

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/7/2023 3:15:53 PM

First name: Alan

Last name: Coulter

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Greetings and thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

1) I am a Chittenden Reservoir user for paddling and camping. Please leave it like it is -- first come , first serve, unimproved campsites, pristine views of untreated (unlogged) forest in all directions except the developed western shoreline and hillside. Any temporary road building or cutting in the Reservoir watershed with puny 50' stream buffers will be a detriment to water quality. I doubt that you can show or monitor that it will not? I am also concerned about increased run off into headwaters the Otter Creek, the Ottauquechee, and the White River.

2) The 2006 Forest Plan appears to not even mention Climate Change as a factor in GMNF management. That may not be your fault, but clearly the plan is not up to date nor is the science you are choosing to use in the TGIRP. It is now known that mature/old trees accumulate and store more carbon than early successional forest habitat. We need this sequestration and storage to be happening now, not in future decades when the forest gets old again!

You do not seem to account for the trade off between letting mature/old tree acreage stay standing to sequester and store carbon vs the carbon emissions released by all your treatments -- temporary road building, cutting, removing cut trees, transporting them to (you can't track) where, and turning them into you don't know what. All that creates significant emissions in the present, just when we do not want them.

3) I have never been able to get an answer to the following question. How much of GMNF that is not already a buffer, or is at too high an elevation, or on too steep a slope is actually being protected from logging? The usual answer of wilderness and research areas begs the question.

Much of the designated wilderness areas are too wet (Aitken) or too high or steep or hopefully inaccessible for logging anyway. The TGIRP is the perfect place to designate a carbon sequestration and storage reserve that will allow mature/old trees to continue growing toward becoming old growth for future generations. This is managing for Climate Change, and for overall biodiversity for that matter. You could put some of your research into the outcomes of a significantly sized carbon sequestration and storage reserve. Any treatments would be very limited and directed at younger stands of trees within the Telephone Gap project area.

4) Early successional habitat, one of the GMNF mantras! Do you have any idea of how much early successional habitat is already for of Vermont's forests overall? Given that the vast majority of logging in this state occurs on private lands, there is already a lot of early successional habitat and we do not need more in public forests. Let the Ruffed Grouse Foundation (a very small part of the public) work with private landowners.

5) Northern Long-eared bat -- even if you have been unable to find it, it uses "old" forest, and could use the TGP area in the future. If/when you do find this bat, a little buffer area around where you spot it is absurd!

6) Please, no new temporary roads in Inventoried Roadless areas! "Temporary" or not they don't belong there. Large roadless areas are good for the largest diversity of wildlife and good for humans seeking solace away from treated areas. Invasive species can move in, even on temporary roads, and then come the herbicides. Roadless areas left alone are perfect for climate change mitigation.

7) Show me an area that you have treated with clear, patch or shelterwood cuts that has come back with predominately red oak, even if you have planted them. I don't think you can?! If you are managing for red oaks be prepared to show the public the results, 5 yrs, 10yrs., 15 yrs., 20 yrs. later with well established red oak trees.

8) More non-public huts on public land built partially with public money and then not open to the public on an even basis -- not my idea of a good model.

9) Commercial sugaring in public forests. One, you should get a fee based on how much syrup is produced each year. Two, it should not be assumed that maple trees can withstand continuous annual tapping in a time of drought. Perhaps you could follow up any permitting/leasing with some research on tree health in the stand.

Ok, plan away!