Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2019 9:00:00 AM
First name: Susan
Last name: Culliney
Organization: Multiple Organizations
Title:
Comments: NGO Letter re AK Roadless Rule Public Meeting Recordings Transcripts

Hello,

Attached is a letter that includes transcripts from meetings that took place during the comment period for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS. Please be advised, I have also sent a copy of this letter via certified mail, along with a thumb drive that contains the referenced multimedia files.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Susan Culliney

-

Susan Culliney

Policy Director

Pronouns: she, her, hers

Audubon Alaska

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

AUDUBON ALASKA * EARTHJUSTICE * SOUTHEAST ALASKA CONSERVATION COUNCIL * THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY * WOMEN'S EARTH AND CLIMATE ACTION NETWORK * WASHINGTON WILD

December 16, 2019

VIA EMAIL AND CERTIFIED MAIL

Ken Tu, Interdisciplinary Team Leader

Alaska Roadless Rule

USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region
PO Box 21628

Juneau, Alaska 99802

akroadlessrule@usda.gov

Re: Transcripts and recordings of public meetings for the Alaska Roadless Rule Draft Environmental Impact Statement administrative record

Dear Mr. Tu,

We are discouraged that the Forest Service did not record oral testimony at public meetings for the Alaska Roadless Rule Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). In an effort to capture the public's statements and questions, we collectively recorded 7 of the public meetings and now provide you with these recordings (audio and/or video files) and associated transcripts. The fact that we do not include recordings from the other 14 public meetings in Alaska does not reflect their lower importance, but rather our lack of capacity to arrange for recordings there. We also include video and a transcript from an additional meeting, in Seattle, held by the public regarding the Alaska Roadless Rule issue.

The agency is missing important information by failing to record the public meetings. The agency did not record public meetings during the scoping period, but later recognized that information from those scoping meetings helped to develop the DEIS.1 Accordingly, the public meetings for the DEIS are also important sources of information and comments that the agency is failing to capture. Although the agency records testimony at subsistence hearings, some public meetings were not followed by a subsistence hearing. Further, while subsistence topics are critically important to consider for the DEIS, other important issues such as recreation, wilderness values, and commercial fishing would not be captured in a subsistence hearing.

Failing to consider oral comments from public meetings erodes public trust. The majority of commenters during scoping opposed changing the roadless rule on the Tongass. Our own review of the scoping comments found over 95% of commenters supported keeping the roadless rule intact. Yet the agency's preferred alternative is to fully remove the roadless rule from operating on the Tongass. As one member of the public stated at the meeting in Washington DC, "...[Y]ou weren't even recording the comments made this afternoon or at most of the public hearings in Alaska, there is no excuse for that. You could have brought in a court reporter or video recorded it and had comments transcribed . . . Why is the Forest Service refusing to truly listen to the people who will have to be left in this devastation of the consequences of this repeal, especially Alaska natives?"2 Failing to record oral comments at these meetings not only misses vital information but also contributes to the public's growing sense that the agency is not listening.

1 84 Federal Register 55522, 55527 (October 17, 2019) ("Public comments received during the [scoping] comment period and information from the public [scoping] meetings helped inform the development of the alternatives to the proposed rule.").

2 Kari Ames, Tlingit, Alaska Native Voices Cultural Heritage Guide, at the Washington DC meeting on November 14, 2019.

In addition, despite numerous requests for a greater geographical spread of meetings from conservation and

recreation organizations and local elected officials across the nation, public meetings for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS were only held within Alaska and in Washington, D.C. The Tongass National Forest is federally managed for all Americans, yet this decision sharply limited the opportunity for interested persons to learn about the project and supply oral comments. In the state of Washington, where the connection to the Tongass National Forest is close and powerful, the public held their own meeting in lieu of an official opportunity to meet with the United States Forest Service.

We submit the following audio files, video files, and associated transcripts3 for you to incorporate into the administrative record:

* Juneau meeting on November 4: audio file and transcript.
* Wrangell meeting on November 6: audio file and transcript.
* Anchorage meeting on November 6: audio file of the presentation, audio file of the Question & Answer session, and transcript of the Question & Answer session.
* Washington DC meeting on November 14: audio files, video files, web links to video, and transcript.
* Gustavus meeting on November 20: audio file (transcript provided via a separate submission).
* Seattle Community Public Meeting on November 23: video file and transcript.
* Skagway meeting on November 26: audio file and transcript.
* Haines meeting on December 7: audio file and transcript.

We are sending all written materials by email to akroadlessrule@usda.gov; we also provide both the written material and the multimedia files on a thumb drive sent via certified mail. We ask that you include this letter, the transcripts, audio files, and video files as part of the administrative record for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS and for the associated rulemaking, and we urge the Forest Service to record oral testimony at public meetings in the future. Please contact susan.culliney@audubon.org or jill_gottesman@tws.org with any questions. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Audubon Alaska

Earthjustice

Southeast Alaska Conservation Council

The Wilderness Society

Women's Earth and Climate Action Network (WECAN)

Washington Wild

3 We used transcription services to transcribe audio and video files recorded at the public meetings. However, we cannot guarantee accuracy of the written transcripts, and therefore also provide the underlying audio and video files.

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Juneau Alaska Roadless Rulemaking Public Meeting Recorded on November 4th, 2019.

Speaker 1: Once again, you have to look at the fact that the level first doesn't change and same with the fisheries in your industry. You've got the neutral no effects all the way across the border. The reason for that is the protections, the recurring productions, the applied, and Thomas sports time we've continued to acquire. So you still wouldn't be able to go cut up to the extreme, right in any of the alternatives. And we still have the key watershed is protected in all the alternative is including the full exception actually, there is a forest plan ready for forest planning policy direction that protect those watersheds.

Speaker 1: We'll get to that, that crusades to that. And then lastly, there's protecting terrestrial habitat on habitat and biological diversity. This is kind of a summary of those effects. They are slightly different [inaudible 00:01:15] and there are some, but overall it's minimal adverse effect. So if you want more information, we've got two websites. One, it has our general rule is information and the other one is project information and all the Dr. Carl polo documents are posted on the side on the left. Also, we have a story map online tool that you can use. It has all the alternatives. You can drill down into each alternatives, but probably the most useful tab is the furthest tab to the right that's tab you'll be able to turn off, on and off, various data layers and you'll be able to compare the alternatives on the same map out to a specific area.

Speaker 1: So if you want to comment, you have until close of business December 17th or midnight December 17th I should say Alaska time to provide your cards. You can do that through regulations.gov you can do that through our project website. You can do that by filling us a letter to that address. He also had an email address. [inaudible 00:02:38] That you can send an email to or today we will accept any written comments. So the next steps, as you know, we issued order DEIS as opposed to Google last month in October, which initiated the public comment period ends December 17 the rest of the month of November we'll be going around Southeast Alaska and giving very similar meetings throughout Southeast Alaska will also be an Anchorage in Washington, D C then after close to the common period. We were both transition the draft environmental impact to the final environmental impact statement based on public input. That could mean changes in analysis, changing the law alternatives are tribal and native Alaskan Data consultation is ongoing as well as our public engagement is ongoing.

Speaker 1: The final environmental impact statement will be published late spring, early summer of 2020 and then the secretary of agriculture who is the responsible official for this decision will determine which alternative should become final and then we will need to come upon a rule in summer of 2020 and with that I'm going to turn it over to Chris and we will open it up for Q and A.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 2: So thank you once again for joining us. Then we switched over to the questions and answer session. I'm just going to ask if you put your hands up so I can get a feel for how many questions we're going to have this evening. I get a feel for that or make sure we are at that time. I have a question as we continue, we're going to ask it to ask the question on the microphone so please hold the microphone for you. My colleague on the far side over there on that side of the room and I'll work with that. We will transition to introductions.

Speaker 2: So you've met Ken and it also introduced a couple other folks here. Christine Goff, he's our national director for the city management board. Christine oversees [inaudible 00:04:56] and NEPA and forest planning for the agency and she has been can be executive working with Ken and others on developing the rule and [inaudible 00:05:09] region. Okay, so what we want to do here is just to answer any broader questions for the

group. We also want to again remind you that if you have comments, things like that, that were stuck in, you read the comments in the back and we encourage you to do that. Let me take the first question that was asked [inaudible 00:05:31] you know, so if it didn't change much, why are we doing this?

Speaker 2: I think it's important to look at the, the information that when this was initiated wisely as for this exemption and when the secretary made his decision that he thought this was the most responsive based on the information that he gave up, we gave him, basically the saying was, Hey look, this wasn't just about where you look at the comments and input they gave us and the petition, it was actually my fraud, the requests really focused in on barriers to economic development within communities here in Southeast Alaska.

Speaker 2: A part of that is was forest products and timber production, but it was also around access to critical minerals, mining, access to development of mitigation sites, hydroelectric energy and other connections between communities, those sorts of things. So it was a host of issues that were brought forward. And it is true that there's not a lot of fluctuation between the various alternatives. If you just look at it through the lens of timber production because that's really controlled by other pieces. The boundaries of that are controlled by statute through the timber, the Tonga timber reformat, the specifics of how you deliver that are bound by the forest plan and the road less rule which sits in between. That provides essentially this overriding piece to the forest plan about where you could do that and what this change is, where he can do that.

Speaker 2: But the probably the broadest effect is the ability for local communities to develop some of these others without some of the border that the robo school puts in place to focus on. I know the following question to that is how would you approve many of those were those that come in. We have, but what this allows us to do is to do that more expediently and maybe in ways that are more cost effective that proponents of this are saying are creating barriers to economic development and local communities. So that's the overall basically. All right, we're going to open it up for questions and Earl is going to be the guy.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 3: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. My question involves climate change. Given the fact that that is probably one of the, it is one of the largest environmental issues chasing the globe and that the [inaudible 00:08:23] is the largest US [inaudible 00:08:31] 8% that's about half of all the other national forest. Why isn't climate change considered on this presentation? I know that looking over in US forest service records that had been considered in 2010, 2006 thank you very much.

Speaker 1: Okay, thank you. I'll go first and then Ken or someone else want to do this for the road less role, doesn't authorize any actual activities that would affect those things that you're talking about in terms of carbon on the Thomas that's really controlled by both statue and the forest plan and the way that it and the way that that operates. And so that's, I would say that's the broader reason why they see that and much of your analysis within the EIS is into the analysis that was associated with [inaudible 00:09:43] plan where it clearly talked about the linkages, their climate change and how that was considered in the development of that plan. And that's really the controlling piece about how we're managing the forest within that context. And I, I don't know [inaudible 00:09:58]

Speaker 3: I would just add that to Chris's point about the, the proposed Rover's role, no matter which alternative to selected doesn't change the harvest level. It only changes the potential locations where you could actually go accomplish that harvest. And so the level of harvest is the same as it is prescribed in the 2016 forest plan. And

hence with that additional environmental analysis will happen when actual activities are proposed on the ground so that we can analyze that based on where those activities are actually proposed. But the road was from doesn't do that and not wish alternative is selected.

Speaker 1: Well I've got one more question over here and y'all can just keep your seats [inaudible 00:10:52] .

Speaker 2: Thank you Bill [inaudible 00:10:54] Thank you for being here and for your continued professionalism. It's difficult times in the deliberative process. Leading up to the choice of option six. How did the debt process consider the warmest ecological contributions? The natural capital, every system provided by the congress which resulted in about $700 million worth of economic activity benefit. The possibility that would be equivalent to door and lead to future degradation, degradation, value of that natural. Thank you.

Speaker 1: So what's getting that goes back to the fact Alaska rules for alternative [inaudible 00:11:46] doesn't change the level part. So you know whether you heard of steam overruled over here in the lowest area versus old road in the there that's not, those have roughly pulling back. And the always for his plan [inaudible 00:12:08] alive for a base set of ecological protection to [inaudible 00:12:16] to old growth habitat and we believe that the 2016 forest plan provides [inaudible 00:12:27]

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 4: I think I can make this a lot more fun. How about if we know that we don't want to do comments tonight for the record, how about stand up? It'll get blood flowing as well if you're here tonight because you care about what happens on the Tonga national floor. Now stay standing

Speaker 3: [inaudible]

Speaker 4: because you want to see the no action alternative on the Tonga.

Speaker 4: Are you here to grow the no [inaudible 00:13:19] service?

Speaker 4: know this all ready but we're really tired of being bored out of these meetings where we want to have a stay and also want to ask a question important as well. So thank you for standing up. Thank you for being heard. My question to the forest service would be

Speaker 1: [inaudible 00:13:38] hold on. I want us to be professional and other clubs that were ready to ask questions we're going to get to you of course we are. [inaudible 00:14:08] I appreciate that. I'm say, I want to make sure, I want to make sure everybody gets the, I want to make sure that everybody is able to ask if they want to,

Speaker 4: but would like to make a comment for the record while you're here tonight because you came out and set aside time aside in your evening, you could be home with your kids, you could be home with your families, you could be out doing your hobby. Then instead we're here in this room. We're tired of not being heard in Southeast Alaska. I don't think that that's news

Speaker 1: [inaudible 00:14:41] provide your comments to us in, in written format. We will definitely consider it.

So if you have some thoughts here, you could just jot it down. We got yellow stickies, write it on the back, what our head down is headed into [inaudible 00:14:57] and then you can also send us a letter later on when you have time to articulate anything more. We have a woman over here that has question [inaudible 00:15:09] .

Speaker 5: Thank you. My name's Jaylene [inaudible 00:15:24] passion here with on behalf of the sea Alaska corporation, originally from Angoon from [inaudible 00:15:28] national monument. Question suggestion are alternative six map. It looks like there's 9 million acres open now for development, but I have been around the road less or the longest management regulations that you've for many years and I know that that map doesn't really show what's actually even available for development. It's just showing me what's off the [inaudible 00:15:55] Is there a way for you to create a map like that that shows what's actually available for development so that people don't continue to misconstrue this as opening out 9 billion acres of the time is to development because that is not what is happening here. There are many regulations in place that protect the tiniest and

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

I'm hoping that you'll take that suggestion and potentially make a map that shows the real picture of what this does.

Speaker 5: And then my last question is because I know that a lot of our cries and our communities are concerned about now having a case by case analysis of projects, whether it's timber or other, what are you going to do with the forest service to ensure that that input is meaningful, that the communities and tribes in the state and all the community members still feel that their concerns are heard on, on each of those projects that are at analysis analyze on a case by case bases.

Speaker 1: So in terms of the actual impact is going to be opened up on the Tongus as a result of selecting alternative sixth and full attention alternative. We do have a map, I think it's over by the gentleman in red back there that describes and shows the hundred and 85,000 acres that we'd be open to resulting selecting alternative six and those 185,000 acres. There's about 165,000 acres that are about 20,000 acres [inaudible 00:17:27] . And how we determined that based on the suitability analysis from the 2016 correspondence analysis, who is are the areas that were determined based solely on the rules, the status. The only other remaining areas is by far the majority of the areas were determined to be not suitable to our analysis which are based on the fact that there's no trees out there.

Speaker 1: There's two seat for one operation. There's other considerations are in wilderness areas or another areas that prohibited [inaudible 00:18:20] . Anybody want to add to that?

Speaker 6: Well, you know in terms of, okay, so there's two questions here. One is what is, what is your sense of actually affect and is more limited in terms of what you can actually do more on those acres? You know, both of us basically said you can't harvest commercial timber, you can't build roads. If you look at what allows us and how we can find where we can do it there, those two things. If you don't have road this, there's a series of other things that we have to follow ball and regulation and forest plan that decline that. So you can't really build the road on a smoke that's going like this. You can't, our national forest management act doesn't allow us to harvest timber and that's why we talk about, again, this more limited set of acres that were actually disclosed in the two thousands about where you could do, you could do this nationally.

Speaker 6: That plan is probably the biggest controlling factor where you can do things are not roasted as well as an ELCA and the time is typically going to happen and that's [inaudible 00:19:32]

Speaker 2: that's the reality clarification. I think a lot of misinformation.

Speaker 2: I'm sorry I didn't answer your second question. The second question, if I heard you correctly, how are we doing? Do you size the civic input and analysis on

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

projects? Correct. [inaudible 00:19:56] right. Let me turn that over to digital course.

Speaker 7: Yeah, so site specific projects is like our normal NEPA process. So we we're required to follow a national environmental policy act and I think most of you are familiar with that person proposed timber sale. If there's a proposed recreation project that goes through the standard NEPA process of public input decision making and objection process and so that all gets considered. That's not a Trump day way by, so again, we've got alignment. Clarity has led to a lot of emotional Elizabeth some topic and you'll hear a lot on both extremes, but there's not a lot of emphasis or attention to students at all the alternatives and little some of the language that could improve those. I was a member of the [inaudible 00:21:02] by myself.

Speaker 7: I was also a member of the citizens advisory committee that worked on a lot of the worse than all the alternatives that work is between those two strings and what was unanimously agreed to an adopted very specific language on settler. I'm on forest service. We refer to that to some various levels throughout. None, none of the exact mean really adopted. I'm just curious when the veganism is to bring that forward with the language tech dispensary, is that still a possibility?

Speaker 2: So I'm going to answer your question Roger. Way for anyone in the audience that thinks that we miss something we didn't reflect and one of the alternatives are viewpoints or on the analysis that we we were missing something or didn't do correctly and that's what you're bringing up Robert, this you don't think that'd be reflecting those exceptions. Correct. Any input from and we'll make those adjustments and then do your input. There may be some things we agree with, some things we don't agree with, but that's, that's the process that, and I'm sure across the board whenever we have this many comments and this much input, we did our best to reflect everything we've heard and what you see on the wall. But I know that it can't, there's going to be refinements and changes. And Ken talked earlier about those commitment protection areas that we know we have still work to do in other areas. So this is that space to do this. Tell us,

Speaker 8: hi, my name is Elaine trooper. I was wondering since it's pretty clear by the Nora's attendance at this gathering and by the huge number of ribbon comments here is received, there must be some debrief and for trying to fight the no action role. So I'm wondering, my question is what are the financial advantages to corporations with any of these alternatives compared to the no alternative option?

