

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/17/2025 4:30:26 PM

First name: Michael

Last name: Bald

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I commented on the preliminary EA in 2024 that the Research Natural Area needed appropriate buffering from disruptive / disturbance activity. I still hold that position, and understand the agency response. I do believe my comment was distorted to talk about expanding the RNA, which I did not say. My comment was dated 5 April, 2024.

I accept that stands to the east of the RNA are buffered by terrain, true enough and valid, however I would insist on 100' buffers along Puss and Kill Brook. The agency and I do not agree on this, because the Forest Plan is so antiquated. I see a real issue with the Stand 4 and its log landing in Compartment 129 to the south of the RNA. The lines are not particularly clear, so it is either in compartment 129 or 109. The proposal to place a harvest and a log landing are completely disruptive to the research area, in terms of noise and light penetration, invasive species exposure, earthworms, and water quality / erosion. My concern is not about the stand of old growth trees; it is for the entire RNA to be buffered against disruption along its perimeter in a manner that alters processes occurring within the RNA. Simple.

The agency should understand that an RNA should be buffered from adjacent events that would alter, even temporarily, the processes underway within it. Sunlight angles mean that removal of large trees south of any area will alter the light / shade / temperature regimes. I don't know how you wish for me to prove this; it is simply obvious and a startpoint consideration in managing invasive plants.