be a high priority to retaining the ecological values of the site.

- Maintaining hiding cover will be important on upper Tucker and Elk Draw. And if there is any public access to this area, hiding cover becomes even more important. The area is heavily used by elk in spring, as well as other seasons by elk, moose, deer and many mid-sized mammals (winter use is dependent on severity of the snow pack).

- Maintaining structural diversity of the vegetation is important to retaining high wildlife values. There should be an effort to retain significant amounts of low and medium sized shrubs, as well as seedlings and saplings that help provide good horizontal and vertical diversity of the vegetation. I recognize that these ecological components are viewed as "ladder fuels" for wildfire mitigation. The habitat becomes more simplified as structural components are removed.

- Minimize the use of vehicles off of the central road to reduce disturbance to soils and the complex below ground ecosystems of mineral and organic matter, roots, various types of mycorrhizal fungi, bacteria, insects and a host of other organisms. It can take decades for these soils to develop and evolve, but when intact, they help support the living vegetation, are harder to erode, help retain moisture, and resist invasive weeds.

- Maybe there should be a progression in mitigation intensity, with the most intense actions taken on the forests of the west side of Nederland and the 40-acre USFS parcel. Mitigation actions on Elk Draw and Tucker may want to focus more on coarse woody debris on the ground (debris from past management actions and deadfall), though retaining some debris on the forest floor is advised. Retain snags and some of the larger deadfall.

- There should be a spring closure of this area and probably all of Tucker to protect elk spring and calving activities, much like how Caribou Ranch Open Space is managed where the same activities occur (April 1 - July 1 closure). A full closure of this upper Tucker and Elk Draw area for habitat protection could be warranted but will be influenced by how the remainder of Tucker is managed for public use.

- A number of Boulder County Avian Species of Special Concern are present on this portion of Tucker/Elk Draw and appear to be regular breeders : Olive-sided Flycatcher, Golden-crowned Kinglet, Virginia's Warbler, American Three-toed Woodpecker, Band-tailed Pigeon, Pine Siskin, and Northern Flicker. I have been conducting bird inventories on Tucker Homestead for 44 years and can provide GPS information on most recent territories.

- There is some old, dilapidated fencing in this area. It would be great if it could be removed and replaced by wildlife friendly fencing where needed for property demarcation.

Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Alex M. 6/5

The goal of the project should be to maximize the ecological health of the targeted land area. Fuels reduction is a narrow, single goal (wildfire risk mitigation) target, and even for that single goal the actual impact can be positive or negative, depending on the circumstances. A goal of ecological health is much broader and takes into account a wide range of considerations. Generally, ecological health also leads to better resilance against wildfire.

During the meeting on June 12 at the Nederland Community Center I will be interested to hear to what extent planned treatments will actually improve ecological health.

Wesley I. 6/6/25

“Sometimes you have to cut a tree to save a forest” sounds like the kind of saying that fits in this anti-science age and skepticism regarding our forest preservation practices. A case in point is the Middle Boulder Creek Fuel Reduction Project. It is a large-scale landscape treatment project that is funded for a million dollars which breaks down to about $5,000 per acre.

The goal according to the project website (bouldercounty.gov/open-space/management/middle-boulder-creek) is to decrease the amount of hazardous forest fuels and reduce the risk of severe wildfires. The treatment methods of thinning the forests or doing patch cuts stem from the generally accepted science that reducing fuel loads should reduce the severity and/or duration of a wildfire.

A commonsense example would be putting another log or two on a campfire. The more logs on the fire the bigger and hotter the fire. If you want to put out a campfire, you stop adding logs to it. More forest fuel will likely produce a more severe wildfire.

Fire has always been a part of this forest ecosystem but it relies on lower fire temperatures to regenerate the land. Reducing fuel loads improves the chances that an uncontrolled wildfire in the area will not sterilize the ground and leave lasting environmental damage.

The Boulder County Parks & Open Space Department celebrates 50 years of service this year and manages over 100,000 acres in Boulder County. They are tasked with developing the fire plan for the Middle Boulder Creek property. They are uniquely qualified to design and implement this fire plan and do it in a way to maximize the funding impact. Every last dollar should be spent improving the survivability of this Open Space land west of Nederland.

We can’t control when or where a wildfire will start but we can control how much fuel it will consume. Reducing fuel loads and opening up the canopy is something we can do. We have the funds, the talent, the resources and the will to get it done. Long live our magnificent forests.

Julie S. 6/6/25

My name is Julie S. I live in the City of Boulder, and I'm director of the grassroots group, Save Boulder Parks & Trails. I'd like to comment on the "Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project" proposal for Tucker Ranch in Nederland, which is now a part of Boulder County Open Space.

Unfortunately, the effectiveness of this tree-cutting for "wildfire mitigation" is disputed by an abundance of scientific studies, including one financed by Boulder County and City of Boulder in 2022.

This study found, in forests already "thinned" by Boulder County in the name of wildfire mitigation, a "lack of clear effectiveness of the treatments at increasing surviving live biomass when exposed to a wildfire." The authors of the study suggest the reason for this is "partially that

the high ground fuel loads and decreased tree density led to increased fire intensity as a result of easier wind movement, an unintended consequence seen in the 2010 Four Mile fire as well."