Speaker 1: The question, just so we get it correctly, what, what were the financial benefits to corporations in any of the action alternatives as compared to the no action?

Speaker 2: Okay. That's a good question. I don't think we really hit analysis to

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 2: any specific corporations. However, our analysis was very broad, qualitative because I can paint your time for the record, but once again to the fact that there is no increase in timber harvest, that it really has minimal beneficial effect to the timber industry. We also think that the visitor use industry that there, there is a adverse effect to that. However, would you think that it's a displacement effect and will will really be bad for some outfitter and guys that are displaced potentially permanently or for long term in specific areas? So civic areas or watersheds could the visual quality could, they could get to the or to be roads in certain areas that are kind of while today and that could displace an adverse [inaudible 00:24:52] .

Speaker 2: However, on the flip side of that, the roads that are used to vault, they could be utilized for greater access to road less areas and increase a different type of recreation, motorized recreation, recreational use that is dependent on roads and then the fishing fishing industry. We felt that there was no effect because being because of the, the protections in place from the 2016 forest plan and the protection of all the watersheds on the top of the session for us. Did that answer your question?

Speaker 2: Okay. Sorry. Cut. We'll have to come back on the one-on-one trying to answer that better.

Speaker 9: Yeah. Hi, my name is Erin Branco. I would just like to a dollar for every time you said 2016 forest plan because one of the things that I think is really important to recognize is how temporary that is and this exemption is not a temporary exemption. Can you tell me if it sunsets the exemption with the parts plan? That's a rhetorical question. So I would ask that each time in these public areas that you have, here's my question, what are you, what would you, what do you say, 2016 and protections for the duration of the 2016 forest planning because the road less act black to shape the next plan. And if it doesn't exist, those protections won't be in it. And we want those protections. And you're no longer in the congress and you're back in Washington, D C you're, you're onto your next [inaudible 00:27:04] .

PART 1 OF 3 ENDS [00:27:04]

Speaker 10: ...And you're back in Washington, D.C. or you're on to your next assignment in the [port 00:27:05] service. The people who are here are still here. [crosstalk 00:27:11]

Speaker 10: Okay, here's another question. Will you please take my question as a formal comment [crosstalk 00:27:18] this discussion, into the record?

Speaker 11: If you write it down.

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 10: So, [crosstalk 00:27:34] just to talk about that real quick. Rules, like the Roadless Rule, are generated as policy by every administration that's in there. So, the 2001 Roadless Rule was graded under Administration.

Speaker 10: Other rules that we follow, same thing. In fact, [inaudible 00:27:55] if it does get revised at some point, and we're asked to look at that every 10, 15 years, it follows another rule that was just updated under the last Administration called the 2012 Forest Planning Rule. And that sets the guise of how we think about management for the Forest Plan going forward.

Speaker 10: So yes, that is a multi-year plan. On average, the Agency takes six to eight years, a big public process to revise those Forest Plans. Yes, any of these can be changed at a time. The Administration that wants to change a policy or rule, they can be [crosstalk 00:28:33] public that's working with us when we revise the Plan that could change how the plan works.

Speaker 11: But both of those have a lot of public info [inaudible 00:28:41].

Speaker 10: That's just the best way I can answer that.

Speaker 10: Also, I didn't want to be flippant saying that if you write it down, we will take it. But, there's a reason behind that. And, the Agency...

Speaker 12: But don't we have a recorder?

Speaker 10: Well, we haven't done the best in interpreting what people have to say in the past. And we did it wrong, so it is best if you write it down, and that way, we can get multiple people to look at it.

Speaker 12: [inaudible 00:29:19] can give you some!

Speaker 10: I'm sorry.

Speaker 10: I mean, we encourage it. If you have thoughts, write them down. And that way, we'll take what's in the [inaudible 00:29:29] record, and that's important.

Speaker 10: Are there other questions?

Speaker 13: Yes, thank you. I'm going to go into a bit more delicate scale. I had the good fortune to go out and pull invasive weeds with [SEAF 00:29:42] in partnership with the Tongass National Forest a couple times.

Speaker 13: And, that's made me really aware of the impact that we have on the ecosystem and on the habitat here in [inaudible 00:29:54]. I also row along the coast and I've had a chance to volunteer both with Forest Service biologists and other biologist friends into a lot of places [crosstalk 00:30:05].

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 13: The amount of invasive species that I, with my limited experience, can recognize deep into places when they're in proximity to roads is horrifying to me. The ecological value of some of these invasive species... The ecological damage to these invasive species.

Speaker 13: So, I have three questions. One is, what the Tongess' current budget is to deal with invasive species on the Forest. The second would be what the success of eradicating invasive species on the Forest is given your current budget. And the third would be how do you factor the public cost and ecological cost of extending roads into these areas which make corridors to put invasive species on that basically, from the best I can see, you can never undo.

Speaker 10: I appreciate that comment. I remember working as a Ranger at Prince of Wales over in 2003. Prior to that, I think we were all in denial, this can't happen to Alaska. I remember someone pointing out reed canary grass in an area that I was familiar with that as well.

Speaker 10: Invasives are an issue. I don't know currently exactly how much the Tongess... Even some local folks here are spending. We do have strategies in place. You're right, roads tend to be [portals 00:31:39] at areas, and we have taken precautions. We've got standards in terms of our seat next year, [inaudible 00:31:47] seat, and things. We do go in to recover sites.

Speaker 10: I'd have to get you someone in the Tongess for exactly how much and what the success is. I know in some areas, we're certainly more successful than others. And typically, we have a strategy to see where we can put our money where we'll be most effective as well. But I'd have to talk to some of the specialists on the Tongess, yeah.

Speaker 14: Thank you, sir. And my blood pressure has gone up every time you said, "written comments." I remember a time when we used to have public hearings where we would listen to the people we convened with. Not just say, "send in your written comments."

Speaker 14: Some people don't have either the time or the ability to write well and to put thoughts that are so important to them on paper. And, I think you are shirking your responsibility to not have [inaudible 00:33:05] where you hear people. You don't read people. And, I have seen this as being a trend in all the course of these meetings in the last... How many? Ten to 15 years, where you've done away with public [crosstalk 00:33:28].

Speaker 14: We're a public [inaudible 00:33:33], which I think is extremely important to the process, extremely important to us. And how could you rationalize not recording any of our public comments?

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 10: Thank you. I appreciate what you're saying. I will seriously think about that. We're trying to create an even playing field for everyone and make sure that everyone has an opportunity to provide their input.

Speaker 10: One of our core values as an agency is to make sure that we are listening, and if you feel that we're not doing that, or if your views are not represented in what we put up here in the alternatives, for that, I hear you. And I said something that as we look at those comments that come in at the leadership [crosstalk 00:34:49].

Speaker 15: My name is Bob [Canes 00:34:52] and I'm a [crosstalk 00:34:53] here. I've gone here and [inaudible 00:34:59] National Forest. But, my question is really not related to my true business. It's related to the big picture. And I wonder if you could bring up that environmental analysis slide. Which one... Yeah, that's it.

Speaker 15: My question to you is, looking at these different alternatives, our [inaudible 00:35:34]. Minimal or none. And my question is, how were those determined? How far into the future did your analysts go when putting up with these effects?

Speaker 15: Because when we look at the Tongess and the resource it is and what it provides, we live here, but what it's going to provide to residents, citizens of our country in the next 50 years, 60 years. As our climate and our livability areas change, the Tongess is going to be worth more and more and more, economically in the state that it's in now, rather than in a compromised state with roads. I really believe that we need to look at this way in the future.

Speaker 15: So my question is, how far into the future, when these effects were determined, did your team look? And what kinds of parameters did your team set for what effects are?

Speaker 10: That's a great question. I don't know the exact answer, but I do know that in terms of long-term, our planned horizon is only like, 20 years that we looked at. So, we did not look 50, 100 years out in the future. And I can find out specifically for you, in terms of exactly how we did that specific analysis.

Speaker 11: I'd also say those ranges should be [inaudible 00:37:25]. Because every resource you look at, you're going to look at a different time horizon, usually. I'd also say that this slide actually is only looking at key issues. Those key issues that we heard from the public that [inaudible 00:37:41]. There's a whole host of other effects and analyses that [inaudible 00:37:46]. This is the really key issues that we talked about at the beginning of this. So I'd go there and look there. And if you think we got some of those wrong, [inaudible 00:38:00].

Speaker 10: Am I still going with you in terms of questions? Okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

Speaker 16: Hello.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 10: Oh.

Speaker 16: My name is [inaudible 00:38:12] and I have two questions. My first question is, out of the over 100,000 comments you've received so far, approximately what percentage of those prefer to have the current Road Rule on the Tongess?

Speaker 10: I can't give you an exact number, but it is very high. [crosstalk 00:38:40]

Speaker 16: And I had a second question, which is, it was widely reported that President Trump directed Secretary Purdue to select option six. And I'm curious, is that 90% of all those thousands and thousands of voices going to stop that from happening?

Speaker 11: So, first of all, it wasn't just the comments that were input that came into this. As we named at the beginning, there was the comments, there were the citizens advisory, the state's government cooperating agency, other cooperating agencies, info we received in consultation, and then some of the work that we did with municipalities and others. That all informed where we were, so I want to make sure that we characterize that correctly.

Speaker 11: We have provided all of that information about the voices we heard, the amounts of support for any various alternative to the Secretary. The Secretary asked us, like I said, to go back and look at some other things to kind of divide out some of those a little more closely. And that all informed the decision.

Speaker 11: In terms of your question in terms of the President, what I can tell you is that we get our direction from the Secretary. We inform the Secretary about what we heard and what we analyzed. He told us to select which alternative as the [inaudible 00:40:12].

Speaker 17: Well, my name's [Somers Cole 00:40:19]. I'm a [inaudible 00:40:19] here in Southeastern Alaska. And I guess I want to thank Bob for asking questions about the environmental analysis slide. I also have a question on that slide.

Speaker 17: So, [inaudible 00:40:33] that alternatives two through six would have an adverse effect on natural habitat- it didn't say that, but an adverse effect on natural habitat [inaudible 00:40:46]. How is it possible that adverse effect on [inaudible 00:40:56], aquatic and biological diversity will have zero impact on the land that's here?

Speaker 11: So, this slide here doesn't really explain the whole story. And mainly it is a [crosstalk 00:41:15] because if you look at the EIS, you will see that we had a wide variety of [inaudible 00:41:24] and aquatic habitat [crosstalk 00:41:27] going from no effect all the way across the board to this will have an adverse effect.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 11: And I was trying to generalize this slide and that's my fault for generalizing the slide too much and throwing that whole key issue into this one descriptor. But you have to go to the EIS to look at the descriptors of the effects. And if you do look at aquatic habitat, you will see that there is no effect across the board.

Speaker 18: [crosstalk 00:41:59] I'm Doug Bryan, I've lived in Alaska for a long time, moved out in the woods and fished for a long time. Question that has a key thing to do with that, you guys developed really nice alternatives and whatnot. As I look at that and what's going on, [inaudible 00:42:22] forgotten about it, taking alternative six [inaudible 00:42:27].

Speaker 18: My question is, will all of this change with the change in Administration in Washington, D.C. in 2020?

Speaker 11: We are... Yes. I mean, if you look at the history of our rulemakings and others', they are fresh in the policy by any Administration who is elected to be in the Executive branch. And so, the answer is yes. Another Administration could add a different policy reference and they could ask us to undertake a rule-making like this. That's the bottom line.

Speaker 11: And on the [inaudible 00:43:13] one, just to follow up a little bit on what Ken said, it's really important to recognize that the protection against the streams from any activity that they're doing, they're bounded by the Forest Plans standards and guides, the [crosstalk 00:43:33]. And those are really the things that affect when you do an individual project, how you do that project. And you'll see that in the EIS.

Speaker 11: And what I would say to that is, we're not standing up here... We've gone through and done [inaudible 00:43:53]. We've made a series of alternatives that reflect what we heard. The Secretary has chosen preferred alternatives. This is your space to look at those and provide us with what you think.

Speaker 12: No, no, no, no.That's not what this is. It's not a public hearing.

Speaker 11: No. I'm saying- [crosstalk 00:44:11] That's what we're trying to do is to set you up here today about how you comment and how you can provide that input [inaudible 00:44:21]. That's the bottom line.

Speaker 19: [inaudible 00:44:31] Just a couple of quick things before my question, which is a direct response to whether this is a hearing or not. It's disturbing that the legislative [inaudible 00:44:45] are not treated the same across the board, and the alternatives. Because those are standard by-law by the Congress, Senator Murkowski and Senator Stevens both voted for [inaudible 00:44:56]. And many, many people in this room and other communities have great support for that.

Speaker 19: My issue is, I'm really confused here. I got a letter, [inaudible 00:45:16], I opened it up last night, dated October 18th and it talked about the public

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

process that was going to go forward. And it talked about subsistence hearings. Subsistence hearings.

Speaker 19: And, as I understand it, talking with my friend [inaudible 00:45:37] Sanders, I don't know if he's here or not tonight, but he argued last night that under the law of the Alaska Benefact, you are required to hold subsistence hearings about something of this magnitude happening on this Forest.

Speaker 19: Now, I came here thinking this was going to be a statistics thing. I am not a statistician. I have great respect for those people in this room and throughout Alaska [inaudible 00:46:06]. And, this was supposed to be the time and place for people to come together and say exactly what [Kayla 00:46:16] was talking about earlier. When you talked eloquently about guides in this little nook and this cranny, or where have you, some hidden place in the forest, with their spot, and they were going to get dislodged from that spot. That's exactly what's going to happen statistically to this Forest. And we're sitting here waiting for this hearing and it's not here. Do you guys have some kind of answer for this, please?

Speaker 11: Yeah, I do. We should've been more clear upfront. So, we have 17 or 18 public meetings here in Alaska. All of those in rural Alaska, rural regions, we will have subsistence hearings. Only Anchorage and Juneau we did not because of the rural argument parts.

Speaker 11: And so, we will be hosting our standard public meeting, it will be similar to tonight. About a half-hour introduction, an hour of question and answer, and then a break. At that time, we'll meet with people one-on-one, and then we'll conduct an intensive subsistence hearing.

Speaker 14: Isn't there a subsistence [inaudible 00:47:30]?

Speaker 11: I'm sorry, I can't hear you without the mic.

Speaker 14: I just wondered if there was a subsistence hearing [crosstalk 00:47:37]

Speaker 11: So, I believe there is a subsistence [RAAC 00:47:42] member that resides in Juneau. There will be a RAAC member from Southeast, and these are the subsistence hearings we're conducting. But we did not plan for Anchorage and Juneau or more urban areas here to conduct or to host. I'm sorry that we weren't clear.

Speaker 20: [inaudible 00:48:07]

Speaker 11: I'm sorry?

Speaker 20: That's not true.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 10: I have a question here and then I'll quick [inaudible 00:48:16]

Speaker 21: Is this working? Good, thank you. I want to give you a little private consult on this via diversity and minimal effects. At one time, there was a herring biomass [inaudible 00:48:30] 40 miles. It's gone. When are you putting it back?

Speaker 21: I am [inaudible 00:48:43]. And when I speak for my people, I speak for all my ancestors. Our foods, ancestral lands, are these roads in this [inaudible 00:48:54] ain't gonna take place.

Speaker 11: Yes sir, thank you for your comments. And I very much appreciate what you're saying. And again, we are going to consultation, we're allowing for that input to come in through cooperative agency status. And I certainly respect your input on that. And come and talk to me afterwards. I appreciate [inaudible 00:49:33].

Speaker 11: So, we've got about a few minutes left here for Q&A, then we break up. So, let's get a sense of how many more questions we have. I think there was [inaudible 00:49:48].

Speaker 22: Yeah. My question is on the slide that's up there, too. You answered some of it and maybe you're going to put some more clout into this slide, but if you look at alternative four, five, and six, they're all exactly the same dialogue in each box. But alternative four is minimal adverse effect and five and six are moderate.

Speaker 22: And I guess what I heard is there is a lot more things you just couldn't fit on there, but I'm just wondering how many hop from minimal to adverse would have exactly the same dialogue underneath about minimal effects in development?

Speaker 10: So, in terms of alternatives four, five, and six, these are very similar in terms of impact on [inaudible 00:50:52]. However, as you go along the spectrum, alternative four only allows [inaudible 00:51:04] harvest within

the modified landscape and the timber development. And then as you move to alternative five, it adds in [crosstalk 00:51:07] that could potentially get effected. And then alternative six is essentially the same as alternative five, [inaudible 00:51:18] potential harvest.

Speaker 23: Thank you. My name's Kathy [inaudible 00:51:18] and I have a follow-up question on Juneau into urban to have a subsistence hearing. And I'm just curious, is there a population size? Like, at some point will any move be too big to have subsistence input?

Speaker 23: Then I also had a question about [inaudible 00:51:45] along roads. And I'm not up-to-date on whether or not Forest policy includes the use of pesticides on roads and whether that would be something else potentially introduced by this Roadless.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 23: And my third thing is just being a little bit confused. There was a question before the official question and answers that I think somebody said, if there's really going to be no impact, because it seems like you guys are trying to suggest that we're overblowing the effects of alternative six. So, if it's really not going to be that, why is it being proposed?

Speaker 23: Somebody out there said we'll get to that in the questions. So, three questions. The subsistence, the pesticides, and why are we even... Well, I guess you said, because the Secretary told you to.

Speaker 10: So there's quite a few questions in there. I'll just try to address again. So, under the Federal Subsistence Program, the communities of Juneau, Ketchikan, and Anchorage-Fairbanks have not been designated as rural under subsistence. They're larger communities. So that community [inaudible 00:53:17]. And so, the federally-qualified users primarily reside in the rural communities that we'll be visiting during this effort.

