

Kahlil Martin Wall-Johnson  
[kwjogobonito@gmail.com](mailto:kwjogobonito@gmail.com)  
971-401-6716  
4/21/2020

Jim Roden  
USFS  
70220 E. Highway 26 Zigzag  
OR 97049

RE: Zig Zag Integrated Resource Project scoping comments

I take it that most, if not all Forest Service employees begin their careers with a sense of commitment to their surrounding forests. If this is the case it is unfortunate for you to be the middleman between concerned local citizens and a timber volume quota in which you have had no say. There are however several aspects of the proposed project that I find problematic and/or self contradictory. You are no doubt aware of these contradictions that surface in the attempt to reconcile commercial timber extraction with a superficial concern for Mt. Hood forests and the many species that depend upon it for their health and survival.

I recognize that the *Zig Zag Integrated Resource Project Information Sheet* is intended to be a brief document that explains and justifies the project in a concise manner. Having said that, the document alludes to a handful of ambiguous concepts which play key roles in the justification of most, if not all of the actions here proposed. It would be very considerate of the *'interdisciplinary team of agency resource specialists'* if they could kindly provide a bibliography for some of the literature regarding terms such as *'healthy forest condition'* or *'health of the aquatic system'*. There is rarely a clear consensus on these terms in scientific literature and my intention is not to label any of the definitions you have chosen to use as incorrect. It would simply be clarifying to know what you are referring to and where these ideas come from. For instance how one defines *forest health* varies vastly depending on whether you are viewing *forest health* through the lense of ecology and environmental science, or silviculture.

With the fundamental changes that fields such as environmental science or biology have undergone in the past several decades, does it not seem absurd to be binded by a management plan published more than thirty years ago? Is the implementation of an updated version of the *Mt. Hood National Forest Land and Management Resource Plan* not in your best interests? As the well intentioned Forest Service employees that I take you to be, would an updated version not make it easier to negotiate between concerned citizens and commercial timber quotas?

On another note, the *huckleberry productivity enhancement* mentioned in the proposal is pitched as if it were developed with the consent and advocacy of Confederate Tribes in the Mt. Hood area. Were any first Confederate Tribes involved or consulted in the planning of the Zig Zag project? It seems highly unlikely to me that any of the Confederate Tribes (or Native American groups of any kind) in the area requested that trees be cut down in the Zig Zag ranger district in order to enhance huckleberry productivity, however if said communication did take place, I kindly request that a record of the request be made public. Additionally, due to the fact that reparations for the Native American peoples living near or around Mt. Hood appears to

Kahlil Martin Wall-Johnson

[kwjogobonito@gmail.com](mailto:kwjogobonito@gmail.com)

971-401-6716

4/21/2020

be one of the objectives of this project, why are Native American groups and Confederate Tribes not consulted when other land management decisions are made?

Lastly it deeply concerns me that logging will resume in the Zig Zag ranger district. Since it borders the Portland Metro Area, the localities in the Zig Zag ranger district (and nearby the proposed harvest units) depend greatly on the influx of recreational tourists from Portland, more so than other parts of Mt. Hood. Any damage to the scenery (seen from both roads and trails) or closures to trails or recreational areas will have negative effects on the livelihoods of these towns.