Here is the study info: "Fuels treatments and their impact on carbon stocks and fire severity in Boulder and Jefferson Counties and the City of Boulder." 25 January 2022 Authors: Brian Buma1, Anthony Vorster2 , Erin Twaddell 1. University of Colorado, Denver. Brian.Buma@ucdenver.edu & Erin.Twaddell@ucdenver.edu 2. Colorado State University, Fort Collins. Anthony.Vorster@colostate.edu.

Since the County's own study and countless other peer-reviewed studies challenge the goals of this project, we ask that plans to remove any trees in Tucker Ranch be set aside until the conflicts in the scientific literature are properly resolved with full community engagement.

Betina M. 6/7/25

The fabulous beauty, diversity and ecological stability of Tucker Ranch East doesn't need disturbance; but disturbance it will receive. This is because the Wildfire Industrial Complex, with big government money, has arrived. It's human nature to want a quick fix to the natural wildfire processes impacting us - but sadly, this won't do it. Plentiful independent (non-agency) science says that home hardening and defensible space is the way to go. Why can't the money be spent there?

Nederland is a town with numerous 80 acre clearcuts and other intensive management in our treasured places. Since we are told that the goal is to achieve a landscape scale "mosaic" of land uses, a very light touch is indicated here.

Please focus on cleaning up the untreated slash, debris and blowdown from letting in the wind in the logged lodgepole area - and use minimal hand crews only and exclusion areas in the perfect places beyond.

Thanks.

Tom W. 6/10/25

I am writing you as a Nederland resident and as president of Climate Crisis Solutions regarding planned logging ("mechanical forest thinning") on Tucker Open Space. Logging is too often leaned on as an outdated fire management prescription that ends up making things worse. Logging dries out forests, compacts the soil, and removes natural windbreaks, all of which increase, not decrease, fire intensity. Logging also silts streams and erodes streambanks. Logging isn't the solution. Logging is the problem.

Healthy, standing forests absorb and store carbon dioxide, making them one of our strongest lines of defense against accelerating climate breakdown. Standing forests also serve as natural windbreaks and help keep the ground moist and cool by providing essential shade. Forests filter our water; clean our air and provide food, water, and homes for countless species of wildlife. Where is the consideration for what is best for the forest and for local wildlife and their forested habitat? For too long has a human-centric approach dominated land management practices at the expense of the rest of life with whom we share this living planet. Adopting a more holistic, multi-species approach would better serve both humans and our other-than-human kin. For

more information on how best to effectively address wildfire risks and hazards, I recommend to you forest and fire ecologist Chad Hanson's science-based book, "SMOKESCREEN: Debunking

Wildfire Myths to Save Our Forests and our Climate," to help guide the County's efforts going forward.

Logging public forests takes Boulder County in the wrong direction in its fight against climate breakdown. Instead of logging Tucker Open Space, let's protect these forests as a climate refuge for the sake of our collective future.

Thank you for considering my views.

Teagen B. 6/10/25

Dear Boulder County,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Tucker

Ranch Project. The following are some of the points we have concerns about: Firstly is the severe lack of detailed project information available to the public to comment on. We would like to see a draft plan, such as the USFS provides, for further public comment. It is exceptionally hard to provide feedback when we are missing important project details to comment on such as the location of cover types on the map, where certain treatments will be implemented in the project area, the maximum DBH cap (if there is any), and the proposed BA reduction.

This area is designated as critical wildlife habitat and a full management plan should be developed and approved before any projects are undertaken here. We seem to be putting the horse before the cart here.

We are concerned about the potential for further recreation in the Tucker Ranch area following project implementation with particular regards to mechanical equipment. If skid roads are not obliterated and blocked off (which is very hard to do in this area) they often become new recreation routes for bikers, hikers and off roading. If slash is used to cover these skid roads you have simply rearranged fuels and are now contributing to the surface fuel problem you are trying to address. Additionally mechanical equipment often leaves nicks and scars on the remaining

trees that never disappear. We strongly support the use of manual treatment for any location off of the existing road.

Treatments, in particular lodgepole patch/clear cuts, need a plan for follow up maintenance before the initial project is undertaken. Ideally this would be some form of regen thin for lodgepole, or prescribed burn for other cover types. Without follow up maintenance the long term result of your project will likely be an increase in surface and ladder fuels and an increase, rather than reduction, in wildfire risk.

Forest management has questionable effectiveness under wildfire conditions, especially with high wind (which is very common in Nederland, and typically underestimated in percentile severity models), and without prescribed burns (which are not currently part of the plan).

Treatment should not take place in any spruce/fir cover types. These are often dense, wet forests. Though they have a higher fuel loading they are much less likely to burn than drier, more open areas. If you do treat these areas you open them up to drying and increased opportunities for embers to enter. As result you increase the risk for wildfire (i.e. a larger window of conditions under which they will burn), even while reducing fuel. Along these lines there has been very little research done to date on managing these forests, and nothing that conclusively supports management as a good idea.