Speaker 10: So, we put that, but we did not advertise a subsistence hearing in a non-rural community like Anchorage or Juneau. Looking at it right here, our pesticide has changed since I left Alaska. I'm not sure if we're using herbicides as far as what's approved here in Alaska.

Speaker 24: We are on a project-by-project-

Speaker 10: Project-by-project basis. I know that the Prince of Wales, our landscape assessment

PART 2 OF 3 ENDS [00:54:04]

Speaker 25: I know that the personal's large landscape assessment... That was an issue that we were working through, on whether we would use herbicides as part of that.

Speaker 26: So that is a potential?

Speaker 25: What's that? Not in Roadless, no. Yeah, so just real quick, the Roadless Rule doesn't talk to that. All Roadless-

Speaker 26: Right, but if you have a road and pesticides are allowed-

Speaker 25: Right. And then so the thing to remember is that if we propose to build a road, it has to be consistent with the forest plan and then we're going to go through with the project, an eco analysis and a decision to do that. And as [Troy 00:54:46] was saying, at that point we look at the affects of the bases where we put that road in. So in the case of the Prince of Wales one, we called for the use of herbicides, is that correct? In order to deal with that. So it happens on a project by project basis through a public process.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 25: And on your first question, I did actually answer the first thing. I came in and I talked about the broader, you know, if you look at this in terms of, you know, there's really no difference... Well we're looking at that through the lens of timber, where there's mild differences. But most of that is really about where, and not necessarily about how much.

Speaker 25: But there are other affects that were brought forward that these different alternatives address. And they really have to do with the barriers to economic development or other things that Roadless affected. And that can be access to mining. So right now with the existing Roadless, if there is an existing mining claim, you can get access to that, but this makes the process more direct and more clear and you may have a cheaper way to get there that than what is currently allowed under Road Rule.

Speaker 25: And I'm speculating there, but I'm just saying that's some of the things that we've gotten back. It addresses connectivity between communities, which is another issue that was brought forward by the state. It addresses energy development. There are some exceptions in the existing 2001 rule for energy development. There's others that are not. It addressed those in places. So there's a broader set of things that are disclosed in the ELS referring to that.

Speaker 25: And so, sir, I want to just check in. I will get to you, I want to make sure we're not... Can I go here first or there? Here first. Sir, can I do that and I'll com right to you. Sorry.

Theresa Jermain: Okay. I guess that means me. My name is [Theresa Jermaine 00:00:56:45], and I was born here in Juneau in 1955, and I was raised in this village, The Juneau Indian Village, and I graduated high school of JDHS. I worked for [Klukwan and Haida 00:57:03] for 20 years. I worked for the state of Alaska for 15 years. All of that doing job creation.

Theresa Jermain: And this Roadless thing is to create jobs and economic development? For who? It's going to be for those developers that want those resources. We might get a few of our people employed on their jobs, but the majority of them are going to be people from out of state.

Theresa Jermain: Of the 144 thousand comments that you've received so far, what was the breakdown? How many were Alaska residents? How many were from our of state? How many were for the change? How many were in opposition of the change?

Speaker 27: It doesn't matter.

Theresa Jermain: Questions. Those are all questions. And in Alternative 6, what information was used to go with Alternative 6? I don't see that in here. How will Alternative 6 affect the carbon offset projects that are underway right now?

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Theresa Jermain: With Sealaska, they get paid to not cut their trees down, because of the carbon monoxide going into the atmosphere. They need more trees. To help offset what is going on there. Will exemption from the Roadless Rule affect those carbon offset projects?

Theresa Jermain: There is also a section in there that says, "There is no regulatory prohibitions on timber harvest or road construction/reconstruction." What does that mean? When I first read it, I thought it meant, okay, they can cut down every tree. They can build as many roads as they want to, to get to whatever minerals they want to extract and process. Is that what that means? A better explanation there would be helpful.

Theresa Jermain: And I am in favor of no action. Everything's been going good. Who is the ones that are asking for the development of those lands? We've lived here for 10,000 years and more, without developing those resources, without cutting down those trees. And we're still here, we're surviving. If we cut those trees, and we take those minerals out, what are we going to have left? Barren land.

Theresa Jermain: Mother Nature is doing that just fine. Right now with all of the forest fires that we have in Alaska, now are going on in California. All the trees being burned down. What we're doing for the carbon effect offset projects, all these forest fires are negating what we're trying to do by planting more trees, keeping our trees, keeping our environment safe. Doing whatever it is that we need to do to protect our land, to protect our waters, to protect our animals, and to protect the air we breathe.

Theresa Jermain: If you're not taking public comments here? I came with a two page written comment and put it in your box. I didn't see any other comments in that box. I came here because I was told that we were going to be testifying. You were going to be taking testimonies. Obviously that wasn't true. So somebody needs to be doing better work as far as communicating the information we need to make effective decisions. Because whatever you guys decide, it's going to affect every one of us. And we can not do that. You have to come together. We have to work together. We have to come up with solutions that will not decimate our land, and will provide economic growth.

Speaker 25: Thank you.

Theresa Jermain: I had to do that for 35 years, so I know what it's like to create jobs in villages where there are no jobs. It can be done. So, I think it can be done without changing the Roadless Rule.

Speaker 25: Thank you. I want to thank you for your feedback, and I want to be really clear that we are taking your comments still.

Speaker 25: And in the effort of time, you know you asked several questions in there. But one I'll answer is that this doesn't affect the Sealaska Program at all. But

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

others... I'm available after this, one on one, and I can answer some of your other pieces that are there.

Speaker 25: There's a couple other people that are just waiting to get online, you know. So I want to make sure we get to them.

John Levitt: Hey, my name is [John Levitt Switchbuck 01:03:01] I'm a retired fish biologist from way back. A couple of simple questions. One is there other many examples of the state being granted an exemption from a federal regulation of this magnitude?

Speaker 25: So, I don't know of any other outside of actually this... Alaska. Because the original proposed rule for the 2001 Roadless Rule exempted Alaska. And then that was changed in the final rule. And then the USDA changed that again, and made a new rule, that said they would be exempt in 2003, and that was the state of policy at that time. And then we've gone back and forth in court since that time. So I'm not aware of other rules that take that approach.

Speaker 25: But what I do know is that in the 2001 Roadless Rule, different states have petitioned us, like Alaska did, for creating a more specific Roadless Rule for their state. But Alaska is the one that has been, since it's inception, the one that was called out [inaudible 00:10:13].

John Levitt: My second question is, are there any times that the level of timber harvest isn't going to change really and corrupt the alternative? You know, what I'm interested in is the level of timber harvest in old growth areas and an increase in [crosstalk 01:04:35].

Speaker 28: So the other thing that the Roadless Rule doesn't change, no matter which alternative is selected, and again I know some people aren't going to be too happy about this, but the Tongess is in the process of transitioning from an old growth to the young growth strategy, and that is not going to change. Even under the full exemption alternative. So that the Tongess is still on track to transition away from old growth to new growth over the next... Well, at the end of 12 years now. 12 to 15.

Speaker 28: It does make additional acres. The full exemption alternative does make, actually a variety of alternatives, there are additional old growth acres that are made available to increase the number of places that you could go get that 4 to 6 million board feet that is prescribed in the forest plan.

John Levitt: [inaudible 01:05:27].

Speaker 28: Eventually, yes.

Speaker 25: All right, so a few more questions. Yep. We're going to take a few more questions, and then we're going to be available out there, so.

Phillip Moser: Okay. Hi, my name is [Phillip Moser 00:01:05:41], I was born here in 1990. I feel like we could do a better acknowledgement of indigenous lands here. So I'd like

to say, thank you Klukwan and Haida for having us here.

Phillip Moser: In regards to technology in the lands, I have a couple of questions. The first would be, is there any reason why this [inaudible 01:06:06] today Klukwan and Haida for the women, violence against women. [inaudible 01:06:13] go off.

Speaker 25: Repeat the question.

Phillip Moser: The question is, did you did we schedule this with knowledge that there was [inaudible 01:06:24]?

Speaker 25: No.

Phillip Moser: Okay. And then the second question would be, I guess this past Saturday in the nation, our representatives from [Hik, Una, and Klukwan Haida 00:12:41] and [Heidenberg 01:06:41] exchanged, within the community [inaudible 01:06:45]. I think had a meeting with the forest service. And before that last week, Tlingit and Haida community organization, Hoonah Indian Association organized [inaudible 01:06:53] issued a joint statement within the Forest Service's plan. There's a quote... I'm sorry, hold on one sec, from one of the leaders of those communities, saying that, they felt steamrolled by being treated as cooperative agencies instead of sovereign governments on unseated land. I would just like to ask if we're bringing acknowledgements of native land, how much weight did the forest service give to our recognized tribes here in Southeast Alaska?

Speaker 25: Yeah, a couple of comments, and yes, very serious. So we did conduct a consultation with our secretary this weekend, with a number of the tribes that had requested that. This is the first time in Alaska that we offer cooperating agency status to the tribes, and I sent a letter out inviting all of the tribes in Southeast Alaska to do that.

Speaker 25: For some of the same reasons that you shared. And we did have six tribes including Tlingit Haida Council, that did sign on as cooperating agencies. I know that they have put a lot of effort and a lot of work into the specific alternatives.

Speaker 25: They shared their concerns, they felt very strongly that it was... that they felt steamrolled, bait and switch, I've heard other terms. And so they have shared that with us. And considering and trying to work through that, the timing, because where they put their efforts, it came as somewhat of a surprise, I think to those folks as well.

Speaker 25: And so, we have been working, and will continue to work throughout this process. We have trust responsibilities with the tribes, and you saw one of the slides that talked about [inaudible 01:09:17] consultation is open, it is ongoing. And we'll continue to, kind to solve, and in a meaningful way and continue that

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

dialogue. And I think we actually had a very difficult but very productive meeting and consultation this last weekend in some places.

Phillip Moser: Okay. The other question, whose suggestion [inaudible 01:09:43]. It sounds like, from what I'm reading, that meeting was protested from [Wallace 01:09:54] and other native communities. [inaudible 01:09:55] community.

Speaker 25: So yeah. So two of the tribes, one of them the [inaudible 01:10:02] and parts of the [Jackson and parts of the Wallace 01:10:13] from Jackson, had requested formal consultation with the department and the Secretary, and the under secretary. As in Secretary designates, took them upon that offer, and he actually offered to come out to Alaska at the commission [inaudible 01:10:24] Washington DC to consult. So it was at their request.

Phillip Moser: Why wasn't it the secretary?

Speaker 25: The secretary designated the other secretary. I can't give a rationale, that's normal though. It's a very common approach. So we're going to take one last question. You've been waiting.

Briana: My name is [Briana Malcove 01:10:56], and I was here in June. A couple of texts that you have accepted, that are named under the current Roadless Rule, and I just wanted to clarity, It is my understanding that the Forest Service has approved every exception permit that has been put through, under current Roadless protection for both the Tongess and the Chubach National Forests.

Speaker 25: That is correct.

Briana: Okay. And so I just wanted to make sure of that. Do you think that, a few things like hydroelectric projects that have been proposed, exceptions are being made

already, under current Roadless Rule for those projects.

Speaker 25: Yeah, I think the thing to clarify there, the position of the sate, and through their petition, and other folks have provided that provided us input. Two factors there. One is the length of time to go through that added process, those exceptions get approved through a broader process that can create a barrier for economic development. And then the other piece that was brought to us, from a comment from the sate is that there are some activities that don't have exceptions, such as geothermal [inaudible 01:12:09]. So it's both. [crosstalk 00:18:23].

Speaker 25: Okay, so I really appreciate the time today. We're available-

Briana: A few more questions please. We're got two more questions right here ready to go. We've been waiting a long time.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 25: All right. All right. Fair enough. That's great.

Larry West: And I think we're ready. My name is Larry West, I am the core director of [crosstalk 01:12:37].

Larry West: I've lived in Southeast Alaska since 1997. And every summer, I show hundreds, and now collectively over the years, thousands of visitors through this region, over time. And the issue that I specifically want to address, I'm just going to but in here and make the move, go away here comes back, is does this have a fair playing field? And human playing field? That has come up more that once tonight, and I'm going to specifically address that by saying three things and asking questions, so here we go with that.

Larry West: Several years ago the committee appointed by the Forest Service to steer the process of reviving the Tongess Management Plan was highly fire, in it's varied composition. So [inaudible 00:19:23]. And no we face the results of those decisions. And by and large, they're not favorable for the region's biggest economic interest, which are tourism and fishing. Both of which have always been negatively impacted by timber activities throughout the region. Roads, as developed by and for the commercial interests of nonnative populations, have been non favorable to the region's indigenous populations.

Larry West: Ever since people like [inaudible 01:13:54] usurped the breeze [inaudible 01:13:57] over a hundred years ago. That kind of was an even playing field, and now the many many voices that I'm in touch with all the time in my work. In places like Haines, in places like Klukwan in places like Teslin, and other places around Southeast Alaska where I do my work. The native voices of these people are very clearly opposed to activities like building more roads, which will almost certainly benefit, primarily, yet not exclusively, large scale commercial entities and their industrial scale activities, which they are even more to reduce native people's ability to live in their traditional ways.

Larry West: Yet the Forest Service itself is on record as paying for opinions favorable to building roads, and yet not paying Native groups their opinions. That just came up in this week's news. 90 percent of nearly 150 thousand comments favored no access, and yet for reasons you have stopped far short of making clear, the US Forest Service had decided that Alternative 6 is preferred, right?

Larry West: Would you please show all of us, not how we should be using our time here, which I appreciate that, but why you reached that decision in the face of that kind of opposition, and that kind of impact from so many people, particularly those who have been here for a very long time? And seeking alternatives, we not live in a time when alternative facts are created ad naseum on a daily basis at the country's highest level of authority, and [finally 01:15:45] state policy is increasingly and not seemingly entirely dictated by corporate interests and influence, because that is where the money comes from, to get big policy. That's the way things work these days.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 13, 2019 - view latest version here.

Larry West: All right. So, how are you going to assure us in this room, that you have anything close to an even playing field? That's what we need to know.

Speaker 25: Thank you. I can assure you that we have represented the views that we've heard thus far from the secretary to inform his decision of the preferred alternative. We are asking you, did we get it right in what we presented in terms of various alternatives that reflect the views that we heard, and we'll continue to do that. My

job is to accurately portray to the secretary what we're hearing that informs these decisions in this case, things like the preference of Alternative 6 as the preferred alternative proposed action. And we will continue through that process.

Larry West: All right, I promise to keep this focused. Prior to my recent retirement, I was a [clikline 01:17:11] biologist for 24 years. For Southeast Alaska, I am familiar with the Tongess Forest Plan, although I've never worked for the Forest Service. I understand that the 46 million board feet figure that several of you have mentioned, right? Is a reflection of the allowed [inaudible 01:17:26] with protects the maximum that could be cut on any given year on average, across timber average. I wonder, and I understand that that won't change as a result of whatever happens with this Roadless Rule. My question is, what is the actual harvest been, annual harvest been over the last five, ten years? And do you realistically think that won't change if the industry is allowed to build new roads into places that they really want to harvest? What do you expect actual harvest to be, and not allow the silt point to be?

Speaker 25: Yeah, I don't have the actual numbers. Let's see, but it's been roughly about 9 million [inaudible 01:18:33] relative... Gosh, I'm not sure what the Forest would tell us exactly where we landed at the end of the year. But that's the goal, that's the target. It's hard to predict. There are lots of other factors out there besides our projects. There are tariffs now that are affecting values, there are softening markets. There are different demands. 46 is what the allowable quantity is. That is roughly where our target has been, and we've certainly fallen short of that in the last couple of years.

Speaker 25: Okay. Thank you. I know how polarizing this is. [inaudible 01:19:28] oppose or support. And actually from all of the folks that we heard from the [inaudible 00:25:36]. What I want you to hear is exactly what I said before, please talk. Please talk to your neighbors, talk to your organizations, talk to your representatives, talk to us. Provide us with those comments. We will accurately reflect that to how we will provide that information to the secretary. We're available for conversation after this, and I appreciate the time today. Thank you.

Speaker 25: [crosstalk 01:20:16]

PART 3 OF 3 ENDS [01:20:20]

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Wrangell, Alaska

November 6, 2019

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service.

Mike: [inaudible 00:00:01]

Speaker 1: All right, thanks Mike. So with that, let me just open it up for questions. If there's questions, comments. I know [inaudible 00:00:13] mentioned we do take written comments as well, it can be hard to hear. If

you want to leave those individually with us, but I'll open it up [inaudible 00:00:24]

Speaker 2: Hi. I need a little better understanding of, you know, looking up at the maps up there, I know we've talked about the LUDS and exactly... LUDS is a land designation, but what exactly does it cover and not cover? What's decided on, to use the term LUD, because [inaudible 00:00:52] especially in the first one, like I see on that last map there, there's LUD development, LUD non-development, what's the difference?

Speaker 1: There's one map, [inaudible 00:01:05] and then regulations overlay that [inaudible 00:01:22] with the five land categories, you see that ice, right? And there will be additional direction on top of, of course, planned direction.

Dave: [crosstalk 00:01:35] so you've got a development lot here, you can harvest timber in development lots, it still grows. We have other LUDS, like on the other end of the spectrum, that land-use designation seemingly [crosstalk 00:01:51]

Speaker 3: And think of it like zoning. So you zone your town in different developments, you do commercial zoning, you can built a Wal-Mart here [inaudible 00:02:00] or you can do other things. That's sort of the simple analogy, I think, for how those LUDS affect just what you can do in these areas, and what you're allowed to do. Those are further defined by what's in the plans and in the guideline.

Speaker 3: It is like the land use plan and zoning plan, where each one of these has these set zoning regulations, what we call standards and guidelines. For each one of these various, we're mandated by multiple-use. We need to try to apply that to these different variations on the landscape of zoning.

Speaker 2: So what is a non-development LUD mean?

