

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/12/2024 9:03:16 PM

First name: Randy

Last name: Raskin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I believe that the public and USFS shift toward acceptance of prescribed burning suggests that we can learn from past mistakes. The GAP overview includes the word "restoration" which catches my attention but also should attract scrutiny. In the name of restoration are we going to sanction commercial logging, non-commercial logging (how do you define that?) , or burning in rich cove forest or areas documented by NCNHP as significant? Before I could agree that the GAP plan is indeed restoration I would need to see robust mandates and methods for protecting all directly and indirectly affected waterways which, in the area I know best, would include Little Whiteoak Creek, Clear Creek and Big Crabtree Creek. If logging must be part of the plan, it should be clearly defined, should have clear goals, and should be permitted only in a way that minimizes stream crossings, mitigates impact when crossing is necessary, and adds no new roads to the already extensive backcountry road network. Please limit the use of burning to areas that would be improved by fire -- that would not include rich coves or the Red Spruce bog area on Sevenmile Ridge. A refined GAP plan could be a significant step forward, truly restorative and something many of us could feel good about.