Some existing snags and coarse woody debris should be left for wildlife habitat while focusing on removing already dead and downed trees in areas of wind throw to address fire mitigation. We would also like to echo Dave Hallock's concerns for maintaining cover, in particular for the elk herd, which uses this area as a major east-west corridor. For the specific migration corridor mapped by CPW we would like to see minimal treatment of forest that provide cover for the elk (typically, but not exclusively, young Doug fir with low, broad branches).

We also support the general concept of reducing the intensity of treatment and shifting to a stronger focus on ecological values the further from the town boundary you move. There have been conflicting statements made about putting firefighters into this area during a wildfire. During extreme wildfire weather, which is the most likely condition under which this area would burn, it should be considered whether or not it is realistic to consider putting firefighters in here, or if more realistically they will be tasked with evacuating Nederland.

We support the following practices that were outlined on the May field trip, and hope to see them put into writing: That there will be no treatment undertaken in pockets of spruce. Other tree types of an age not prone to blow down will be kept within lodgepole patch/clear cuts. Limber pine will be protected (i.e. not cut). Work will be carried out over the winter to reduce the impact of the equipment on the soil and the affect of cutting on nesting and migrating birds. (Note: we do have concern that with potentially warm winters mechanical equipment will still compress the soil, and potentially even be tracked through muddy soil. Operation limits should be put in place not just for timing, but for conditions on the ground).

It's good to hear Boulder County is contact with CPW for their elk collaring data, and has intent to use the data in real time to stop work while the elk are in the area.

Slash management is very important for any project. We support removing slash offsite where possible, and pile burning where not so long as it doesn't result in high mortality of the remaining live trees.

Avoiding treatment in areas with moist soil, and old growth or fire scared lodgepole pine.

Working to close social trails known, or discovered during the project given that this is an area of great importance for wildlife. Acknowledging that any treatment in this area has a limit and will be ineffective in the top 3-5% of conditions.

Again we hope to see a more formal plan for the Tucker Ranch Project for the public to comment on before any final decisions are made.

Robert L. 6/12/25

I have a few comments here:

1. burning/Biofuel use: These forests are already in tough shape having been logged many times over. I think the best health for the forest to would be to mulch to increase soil moisture retention, build back the topsoil

2. Mechanical thinning: Depending on how much thinning is performed changes my attitude towards the entire initiative. I'd prefer to see the forest thinned with forrest resilience to wildfire in mind rather than mass removal that permits a lot of successional growth.

3. Revisit the site: There will be subsequent losses to wind after thinning. Is there a plan to go back to the site to remediate windfall? I suspect not. Many of the fire breaks that were cut in a decade or so ago now have super dense 5-15' successional growth (depending on aspect mostly) which defeats the intention of the firebreaks in the first place. If the forest is to be managed there should be an ongoing strategy to provide for a diverse and resilient forest without issues of undergrowth and long term strategies in place.

4. Different strategies of thinning: I suspect that there is just one thinning protocol that will be applied here. However the forests in this region are highly dependent on aspect which dictates species, density, soil moisture, etc. I'd hope we can apply different thinning strategies to the N aspects than the south facing aspects, which I'd expect also have different fire risk profiles.

Jesse S. 7/21/25

Subject: Public Comment Supporting Recreational Trails Integration into the Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Project Dear Boulder County Parks and Open Space Team, Thank you for your diligent efforts to enhance forest resilience and protect our communities through the Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project. As a longtime Nederland resident and passionate outdoor enthusiast, I see a unique opportunity to seamlessly integrate recreational trails into the scope of this important wildfire mitigation effort.

Nederland and its surrounding areas have a growing need for more bike-friendly and multi-use trails. Incorporating trails into the project would serve the dual purpose of managing forest fuels and enhancing local quality of life through outdoor recreation. Trails connect our community members to nature, improving both mental and physical health. Moreover, users of trails naturally become stewards of the land, motivated to care for and protect these spaces they regularly enjoy. Strategically designed trails can also enhance safety and accessibility for forest management and emergency response. Additionally, sustainably built trails can boost our local economy by attracting visitors who spend time and resources in Nederland's businesses. As you finalize project details, I urge you to explicitly include recreational trail infrastructure as part of your management plans. Integrating sustainable multi-use and mountain bike trails will greatly increase community engagement, ensure continued stewardship, and provide lasting benefits for our town and the surrounding forests.

Thank you for considering this important community perspective. I look forward to continued involvement as the project develops.

Eric D. 7/29/25

Hi there - I live adjacent to some of the fuel reduction areas on the map as we share a border with Arapahoe ranch. I am concerned with the county's approach to wildfire mitigation. By removing too much forest material, I have noticed that the surviving forest is weakening and drying out. Many of the county's attempts to mitigate fire danger is interrupting and damaging the "cycle of life" of the forest.... by removing deadfall, we are robbing the existing/living forest of the critical plant material and nutrients that eventually decompose and return to the soil to nourish the existing and future forest. The long-term effects of these actions often further dry out the forest and weaken the long-term prospects and health of the forest. Please reconsider sacrificing the long-term fire outlook with your attempts at mitigating the near-term fire danger. The best solution is that any dead or decomposing forest material AND and living trees cut down should be shredded and returned to the soil so the remaining forest can absorb and recycle the critical nutrients in the plant material. A certain number of trees that are dead and remain standing should remain standing because they are often the homes of critical wildlife that also contribute to the health of the forest. I'd rather live adjacent to a natural forest habitat the includes near-term fire risk than next to a forest that has been "mitigated" but in reality has weakened the long-term health of the forest and increased the fire danger over the long-term for all of us.