Speaker 5: It means it's not meant for commercial super-production, like mining or commodity capital. If you want to go to a [inaudible 00:02:57] recreational animal-centric activities.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 4: Hi. Is the new FCA secretary the only person who can opt for alternative one instead of six?

Speaker 1: I'm sorry?

Speaker 4: In the packet on the slide, it said the USDA secretary is the decision-maker on alternative six. Is that the only entity that can opt for, say, alternative one?

Dave: One or two or three. Yeah. So the secretary [inaudible 00:03:29] is the responsible official, so he is the-

Speaker 4: Will that person review all of our comments?

Dave: I don't know if the secretary will actually read every comment, but we will be pulling that together and yes, we as the team [crosstalk 00:03:48]

Speaker 1: So, what I'll do is we've got a process called [inaudible 00:03:52] analysis, and we'll just do [inaudible 00:04:02] and we'll probably have to have [inaudible 00:04:02] comments by the time the [inaudible 00:04:02] but we'll distill all that. We'll write it down and give it to them. We'll simplify it like we did last time, [crosstalk 00:04:10]

Speaker 4: So [inaudible 00:04:18] ground here, [inaudible 00:04:20] lot of roads, but [inaudible 00:04:26] including alternative three, I assumed it would mean [inaudible 00:04:29] roadless [inaudible 00:04:32] Why would we change such an important... what does that mean? That's pretty important to have a system, and why would you do that, [inaudible 00:04:41] rebuild the roads, and what would that mean for that other [inaudible 00:04:45]

Dave: I didn't look specifically at [inaudible 00:04:46] on this. I don't know the specifics of that area, but I put in three areas that didn't [inaudible 00:04:54] those areas were either [inaudible 00:04:57] or the area adjacent to [inaudible 00:04:59].

Speaker 1: There's areas right next to [inaudible 00:05:05] that, that have room [inaudible 00:05:06] we saw that as an opportunity for [inaudible 00:05:06]

Dave: Yeah, we'll have to look at that, I don't know that [inaudible 00:05:17] very logical exception, so the area's [inaudible 00:05:23] existing road system that would be expanded on [inaudible 00:05:41] we'll have to look at that [inaudible 00:05:41]

Speaker 3: Maybe after [inaudible 00:05:41] this is [inaudible 00:05:41]

Speaker 3: So yeah, it is a LUD two even though there's something there.... oh, that's why, because in an alternative three, you drop all the LUD twos [inaudible 00:05:59] because we didn't want the regulatory direction overlaying the statutory reference. [inaudible 00:06:04] direction, kind of [inaudible 00:06:09]

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 5: So it would be under-

Speaker 3: Statutory direction, yeah.

Speaker 5: Sorry, I'm trying to think of an ordinance. Okay.

Speaker 6: At this point in the process, are we locked into one of these six alternatives as... basically, has everything been locked, are there still stuff we can change, or based upon all of your community meetings and your community comments, is a new alternative possible, or do you expect, like, an amendment to these alternatives? Or just kind of [inaudible 00:06:41] and you're going to filter them into one of the six [crosstalk 00:06:43]

Dave: So we spent a lot of time trying to explain all of those other action alternatives. Right now, as we went, as the secretary went out with this, he indicated a preferred, which was alternative six. We are taking comments on all of the alternatives, yeah, again, but I would say in our initial meetings as well, there is a lot of support for other than alternative six. So that information will all be provided, and there is space in there to comment on it. That

does rest with the secretary, but that's why we're here, so we can hear from folks as well on alternative six as well as one through five.

Speaker 1: [inaudible 00:07:28]

Speaker 7: I think one of the things that might be helpful for us [inaudible 00:07:36] here, it would be nice if you could have the map, even of the [inaudible 00:07:44] alternative six, put up to look at our [inaudible 00:07:50] even the points in one color tell us, these are the things that kind of [inaudible 00:08:00] under the alternatives [inaudible 00:08:00] potentially, so we can go to this as leverage [inaudible 00:08:03] I think that would help us [inaudible 00:08:08] and how this fight affects our areas, how can you [inaudible 00:08:10] those different color things that talk specifically about [inaudible 00:08:25]

Dave: [inaudible 00:08:25] mentioned, we want to put back, there's a storyboard piece that you can go on and you can go right in and look and say, this is the area I'm most interested in [inaudible 00:08:32] favorite places in the world, and you can turn colors on and off and it'll show you exactly what [inaudible 00:08:32]

Speaker 7: You know [inaudible 00:08:32] also is, yes, like a little map like this one that talks about the different impacts based on different [inaudible 00:08:32] to this [inaudible 00:08:32] four to five... yes, this one. By what mechanism did we decide there was still affect on fisheries in certain alternatives or things like that? What [inaudible 00:08:32] come up with that?

Dave: So it's a qualitative assessment, [inaudible 00:08:32] the underlying piece here, and this is what is challenging for folks, yes, Cam tried to speak to the 2016 forest plan, it's still in place. If you're looking at the [inaudible 00:09:30] so what that would do is the forest plan, we have a nominal sale quantity of 46.1 million [inaudible 00:09:41] harvesting

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

less than that for the past ten years. Is that going to occur on a broader landscape?

[inaudible 00:09:41] 5,000 more meters across the [inaudible 00:09:41]

Dave: Right now, that would allow that harvest to occur in places that it currently is not allowed to harvest in. It doesn't change the amount of harvest, and it doesn't change all the standards and guidelines that are underneath that. So, like, the streams' fish, for instance. We've got things like [inaudible 00:09:41] timber format, required [inaudible 00:09:41]

Dave: Our practices for ensuring adequate fish passage [inaudible 00:09:41] other things we can do. All those protections, I'd say, we have in place, are still in that forest plan.

Speaker 7: But it looks to me, and correct me if I'm wrong, we had the studies done in [inaudible 00:10:49] and he identified that were really critical, for fish habitat. They seem to banish [inaudible 00:10:55] alternative six, am I wrong about that? Are those [inaudible 00:11:02]

Speaker 1: Even though alternative six is a whole [inaudible 00:11:05] watershed protections that were identified

for [inaudible 00:11:10] watersheds [inaudible 00:11:12] even with the [inaudible 00:11:19]

Speaker 1: That's all we have at this time.

Speaker 7: Okay.

Dave: So let [inaudible 00:11:26] one of the other pieces. Again, what changes here, and that's why it's difficult and we spent a long time with this slide, is where those activities will take place on a landscape. Some folks are concerned, some [inaudible 00:11:42] more valuable than other [inaudible 00:11:46] species [inaudible 00:11:47] timber, where would that happen. The amount [inaudible 00:11:52] standard [inaudible 00:11:53] protections [inaudible 00:11:55]

Speaker 9: So looking at this slide right here, alternatives number three and six all say they have a minimal [inaudible 00:12:08] effect on bird species [inaudible 00:12:10]

Dave: I looked at it generally and in the large area, and [inaudible 00:12:23] some of those areas that are open, so say for [inaudible 00:12:28] displacement depending on where that would occur. But generally across the landscape, at least as the visitor industry and tourism are concerned, they were relatively neutral to any [inaudible 00:12:46] adverse effect. It would be certainly very mobilized, so [inaudible 00:12:53]

Speaker 8: Who does alternative six benefit?

Dave: Who does alternative six benefit? I don't know if there's a benefit or an impact, but I will say where the state was coming from when they petitioned for the exemption, and we were under an exemption for I don't know how many years, up until... 2011, so for quite

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

a while we were under that, was there's a feeling, or maybe more that a perception that it wasn't all about timber either, that it would afford more opportunities, hydropower development. Different things. There are exemptions in the [inaudible 00:13:51] seen by a number of folks who have [inaudible 00:13:55] to do that, more expensive. There are other things. We heard from communities, broadband, folks were very interested in some of these rural communities in being able to go into roadless areas to provide that kind of infrastructure as well.

Dave: The timber industry certainly looks at having more area to operate in, to look at more economical [inaudible 00:14:26] those are some of the interests that would benefit. Follow up?

Speaker 8: Yeah, I was wondering how much does each mile of new road cost the taxpayer?

Dave: How much does a mile of road... I'm going to turn that to [inaudible 00:14:41] it's not a cheap place to build roads, up here.

Speaker 3: Oh, boy. Cost the taxpayer? That one's a little harder to get to. The way we operate now, in the old days we got a lot of... it was under litigation, there was a lot of negative press about pre-roading, and that was something we did under the long-term timber contracts. That's not the way we operate anymore. Road costs are

incorporated into the timber contract, so the value of that timber contract is appraised based on cost of roads.

Speaker 3: I don't remember exactly, but as Dave mentioned, it's not cheap. But again, that's part of what is in the timber contract.

Dave: So the value of the timber and the person that buys the timber pays for the road, versus a subsidy for [inaudible 00:15:26]

Speaker 10: I had a hand up. But she can go first. Sylvia.

Dave: Go ahead, Sylvia.

Sylvia: One of the questions [inaudible 00:15:42] about the roading in those areas, and currently there are a lot of roads in the roadless areas that are [inaudible 00:15:53] so that there [inaudible 00:15:56] on them. I'm going to assume, which I know makes an ass out of me, but I'm going to assume that a lot of that also has to do with the cost of maintenance on roads that were built previously.

Sylvia: Does this allow for, is there any plan to open up some of those roads that already exist that are [inaudible 00:16:30]? My understanding was that they're [inaudible 00:16:33] also that they would only be used for timber harvest, and I think that the nature of some of these has changed a little bit, and there's always [inaudible 00:16:44] special about not having access to [inaudible 00:16:48] and how does any of this [inaudible 00:16:50]

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Dave: That's a good question, Sylvia. We do have areas where we have roads, old roads that are in [inaudible 00:16:58] roadless areas, [inaudible 00:16:58] hard for me to understand, [inaudible 00:17:00]

Dave: Every project that you would... so if you were going to go in and re-open a road that was put into storage for another use or something, it would also go through a project that... would go through project-level analysis that would be subject to [inaudible 00:17:18] and there would need to be a proposed [inaudible 00:17:18] hiking rail, or some other type of activity on there. [inaudible 00:17:18] have to be consistent with [inaudible 00:17:37]

Dave: If the [inaudible 00:17:40] roadless opening that would be areas [inaudible 00:17:40]

Sylvia: What's currently under the road [inaudible 00:17:52] those are out of-

Dave: Currently, if they're in a designated roadless area, not only does it prohibit timber harvest and road construction [inaudible 00:18:03]

PART 1 OF 3 ENDS [00:18:04]

Speaker 11: Regardless of road construction. [inaudible 00:18:05]

Speaker 14: Can I give an example, though? Nemo loop is in the roadless area and we reconstructed the wood waste there, so that's one on Wrangell Island. We have an open road through a roadless. What you don't have is

timber harvest along that road, but we have free use cutting.

Speaker 12: I might be almost hearing what I want to hear.

Speaker 13: Oh, if I remember right, we have more over here. [inaudible 00:18:38]

Meredith: Mine's not actually a question. It's in the form of additional information. My name is Meredith Trainer, and I'm with the Southeast Alaska conservation council: SEACC. Many of you will have heard of us before, and I just wanted to add some additional information to Dave's response on the question of who is this for? In the regional economy of Southeast Alaska logging, makes up less than 1% of either our jobs or earnings as a region, whereas tourism and fisheries make up well over 20%, as you know, while here in wrangle, given where your economy has gone in the last few decades. For the purposes of this change, you know the state of Alaska fought the roadless rule right from the beginning, and it's been a tug of war back and forth about whether it would continue to apply in Alaska. The state did not win when they challenged the roadless rule in court repeatedly, and so this is just a different effort.

Meredith: It's like a backdoor because they couldn't win in court under law. But I think it's worth mentioning that the question of who is this for is a really good one. Arguably, this is more about political positions and ideas of who we are in the past than really about

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

where our economies are going now and in the future and where are the young people that are setting up their families and their lives in Southeast Alaska want our economies to go? I always joke that when you go to communities, there's a lot of people starting pretty incredible small businesses, including here in this room, but you don't hear a lot of young people say. I'm really dying to get into logging in to start a logging business. That's not a knock against logging. It's just about where the trajectory of our region has gone as we've grown.

Meredith: The other part I wanted to just add information on that Dave spoke to is that there are exceptions allowed to the roadless rule under the existing national roadless rule. If I want to put in broadband, or if I want to put in a hydro facility, I'm able to apply for an exception. So this is really important. This is utility corridor, and actually 57 different projects have applied to the forest service for an exception over the course of the years since the roadless rule was first put forward in 2001, not a single one. And the first is the forest services own frequently asked questions on pulling from here, but not a single one has been denied. So never has someone said, Hey, I'd like to access this area for hydro. Or Hey, I'd like to access this area for my mining road. Hey, I'd like to access this area for broadband.

Meredith: Never has a forest service. Said, sorry, bud, can't do it. This is a roadless area. The only thing that a roadless area designation actually stops right now in practice in what we've actually seen on the ground is the addition of new logging roads. And the last thing I just wanted to add to, and then I'll sit down again, is that Dave appropriately mentioned that there are areas that we consider roadless that have roads in them. That's true, that's not effective when the roadless rule was first put forward. There are also areas that are described as roadbed that never had those roads added and are actually roadless and so deserve to be protected for all the same reasons that we protect roadless areas now. Dave spoke to a lot of those concerns very accurately, and I just wanted to add that information. You know, as someone who's lived in here in Southeast and is looking at a

lot of these landscapes pretty closely. Thanks.

Speaker 11: You still have pending [inaudible 00:22:26]

Meredith: Yeah, but we're winning so far.

Meredith: Yeah.

Meredith: As long as I can do my sustainably, I support [inaudible 00:04:49], but they shouldn't displace another Hubbard industry. I shouldn't be compromised. But that's these guys' job to tell them don't mess with the Fisher. I still support the district.

Meredith: Yeah. I mean, I totally hear you, and I think one important part for the roadless rule is we currently have it, is that it's not everywhere in the Tongans. Right. You guys, your stat says it's 55% of the Tongans national forest. That's roadless. So you know the other 45% is all open to industrial logging. So it's not in any way saying it shouldn't happen everywhere. Is that the stat you used?

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 11: 85% of the time?

Meredith: Oh, sorry not, I wasn't looking at the filter on your stat. Yeah. Basically, there are a lot of areas that remain open for industrial logging, so it's not, they're not adding closures. What they're doing is removing protections. If the roadless rule is rolled back.

Speaker 11: [inaudible 00:23:48] go back to that side.

Speaker 15: Yeah. [inaudible 00:23:58] And you mentioned that [inaudible 00:24:04] In a long term [inaudible 00:24:31]

Speaker 11: That's a good question. So a lot of the proposed [inaudible 00:06:51] there's a decision to build a road [inaudible 00:25:25] for other uses as well as [inaudible 00:07:29] most of the roads [inaudible 00:07:37] subject, all of our sales staff that have a positive economic [inaudible 00:08:04].

Speaker 11: [inaudible 00:26:55] without making a huge commitment to another large scale [inaudible 00:26:58] looking at [inaudible 00:27:11] and some of those dates are in areas that, and the costs are prohibited. We have to fly in everything versus constructing road water where we do renewable [inaudible 00:27:34] not put a burden on the community for $250 million. [inaudible 00:27:44] investigation. Right. [inaudible 00:28:18] we may be able to get there to that project. Everything in the hydro world is pargetting and money, money, money and years ago .[inaudible 00:10:43] any product that really helped her eight years. And also, you know, although we did have approved all those projects that were proposed, including that we received, a lot of them don't ever make it to us. You know, the fact that some proletariat scares way faster.

Speaker 12: Can I make a comment though about Steve's idea of roadless? I think you'd have to look at the underlying Lud, and I think what the force, the underlying Lud, so the roadless is really only for three Luds, timber

development, scenic, a lot of like landscape. So as far as your hydro development, if you're in a remote, you know one of the Lud that doesn't allow that, and we had that down and catch a can, and they changed it with forest plan. But I think it's really, you can do away with roadless, but the forest plan Luds are still going to stop you and that's what you're talking about. Just putting it on roadless. I don't think that really is an issue.

Speaker 11: Okay. I'm looking a little bit here. We got about 10 minutes or so for open questions, and then we'll be here for your one on one time.

Speaker 12: Can I ask a really boring. I've actually looked at the EIS, and the first part of chapter two says we're, this project is going to amend or modify, modify our existing forest plan by changing the suitability. And it's like, okay, well, what does suitability mean? That's appendix a of the forest plan. Yeah, I guess. But why are we doing that is with this project, what are the implications of that?

Speaker 11: So the areas of action can your product speak correct. And so what it did was, so we could go through the process of the roadless rule and rulemaking [inaudible 00:30:46] at

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

the end of the day it does take acres out of other than no action alternative out of roadless, but you still have to have volts. So this would do it.

Speaker 11: Instead of going through a second process, we go through all this back out, another multiyear process, probably two-way process to change those laws from suitable or unsuitable. And so what this will do is combine those into this rulemaking process. Well, the secretary is going to actually, of course [inaudible 00:13:32] 1930 16 part 19 provisions.

Speaker 11: The force change. We believe in this. This falls in history because the acres that we have identified, 5,000 for alternative six are the 2016 suitable solely because of Rome. And because regulation and Trump's plan there, is still regulation now in the event, and there would be no reason to make those unsuitable cause there's no regulation behind that a suitable cause. Does that make sense? So let's do the line of reasoning. Those anchors right now are currently unsuitable to a client because we're also, this is overlay that if you take roadless of, what does this actually do. [inaudible 00:14:40].

Speaker 12: Why would you? What's the implication? Why would you do that? And so is that, is this document, if this EIS going to be what we pull up for forest plan amendment it to the EIS?

Speaker 11: It's like any other; you have to adhere to it.

Speaker 12: Yeah. I guess I don't see why we have it. I don't understand why you would do that.

