

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/11/2021 10:52:47 PM

First name: Ashlee

Last name: Jones

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I would like to begin by thanking the Forest Service for using a programmatic EA, as well as for committing to designate areas to manage for old-growth.

I now would like to Ask the Forest Service to avoid gridlock by narrowing the project to focus on issues with broad support. The Forest Service could gain efficiency, do more, and gain support for a broad program of future work by excluding areas that will stir up disagreements and are widely acknowledged as being healthier than other areas. For example, the Forest Service should limit the scope of the project to:

Exclude Georgia's Mountain Treasures from commercial timber harvests

Restrict commercial timber harvests to "fire adapted" forest types. Those forest types cover 77% of the Foothills Landscape and include the areas where most people agree active management is most needed.

Exclude areas more than half a mile from a road. "Temporary roads" actually last decades to centuries, and regardless of any good that logging accomplishes, access roads disrupt ground water, fragment habitat, and destroy soil.

Stop plans to log in mesic forests.

Not cut all trees in attempts to regenerate southern yellow pine. In some southern yellow pine stands, the Forest Service plans to cut most of the trees then come back later and cut the rest of the trees. The second harvest is unnecessary and damages forest structure and wildlife habitat value.

Not to thin in mesic forests. Forests on moist sites naturally have dense canopies.

Manage forests the way they really work: Southern Appalachian forests naturally contain trees of many different ages, species that typically live over 200 years, and young trees growing in response to the death of one or a few trees. In contrast the Forest Service manages as if all the trees in a stand should be the same age, as if trees are old at 80 years, and as if disturbances typically wipe out entire stands of trees.

Choose Alternative 3. Alternative 3 excludes areas that the Forest Service's own plan identifies as "unsuitable" for "timber production."

Thank you for your time and consideration.