Mary J. 7/31/25

Dear Boulder County Parks and Open Space Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Tucker Ranch Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Project. This network of mixed conifers, marshy areas, meadows, and culturally modified trees (CMT) is a stunning jewel in the crown of Boulder County Parks and Open Space and the State of Colorado. I live nearby and have spent the last 35 years riding horseback and hiking throughout this area. I've attended the field trip hosted by the partnership on this proposal, the latest meeting, and closely tracked the beetle problem that threatens so many of our forests since the 1970's.

I understand that the team has isolated a spot which they intend to use as a staging point in the event of a fire. I find the site chosen probably will fit the bill. I also understand that staff biologists and arborists have commented about the bio-diversity and mini-climates found throughout the property. Perhaps the team has realized by now the incredible diversity and richness that exists at present in this area. And of course they have been able to evaluate past mitigation efforts, in addition to the few areas of lodgepole that are almost completely dead and down (many of them on National Forest land).

Some team members have also toured some of what I believe are CMTs, trees shaped by Native Americans to show such things as spring locations, meeting or directional trees, memorial trees, etc. And while some of the trees may have been shaped by non-human causes, the fact remains that a number of them match trees discussed in online forums about culturally modified trees. From what I have heard so far, there has been no formal and concerted effort by the county at outreach, for example, sending photos and questions to the sixty tribes (many of whom have cultural liaisons) known to have crossed through this area to verify once and for all whether or not there was intervention by human hands, and if so, which tribe. Without this step, I believe the evaluation of the cultural significance of the area, including trail routes and hunting areas, is lost. Native wisdom can complement the scientific data being recorded by team scientists. I encourage the team to set aside staff time to accomplish the important task of outreach, and incorporate what is learned into the final plan before mitigation begins.

I have read many of the very knowledgeable and pertinent comments already received by the team. For the most part, I agree with the overwhelming majority which suggests the implementation of a very cautious and mindful approach to husbanding this resource for the next seven generations, while at the same time providing improved access for firefighters and hikers, and addressing the safety and management concerns we have for forest health. To that

end, perhaps the team can spend some of the money on beetle mitigation in order to preserve the old growth spruce, fir and ponderosa pine. Additionally, I endorse any type of reserve account set up for followup efforts that will track and potentially mitigate impacts by insects, and to monitor and intercede if necessary after the work has been done.

In closing, I think this project has the potential to improve forest health by mitigating beetle infestations, thus reducing fire risk, to provide a staging area for firefighters, and to increase access and remove volume in the lodgepole stands that are in decay.

Thanks again for a very knowledgeable team, lots of great work and great intention!

Comments Received on the Scope of Work Online Comment Form

Josh S. 8/9/25

Since Boulder County's main goal for the Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Project-to "reduce the risk of severe wildfires"-will NOT be met by the county's own admission in the Scope of Work, Eco-Integrity Alliance asks that the taxpayer-funded, ecologically harmful experiment be canceled.

Scope of Work:

"The treatment is not expected to stop a fire, nor does it guarantee any specific outcomes under all fire weather conditions. It is anticipated that up to the level of moderate fire conditions, fire personnel may be able to engage directly with a fire within the treatment area. If extreme fire conditions are present and fire personnel cannot directly engage the fire, treating this area increases the opportunity for, and effectiveness of, aerial suppression efforts such as water and retardant drops."

That aside, Eco-Integrity Alliance is disappointed to see that Boulder County did not appear to alter any of its cutting plans in the Scope of Work despite the overwhelming majority of public comment (10/14 or 70%) offering critique based on peer-reviewed science. The other four comments either perpetuated false, misleading, or at best scientifically disputed opinions or ignored the fire issue altogether.

There are too many false, partially true, or misleading statements along with opinions disguised as facts in the Scope of Work (SOW) to address all of them in these comments, yet enough to determine that the burden of proof has not been sufficiently met for this ecologically-harmful and potentially dangerous experiment to move forward.

Although the evidence suggests to us that Boulder County is uninterested in the full spectrum of peer-reviewed science and public opinion when it comes to using our tax dollars to cut down our public forests, we'll respond to certain parts of the SOW to have this on the public record.

Scope of Work:

"The primary goal of forest management at Tucker Ranch and Elk Draw is fire mitigation with the additional goal of forest resilience. The area has experienced fire in the past as evidenced by numerous fire scars and will experience fire again in the future. Treatments on the property will aim to foster an ecosystem that is able to accept fire in a less catastrophic way."

The SOW ignores the vast body of peer-reviewed studies finding "fuel reduction" to be ineffective or even counterproductive at reducing fire severity. https://eco-integrityalliance.org/wildfire-fuel-reduction-scientific-studies/

Boulder County even ignores the findings of the two most relevant local studies that dispute the idea that cutting forests will reduce wildfire severity, much less protect communities. 1) FOURMILE CANYON FIRE FINDINGS United States Department of Agriculture / Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station (August 2012) "No evidence was found that the progression of the Fourmile Canyon Fire was altered by the presence of fuel treatments and the treated areas were probably of limited value to suppression efforts on September 6."

