

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/13/2023 7:56:15 PM

First name: Bill

Last name: Copeland

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Based on the plan details submitted by the USFS, I oppose the plan to extensively log in the Telephone Gap in Vermont.

The plan proposes to "adjust" the proportion of several forest types without any justification whatever. No ecological or public benefit is apparent. The plan simply makes the unfounded assertion that there are too many hardwoods. Somehow this recovering forest has developed its current character at odds with the ecological conditions! It is hard to understand why professionals who should understand forest ecosystems would say such a thing. Perhaps the softwoods are preferred for extraction forestry but if that is the reason then the plan should say so and not be secretive. This lack of honesty is just one reason that I oppose the plan.

The assertion about hardwoods is almost certainly wrong too, from the standpoint of resilience to climate change. It is clear that the northern forest is going to change dramatically in the near future. Toward what? Toward Oak and Hickory and Cherry and Beech. White Pine may do well too but it would be especially foolish to attempt to encourage more Hemlock, spruce or Red Pine which have shown they are not suited to the present conditions and even less to the conditions that will prevail in the very near future.

A third reason that I object to this plan is that the forest currently in place is substantial in size but still relatively young and in a state of high productivity, meaning that it is both actively storing carbon at a high rate and it already contains a large carbon pool. Logging this forest will be a setback for regional climate and carbon goals. At the current social cost of carbon of \$120/ton, this proposal can only be a loser when the cost accounting is done.