Speaker 11: Make the administrative change; we made this regulation, this board section that you did not make the corresponding notes.

Speaker 12: Why don't you change it at the course plan amendment?

Speaker 11: [inaudible 00:33:42] tell you process registration process [inaudible 00:33:43] we can come back to

it. That's a good question. Yeah, because I said over here was kind of based on the plan, and so we're working now under the 2000 Walt wedding role. That's another rule. Just like we're making with the Romans, the role that they play some planning documents about a 20-year planning horizon. So we want to change the forest plan. That would for one more; it falls under that same process. So I average about five or six years. [inaudible 00:34:44] nurse service updated my planning rule, I went through a process just like the road cross the country before that. We've been operating under different planning rules for a lot of times as well. 2012, There's a rule in place right now for us to start revising under that, that earlier adopters that you guys had started a revised 2013 probably plans. We just got the vital objection, your honor. [inaudible 00:35:50]

PART 2 OF 3 ENDS [00:36:04]

Speaker 16: It seemed like ultimately they really favored one specific industry, and that tends to be the underlying goal. With this exemption, at least, as far as in terms of topic of

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

conversation and recent light bulb with all the [inaudible 00:36:17] industry. And I'm wondering why that specific industry is being prioritized over all the other opportunities that Alaska has somewhat to [inaudible 00:36:37].

Speaker 17: That's a good question. I think that all of the input that the secretary receives, and we decided to go out with that as a preference at this point in time and preferred all [inaudible 00:36:56]. I can't speak to how he made that decision exactly. [crosstalk 00:37:03].

Speaker 18: That's not allowed.

Speaker 19: Everyone knows that. It's a bad decision.

Speaker 22: [crosstalk 00:37:07]. Real quick here, in addition to [crosstalk 00:37:09].

Speaker 17: Yeah, it doesn't benefit [crosstalk 00:37:12]. But also, it's the finance industry [crosstalk 00:37:16].

Speaker 19: Probably.

Speaker 17: [inaudible 00:37:33] In addition there's smoke. [inaudible 00:37:38]. You know, for community connections. [inaudible 00:37:47] It's also the infrastructure needed for hydropower. Once again, that eliminates those needs for [inaudible 00:37:54] that is not allowed in military service. And again these will [Inaudible 00:38:03], mineral activity that's not allowed [inaudible 00:38:07].

Speaker 16: [inaudible 00:38:15] I was wondering why [inaudible 00:38:18] focus on one specific industry [inaudible 00:38:20].

Speaker 23: It seems like recreation is developing infrastructure development with [inaudible 00:38:27] it seems like there's an underlying goal overt with this [inaudible 00:38:53], it's just interesting that that focus of the conversation is focused aroun [inaudible 00:38:59]. [crosstalk 00:39:00].

Speaker 17: You develop a slice, and I focused in on [inaudible 00:39:03] because I [inaudible 00:39:07].

Speaker 20: [inaudible 00:39:05] I want to make sure we get more questions. So let me... that's why we're here today, is to hear from you all, and your comments are right on point. And you're not the only one we've had here [inaudible 00:39:20], your neighbors, your elected representatives, everyone else [inaudible 00:39:27].

Speaker 17: Then after today we'll schedule a poll check and see where we are on time, and what [inaudible 00:39:45].

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 21: Okay. I'm going to step back to the question [inaudible 00:39:49] back here, about the [inaudible 00:39:52] ... In 2012, the regulations on how to regulate, how to develop our community, and two factions which [inaudible 00:40:07].

Speaker 20: The schematics are [inaudible 00:40:18] first slide. There are laws, there are [inaudible 00:40:18] and there are regulations and there are policies. So in 2012 we updated the planning rule, the rule tells us, directs us on how we move forward with planning. And so, the rule [inaudible 00:40:32] in 1982 planning mode they were all in [inaudible 00:40:33] surviving the reviews and rules, so [inaudible 00:40:39].

Speaker 21: So this [inaudible 00:40:33] in 2012.

Speaker 20: Yes.

Speaker 21: Planning, rules were the constants. In both [inaudible 00:40:33] 2016.

Speaker 20: [crosstalk 00:40:51] And one of the things that's key to that and people bring up, we didn't talk about it tonight. We talked about the amount of harm this would have, [inaudible 00:41:04] that does include a number of transition strategy [inaudible 00:41:08].

Speaker 21: It's like [inaudible 00:41:24]. So, everybody's group is running tonight. Everybody's thinking about this and all the edges are arguing with me about timber. But how many timber sales did you guys put out recently? That is still [inaudible 00:05:45]? Or not [inaubile 00:41:48], or indicates that the economics of timber right now don't necessarily mean that if something is open it's going to be [inaudible 00:42:00].

Speaker 20: I followed the question the other night on how much [inaudible 00:42:06]. So the last 10 years we've harvested a 35 million year on average, I'm glad in recent years that's actually gone down, I think the last two years were [inaudible 00:42:11] this year we did have a reduction of [inaudible 00:42:22] of 25 million in sales. [inaudible 00:42:30].

Speaker 18: But North QU was listed and never bid on, and relisted, and then never bid on. So I mean, and that's one of the most recent sales that actually went up, right? In terms of getting posted.

Speaker 21: No Wrangel Island.

Speaker 18: And Wrangel, before that Wrangel Island. Yeah.

Speaker 17: So there's lots of factors in all of your industries [inaudible 00:42:58] are a big deal right now. Young growth, most of this young growth market is an export market and so slap a 20% tarrif on [inaudible 00:43:07] get lots of no bid sales near the end of the year in Washington, Oregon which is [inaudible 00:43:17] some of those other markets have been walking out [inaudible 00:43:17]

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 20: Yeah that's a good question.

Speaker 16: So a piece of the original part of 24,000 public comments in the [inaudible 00:43:27] wing of this. In those, the majority of those comments favor [inaudible 00:43:49] not verbatim.

Speaker 22: Yeah, we actually don't tally it [inaudible 00:44:01].

Speaker 16: They were in favor of no action, yet this proposed alternative is [inaudible 00:44:14].

Speaker 22: Yeah, it's not about [inaudible 00:43:59] process-

Speaker 16: I understand that, but why do we have public comments if the public comment is not really listened to?

Speaker 22: We listen to the merits [inaudible 00:44:38], out of 144,000 comments, actually we only had 1,000 [inaudible 00:08:52]. So only all 144,000 were formally [inaudible 00:45:01], the website, click a button, and this letter comes [inaudible 00:09:06].

Speaker 18: But not verbatim. You counted them differently this time than you normally do. The forest service used to... You could have like two sentences that said an overall direction. And then if you sat down and wrote like 10 sentences afterwards, that used to count as a letter. This time they changed it. And not these gentlemen in the room, I want to be clear, I'm not looking at these guys and being like you, [inaudible 00:45:28], you

changed it. [inaudubiel 00:09:29], I don't think changed it.

Speaker 18: But maybe you did, but you know what happened is they changed the way they counted letters so that what was someone actually taking the time to write what they wanted and to write what they felt didn't get counted because there was one sentence at the top of the letter. Instead they counted it as a single petition even though they got tens of thousands of them. And I think that's important to acknowledge as we think about how to make this process better going forward and whether people are being heard because 90% saying they want no action is pretty substantial. No matter how you do the math, right?

Speaker 20: Did you say the majority of rules are non local?

Speaker 17: So, we can't really tell because most people [crosstalk 00:46:12] don't put their address or they [inaudible 00:10:24]. What's that?

Speaker 20: I thought you said you had a lot more [inaudible 00:46:25].

Speaker 17: There were a lot but you know, we find more of the majority [inaudible 00:46:34]. That's like 90% of them sort of have [inaudible 00:46:40].

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 20: [inaudible 00:46:45]. I think we're going to probably to have to transition in getting ready for [crosstalk 00:46:49].

Speaker 17: There are some people that are uncomfortable with passing the [inaudible 00:46:52].

Speaker 22: Well, there [inaudible 00:47:00] no suggestion that there are restrictions on [inaudible 00:47:05], that would involve low-risk [inaudible 00:47:10]. Because there are statutable regulations that are in effect, that are providing the [inaudible 00:47:17]. Like, reasonable access to [inaudible 00:47:08] business. It's [inaudible 00:47:08] theirs, mostly we've [00:47:08] this process, and 2005 [inaudible 00:47:08] had [inaudible 00:47:35]. The bottom line is all this [inaudible 00:47:38], the candidate from the back [inaudible 00:47:49].

Speaker 17: I appreciate the comment. There is a perceived... that it costs more money, just putting the [inaudible 00:47:59] over us [inaudible 00:48:08].

Speaker 22: [inaudible 00:48:38] would be cheaper to have built [inaudible 00:48:17], asserted that [inaudible 00:48:23]... years for that. Localists were existing at the end of 2001, so [inaudible 00:48:34]. I mean, they didn't propose the roads. Why didn't the [inaudible 00:48:39] tell me, I was on the IFP. So, the best level of all things, oh and you don't know [inaudible 00:48:47]. [crosstalk 00:48:58].

Speaker 17: Well, let's go one more, and then we'll go into [inaudible 00:49:01].

Speaker 16: Okay, but I don't know who [inaudible00:49:04]. So each of these maps talks about the acres that's being removed at [inaudible 00:13:09]. However, some of those underlying planned, pre-existing plan underlying [inaudible 00:49:18] is what is so to tell what actually can happen in there. Is there a map that will show, even though that's being removed from the road less, you still can't harvest there, so or you can do this. I mean, is there a map that clarifies that? [inaudible 00:49:39]. Okay.

Speaker 17: You may look at me. We don't have a printed copy. It's harder to [crosstalk 00:49:44], to be able to scale, but if you use the story map, you can [inaudible 00:49:49] at where you're looking.

Speaker 16: Okay.

Speaker 17: That's the size [inaudible 00:49:49].

Speaker 23: So, do you still have phase one and phase two? We used to have things under one of our forest plans, you had to log so much to get into phase two plans. And so did we get rid of phase one and phase two with the last board plan?

Speaker 22: There still in, yeah, they still apply.

Speaker 23: They still are. So is that in the underlying maps?

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 22: They're in the underlying forest plan.

Speaker 23: Oh but, would Carol see these are phase two lands?

Speaker 22: I think you'd have to go to [inaudible 00:50:24] now.

Speaker 23: [inaudible 00:50:26], what does that mean? [crosstalk 00:50:30].

Speaker 17: So yeah. We'll set up [inaudible 00:50:39] [crosstalk 00:50:37].

Speaker 20: Folks, why don't we just break from here, folks. One on one we'll have time to say [inaudible 00:14:43], we can do that, [inaudible 00:50:44] the set up, over [inaudible 00:00:50:47]. Is there anyone that wants to testify at the assignment? You can get that [inaudible 00:50:51] on the... actually, just a show of hands on how many people want to provide fiscal testimony?

Speaker 20: [crosstalk 00:51:03]. And we can't start that until seven, we have a big [crosstalk 00:51:08].

PART 3 OF 3 ENDS [00:51:42]

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Anchorage, Alaska

November 6, 2019

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service.

Speaker 1: So we don't actually go through and sort out whether the 144,000 comments are from a specific geographic area, we just comments into the process. So I don't know that I actually have a number that we could articulate.

Christine: I don't think we have a specific number but I would say that probably the majority of them were from within the state of Alaska.

Speaker 3: Okay. And for those of us who live there or work there are our concerns getting considered seriously? Because you know there's been a lot of these meetings [inaudible 00:00:32] and things like that over and over for many years and it's really tiresome. And meanwhile there's a lot of families leaving southeast, some of the schools are probably going to have to close. There aren't many jobs. I mean, you can't even live there anymore really with the available jobs. I guess I'm trying to understand [inaudible 00:01:00] system and maybe stop so that we don't have to keep coming to these meetings. Because I mean this has kind of been overturned already a couple times, I mentioned 2003, and it's really hard. And so that's why I'm asking that question. Are we going to be, those of us who actually live there, work there, have property there, are we going to be taken seriously?

Christine: Yes. I think this is the most important time for you to make your voices heard, those of you who are going to be most impacted by this. The secretary has been very clear with us about wanting to know what folks think in terms of the alternatives that we've put out and whether or not it addresses the needs and concerns of the people here in Alaska. IN the beginning when he received the petition from the governor he was very clear about wanting a long term solution to settle this issue once and for all. And so I think now is really the time for folks to make their voices heard during this coming period.

Speaker 3: Thank you.Christine: It's very important.Speaker 3: Thank you.Speaker 1: Thank you for your question. Yes sir?Roadless Rule meeting Anc_Q and A session_6Nov20... (Completed 11/23/19) Transcript by Rev.comPage 1 of 24

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 4: First off, Just want to thank the three of you for coming in here and listening to our comments. And, Christine, thank you for coming all the way to DC. We do appreciate that you guys pay attention to our responses. I'm from Juneau, spent most of my life there. Was just living there in the summer doing commercial fishing, and then [inaudible 00:02:24] so the idea of putting the economy at risk is very personal to me. Looking over at table 211, the expansion of that spreadsheet you were showing earlier, and everything that list minimal beneficial effect and one moderate beneficial effect, minimal, minimal, [inaudible 00:02:45] really don't look like it will go up that much even with [inaudible 00:02:50]. So why are we doing this? Why is it even being proposed other than a petition from the state of Alaska? I mean as professionals, would you guys have advised the secretary to make changes to the roadless rule if it weren't for the petition from the state of Alaska?

Christine: The petition from Alaska was the triggering event for us to take a look at this and we were directed to do that by the secretary. So, when Al got, we did not have a plan to specifically look at the roadless rule as it relates to Alaska.

Christine: A couple of things I wanted to make about the point you made about, why are we showing minimum effects. One thing about the roadless rule is that, to understand is that it's programmatic in nature. It doesn't authorize any on the ground activities. All proposed projects and activities that are proposed at a later date will have to go through subsequent [inaudible 00:03:50] and be consistent with the forest plan that's in place which offers significant level of protections to a lot of the landscape that is also under roadless. Not all of it but a portion of it. And so without knowing, we can't speculate about, no matter what alternative is chosen we can't speculate into the future and say "well I know there's going to be a recreation project over here or a timber harvest over here or some other type of recreate trails project over here" to be able to, we can't analyze the impacts like we do on a site specific project that we know what's being proposed on the ground. SO at this programmatic level there aren't, the roadless rule itself is not going to cause significant changes, it's what activities that are proposed

subsequent to that that you will see the specific changes from those specific projects that are implemented on the ground.

Speaker 1: If I can add a little bit more to it? So the current 2016 [inaudible 00:04:45] enforcement on the Tongass sets the timber harvest at 46 million annually. So that's the average if you look at it across a 10 year period of time. That number doesn't change.

Christine: Can you speak up?Speaker 1: Excuse me.Christine: Can you speak up a little?Roadless Rule meeting Anc_Q and A session_6Nov20... (Completed 11/23/19) Transcript by Rev.comPage 2 of 24

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Yes. I thought I was speaking too loud. I was apologizing. The amended 2016 forest plan still is in place. And so if actions were to occur under that plan all the standards and guides in the plan objective components still exist. So if you took another project that later on occurred that's when the analysis would occur relative to that. So the plan itself is just a land allocation type project. 46 million more feet on average per year on the Tongass, that number stays the same. This just is a flexibility on where [inaudible 00:05:32]. Is that helpful?

Speaker 4: Yeah. It's just that, again, there are other barriers to any sort of development. It's removing one of the barriers.

Speaker 1: Still subsequent environmental [inaudible 00:05:45]. Sir?

Speaker 5: Yeah. My name is [inaudible 00:05:51]. Why don't you have enough faith in your proposal to the Alaska public at this meeting to come and not just [inaudible 00:06:00] to allow a public meeting where the advertising [inaudible 00:06:06] and allow for a reasonable opportunity to occur, and that by the way is state law, a reasonable opportunity [inaudible 00:06:16] you have basically stated that they can only comment, no they could only question and not comment. And I'd like to remind you why is there not a transcriber for this meeting? The record of this meeting? A clear record. Let these people know, why is that you have a presentation that a two hour period you've devoted 48 minutes to a presentation. A presentation where a copy of is not legible on many pages. Good luck to the public. And this notice, as was told to me, was advertised on [inaudible 00:06:57], the register. Why are you fast tracking this scenario until the public can digest the information, know what it's all about, and attend these meetings that you're going at, and why are you doing a sell job? This is a place the public to be heard. Thank you.

Speaker 5: Oh, one last point. It took me several hours to figure out where this was. And why do you have it at a location where it's not accessible for both Valley and Anchorage? This is in a small room, yes, you have enough seating. But you made it so that there's no seating, but if it was in a more appropriate location where most meetings in the feds do is in downtown Anchorage in a larger room so they can be heard. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Thank you, sir. And we would continue to welcome people's comments. If you have something you want to comment on, feel free to write them down. We have paper in the back and everything and you can certainly do that if you like. Yes ma'am?

Speaker 6: Yeah. I'd like to answer his questions.

Speaker 1: Which?

Speaker 6: The gentleman just asked some questions about why the meeting wasn't being recorded. Why people

can't give testimony, and you said "thank you".

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: So different components-

Speaker 6: Can you respond to his questions please? Thank you.

Speaker 1: So there are section 810 of [inaudible 00:08:14] subsistence hearings in most of the locations. They aren't being held in Juneau, or Anchorage, or Washington DC. In Juneau and Anchorage because they're not designated as rural communities, so that's the reason there. But any of the other communities in southeast are having formal testimony from [inaudible 00:08:32] subsistence hearing. At this one it's not because it's not designated as a rural community. I'm going to come up here now to you sir. Yes sir?

John Shane: My name is John Shane. I'm a wildlife scientist. I lived in Juneau from in the mid seventies through the eighties. I conducted research on the Tongass when I worked for the Alaska department of fish and game. I've been involved in Tongass research and wildlife science for the last 40 years. I have a couple of comments and I want to provide a comment because I think it's really important, about habitat and biodiversity. That's one of those important needs.

