

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/24/2023 5:00:00 AM

First name: Jim

Last name: Furnish

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I write to pose the simple question: what will it take for you to reconsider the merits of the TG project?

This project seems to be looking backwards when the situation cries out for a future perspective. I speak of two major objections - 1) EO 14072 and 2) the Roadless Rule. One of my guiding axioms while working with the FS was "just because you can do something doesn't mean you should". I realize that neither the EO nor the Roadless Rule requires you to 1) avoid logging mature/old growth trees and 2) avoid roadless areas, however, BOTH provide strong rationale for doing so. You have full discretion at your disposal. True, the Chief has not provided explicit policy, and the Roadless Rule doesn't prohibit commercial logging in this case, but this does not preclude you from relying on the intent of both EO and Rule to choose a precautionary approach.

The RF in PNW Region wisely pulled a sale that violated the spirit of the EO. I sense that you are waiting for public ire to reach an intolerable level. I assure you, it will. My contacts in the environmental community are anxiously waiting for an enlightened FS to reposition its policies to reflect current priorities and realities. Reconsidering this project will go a long ways toward making your organization newly relevant and responsive to your constituency.

I also add that the rationale that you need to clear hundreds of acres of mature forest to create new wildlife habitat is becoming very dated and stale in light of other realities; notably young seral habitat is not lacking in NE, while old growth is rare. Starting over, as you are doing here, ensures that these acres will have no chance of becoming OG for many decades. Second, the importance of storing carbon, as the TG project area now does exceedingly well, is far more important than creating young seral habitat. Consider the GMNF in its larger context please.