"The changes in fire activity in this area were apparently a result of changing weather (increases in air humidity and decreases in wind speed, see Figure 28) and topography (northerly aspect) rather than any changes in forest structure and composition resulting from a fuel treatment."

"Note the areas where the fuels were treated along the "Escape Route" were burned more severely than neighboring areas where the fuels were not treated."

2) "Fuels treatments and their impact on carbon stocks and fire severity in Boulder and Jefferson Counties and the City of Boulder" by climate scientist Brian Buma, Ph.D. and Erin Twaddel from University of Colorado and research scientist Anthony Vorster from Colorado State University in Fort Collins, found in forest plots previously "thinned" in the name of "wildfire mitigation" by Boulder County Open Space and other entities, a "lack of clear effectiveness of the treatments at increasing surviving live biomass when exposed to a wildfire."

Study authors theorize "partially that the high ground fuel loads and decreased tree density led to increased fire intensity as a result of easier wind movement, an unintended consequence seen in the 2010 Four Mile fire as well."

Scope of Work:

"The treatment is not expected to stop a fire, nor does it guarantee any specific outcomes under all fire weather conditions. It is anticipated that up to the level of moderate fire conditions, fire personnel may be able to engage directly with a fire within the treatment area. If extreme fire conditions are present and fire personnel cannot directly engage the fire, treating this area increases the opportunity for, and effectiveness of, aerial suppression efforts such as water and retardant drops."

It's frustrating how the main thrust of Boulder County's "mitigation" is "community protection," yet even the studies that show some reduction of fire severity during moderate or low intensity fires-which are usually easily contained and do not pose much of a threat to communities-candidly acknowledge that they do not reduce the spread of wildfire, as does this Scope of Work: "Finally, fuel treatments generally are designed to mitigate wildfire intensity and effects but they are not necessarily intended to impede fire spread or reduce fire size." (Adapting western North American forests to climate change and wildfires: 10 common questions by Prichard et al., 2021)

Yet "community protection" from wildfire is the main selling point behind these "treatments" to the public, media, elected officials, and government agencies, and it is undoubtedly why this experiment was funded and is still moving forward at this time. That funding could instead be put towards proven-to-be-effective home hardening and defensible space pruning 100 feet around homes adjacent to Tucker Ranch as well as patrolling of the area to discourage human-caused wildfire, the source of 84% of wildfires.

Scope of Work:

"Additionally, opening up the canopy will enhance understory vegetation, both in species richness and cover, leading to more grasses, forbs, and shrubs that quickly regrow after a fire, which helps to stabilize the soil post fire."

The SOW acknowledges that this tree removal will INCREASE flammable vegetation, particularly that more likely to spread fires most quickly.

The study, "The fastest-growing and most destructive fires in the US (2001 to 2020)," by Jennifer K. Balch et al. from CU Boulder, analyzes 60,000 fires across forests and grasslands. It concludes that the most rapid wildfires-such as the nearby Marshall Fire-occurred in grasslands, not forests, which "highlights the role of fine, flashy fuels and low wind friction," not trees.

Scope of Work:

"TPA [Trees Per Acre] will decrease from approximately 683.79 to approximately 356.28, with a 49.9% reduction in trees per acre for DBH classes 0-8 and 26.2% reduction in trees per acre for DBH classes 8-16." Despite the local forest not being out of its historical range of fire return interval (see proof of that below in our previous comments), the county wants to remove between one quarter to one half the forest cover at Tucker Ranch, including trees up to 16 inches in diameter. At the public meeting on August, Boulder County Open Space's Scott Golden said "I want to remove as much material as I can" from Tucker Ranch.

Scope of Work:

"WindNinja, a wind modeling program, was used to assess areas with heavier wind load by running the program using weather data from some past high wind advisory days." While the wind modelling shows which areas are CURRENTLY most impacted by wind, the SOW does not include any data on the potential increase in wind spread due to forest cutting. Nor the likelihood of that increased wind spreading fire more quickly to adjacent homes and the Town of Nederland, which can threaten not just structures, but evacuees and firefighters.

As aforementioned, we're including our previous comments below, since none of them appeared to have been addressed in the SOW. Once again, we ask that this experimental project be canceled and the taxpayer funding be allocated to actions proven to actually protect communities from wildfire.

***

Eco-Integrity Alliance opposes the proposed "Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project" on the newly acquired 104-acre Boulder County Open Space property of Tucker Ranch and Elk Draw west of Nederland, Colorado. We also oppose any tree removal in the adjacent 43-acre Roosevelt National Forest parcel. While we don't have a position on activities on the privately-owned Arapaho Ranch, we oppose the use of taxpayer funding for any purposes beyond home hardening and/or defensible space pruning up to 100 feet around structures. Eco-Integrity Alliance does not believe that Boulder County has met the burden of proof in its claims that the tree removal at Tucker Ranch will address "wildfire risk" and/or "public safety." To the contrary, it appears the County has completely ignored: several hundred peer-reviewed studies by hundreds of scientists concluding that cutting forests to supposedly protect communities from wildfire is often ineffective or even counterproductive; abundant evidence from U.S. Forest Service reports showing the same thing; as well as Boulder County's own 2022 study finding a "lack of clear effectiveness of the treatments at increasing surviving live biomass when exposed to a wildfire," and surmising "partially that the high ground fuel loads and decreased tree density led to increased fire intensity as a result of easier wind movement..."

