

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/4/2021 4:07:27 AM

First name: Bruce

Last name: Many

Organization:

Title:

Comments: For the Forest Plan Revision for the GMUG, I support Draft Alternative B because it has the highest timber volume target, and I think we need to have more aggressive management in the GMUG.

I am a retired logging contractor, so I know I am biased toward timber harvesting. But I have seen the beneficial effects that logging, correctly planned and correctly implemented, can have on forests. It increases the health of the remaining trees, makes areas less prone to catastrophic fires, increases water yields, provides variety in wildlife habitat, and helps to keep habitat it instead of burning it up.

In addition, logging and thinning provides jobs for local residents, from the actual workers to the mills to the school teachers and shop clerks, and increases the local tax base.

I think the GMUG can be sustainably logged at the 55,000 ccf level (or more) without having negative impacts on recreation or other forest values. And I think that level is necessary to remove dead and dying trees and to make the forest healthier and safer, and able to produce more trees and more water.

I hope that no more Wilderness or Roadless areas (or similar 'off limits' areas) will be designated. There is already too much of the GMUG locked up in these areas that put, I think, the whole Forest and surroundings in jeopardy. Having areas that cannot be logged or thinned and do not have access roads is asking for insect infestations and wildfires. I realize there are people who prefer to use such areas, and that they often provide critical habitat, but these designations should comprise a small area of National Forests, in my opinion.