

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/5/2020 4:53:57 PM

First name: Scott

Last name: Stikkenboom

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am against the implementation of the current plan as it stands. While surely there would be benefits, the execution of this plan is where things will go astray. It is way too vague and decentralized, misclassifies the region as 'foothills' and proposes no real 'restoration' of native species. The southern yellow pine that is promoted in this plan as some sort of savior of our forests is not predominantly native to the region at all!..but very commercially viable.

Given the flaws in the plan's premise, I cannot convince myself that the outcome would be positive.

These lands are the last of the wild and remote inheritance Georgians have left. The USDA is asking us to approve a plan that would not allow the general public input into how specific parcels and areas are to be used, while I have not doubt timber corporations would surely be at the table in deciding which parcels to log. I wonder what the timber industry really wants most? current pine stands available in places much less remote or the few old growth forests remaining? We, the people own these lands, we the people want to continue to use them for recreation, not having logging trucks and forestry equipment fouling our experience. This area is full of tourists on the weekends coming from cities to explore nature. Endangering this will cause much more economic damage to the communities than the jobs logging companies would bring.

Then there is the question of funding. How is this plan proposed to be funded? Why is there no word on this? If all funding is to come from timber sales as I suspect, then our worst fears will come true.