Any arguments that forests at this upper montane elevation (7,500-9000') are "overcrowded" or "overly dense" due to fire suppression are false and fully refuted by the consensus of peer-reviewed science. Indeed, even the U.S. Forest Service acknowledges that lodgepole pine stands have a fire return interval of 300-600 years. Additionally, Boulder County's management plan for nearby Caribou Ranch (about 2 miles as the crow flies) reaches the conclusion that "today's forests are within the historical range of variability." The County admits that "regional climate appears to be the most important factor in the large-scale forest fires that influence this area rather than the buildup of fuels" and cautions how "thinning lodgepole pine and spruce-fir forests tends to simplify the forest structure and removes important ecological components."

Aside from the County seeming to disregard any and all science that doesn't promote cutting in the name of wildfire-including its own 2022 study "finding a lack of clear effectiveness" of "fuel reduction" in reducing wildfire severity-Eco-Integrity Alliance has ongoing concerns about the lack of meaningful public engagement for "managing" Tucker Ranch. Before even discussing the issue with the public, the County had already decided the property would be logged and set a date only six months after its official announcement. A more democratic approach would've been to publicly propose the idea of "fuel reduction" immediately upon the County's acquisition of Tucker Ranch, and then allow comment BEFORE deciding to cut, much less setting a date for the cutting.

Due to Boulder County's ongoing refusal to include the full body of science and public opinion into its taxpayer-funded public lands decision making process, Eco-Integrity Alliance calls for a moratorium on all forest cutting on Open Space lands until this changes.

In conclusion, it's important to understand the larger context of aggressive "fuel reduction" logging at Tucker Ranch. While the ecological and climate value of this local parcel is crucial, the "Middle Boulder Creek Fuels Reduction Partnership Project" is simply one of countless

examples of the degradation of public lands across the U.S. in the name of "wildfire." If the U.S. is going to meet its responsibilities under the Global Biodiversity Framework of protecting 30% of world ecosystems by 2030 and 50% by 2050-as well as CO2 emissions targets under the Paris Agreement-all federal, state, county, and municipal public lands must be set aside as Biodiversity & Climate Reserves off limits to extraction. If Boulder County, the most progressive County in Colorado (if not the U.S.), not only refuses to protect its existing public lands, but is purchasing new lands to log them, we are rushing headlong into what may be irreversible ecological unraveling.

Andrew D. 8/10/25

I live at 787 W 1st Street, Nederland CO 80466. We are working on mitigating our property. In the past, someone cut several large fir trees on USFS land that fell on/or adjacent to our land. We would like to help engage the project managers to see how we can help with the removal of these large trees that are on the boundary of our land and USFS land. Unfortunately, we were traveling this summer and not able to make it to any of the community meetings. However, we would like to connect with the project.

Thank you

Betina M. 8/13/25

Amazingly our nation's problem of the erosion of democracy is playing out here. In spite of being promised that the project would reflect our community's wishes, and a great majority of comments saying take great care, a big bad Trumpian Fix Our Forests cut is being proposed. And objective science says it won't work for wildfire protection. Take a look at what controversial, intensive logging did for the North Rim of the Grand Canyon. It burned to smithereens. We shouldn't be wasting taxpayer money and fostering a false sense of security.

Redemption please:

- Much bigger reserve "leave" areas. You and I know the perfect places. Leave them be - for beauty, refuge and carbon sequestration.

- Preserve, respect and protect the many cool, shady spruce/fir microhabitats so important to many species in our broiling world.

- I am learning about site fidelity for birds - and butterflies! - where they return to the very trees where they were born. What happens when those trees are gone and the forest is transformed?

- It's great to leave the Legacy Trees but the science of soil ecology and mutualism says leave their neighbors too.

- No new access and leave the road primitive. Obliterate and restore any routes you make.This is a valuable and sensitive ecosystem, not a woodlot.

- Mechanization might be good for your contractors but careful hand crews (jobs!) are better for the land and wildlife.

- Monitor and STOP the fragmenting and damaging illegal recreation so common in all of our mountain forests. Address this on the adjacent public lands too (take a landscape view).

Theodore Roosevelt 1903: "Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it."

This won't be Wilderness (I wish it was) but it can be a place where respect, restraint and a substantial revision of the draft plan - please - make it the best that it can be.

