

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/13/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Beverly

Last name: Maliner

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I favor option 1 of the EIS. Please see the attached for my rationale. My concerns overall were well captured in the "Alaska roadless rule scoping period: written public comment summary" document found at https://www.fs.usda.gov/nfs/11558/www/nepa/109834_FSPLT3_4631713.pdf.

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

December 12, 2019

Subject: Input to the UDSA proposed exemption of Alaska lands from the 2001 Roadless Rule as requested by the State of Alaska

To the USDA;

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. My bottom line opinion is that options 2-6 presented in the draft environmental impact statement are unacceptable. They are very broadly written and afford no real constraints to short term economic or political desires, they bear no evidence of lessons learned from past experiences in the Tongass or other large lands that boast extractable resources, and they don't account for existing access and extraction rights already granted at State and Federal level. Therefore, only option 1 is a good option.

Alaska already has authorization to develop transportation and utility infrastructure in the Tongass National Forest (Section 4407 of a 2005 Federal transport funding bill). It does not need this exemption to construct new roads.

Keeping the Forest as intact as possible (current state) better favors the National interest and the fiscal state of the Forest Service. While the Forest is already severely degraded with over 2/3 of largest trees timbered and populations of Alaska Cedar and Red Cedar greatly depleted, we owe it to our descendants to leave what remains to them. We owe it to our already greatly stressed flora and fauna communities to leave them intact ecosystems, ranges, and migration corridors, and we owe it to ourselves to retain this vast space. It cannot serve us well if we continue to degrade it and to chop it up; even though numbers might still suggest large space it will not be fully functional as a greenhouse gas absorber, as a producer of clean water, as a mental health escape, and as habitat for indigenous groups. Destruction is easy, preservation and discipline are harder. Certainly, the numerous embedded wilderness areas demand essentially undisturbed surrounding lands to maintain their wild nature.

It has been previously determined that harvesting Tongas wood is fiscally irresponsible. In addition, the region has already made significant adjustments to the loss of large timber operations and [ldquo]the region has transitioned into "non-timber... [sources of revenue] such as recreation, subsistence food, salmon, scientific use, and carbon sequestration [which] contributes more than \$2 billion" annually.[27][29] Tourism supports over 10,000 jobs in the Tongass National Forest, with about 10% being related to fishing activities.[28][ldquo] (Wikipedia)

Perhaps it is possible to construct very targeted exemptions that afford necessary protections to sensitive environments while removing very specific and long-term supportable obstacles to local communities and not large extraction firms or politician interest. Until then, I favor option 1 of the draft environmental impact statement.

Sincerely,

Beverly I. Maliner

[Position]

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

December 12, 2019

Subject: Input to the USDA proposed exemption of Alaska lands from the 2001 Roadless Rule as requested by the State of Alaska

To the USDA;

Thank you for this opportunity to comment. My bottom line opinion is that options 2-6 presented in the draft environmental impact statement are unacceptable. They are very broadly written and afford no real constraints to short term economic or political desires, they bear no evidence of lessons learned from past experiences in the Tongass or other large lands that boast extractable resources, and they don't account for existing access and extraction rights already granted at State and Federal level. Therefore, only option 1 is a good option.

Alaska already has authorization to develop transportation and utility infrastructure in the Tongass National Forest (Section 4407 of a 2005 Federal transport funding bill). It does not need this exemption to construct new roads.

Keeping the Forest as intact as possible (current state) better favors the National interest and the fiscal state of the Forest Service. While the Forest is already severely degraded with over 2/3 of largest trees timbered and populations of Alaska Cedar and Red Cedar greatly depleted, we owe it to our descendants to leave what remains to them. We owe it to our already greatly stressed flora and fauna communities to leave them intact ecosystems, ranges, and migration corridors, and we owe it to ourselves to retain this vast space. It cannot serve us well if we continue to degrade it and to chop it up; even though numbers might still suggest large space it will not be fully functional as a greenhouse gas absorber, as a producer of clean water, as a mental health escape, and as habitat for indigenous groups. Destruction is easy, preservation and discipline are harder. Certainly, the numerous embedded wilderness areas demand essentially undisturbed surrounding lands to maintain their wild nature.

It has been previously determined that harvesting Tongas wood is fiscally irresponsible. In addition, the region has already made significant adjustments to the loss of large timber operations and [Idquo]the region has transitioned into "non-timber... [sources of revenue] such as recreation, subsistence food, salmon, scientific use, and carbon sequestration [which] contributes more than \$2 billion" annually.[27][29] Tourism supports over 10,000 jobs in the Tongass National Forest, with about 10% being related to fishing activities.[28][Idquo]

(Wikipedia)

Perhaps it is possible to construct very targeted exemptions that afford necessary protections to sensitive environments while removing very specific and long-term supportable obstacles to local communities and not large extraction firms or politician interest. Until then, I favor option 1 of the draft environmental impact statement.

Sincerely,

Beverly I. Maliner

[Position]