

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/24/2019 8:00:00 AM

First name: McKenna

Last name: Evert

Organization:

Title:

Comments: See attached file(s)

The following text was copy/pasted from an attached letter. The system cannot display the formatting, graphics, or tables from the attached original.

To the Forest Service,

I do not agree with the removal of the Tongass National Forest from the Roadless Rule. The only positive side to this scenario is to open several acres of the forest for logging purposes, but there are several downsides and negative aspects that surely outweighs the good in this situation. Logging the trees in this area will make the forest more prone to water pollution in rivers and streams, will decline the salmon and deer populations due to the pollution, and create a visual pollution of the scenery that these fortifying trees provide.

Because this forest is so vast in its quantities of fishing and hunting, and is such a fantastic place to fish and hunt, it attracts a lot of tourism. The fishers and hunters the forest brings in alone provides a lot of local jobs to the people that live in or around the area already, and the paving of new constructed or reconstructed roads will be expensive. As I have already mentioned, the removal of these trees will greatly decline the populations of these fish and wildlife, which in turn will decline the amount of tourism to this area, which will also in turn result in the loss of jobs to the local people.

The removal of the acres of trees in general will cause a great decline in the prosperity of the forest as a whole. As soon as the trees are chopped down, it will change the flow of those nearby rivers and streams that rely on these trees to meander, and leave them prone to erosion due to the roots of the trees not being able to hold the soil in place. The trees can provide shelter and food to the wildlife in the forest, but when the resources are taken away, the wildlife that needs to survive on these trees will start to face a decline. Eagles and ravens in the area rely on the trees for shelter; taking the trees away will just minimize their ability to find a home. The wildlife that relies on the rivers and streams to provide plentiful amounts of fish will also face a decline if their food source, due to rivers and streams changing flow and the fish dying off to pollution, is taken away from them as a whole.

I strongly urge the rethinking of this idea, because it is not only about expanding the logging industry. These trees have been in this forest for a long, undisturbed time; most of these trees would not even be sufficient for the logging industry due to most of them being low quality sources of timber. Logging will greatly affect the ecosystem of the habitat as a whole, and everything living within or around it. Not only will it affect the wilderness, but it will face a lack in tourism if the habitat is in a decline with the wildlife populations due to the logging of its trees. People will not want to come to a forest for hunting and fishing if there isn't good enough and plentiful enough game in the area that is within a stable population.

Sincerely,

McKenna Evert

[Position]

The following text was copy/pasted from an attached letter. The system cannot display the formatting, graphics, or tables from the attached original.

To the Forest Service,

I do not agree with the removal of the Tongass National Forest from the Roadless Rule. The only positive side to this scenario is to open several acres of the forest for logging purposes, but there are several downsides and negative aspects that surely outweighs the good in this situation. Logging the trees in this area will make the forest more prone to water pollution in rivers and streams, will decline the salmon and deer populations due to the pollution, and create a visual pollution of the scenery that these fortifying trees provide.

Because this forest is so vast in its quantities of fishing and hunting, and is such a fantastic place to fish and hunt, it attracts a lot of tourism. The fishers and hunters the forest brings in alone provides a lot of local jobs to the people that live in or around the area already, and the paving of new constructed or reconstructed roads will be expensive. As I have already mentioned, the removal of these trees will greatly decline the populations of these fish and wildlife, which in turn will decline the amount of tourism to this area, which will also in turn result in the loss of jobs to the local people.

The removal of the acres of trees in general will cause a great decline in the prosperity of the forest as a whole. As soon as the trees are chopped down, it will change the flow of those nearby rivers and streams that rely on these trees to meander, and leave them prone to erosion due to the roots of the trees not being able to hold the soil in place. The trees can provide shelter and food to the wildlife in the forest, but when the resources are taken away, the wildlife that needs to survive on these trees will start to face a decline. Eagles and ravens in the area rely on the trees for shelter; taking the trees away will just minimize their ability to find a home. The wildlife that relies on the rivers and streams to provide plentiful amounts of fish will also face a decline if their food source, due to rivers and streams changing flow and the fish dying off to pollution, is taken away from them as a whole.

I strongly urge the rethinking of this idea, because it is not only about expanding the logging industry. These trees have been in this forest for a long, undisturbed time; most of these trees would not even be sufficient for the logging industry due to most of them being low quality sources of timber. Logging will greatly affect the ecosystem of the habitat as a whole, and everything living within or around it. Not only will it affect the wilderness, but it will face a lack in tourism if the habitat is in a decline with the wildlife populations due to the logging of its trees. People will not want to come to a forest for hunting and fishing if there isn't good enough and plentiful enough game in the area that is within a stable population.

Sincerely,

McKenna Evert

[Position]