Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/22/2023 12:26:04 AM
First name: Allen
Last name: McGonagill
Organization:
Title:
Comments: I object to this project moving forward.

Firstly. We are working off of a forest plan from 2006 that should have been updated after 15 years, so 2 years ago now. In the last 15 years, we have learned a significant amount about the pace of climate change and the importance of land management in sequestering carbon. We've also learned about how cutting negatively impacts sequestration potential. So the foundational plan we are operating under is outdated. We need to be placing a high priority on the preservation of our carbon sinks in New England - which is the most carbon-dense area of forest in the country (outside of small geographic areas in the redwoods of CA). In addition to the importance of carbon sequestration increasing, we have also seen an increasing importance of conservation. A recent report showed that the tracking of 30,000 populations of animals have resulted in a 69% decline in animal populations since the 1970s.

Secondly. The USFS shared on a call that the goal for "old growth" (100 year old trees) forest was only 1% of the green mountains. That's unbelievably low. This Telephone Gap project alone represents an area 25% of that goal. Old growth forests are essential in developing a robust and diverse ecosystem and in sequestering carbon (see urgency of both above). If we are determining what to do with these 12,000 acres, why was turning an equivalent area into old growth forest considered as an option? We should be considering setting a goal of 50% or something in that range in order to start sequestering more carbon and moving towards the US's commitment to the Paris Agreement - which we are nowhere near on track for. Can the USFS start a process to revisit this 1% number and determine why old growth forests as a resource cannot be expanded and further protected?

Thirdly. About half of the proposed cutting is uneven selection (meaning single or group selection). Why is this not the standard policy? If it is seen as preferable in that it is closer to how forests would age naturally and doesn't fully destroy habitat, why would this not be a standard policy. I would like to see the USFS justify why the remaining half of this project couldn't be single or group selection as well.

Lastly. I'll leave you with a question. Who are we serving with our forest planning & why is it assumed that we must prioritize logging and industry (with small areas for human recreation) over anything else? I would encourage the USFS to put out a public poll to see what the general public wants done with this land. A small few people benefit from the continued logging of the USFS at the expense of all of our future generations via climate change and having any preserved lands for other species.