Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/2/2024 5:00:00 AM

First name: Sean Last name: Brogan

Organization: North Carolina Forest Service

Title: Asst. State Forester-Forest Mngt. & Development

Comments: Re: North Carolina Forest Service Comments on proposed Old Growth Management DirectiveDocumentation Citation: 88 FR 88042; Document Number: 2023-27875 Notice of Intent to prepare anenvironmental impact statementDear Sir or Madam:The North Carolina Forest Service (NCFS) appreciates the opportunity to respond to the United StatesDepartment of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an environmentalimpact statement (EIS) to amend all land management plans for units of the National Forest System toinclude consistent direction to conserve steward and recruit future old-growth forest conditions. Although the NCFS does not manage National Forest woodlands, our organization has very close workingties with our North Carolina-based U.S. Forest Service leadership and staff. We have a history of positive collaboration on natural resource matters such as but not limited to wildfire control; water qualityprotection; invasive species control; storm response; and staff training. North Carolina has had successfulGood Neighbor Authority agreements; Joint Chiefs project implementation; and North Carolina ForestAction Plan partner discussions. We are very invested in how North Carolina's National Forests aremanaged, as they have significant impacts on our citizens, environment, economy, and lands beyond their property lines. We respectfully offer the following comments as they relate to the old growth directive being considered:A. Recognition of old growth importance:The North Carolina Forest Service recognizes the value of old growth forests, and in particular, the role that our National Forests play in ensuring these forest age classes are part of ourlandscape. We agree that special consideration should be given to this topic during themanagement planning process. National Forests should not be managed with old growth classmaintenance and recruitment objectives as the only/over-riding criteria, but we believe it shouldcarry weight when developing a balanced management approach. This is particularly true in stateswhere adjacent private woodlands tend to have notably younger stand classes as the norm.B. Importance oflocal & Damp; state-level stakeholder collaboration:Our National Forests are the source of numerous environmental and societal benefits. Balanced, scientifically based management is often challenging as meeting some resource objectives maydirectly conflict with meeting other objectives. Diverse local and state-level stakeholder input and collaboration is a critical component in the management planning process. North Carolina has four National Forests (Nantahala; Pisgah; Uwharrie; and Croatan). The Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests make up a large percentage of western North Carolina. TheNorth Carolina Forest Service and many other stakeholders worked diligently between 2014 -2023 to provide input and advice as the Nantahala - Pisgah National Forest Management Plan wasrevised. Reference the four attached letters (dated 2014; 2020; and 2022) from the North CarolinaForest Service and North Carolina Department of Agriculture & De inputs and recommendations for therevised National Forest Management Plan. A large number of additional diverse stakeholders werealso "at the table". This stakeholder process took a very long time to finalize, but we believe therevised Nantahala - Pisgah National Forest Management Plan offers a balanced approach inmeeting the many multiple resources objectives. This includes the identification and intentionalmanagement of an old growth network across the Forests that should ensure sustainable age classmanagement moving forward. This is only one example of a National Forest Management processand plan potentially affected by this directive, but it is a very applicable and notable example forour State.C. Use of top-down organizational directives:We understand and respect the need for occasional "top-down directives". There are times whenNorth Carolina Forest Service leadership provides such guidance in order to communicate pointsof emphasis and ensure consistency. That being said, we recommend the proposed old growth directive be used to "steer" themanagement of our National Forests but that they not replace or supersede National ForestManagement Plans that already address old growth management in a responsible and proactivemanner. Federal directives that replace local and state-level partnership approaches will likelyundermine balanced approaches that work for that National Forest in that particular State, resultingin diminished stakeholder trust and undesirable forest conditions. Our final comment associated with Washington, DC-based Administration Directives is they havethe potential to create a "see saw" environment that makes responsible management of ourNational Forest lands even more difficult. The scenario

of ever-shifting mandates with each newAdministration could wreak havoc with the implementation of long-term National ForestManagement Plans. In the case of old growth management, we recommend sustainable, still be "living with the Forest" long after the current Administration leaves office. This wouldalso help create reasonable management of our old growth that complements the Forests' otherresource objectives ... vs. one that shifts from "little protection" to "absolute protection" as Administrations come and go.D. Need for balanced active forest management: Maintenance and recruitment of old growth stands is an important resource objective for ourNational Forests. There may be other significant resource objectives that may need to be considered, ultimately calling for some compromises. Examples could include but are not limited to increasingforest health and resiliency; replacing certain species in order to restore species of concern on thelandscape; and diversifying overall Forest stand age class inventories. In the previously-cited example of the Nantahala - Pisgah National Forest, one of the primary challenges is the overall lackof early successional habitat. Active forest management to address and meet such objectives that are not old growth-centric may be warranted and reasonable components to factor in whendetermining the future conditions of a given stand.E. Inventory & resource assessment:In order to responsibly manage our old growth forests, National Forest staff must first accuratelyunderstand forest inventories. We recommend robust resources (ex. funding; staff; use oftechnology) be provided to U.S. Forest Service managers so the foundation of their decisionsoriginate from current and scientifically based data. We recognize the complexity and importance of old growth stand management on our National Forests, and appreciate the attention being given to the subject. Our hope is that National Forest staff have the abilityto manage these lands in a balanced manner. This should include decisionmaking resulting in sustainableforest conditions that meet numerous resources needs that are not solely based on and limited by old growthcriteria. Respectfully,

ATTACHMENT: NCFS Comments-Old Growth Forest Directive 2-2-24 final signed.pdf - Comments copy/pasted to text box; coded/completed.

ATTACHMENT: 2020-6-23-NCFSComments-NanPisqahForestPlans-final.pdf - N.C. Forest Service leadership comments on draft Nantahala and Pisgah National Forest Plan.

ATTACHMENT: Comments Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests Plan Revisions_4-28-14_Troxler.pdf - Comments regarding the Notice of Intent, the Preliminary Need for Change and the Proposed Action, published in the Federal Register on March 12, 2014 for the plan revisions for the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests.

ATTACHMENT: NCFS Comments Nantahala and Pisgah National Forests Revision Plans 4-28-14 Final.pdf - North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services comments during the scoping phase of revisions to the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forest Plan.

ATTACHMENT: NCFS Feedback-Nant Pisgah Proposed Plan 3-21-22.pdf - North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the Proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the Proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the Proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates to the Proposed Nantahala & Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services feedback as it relates feedback as it relat