John Shane: And I read the entire DEIS. I was astounded that the preferred alternative was total exemption. And I looked at the impacts and they're all relatively minor and they don't vary between alternative. And I think the insight that I have having flown hundreds of hours radio tracking deer and bear and mountain goats in southeast and tromped over much of that area, the Tongass forest has only about 50% of the area's forest land. And only about a third of it is what's potentially commercial quality forest land. But in reality only about 5% is of enough commercial value that the industry wants to cut it. AN di think one of the unappreciated, unknown factors is that for 70 years the timber industry has high graded they've selected the very oldest, biggest trees. We all know that, that DEIS recognizes that. But what I see happening with the elimination of the roadless rule is it will give the industry another opportunity to go back and high grade, take the best.

John Shane: The analogy would be for commercial fishing to take, to allow a small harvest of the total salmon population but left that harvest go almost entirely to King Salmon, they're rare and they're very valuable. The big trees have always been rare on the Tongass, they're very valuable not only for timber but for wildlife and fisheries. And I see the roadless rule exemption giving the industry, and this is alluded to in the DEIS, the opportunity. It's not how many acres, it's what kind of acres that are logged, that are cleared out. And taking those very rare, very high value forest sites will have a significant impact on fish and wildlife and the people that use and value the forest. So that's an issue that was no adequately addressed in the DEIS and it's a very serious issue.

Speaker 1: Probably should acknowledge your extensive service to the bio populations of Alaska, very extensive sir. Yes ma'am.

Speaker 8: Excuse me.

Speaker 1: The gentleman behind you way. Can we go and then we'll come back up to you if that's okay.

Speaker 8: [crosstalk 00:12:01] So we spent time together as the gentlemen from Juneau comments, biologist comments, your comments about the programmatic nature of this. I guess I'm also surprised that it went straight to full exemption. Because if the goal is economic development, at least for local communities and partially for your comments too, how come it didn't land on alternative three, which would be more limited scope type development and would probably benefit local contractors and whatnot more than this full exemption which to me, the objects of it are that it reeks of being industry coming in and taking advantage of this. Admittedly, this action is not a proposed project but it's opening the way for a proposed project.

Christine: So I would just ... So this is the secretary's decision. It's his discretion to choose both at this point that what the proposed alternative he chose, this is preferred, as well as the final decision. And he tasked us to make sure that we got as much input and created the types of alternatives that'd be responsive to all of the input that we got, which is what we tried to do our best job here. He has asked us to come back again after this comment period and clearly lay out to him what we have heard from the public so that he can decide which will be the final rule. So, I mean, that's what I can tell you right now. It wasn't my choice, or Earl's or the chief's choice. It's the secretary's discretion and we are trying to provide him with as much information as possible so that he can make an informed decision. So that's why I said it's so important right now for folks to comment during this comment period to make sure that we can clearly articulate to the secretary what the concerns are of the folks in Alaska who are going to be the most impacted by this.

Speaker 1: I'm coming up to her and then I'll come to you and then I'll come across.

Speaker 9: So I know in previous years, this is a question about the forest services policy. I know the forest service's policy was moving away from old growth logging, along with the rest of the country, for lots of reasons including climate change and its wilderness value. And then so also because in the southeast as of a few years ago logging was only 1% of the economic value. Most of their economy comes from government, tourism, and fishing which are benefited by having old growth forest. So I was wondering, what is the forest service's policy now on old growth logging?

Speaker 1: I can offer from the August 2016 amended forest plan following the Tongass advisory committee recommendations and following the public process that it went through, it had a transition from old growth to young growth. Slowed down about 16 years is roughly the easiest way to articulate it. Where it had predominately old growth initially and then that minimum came down and then

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

young growth took over. Trying to represent that, it's a little bit of a question on how well it matches up to the age and condition of the young growth at this point in time if roughly that period of time recognizing that it would

continue about 5 million more feet of the 46 million I mentioned earlier as old growth, that would go into a longer term future and that's really trying to respond to some of the music wood and some of the special wood interests. So it does transition over time for old growth, young growth. But the period of time is a little bit tenuous right now. There's continuing to try to assess what that timeline [crosstalk 00:15:41]-

Christine: And that transition will be in place no matter which alternative the secretary selects.

Speaker 1: Yeah, that forest plan stays in place. There's one back here.

Nikki: Yeah, Nikki. Are there any public meetings planned in communities of [inaudible 00:15:57] or any other communities that may be effected on the [inaudible 00:16:07]?

Speaker 1: In south central this is the only-

Christine: Yeah, this is the only one.

Speaker 1: The closest one would have been Yakutat.

Christine: Right. Which we did yesterday.

Nikki: Okay. And can you explain the DEIS, the language is administrative corrections for the Chugach National Forest, what that means?

Christine: Yes. There are two minor provisions in the proposed rule that relate to the Chugach. One is for minor modifications, administrative corrections like mapping errors and things like that for boundaries. Whatever the [inaudible 00:16:41] maps that the IRAs, well the technology is much better now than it was when we did the [inaudible 00:16:45] mapping. So there are some lines on the map that probably don't make sense from an actual on ground administration standpoint. So there's a provision to allow the regional forestry to make minor administrative mapping corrections, errors, things like that.

Christine: The other provision, which we admittedly, after having [inaudible 00:17:02] comments from folks see that people are interpreting it different than we had intended, allows for the regional forester to make minor modifications of roadless areas. After having about close to 20 years experience with the 2001 rule across the country we recognized that it was an issue not to have that provision. We go have that very similar provision in the Idaho roadless rule and the Colorado roadless rule.

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Christine: And I'll give you an example of what the intent is behind that. So for instance, we had an issue in Idaho where we had a reservoir that needed to have some maintenance and repairs done on it in order to maintain it. The road, they hadn't done anything in a long time, the road that accessed the reservoir to do that went through an [inaudible 00:17:51] roadless area, the old road did. And so they didn't have access to go do the repairs. So there was a minor modification to the boundary made to cherry stem that road out so that they could use that road to access the reservoir to do the maintenance and repairs. So that was the intent behind that minor modification provision. It is not, it was never intended to allow the regional forester to just wholesale say, oh that

area's not going to be roadless anymore. We need to clear up the language on that because it's ultimately not clear that that was our intention.

Nikki: Who would oversee these minor changes, or is there any guideline for acreage or areas effected that it would not need to go through another process?

Christine: It will all be subject to public comment. So it's not just going to happen without folks knowing. There will be a public comment period associated with those proposed modifications.

Speaker 1: Next was over here and then I'll go to this side.

Beth Rosenberg: Hi, my name's Beth Rosenberg. We've actually met. I work for the Alaska department of fish and game. And I worked for six years on the Tongass. I lived in Wrangell and worked at Anan Creek, which is a [inaudible 00:19:00] with this DEIS and this early [inaudible 00:19:05]. I did have two specific questions. And we've had to deal as [inaudible 00:19:11] and scientists, like John Shane was saying, a series of drafted environmental impact statements recently and so some of us are familiar with this language, perhaps all too familiar with this language. And I was wondering if you could explicitly speak to this idea of my understanding is there is direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that need to be explicitly addressed. And when we talk about minimal, these minimal designations, and that as you pointed out everything else resource extraction, especially in the non forested areas, those would be subject to separate draft environmental impact statements and various things, would it be disingenuous to say that that is not an expected outcome of alternative six? Alternative six equals many other projects, almost guaranteed, in the Tongass. And I think we need to explicitly hear what your thoughts are about that. That could lead more to impacts of other things, not just kicking it off to there'll be other meetings like this, right?

Beth Rosenberg: My second explicit question would be, in 2010 there was a major push by the forest service at the federal level to infuse money into recreation which is how actually you and I ended up interacting with each other. And there was a lot of enthusiasm for the economic driver after the closing of many mills, especially in and around Wrangell where many of my friends worked, in to recreation [inaudible 00:20:41] a huge economic driver in the Tongass and in southeast

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Alaska for the reasons that were mentioned. Why are we looking at a summer 2020 push for an alternative six for when that push for recreation funding disappeared without discussion?

Beth Rosenberg: So those are my two explicit questions. Thanks.

Speaker 1: You want to try?

Christine: Yeah. So I'll take the first one. [inaudible 00:21:10] And so, there's a couple things. One, the narrow focus is on the roadless rule and what it does. And the roadless rule does basically three primary things. It prohibits timber harvest and it prohibits road construction and reconstruction with some limited exceptions. So that's the focus of the scope of work that we're undertaking, not future non forested, none of those projects or those kind of things. They don't fall within the purview of the roadless rule. And we have certain responsibilities

under the 1872 mine law that we have to provide access for valid plans regardless of the land designation.

Christine: Related to the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects, so a couple things. We tiered our analysis to the analysis that was done for the 2016 forest plan because the 2016 forest plan analyzed an alternative that imagined, it was an alternative where basically the Tongass was exempt from the roadless rule. So we tiered this analysis to that. So you won't see the level of detail in this DEIS because it was tiered to a previous analysis that analyzed a full exemption alternative. And then the other thing related to that is about this whole idea of a reasonably foreseeable effects. [crosstalk 00:22:39] Right. Right. And so at this point without having an actual proposed project or a site or knowing where something's going to be, we can't analyze something that's not reasonable ... I guess we know in general activities are going to be proposed but we don't know where or to what extent and what types.

Beth Rosenberg: But they're littered in your presentation, resource extraction, I mean you give four separate examples of things the roads would be used for.

Christine: Right. Right.

Beth Rosenberg: And [crosstalk 00:23:03] ease of access in the future.

Christine: But we don't know where, when, how, to what scale, any of those things are going to be. So they're not reasonably foreseeable that we're able to analyze the specific effects of those things because we don't know what they are or when they're going to happen.

Speaker 1: And then I'm going to try to cover the second question. Recreation, tourism, fishing, commercial fishing are by far the larger drivers in southeast, significant. As to the 1% that I think was articulated for the timber industry, I think that's the same numbers that I've seen from southeast conference and some of the

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

other components. It's typically fairly localized in that 1% being the much broader context to the value and the contribution that recreation, tourism, fishing provides. I didn't know where they could go from there so I certainly yield if there's a follow up.

Beth Rosenberg: Well, we can talk further, but I think it's safe to say that the drive towards, push towards encouraging recreational opportunities and all of the ecotourism and all of the things that would be the flip side of what this driver is pushing for, I think it's fair to say that those things were shelved, the funding was cut, and they disappeared whereas this is being pushed through this summer.

Speaker 1: Timing.

Christine: I did want to address the timing and also the recreation fund, the pushed recreation funding. So that is something that is the responsibility of congress. We and many of our partners have gone to congress and pushed hard on our behalf to increase the recreation funding for the agency so that we can meet the demands of the public and maintain the recreation facilities and infrastructure that we have. Our recreation budget has continues to decline over the years and so congress has not responded. So that's not the agency's choice to, congress is the one who says here's how much money you have for recreation. So I just wanted to address that

upfront. And then the timeline. It's a typical timeline for rule making is 18 months to two years and that's kind of the window that we're falling in. And we're following the timeline that we've been given by the secretary. I would encourage you if you have concerns or comments or concerns about that that I would include those in your comments.

Speaker 1: Just for organization I'm going to come up here, come back to you at the end end, over to you, you. Try to keep in over here.

Austin Williams: I'm Austin Williams with Trout Unlimited and it's good that I probably followed that last question because I'll tier off of it a bit. One of the points, Robin, that you raised in your presentation were the key issues that were identified in the scoping comments. And I guess I want to take issue a little bit with how some of that was characterized and urge the forest service maybe to, if necessary, go back and take a look at some of those scoping comments again. The three key issues were to conserve roadless area characteristics, to support community socioeconomic wellbeing, and then conserve terrestrial habitat, black habitat and biological diversity. I know our comments focused on each of those three points, in particular the socioeconomic benefits of the forest. We have 26% of the employment using southeast conference's numbers. Coming from tourism and fishing it's less, it's .7% of the region's economy or jobs are based in the timber, logging, milling. Those are very localized jobs but when you look at the socioeconomic benefits from the Tongass to the community, to people, to the region as a whole, you're largely looking at fishing jobs, you're looking at tourism jobs, you're looking at outfitter and guides, you're looking at those

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

types of activities that largely rely on a healthy forest, beautiful scenery, abundant fish and wildlife.

Austin Williams: So as the forest service is considering the alternatives, when I look at alternative six and a full exemption I don't see it satisfying any of the three key issues that were identified in the scoping comments. And I really urge, I have been to many of these meetings as you all know, I read an embarrassing number of the scoping comments that were submitted to the forest service. The scoping comments, there were certainly some looking at the traditional western extraction values but there were a hell of a lot in there looking at salmon, tourism, recreation, scenery, subsistence, cultural values, recreation, those types of activities that really appear to have taken a back seat unfortunately.

Austin Williams: The one other ... I promise I will ask a question. Going back to the Chugach issue a little bit. I guess I read the language for the Chugach Forest, I understand the desire for administrative corrections although I will point out the 2001 roadless rule allows for updates to the inventories. And so the forest service has the ability to make, in my as an attorney, my conclusion would be that the forest service under the 2001 rule can make administrative changes to allow for clerical errors and out corrections, or updates to the inventory, whatever the forest service decides that may be. The second subpart is extremely alarming and of the proposed rule it simply allows the regional forester to modify the classifications and boundaries of inventory roadless areas and there's no limitation there. It doesn't say minor changes. We will submit written comments but when you look at it, just the plain language of the proposed rule, it does not comport with what the forest service says its intent is here.

Christine: I totally own that, Austin. We missed the mark on that language completely. And so that is something

that we have every intent of clarifying between the draft and the final. Totally agree with you. We missed it on that one, I'll own it.

Austin Williams: Well my question is, will you go look at that?

Christine: Yes I will. I will look at that.

Speaker 1: I was going to acknowledge how many [inaudible 00:29:49].

Christine: And if you think we missed the mark on other analysis that supports or doesn't any of the alternatives, please also include that.

Christine Fly: Yeah. I'm Christine Fly. If I understand correctly, and correct me if I'm wrong, the cap for example being able to harvest timber is still under, even alternative five and six, is 46 million forest feet. And I think the industry has said it needs 75 million forest feet to even survive. So there's a shortage right there it sounds like. The way I understand this is it will still put the remaining timber industry that's now down to less than 1% out of business potentially. Is that correct?

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: So I can't speak to the long term implications to the industry but I would say that 46 million is the annualized expectation of timber from the Tongass National Forest. That does not recognize our colleagues in the other land management agencies and the contribution that they provide which adds to-

Christine Fly: But we're less than 5% of the land ownership in southeast Alaska and it's [inaudible 00:31:24]. Okay. Is the Tongass still for multiple uses?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Christine Fly: All users, all socioeconomic classes of people still will have access to the Tongass, right?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Christine Fly: Under all of these alternatives, under any one of them will that still be the case?

Christine: Yes.

Christine Fly: Okay, thank you. Awesome. Thanks.

Speaker 1: Hold on just one second. I think it was you, then I think it was you, and then I've got to go up front and I'll come back to you.

Speaker 14: I'm going to express a little bit of confusion. I'm [inaudible 00:32:03] from southeast Alaska and my understanding of the previous scoping period is a lot of southeast Alaskans have come out in support of keeping the roadless rule on the Tongass. We use it a lot for cultural purposes, we use it a lot for recreational purposes, we value old growth or our tourism and visitor industries and also our fishing industry because of the effects old

growth have on salmon habitat. There's also a lot of development already on the Tongass and allowed on the Tongass. I'm from Sitka, we have a salmon friendly, hydroelectric dam already there that's powering the whole city. So I guess what my question is, or my confusion is, how is this proposed alternative six listening to the southeast Alaskans who have come to the previous meetings already and expressed support of keeping the roadless rule on Tongass?

Christine: What I would tell you is, I think I'll just repeat what I said before, this is the secretary's discretion and it is incredibly important right now for you to make your voices heard. This is the opportunity during the public comment period for the secretary to hear from folks before he makes a final decision. And if you have concerns about whether alternative six is responsive to the concerns that you have as a southeast Alaskan then that's what we want to see in your comments.

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Okay. Gentleman in the back and then I'll come up front and to you, then to you, then to you, then to you.

Speaker 15: Yeah, thanks so much for being here. I'm Andy [inaudible 00:34:01] of the Alaska Wilderness League. I appreciate the time tonight. We have deep concerns about what's going on in the Tongass but I'll leave that to a comment letter. This is the [inaudible 00:34:08] to you guys so I want to dig into that one a little more. Appreciate the clarity and intentions and I don't have to tell anyone in this room that intentions are not regulations. Regulations are regulations. So I'm looking forward to seeing how that changes that. I will say even the minor explanation for what's trying to be attempted in the Chugach brings deep concern to me as a user of the Chugach and from a conservation perspective, especially when I look at this chart and I see minimal effects and no effect and everything else. This idea of minimal or minor changes to this administration it appears the whole [inaudible 00:34:38] out in Alaska might be minor. So I would really urge the agency to not leave ambiguity in what [inaudible 00:34:46]. I say this having been involved with the Chugach planning process as well where there are some interests that wanted into the Chugach and log and they expressed that during that process. So I think it's very critical that this is very clear, what's going on.

Speaker 15: I want to ask, will the agency just consider leaving the Chugach out of this plan? In the analysis, the slideshow [inaudible 00:35:08] was about the Tongass. At the scoping meeting that was generally the way it was going at scoping, we were all in the room, we were actually across the hall there at scoping but I think that would be the most appropriate course of action instead of muddying the waters and putting 5.4 million acres potentially at the whim of what someone may or may not decide is minor in the future. Would that be a thing we can comment on?

Christine: Absolutely you should. Yes.

Speaker 15: Awesome.

Speaker 1: I'm going to come up front, and then it goes to you. You all are going to have to help me. I've lost track.

