

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/31/2023 5:00:00 AM

First name: Jim

Last name: Furnish

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the good conversation y'day, The project is drawing heat, affording you and FS an opportunity to listen hard, make some adjustments, and demonstrate fairness. Which leads me to a topic I meant to discuss...

the issue of converting M/OG forest to seed/sap openings for "improved" w/ habitat. I really struggle with this, while admitting that openings change habitat and afford some species an advantage (but disadvantage others). Jay... what is REALLY missing in New England forests generally is OG!! And how do we restore OG, except by letting M forest become more mature! FS can and should make adjustments based on new knowledge and facts (eg endangered bat status, Biden's EO, worsening climate change, new knowledge on importance forest carbon, CEQ carbon guidance). I understand what the almost 20 yr old forest plan says about openings, proper mix of stand ages, etc. But you need not be wedded to those objectives when faced with new circumstances. You can use Tel Gap project NEPA to justify a one-time plan amendment, or new forest-wide amendment that provides a more appropriate policy on MOG and forest carbon. Why go with 20 year old thinking in the face of such urgencies??

Consider the spirit, if not the letter, of Roadless Rule, EO 14072, new CEQ info, etc... all these point to modernizing and improving the GMNF approach to managing these older forests. Just because you can do something (adhere rigidly to old forest plan) doesn't mean you should, when you have flexibility to change based on new evidence. I think you need to re-imagine the project in light of the future.