Susan W. 8/15/25

My Concerns:

1. I appreciate county intentions to minimize ecosystem harm during logging, but harm will unavoidably be done. To reduce harm, I hope the county will maximize the size of areas to be left untouched--critical wildlife habitat and mesic areas, for example--and minimize the number of trees to be removed in other areas. 75% of lodgepole and Doug Fir between 0-8" DBH and 75% of subalpine fir between 0-3" DBH seems excessive, especially given the tremendous winds, whose velocity will be increased through openings. I also question the necessity of removing 50% of Ponderosa between 0-8", 50% of lodgepole between 8-16", and 25% of both Ponderosa and Doug Fir between 8-16". The local USFS estimates conifers in our area average 1" in diameter per decade, with some in dryer areas growing only 1" in 20 years. Trees of 10" DBH in dry areas are likely to be between 100 and 200 years old; elsewhere in the draft, it's noted that 200-year-old trees are considered legacy trees. I hope the county will be guided by human experience, knowledge, and observation on the ground when marking trees for removal and NOT by computer models, which we were told at 7/31 meeting created the percentages of trees to be removed. Although the draft designates one section as "high wind" area, the entire area should be considered high wind and openings minimized to avoid excessive windthrow and desiccation. Trees reduce both surface heat and wind speed, both important for limiting fire risk--the cool of the forest is something we all appreciate more as our planet heats up.

2. As noted in draft and in others' comments, it makes sense to allow more openings for possible firefighter access in areas on the eastern edge of the project, especially in the USFS parcel, which is not in this current project, but which already has open areas. It's doubtful in a high wind situation that any areas farther west could be safely used by firefighters.

3. I applaud the county's efforts to close unauthorized trails. I hope areas of especially critical wildlife habitat will be closed all year, and that most-- if not all-- of TED will be closed during the

calving season, similar to Caribou open space. I strongly oppose mountain biking trails in TED. There are already many options for mountain bikers in our area, including West Magnolia. Bicycles are especially disturbing to wild animals, and our mountain biking community needs to be educated on the reasons why not every "wild" place should be open for their recreation. I was upset to hear that recreationists have disturbed local goshawks, causing them to move their nest some seven times (if my memory serves from the 7/31 meeting). I don't know where the county plan for Tucker Ranch recreation stands, but I hope any hiking trails will be situated with consideration for wildlife and that trails will be few and narrow for single-file hikers.

4. County Forester Golden stated the county will return to the area to thin regeneration and keep surface fuels in check, which is important.

5. I welcome May Jarril's suggestion that native American tribes be consulted on culturally modified trees in TED. The USFS lists native tribes on referral lists for their logging projects, but I'm not aware of their actual involvement. This Middle Boulder Creek project would be an excellent opportunity to reach out to members of tribes whose history in this area dates back thousands of years.

6. I'm skeptical that extensive logging of forests reduces wildfire risk to communities; home hardening and mitigation of the home ignition zone are the critical factors, as noted in many studies by fire scientists, including from the USFS. I understand the county's funding is for removal of trees, and this will happen regardless public opinion; I hope the county will do their very best to remove no more than is necessary and to focus openings for possible

firefighter use at the eastern edge.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Wesley I. 8/15/25

In assessing the scope of work it is important to recognize the difference between proven science and science misinformation or disinformation.

This is an excellent article discussing forestry and wildfire misinformation:
https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/pubs_journals/2022/rmrs_2022_jones_g003.pdf

This flyer written in 2024 has links analyzing 30 years of landscape level treatments:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/rm/pubs_journals/rmrs/sycu/2024/sycu5_2024_06_burning_questions.pdf

Using science successfully is the key to this project. Separating scientific evidence from pseudo-science misinformation is critical in developing landscape scale forest mitigation plans. Best of luck getting this right.

Comments Summarized from Verbal Comments at May 17th, 2025 Field Site Visit

How is the County identifying and marking culturally modified trees

How is fire (and fire reintroduction) being considered in this plan since it brings new ecosystems and is a natural process?

How many piles have been left in the area versus what is planned to be pile burns?

Does fuel reduction make a difference in stopping fires (e.g. reference to Cold Springs Fire) and are there tradeoffs/impacts to wind patterns that can lead to more intense fires?

How are they considering soil horizons as part of ecosystem health and habitat structure when creating prescriptions?

How is Boulder County determining/weighing what is critical and thriving habitat versus what is considered wildfire risky fuels (as oftentimes they are one in the same)?

Why can't the County focus on cleaning out surface dead fuel instead of cutting live growth?

What is the difference between forest restoration and forest resilience?

Can the County consider not cutting the north side because of wind vectors?

Is Boulder County integrating/have access to CPW's elk monitoring data?

How/what can be done to reduce the grazing pressure of elk and moose in the area on aspens?

What are the impacts of fuel reduction on bird habitat?

What will be done about unsustainable recreation and social trail building in the area?

Comments from Daily Camera Open Forum

Diane B. 5/21/2025

Lodgepole and ponderosa pine forests hold soil on steep slopes in place. They shade the ground and keep it cool and moist. They break the fierce winds that roar down from the tundra, and they minimize windthrow hazards. Chainsaws are raised in the air, Elon Musk style, ready to take down the evil forests on the 323-acre Tucker County Open Space and on Park Hill at Arapaho Ranch near Nederland. What did the forests do wrong? Nothing, itís just that 9 out of 10 wildfires are started by human stupidity and carelessness, and the forests have to pay for it. Why does this matter? Well, the forests are sanctuary to many forms of wildlife, and this will cause loss of habitat for them. Not only are trees rich in conifer seeds and insects targeted for removal, but also the shrub understory, such as kinnikinnick and Oregon grape, which is rich in berries for birds and wildlife, will be removed. Especially targeted is the low-growing common juniper with its tasty berrylike cones that robins solitaires and bluebirds love. Groundcover, including wildflowers such as fairy slipper orchids and spotted coralroot, will be crushed by heavy machinery. And old dead snag trees used by birds for nesting sites and thermal cover will be gone. Is this what we want in our mountains ó an urban landscape with only pavement and non-native bluegrass?

