

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Sean

Last name: Williams

Organization: Hoonah Indian Association

Title:

Comments: I do not support any of the proposed alternatives to the Roadless Area Conservation Rule applicable to National Forest system lands in Alaska, herein referred to as the Alaska roadless rule. The reasoning behind the 2001 Roadless Rule suggests that an expansion of the roadless areas and strengthening of the policy regarding environmental, ecological, and socio-cultural themes listed below would be more appropriate than a reduction in its scope. As such, The US Forest Service has not offered a fair spectrum of choices, as there is no option that reflects the popular reasoning that brought wide-ranging support that confirmed the rule in the 2001 (listed below). Rather we are offered only a choice between reduction in the scope of the roadless rule and or no action. I advocate for a new public comment period in which a full spectrum of alternatives to the roadless rule are explored, including policy options that reference the reasoning behind the 2001 Final Rule (listed below). These new alternatives would include policy changes to reflect the broad themes referenced in support of the 2001 roadless rule.

I wish to see alternative options that reflect the reasoning behind the broad themes listed in support of the 2001 roadless rule, such as: the existing rule does not inhibit community development and economic growth, the Tongass national forest is of greater benefit to Alaskans as an intact ecosystem, the Tongass national forest is important to climate stabilization, the Tongass national forest has cultural value to Alaska Native communities and should be respected as an anthropological world heritage site, road construction and resource extraction are destructive to habitat, and the 2001 roadless rule supports many industries such as tourism and fisheries. It is imperative the forest service offer options that will offer a fair public input process. The current alternatives for action are biased and unfair, and do not represent a full suite of options.

The no action alternative is preferable among the proposed Alaska roadless rule changes, however, even this option does not fit my desires. Please re-enter the public comment period with more inclusive options.

[Attachment is a PDF version of the same comment above.]

[Position]

[Attachment is a PDF version of the same comment above.]

[Position]