Speaker 16: I've got a question about public comments. It seems like it's outlined that this is the only period for public comments until December 17 but don't we also have an opportunity for public comments after the final

DEIS is written before the record of decision is signed?

Christine: There is a 30 day stay, once the final environmental impact statement comes out there is a 30 day period before we can actually promulgate the proposed rule in the records. So the proposed rule will be, the record of decision will be [inaudible 00:36:16].

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 16: After the 30 days?

Christine: Right. There's not another public comment period. That's not public comment period though, it's just a 30 day where the agency, the department has to wait. It's like a waiting period before you can actually promulgate the final rule.

Speaker 16: Okay. But aren't there different public comments for a NIPA process on the EIS and a regulatory process for a new regulation? And so we could comment differently on those two-

Christine: So we did the scoping comment period last year and this is the comment period on the draft DEIS. This is the final public comment period for the ruling.

Speaker 16: For the EIS or the ruling?

Christine: They're connected.

Speaker 17: Correct comment periods. I think what he's asking is-

Christine: Am I missing something?

Speaker 17: There is a comment period on a proposed rule though the APA requires a public comment period.

Christine: They're overlapping.

Speaker 17: They're overlapping and comments submitted on the proposed rule will be accepted at the same time comments on the DEIS. There are technically two different comment periods going on at the same time, they're both 60 day comment periods that overlap each other.

Speaker 16: And don't they have different standards for what's considered substantive comments? For the NIPA you're really asking, what's flawed in the EIS that needs correcting? And in the regulatory it's more, what do you think about the regulation?

Christine: Yes. Technically there are, yes. And we'll consider those separately even though they're all coming into the same system. It's a little confusing the way it works but, yes. If there are comments on the proposed rule and there's comments on the DEIS we expect to get fully to get lots of both to inform the changes we need to make to the final environmental impact statement as well as, and that's going to help the secretary to determine what he's going to select as the final rule, as well as the comments on the proposed rule.

Speaker 17: Thanks. Back to you now.

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Natalie Dossan: Thanks for your endurance on public hearing. My name's Natalie Dossan and I've spent 17 years as a wildlife researcher on the Tongass National Forest, a resident of southeast in the past, I live here in Anchorage now and I'm executive director for Autobahn Alaska. I've been deeply involved in the past forest planning processes as forest service employee with the national forest [inaudible 00:38:44] monitoring program and then as an independent consultant and researcher primarily focused on endemic mammals. So I've worked with the goshawks, the brown bears, the black bears, pacific marten. And I was really curious about section 211 and the [inaudible 00:39:01] tables that gave very high likelihood that the populations would remain well distributed and viable over the course of 100 year span. I didn't see any associated data with those.

Natalie Dossan: And so I'm familiar mostly with endemic mammals, the goshawk surveys because I've done a lot of those for the forest service over the years. The goshawks were stopped in 2015 and a lot of those nest surveys showed across the region that they were abandoned at those times and so we're actually going back to look at viable, well distributed populations since the 2012 fish and wildlife ruling on goshawks that showed if you dropped below that 40% threshold for habitat you may not be able to any longer say that there would still be viable populations. So I just went ahead and ran some numbers with some colleagues and it looks like under the preferred alternative six there will be up to 80% habitat loss for the following species, queen charlotte goshawk, pacific marten, [inaudible 00:40:05] black bear, prince of wales island flying squirrel, prince of wales island spruce grouse. I'm wondering where the data are and if it's possible to get copies of the data that illustrate the results of table 211.

Christine: Do you have any details on that? I'm going to say this was to your analysis [inaudible 00:40:30] forest plan and.

Robin: Yeah, like Christine said a lot of the analysis in this DEIS will fit the analysis that was completed for the forest plan which also included a review of the habitat conservation strategy of the forest plan. So all of that analysis is available from the forest plan record that's available to the public as well as the record of the roadless DEIS.

Christine: Can I just follow up? There's one more thing you mentioned about viability populations. That is something that is addressed at the forest plan so when we propose specific projects we have to ensure that that project is not going to jeopardize the viability of that species across the plan area.

Natalie Dossan: Yes. I know that, so I just want to clarify, the data they used for that table are coming from the forest plan and specifically from the habitat conservation strategy?

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Christine: Follow up with us after and let's take your name so we can get back to you with solid data, information.

Natalie Dossan: Great. And I'll have access to those data?

Christine: Yes.

Natalie Dossan: Great. Thank you.

Speaker 1: Coming up here and back to you, then to you, then to you, then to you.

Speaker 20: Yeah. I'm kind of concerned that climate change hasn't been discussed yet. And I was wondering, because protecting old growth forests should be our top priority since climate change is a current emergency that's affecting the Arctic faster then the rest of the lower 48, and I think it's our responsibility to protect old growth forests for future generations and to stabilize the climate. In your estimate, what percentage of the comments have been about climate change and is that a factor?

Christine: Oh, you mean in the scoping period?

Speaker 20: Yes, for the scoping period.

Christine: I actually have no idea off the top of my head how many comments we got related to climate change. There is a climate analysis as part of the DEIS and supporting documents that was done in conjunction with someone in our office of climate and sustainability. I'd encourage you to take a look at that. And then, I'm not sure that we can get that, we have to check with the content analysis folks to see if we can actually get a specific number of how many comments. Because so many comments have so many things in them, I don't know if we can ferret out every individual one and say we got this many on fish and this many on climate change and this many on bears and this many on. They're all interwoven.

Robin: I do know that we have heard it in every meeting like this.

Speaker 20: I just see it wasn't one of the top three priorities but maybe it was sort of interwoven with all that. Yeah.

Evan: My name is Evan [inaudible 00:43:10]. If alternative six were selected and implemented, would that in any way trigger revisiting of the forest plan because it seems like a massive change in the available resource to manage, in some automatic manner? And if not, would it not be foreseeable given that you have an industry that has said the current forest plan does not provide an economically sustainable level of harvest, would that not lead you to expand the amount of production area but not the amount of production volume, would

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

that not lead to the high grading that John mentioned earlier, and do we not foreseeably expect the industry, which obviously wants its own economic sustainability would choose to harvest the most economically viable trees and not follow the forest service's forecasted ten year switch to second growth which has been proven time and time again not to be economically viable?

Christine: A couple things I would say about that. We do not have an intent, we don't have a plan to amend the forest plan. What the rule making, if alternative six were selected, the full exemption, it would make an additional 165,000 acres of old growth and 20,000 acres of young growth available for harvest beyond what's available now in terms of meeting that 46 million board foot annual average that the Tongass would produce. So it increases the, it gives flexibility in the areas you could go to do that. Those acres of old growth were identified as suitable for timber harvest previously and are currently not because the 2001 roadless rule is in place. So they're not actually creating new suitable acres, they were already suitable and they're just not able to harvest timber because of the current roadless rule restriction right now. So that's the change in difference with full exemption is the availability for industry as an opportunity to go harvest on those additional 165,000 acres of old growth but not increase actual harvest levels. Does that help? Some?

Evan: To me that seems like they are going to choose to high grade the timber but.

Christine: Well, like I said, every project they propose still has to comply with the forest plan and all of the standards and guidelines that are in the forest plan and all of the protections that are in place.

Evan: What metrics were originally used to determine suitability of harvest?

Christine: That's part of any forest planning process where we have to identify acres that are suitable. For instance, on the Tongass is 16.7 million acres total. Of that 16.7 million acres as the very first step that you go through to determine suitability there is 980,000, 970,000 that are suitable. If you go through, and that's without the forest plan in place, and then you go through the process to look at the forest plan and other places, deep slopes, places that are not operable, it comes down to roughly 500,000. And then the forest plan currently has planned 377,000, I think, acres of productive old growth over the life of the plan that's planned. And so what alternative six, the full exemption would do would be to add 165,000 acres of old growth to that 366,000. So basically bring it up to half a million acres of suitable old growth that could be potentially harvested. Is that better. Okay.

Speaker 1: And then we are required to go through an appraisal system called residual value appraisal system that [inaudible 00:47:23] system can operate. And then we utilize our [inaudible 00:47:25] to verify, validate that the prescription needed for that treatment, that action on the ground is sustainable. I apologize, one second. So you and you. I lost track. Please.

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 22: First thanks to all of you for [inaudible 00:47:42] out here, I appreciate that, spend time with us. I find that there's an incredible amount of knowledge in this room that's making incredibly detailed observations and comments. And I have to believe that with six alternatives that of the 144,000 comments that you received that they weren't just binary like all in for the no action alternative or to number six, yet the secretary exercised his discretionary power, ignored what I would assume would have been a real diversity of informed comments, to choose number six. You're saying that he's interesting in hearing our reaction to that, and I'm saying, please carry back to him my concern that what is the probability, what assurance does anybody in this room, in Juneau, in all the other hearings have that their public comments actually matter? That it's not going to be another discretionary decision to just stick with number six? And that any of this matters because right now it kind of doesn't feel that way.

Christine: I appreciate that. And as all of you know, I can't guarantee any of you that he's going to change his mind. But I know that if folks don't speak up then he's not going to make as informed a decision as he could.

Adam: If I could go next. My comment is tiered directly off of hers.

Speaker 24: Go ahead, I'll go after you.

Adam: Okay. The one comment I'd like to make to the room. My name's Adam [inaudible 00:49:40], I'm a federal employee, not with this agency but I'm familiar with the NIPA process. One comment I would like to make is that with the NIPA process the true intent is simply to disclose an event to the public therefore a lot of these comments may or may not have bearing. The question, one question I have for you guys is the secretary of agriculture that you keep referring to, he's an appointed position in the cabinet, okay. And we've already seen this administration appoint lots of people who ... Okay, I'm not going to go down that road. But a lot of people in high level federal agencies like the EPA, the EPA has been gutted, people have been removed from their positions, reassigned to locations far, far away. I have seen it, it has happened to my friends. It does not sit well with me. So my comment to everybody here in the room is that to make any meaningful change we have to do it through law which is to vote for the right people to get them in that legislative process. Us commenting on NIPA isn't necessarily going to get us where we want to be. So we need legal action and we need to vote in the right people.

Speaker 1: Would you come up front? You were next in line.

Speaker 24: Yeah. I'll take a different tack, but thank you for that. I want to ask about the roaded roadless, so you described them, or somebody described them in the PowerPoint, these are areas where they're roadless areas but there are roads in them because they were either built before 2001 or while the roadless rule was being challenged or exempted. But I notice that in all of the action alternatives, maybe not five and six, but in two, three, and four, those alternatives would

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

remove the roaded roadless from the roadless inventory but that some of the alternatives would also create new, quote unquote, roadless categories that would actually allow for more road building. So wouldn't those alternatives lead to more roaded roadless areas? So my question is why do you create more roaded roadless when you're trying to get rid of the roaded roadless from the roadless protections? And won't those areas be vulnerable to your agency removing them entirely from the roadless base in the future?

Christine: So, yes, it's all very confusing. I'll just say that upfront. The intent is, if you remember Robin, currently on the 2001 roadless rule there's basically everything's managed the same and there's a limited set of exceptions that allow for road construction, reconstruction, right? In the current 2001 rule. The alternatives were developed in response to what we heard from the public and others, tribal consultation and the state's committee. So we heard from some folks that they really like the 2001 roadless rule in place but they would like some additional exceptions for things like, currently for geothermal, there isn't currently an exception to develop a geothermal energy source and have road access to that in a roadless area. There isn't currently an exception in 2001 roadless to do other things that local communities said were important to them but they'd like to broadly keep the roadless protections in place.

Christine: So that's why we developed those five different categories of roadless priority to look at, some are more restrictive, some are less restrictive, to try to respond to some of what we heard from the public about additional local economic opportunities they've had that they would like or just for community wellbeing like Robin mentioned, in order to have access to energy development to support local communities, to have access to native, access for native communities for important tribal ceremonies and foods and things like that that they may not currently have access to do because of the limits on road construction and reconstruction. That was the intent and, yeah, it seems like you're creating more roaded roadless but they're really put forward as a set of exceptions to respond to the public comment we got from people about what they would like exceptions for. Generally you can't build roads but we would like an exception to go do this activity.

Speaker 24: And the timber priority would allow for timber production and road building without limitation?

Robin: Correct, yes. There are no limitations on timber harvest or [crosstalk 00:54:22].

Speaker 24: I guess you haven't answered my question. Why remove the roaded roadless when you're creating more categories that would build more roads. Why not include those in part of the categories? And then if you're not going to, would those areas that have new roads in them become vulnerable to removal from the base?

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Christine: Not unless we went through another rule making process. In alternative two, if you look from Robin's presentation, alternative two is actually more restrictive than the current 2001 roadless rule.

Speaker 24: That's not my question.

Christine: But removing the roaded roadless from that you're basically saying, okay, we have roads, these places were developed while the exemption was in place or [crosstalk 00:55:07].

Speaker 24: Well why not restore them? There's no alternative that takes those areas and says, you know, these areas still could be restored to former roadless characteristics, they're also potentially fragmenting roadless areas that would remain under alternative two.

Christine: Yeah. Well if you think that's something we ought to look at then tell us that and we will-

Speaker 24: That's why I asked that question and I'm unsatisfied with the answer but I'll be commenting.

Christine: I don't have a reason why we structured all of the alternatives the way we did. We were trying to be responsive to the input we had. If you think we should have looked at that as an option then please provide that comment and [inaudible 00:55:42].

Robin: If I could add one more thing on the roaded roadless. It wasn't just, those areas don't just include roads. They did include timber harvest as well, those roads were largely constructed for access to timber projects. So when we looked at those areas it's not just that there was a road in it, they had seen other kinds of development that kind of took them out when you think about conserving roadless area characteristics which the original rule was designed to protect they didn't necessarily still have those characteristics in those areas because they had been bulk roaded and in large part they had also been harvested in the past. So they just simply didn't provide

the typical character that roadless area provide. So those were the acres that were removed. It wasn't just because they had a road. It was because they had seen other development as well.

Christine: Thank you Robin.

Speaker 1: So I've got two more questions in the room. We have about 15 minutes I would think for others who have questions. So we've got at least four, five. Okay. Back of the room and up to here, on to you on this side and then we'll go back to you.

Speaker 25: Yeah so I missed the first part of the hearing, the presentation. Was government

to the governing composition talked about? There was? Have there been any

developments since mid October with consultation to the tribe [inaudible Roadless Rule meeting Anc_Q and A session_6Nov20... (Completed 11/23/19) Page 19 of 24 Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

00:57:18]. The six tribes [inaudible 00:57:26] turned down for face to face consultation with [inaudible 00:57:30].

Speaker 1: Do you want to address this?

Christine: The under secretary had a couple of conversations with President Jackson and President Wallace. They were the two tribal entities that had sent that original letter to Secretary Perdue requesting consultation. The under secretary was just out here this past weekend and did a day of tribal consultation with seven or eight tribal entities, I think one didn't make it because some ferries got

canceled. But, yeah. Spent a day doing tribal consultation this past Saturday and

has committed to continue that throughout the process.

Speaker 25: In the [inaudible 00:58:21] of the six tribes came out and said they don't agree with alternative six. And I guess my question is, I feel like what you guys are doing is completely disrespecting those six tribes, I want to just ask why, why are you doing it?

Speaker 1: There is no attempt or intent to ever be disrespectful in that aspect-

Speaker 25: But if someone says, we don't consent to alternative six?

Speaker 1: Our meeting on Saturday with the tribal officials and entities there, I thought the discussion, the dialogue was very good. I thought the intent, the effort by the under secretary to meet with those tribal entities in a governed to government way was very good. A further commitment to continue in that effort will be ongoing. As to how it was felt to portray, I think that each of the tribal entities can express their own views but it was pretty clear to me that there was a need to get together, it was necessary, and I think that the discussion, the dialogue [inaudible 00:59:31] was actually pretty productive. I hope that we continue in a productive way to continue to represent that effort. And I know the commitment from the under secretary is there. Yes sir?

John Shane: I want come back to science and old growth and large field growth for a moment. But I wanted to thank you three because this is a tough time to be a federal employee and I think you're trying hard and I

appreciate that.

John Shane: When I talk about large tree, old growth, I'm talking about trees that are four to ten feet in diameter. There aren't many ten footers left, I've seen a couple of nine footers in the Tongass and they're really hard to find. On Prince of Wales Island, north Prince of Wales, north central Prince of Wales, it's a biogeographic region, the large tree contiguous, these are the big [inaudible 01:00:31], the contiguous large tree old growth has been reduced by 96%. We published that in Conservation Biology, Dave Albert and I from TNC in 2013. That's a really serious issue. That's high grading. We know that old growth is non renewable. You don't create old growth in 100 years or 200 years. It starts developing old growth characteristics at about 300 years. So scientists have recognized that old

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

growth is rare, it's highly valuable, and the Tongass is the only national forest in the nation that still clear cuts old growth forest. That's an issue but it's complicated because of the high grading. And north Prince of Wales was the most productive forest area in all of Alaska and it's been nailed.

John Shane: So this roadless rule really worries me because I see the opportunity for the industry to go in and cherry pick and get the best of what's left. And that's going to have an impact on all of those species like goshawks and marten and salmon in some cases, that require and really need those big tree old growth forest. Th scientific community has absolutely come together on this whole idea that old growth is too valuable to be clear cutting anymore. And I would suggest, and I'll put this in my extensive comments, and I had extensive comments that hit all these issues and I didn't see these things addressed which you know. I think that to go to alternative six we're really talking about unsustainable management of old growth and big tree old growth and all the creatures that need those stands. I just really think that's important and I think you folks understand some of that and you're constrained. But it's important that we, every one of us, makes sure that we get the facts out and the science on the table and force the decision makers up high to do what is the right thing for the American public. Thank you.

Speaker 1: I lost track of where I was going next. I guess [inaudible 01:03:01] gentleman over here and then [inaudible 01:03:03].