Comments from Emails to Project Team

Dave H. 5/21/2025

Why the war on junipers ? (I recognize that they are flammable, but they also have important values for wildlife (forage, berries). Being the property is a critical wildlife habitat I would give the upper hand to retaining them on the landscape. Enough other flammable vegetation will be removed. Find a way to retain enough of the structural components (snags, deadfall, shrubs, seedlings/saplings) to retain the high wildlife values found on the property. (I have kicked around western Boulder County for some years and have conducted bird inventories in post-management landscapes. What I find is a loss of within-stand structural diversity, which tends to simplify the wildlife community and favors habitat generalists over specialists.). Why is a formal management plan is not being done before any management is conducted on the property? (All or portions of the property are designated critical wildlife habitat and node of high biodiversity. It would appear appropriate to look at the whole picture and all the resources rather than piecemeal management applications.)

Mary J. 8/16/25

Hi Scott, I was disappointed that there was only two weeks to submit comments on the mitigation plan. I had a nasty bug that is just now struggling to let go.

I wanted to walk the hills and think about the mitigation plan before commenting. Here are my comments, if they are of interest.

Public Comments

1. The scope of the work is extensive and there are areas that I think warrant further review.

2. I don't think cutting 75% of the young Doug Fir makes any sense at all. They are fire resistant and add diversity to the ponderosa you seem to want to encourage. I think the young Dougs should be encouraged.

3. In a similar vein, cutting a bunch of young spruce is probably unnecessary and will make this incredibly diverse forest eventually devolve.

4. Very important, when you talk of cutting half of the eight inch to large trees, when I tour the forest, what strikes me is this: dead trees and deadfall easily make up one third of the mass in many locations. In many locations, counting the dead and deadfall as part of your mass will eliminate the need for massive cutting and subsequent heating of the forest floor.

5. Given that very few living trees, in many locations, need to be cut, I suggest very limited utilization of mechanical harvest. The wildlife up there is diverse and has been undisturbed, the presence of these wracking machines may force many birds and animals to relocate.

As a final note, I think I and many of the people at the last meeting felt that previous meetings and field trips were a waste of time, as it appears that few if any of the suggestions have been taken. I urge you to call another meeting, and explain how you came up with these numbers, and how you plan to calculate the numbers.

Thank you for your attention to this. Please forward to others on the team if you think appropriate.

All the best,

Betina M. 5/19/25

I am going to ask for large "leave" areas (spruce/fir, North Ridge, old growth, elk cover, seeps) past the lodgepole we were in (a GREAT example of screwed up logging). For the private part : wonderful old growth should be protected. It doesn't need much because Park Hill is meadowy. The rest is wildlife cover. It should be known that Arapaho Ranch has fenced and posted National Forest. That's very problematic. And of course should not be logged. Downstream from here on private land the owner drank the Kool Aid that dead trees are evil and cut down (and just left - very common) old aspen that could have been riparian cavity trees for wildlife. A wildlife expert told me that the logging already done for Arapaho Ranch along the Eldora Road is too open and removed cover for elk. This is a CPW defined Elk migration route. I'm looking into whether aspen "release" works. I think aspen regen should only be encouraged in the log landing. As Dave said, areas are constantly being disturbed and never reach ecological stability. Weeds and blowdown will occur in any openings. I would like hand crews only beyond the lodgepole†tract. I don't want a big bad road system.

Comments Written Down from Community Meeting on June 12th, 2025

Prompt: Are there particular tree species or forest conditions you would like to see preserved or encouraged? Response: Open spaces so aspen can flourish and relieve browsing pressure on existing stands

Prompt: Are there particular tree species or forest conditions you would like to see preserved or encouraged? Response: Continued community involvement post treatment

Prompt: Are there particular tree species or forest conditions you would like to see preserved or encouraged? Response: Support wildlife

Prompt: Are there particular tree species or forest conditions you would like to see preserved or encouraged? Response: Berries, wild oats, doug fir <3, IPS

Concerns about ips and beetles

Maintaining foliage volume is important for avian diversity

Juniper important for wildlife and soil stabilization.

Remove juniper where it is a hazard but leave it in further remote areas.

Parry's oatgrass on West Park Hill

Prompt: What types of forest conditions or wildlife habitat do you value most in the project area? Response: The big trees, the grassy areas and have little springs on them

Prompt: What types of forest conditions or wildlife habitat do you value most in the project area? Response: Culturally modified trees (CMT). Area of social/indigenous significance

Prompt: What types of forest conditions or wildlife habitat do you value most in the project area? Response: No new roads. Take tree mark. No remaining paint

Prompt: What types of forest conditions or wildlife habitat do you value most in the project area? Response: The wet places mesic!

Water resilience needs to be a priority