

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/2/2024 5:35:51 PM

First name: Corinne

Last name: Mayland

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I encourage the USFS to pursue Alternative C or D, rather than Alternative B. My rationale is the overall smaller footprint of the effects of Alternatives C & D, with benefits on less introduction of non-native species and disruption of water-absorbing forests. I work with conservancies in Pennsylvania and have firsthand experience with how devastating garlic mustard and other invasives can be, and have witnessed these plants along logging roads and VAST trail in Vermont. As cited in the Environmental Assessment, fewer new roads means fewer access points for invasive non-natives into the forest. We also have too many high-precipitation events with subsequent soil erosion. Vermont, by the nature of its topography, is susceptible to such events. The disturbance from logging and other heavy equipment operations makes the area especially susceptible to runoff and flooding. We own property in White River Junction, downstream of the Telephone Gap project, and do not need even more insult to an already flood-prone area. Do not pursue Alternative B - instead do Alternative C or D.