Speaker 28: Oh. First off, I mean [inaudible 01:03:07] support for no actions and it seems like that's the majority of the people here but I do want to apologize to any people who really do support the full exemption, we respect your views, sorry you don't feel like speaking up, just disagree with you. I have a question, I guess it's mostly for Christine since you seem to have had the most face time with secretary Perdue. What can you tell us actually about his persona? What comments supporting no action plan would really hit home with him since it really his discretion, like [inaudible 01:03:38] don't really matter, it's really his decision?

Christine: I ant guess, I'm not going to guess, talk about the secretary's persona.

Speaker 28: What's important?

Christine: What's important? What I think is the most important thing to note is he really does have an interest in settling this issue and would like to see a long term solution put in place. And so the things that he would like to hear are things that are going to support what folks think the long term solution is. We would like you to not go

back and have to, we've been in court for almost 20 years on this issue. It's been divisive, it's controversial, people have a wide variety of viewpoints about what they think about roadless area management on the Tongass specifically. I think anything you can do to provide what you think would be a long term solution to this challenge.

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 24: Can I ask a follow up to that? Was that part of the rationale for choosing alternative six? Because that wouldn't seem to be a sustainable?

Christine: I can't guess to what the secretary's rationale is. It's his decision, not mine.

Speaker 24: I thought you said that was what would be important for the final decision?

Christine: For the long term, for a final decision for what a long term solution is going to be. The secretary chose what he thought was most responsive to the state's petition and at this point in the process. I'm not into his head.

Speaker 24: I know, I know. But you characterized it that that would be an important piece of the final.

Christine: It is important.

Speaker 24: And so I was wondering, was that an important piece to this preferred alternative that's identified in the draft?

Christine: I don't know if that was important or not. What was important to him for the draft was for us to create a wide variety of alternatives that addressed what we heard proposed.

Speaker 1: I want to try to honor and respect the folks who waited in line.

Speaker 24: Yes sir.

Speaker 1: I thought there was one more over here, is that you? I apologize. Did I get out of order?

Speaker 29: I don't know. My question also has to do with the concern of the gentleman in front with the old growth trees in the Tongass, some at over a thousand years old. I have a huge concern with the climate change impacts of logging of the old growth trees in the Tongass and I had a question about some of the science in the draft DEIS that recognizes that we're looking at 1.5 to 3 degrees celsius of warming in Alaska by 2050, recognizes that the Tongass plays an important role in regulating global climate, and that changing the forest would carry global consequences but then follows up that emissions from logging would be temporary. which scientists seem to disagree with that those emissions would be temporary, would be recaptured by young trees. We're talking about thousand year old trees releasing carbon, it takes a really long time for trees to store that carbon. New growth trees would not be capturing that carbon. So I'm curious about the science, the temporary emissions of carbon from the old growth trees in the draft DEIS, where that came from?

Christine: That's certainly not my area of expertise. But if you want to talk to us after and we can take your name down I can put you in touch with someone who can answer your questions because I cannot. I can't.

Speaker 1: So we're down to the last five minutes. We have two more questions.

Speaker 30: Since we're on the subject of old growth, what are some of the other limitations or regulations that are allowing for old growth?

Speaker 1: All of the operations currently that result or have a component of harvesting on the Tongass National Forest are as related to the forest plan And the authorities or direction of legislative statues that exist for that. I don't know how I can get [inaudible 01:07:31] specific legislation.

Speaker 30: I'm sorry. I thought I remembered reading something in the draft DEIS about changing the forest plan to a certain percentage of old growth so you're getting more old growth as years go on and that'll eventually balance out. And I thought there was some regulation that initiated that but I couldn't recall what it was.

Speaker 1: I will attempt to go through it and I certainly yield to my colleagues. Initially, this was as related to the amended forest plan of 2016, that came from a 2013 memorandum to the agency to come up with a social, ecological and economic answer that would seek to transition from old growth to young growth.

Speaker 30: That was it, yeah.

Speaker 1: And there was a second component about providing for sustainable energy sources. In that the expectation was to try to do it in the next 10 to 15 years under the memo. As we went through the analysis it looks like it's slightly over 15 years and we're continuing the information collection for young growth because as indicated, I heard from somebody about the viability of the industry and the product at that point in time. So we're not sure exactly what the timeline is but the intent is to reduce down from the current levels of old growth harvesting down to a level of about 5 million, replace that wood product, supply with young growth over that period of time. And then the 5 million old growth would continue, the 41 remain a million under the current forest plan would end up being transitioned in to young growth. So it is an old growth to young growth transition plan.

Speaker 30: And then, just how often is a forest plan revised?

Christine: Technically speaking, they're supposed to be revised every 15 years. We still have many forest plans that are over 30 years because we've been through multiple planning rules that have not survived. So the 2012 planning rule has actually been probably the most stable planning environment we've had in a long time. We are just starting to put out plans that have been revised under

This transcript was exported on Nov 25, 2019 - view latest version here.

the 2012 rule but we still have a lot of plans that are much older than 15 years. And many of those have been amended throughout that time span.

Speaker 1: There was one more question from the back. Yes sir.

Speaker 31: I just have a quick question about the maps. Could you verify the difference between development and non development LUDs as well as priority LUDs, just so we can understand what each of those color legends represent?

Robin: The difference between development and non development was, again that goes back to the forest plan. If you think of the forest plan like a zoning process, when you go through a forest plan amendment or revision you're looking at the entirety of the forest and you're determining what uses are most appropriate for certain areas of that forest. So you go through the forest planning process which, as does the roadless DEIS it might have a variety of different alternatives and then the end, and this goes back to the 2008 Tongass amendment actually was the last time that all of those land use designations were considered on the forest. It separated all of the land on the forest into different land use designation and I don't know the total number of land use designations. I think there are close to 20 different types of land use designations. Those include the old growth habitat LUDs, those are the LUDS with the old growth preserve so to speak. And includes a [inaudible 01:11:10], the current LUD 2 areas, those are statutorily designated but they are also a LUD in the forest plan.

Robin: So the difference between the development and the non development LUDs, the development LUDs are the timber production, modified landscape and [inaudible 01:11:29], those are typically the LUDs that allow commercial activities like mainly commercial timber harvest and road construction that's associated with that. There are other types of commercial activity that might be allowed in non development LUDs, those would be more non discretionary activities like mining operations, the forest service can't prohibit someone who owns a valid mining claim, we can't prohibit their legal right to operate that mining claim. So some of those activities might occur in the non development LUDs but when the forest service actually considers and authorizes other types of activity those occur in the development LUDs if that helps at all. So there's really only three land use designations on the Tongass that kind of fall into that development LUD category. And, again, that's timber production, modified landscape, and scenic leisure.

Speaker 1: So with that that concludes the time that we had scheduled for this meeting. We are willing to stay around for another 20 or 30 minutes if people want to look at the ...

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Washington, DC

November 14, 2019

BEGINNING OF PUBLIC MEETING Q&A PERIOD

Christine Dawes: 29:56 Roxanne is back in the back here in the I think purple sweater so

if you want to go to your closest person with a microphone or Roxanne, you want to start up here?

Roxanne: 30:13 Okay. Thank you very much.

Kari Ames: 30:24 My English name is Kari, my Tlingit name is [foreign language]. I

am with the Women's Earth Climate Action Network. We understand that over the last years you have ignored requests for better tribal consultation. You have funded the logging industry to help with the rulemaking but not us. We are missing the subsistence hearings in our hometowns and a D.C. subsistence hearing would have been a great opportunity for us for we are missing out on the ones back home. We also are glad that you have agreed to adding more hearings. Specifically, we're asking for those in Juneau and Anchorage for our people are being displaced from their villages. And this is why they're going to these places. They will not be advocating for just Anchorage or just Juneau. They're advocating for their home towns and communities that they have had to move away from.

And this is not to mention the fact that you weren't even recording the comments made this afternoon or at most of the public hearings in Alaska, there is no excuse for that. You could have brought in a court reporter or video recorded it and had comments transcribed. The forest service takes public comments as many of these meetings. So to my question, why is the forest service refusing to truly listen to the people who will have to be left in this devastation but the consequences of this repeal, especially Alaska natives?

Thank you. I think we've done 17 we're doing 17 subsistence hearings, all of that are being recorded. They will be transcribed. And for those of you that came here today that this will offer some additional hearings.

We wanted to clarify that Yes, We know that you are recording the subsistence hearings, but we want the Tongass ones recorded too. We feel that is taking away your obligation to listen to us. Some of our elders in our home towns don't have

ways to do a submission online or write letters and stuff, so we are silencing the voices of the people who live in these small towns or who have had to move to the bigger cities because they cannot support their families. We need our voices to be heard and to exclude these people is not right.

Chris French: 32:52 Thank you. I appreciate it.

Adrian Lee: 32:52 [foreign language 00:33:30] My name is Adrian Lee. I'm Tlingit

of the Tongass National Forest indigenous to the Tongass national forest. I'm proud to say I'm the voice of the Tongass women's earth climate action network, WECAN international. As people of the forest and people of the sea, we must speak out for our children's grandchildren to protect our homelands. I'm here representing 95% of Alaskans who are for protecting the Tongass national forest and the 2001 Roadless rule, something that the

forest service has been for, for almost 20 years now. Alaska native tribes are the landowners of private property that our regional corporations Sealaska continues to clearcut on under the state of Alaska law. They do not speak for us and they do not speak for me, nor should any corporation voice in the Roadless rule be considered mine by the Alaska

congressional delegation.

I maintain my own Supreme sovereignty within the authority of my own cultural indigenous tribal laws. I stand in solidarity with my sisters in Hoonah, since the forest service comments in every single poll that you have already have shown that the majority of people in the Southeast and across the country, want the Roadless rule kept in place. Why do you insist upon repealing of the Tongass Roadless Rule?

Thank you. I, I really appreciate the comment and I think that's what's very important about this space right now, both the public comment period and the continuing consultation. We need to hear what people think. This is a proposal. The secretary has indicated his preferred alternative, but it's not a final and this is the space for voices to be heard. Any other questions?

Hi, I'm, Lance Preston, commercial salmon fisherman from Sitka, Alaska here on behalf of the seafood producers

cooperative, the oldest and largest fisherman's cooperative on the Pacific coast with more than 500 individual fishermen owner members. My question, would you not agree that the greatest economic contribution to the Southeast Alaska region to both commercial and the commercial fishing is the commercial fishing industry and the visitor industry? Is it not the greatest contribution, the salmon?

So yes. The only thing I've got when I'm thinking about the charter economic contributions, I actually think there was a larger sector that was in government and I, what I believe the next one absolutely after that is absolutely correct. The sequencers, you are correct, right?

The Tongass, the Tongass--does the Tongass national forest provide more jobs? In government or more jobs?

You're right. The biggest driver of the economy in Southeast Alaska directly ties in Tongass fisheries, in seafood, in tourism from the other data that's been provided to us. Question here.

Imperiled wildlife like wolves, Sitka Blacktail deer and northern goshawks depend on intact forest to survive. Science has demonstrated how clearcut logging and destruction of their habitat harms their species, yet that is precisely what the forest service is proposing. What will the forest service do when the populations of wolves, deer decline even further?

So thank you for your question. As Chris and I both, I think I mentioned before the governing document is the Tongass forest plan and so the protections that are currently in the forest plan are going to remain in place. So the, the requirements of standards and guidelines that projects have to be consistent with or remain in place. The Roadless rule does not change any of those standards and guidelines under which we have to comply whenever we implement projects. So whenever any, any project or activity is proposed, we'll go through an environmental analysis under the national environmental policy act and have a public comment period and take input on those projects and make those decisions at those times so that the Roadless rule itself will not actually remove any of those protections.

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS
Washington, DC

November 14, 2019

Roxanne: 38:17 I'm Matt [inaudible] from Severn, Maryland. Is there any effort

towards replanting when harvesting is done in the timbered areas? I think that's kind of important for all those places. And also, is there any effort to understanding the climatic effect...hello are you paying attention to me? Is there any effort to understanding the climatic effect of harvesting the timber? You call yourselves the Forest Service of America and I'd kind of expect you to research that before you make changes that could not only impact Alaska but all of us.

Christine: So I'm not sure I got all of your questions but I'll do my best to answer. Under the National Forest Management Act, we are required to ensure that acres that are commercially harvested have to be restocked, and that can happen one of two ways. It can be through natural regeneration, or it can be through reforestation. So it really depends on the site. There is a, part of the environmental impact statement, there was an analysis done on the climate effects and the carbon sequestration related to timber harvest, so that is part of the analysis in the EIS, and I think I missed your middle question. Ok. All right.

Joel Jackson: My name is Joel Jackson. I know both of you. I'm from the Organized Village of Kake, I'm the President, and you know, we've been through this process before, with the forest service. It's so hard to continuously fight for traditional homelands. It's sad, you know, to see what's planned for our area. I'm worried about our area. They can speak for their territories, I can speak for mine. So they're going to have to speak up, and they're doing a good job. But you know, I'm just making a comment, I'm not looking to ask a question. My comment is that ever since the logging has been done around Kake, the forest has struggled to come back. Before, when there was logging that was taking place you didn't see much deer. When I was growing up you

could see deer out the back door. We could hike up the hill, shoot what we need, and come home. After logging taking place around our community by the forest service the deer more or less disappeared and we have to make the journey across the sound to deerhunt around back of the island. And we lost 3 young men on that journey. They were returning from Admiralty Island. They drowned. And now, the last couple years, the deer have rebounded. Since the forest is healing, the deer have started coming back. And we have a healthy moose population. And a healthy wolf population. We have a trapper

on our island and he traps wolves. And so this year I think it's the record number of deer. But the streams continue to struggle. The salmon are not coming back in the numbers that they used to. It really hurts us as a native people as the salmon is a keystone to our livelihood and we have to travel further and further away to try to get them. I'm hoping, and we have addressed the forest service, Secretary Sonny Perdue, and Undersecretary Hubbard, as well as our Alaska delegation, that we protect what we have left of the old growth. So we will stand our ground again, don't get me wrong, we will continue to stand our ground. And you guys know what our alternative is. So thank you.

Marina Anderson: I've had my hand up for quite a while. I would not like to turn my back to the entire audience, I want you all to be able to see my face. So if it's appropriate I will address everybody. Marina Anderson [foreign language including recitation of family origins] Forgive me if you do not understand what I said. I introduced myself to you. I come to you from my homeland, Prince of Wales Island, [foreign language] is where my clan is from. And I come from the Sculpin House. I apologize if you didn't understand everything that I said, but I am reclaiming a language that has been ripped away from me and has been ripped away from our people. So bear with me as I express that way. For the attendants, this is quite a show, this is more people in this room than there are actually in my village. And there are more stores in this complex than there are actually in my village as there are zero. So my first question is, to Mr. French, did you say that a ton, a lot of acres that are included in the roadless plan, are a ton of acres that you are never going to do anything with?

Chris French: 00:00 So what we talked about, when you look at the total number of

acres in the Tongass, there are limitations to what we have, various laws and regulation about what could be harvested or not, and one of those, which is a requirement of the National Forest Management Act, looks at suitable acres or not, and one of those pieces are steep slopes. And so those pieces would fall out of being a suitable acre. And that analysis was done in the 2016 forest plan.

Maybe you didn't understand my question, it was a yes or no. Did you say that these are a ton of acres you're never going to do anything with. They're too steep.

I'm not sure if I said a ton of acres. The way that I would speak about that is that when you look at suitable acres, that we have to, when we look at forest plans, we follow that guidance and steep slopes are one of those pieces that we have to look at.

Okay. Well I know it's been really busy so I'll refresh your memory. This is a direct quote I have from you during the consultation that we had with Under Secretary Hubbard recently. And this quote alone, forgive me if I do disrespect other views that are in this room. This quote alone shows that there is a lack of respect for our cultures, our peoples, and our ways of life. Not every single acre, how we utilize and tromped through, and used for extraction, we understand the importance of intact old growth forest. We understand the importance of the old growth forest holding water back from flooding our streams was silt, choking out the salmon eggs and making it so that our indigenous people cannot eat and feed their families.

Marina Anderson: 01:31 And making it so that our commercial fishermen cannot make a

living and cannot provide other variety salmon to the rest of the lower 48 and across the world. We understand our lands better than anybody else will. And this is a very naive statement I think, because it shows Mr. French, and I do have respect for you, but it shows that you do not understand us, and you do not understand our traditional ecological knowledge. Now I have another question. Is it true that the forest service altered the comments of the cooperating agencies before putting out the DEIS? And that's a yes or no question.

Chris French: 02:11 I'm not aware of it.

Marina Anderson: 02:14 Well I'm aware of it. Cooperating agencies had a meeting with

the forest service. The forest service themselves told us we were not aware that these comments were altered before they were published. They are altered so significantly that I could barely even find my own comments. And my next question, is it true that tribes, the cooperating agency tribes, provided the

forest service with maps to be included in the DEIS that included our traditional territory?

Yes, that's true.

And were the maps included in the DEIS?

Not all of them. And we acknowledge that in the DEIS and we've talked about that in each of our hearings.

And why was that not included? The traditional territory of the people that have been living in these areas for over 10,000 years. And I saw up here that has said that we've been living in a national forest for over 10,000 years. I'm sorry, but we have been there before the national forest system has come into place.

Yes. And I greatly respect that. Yes, most of the maps were included. Two communities were not. We weren't able to get them into the deadlines we had. And we acknowledge that in the DEIS, we've acknowledged that in all of our public meetings and the subsistence hearings and we've provided those maps for the public to see.

Okay, thank you. This is a great quote I have in here. I just have to read it. "We were conservationists way before that was a word". That comes from a man that I respect very well, Joel Jackson. Okay. Now I have another question. If you came to our village, if you got dropped off with nothing, nothing on your back, what would you do?

Chris French: That would be a hard thing to do, to answer.

Marina Anderson: That would be a hard thing to do, because we don't have a single store, like I said, and so we rely heavily on our traditional economy. We rely heavily on trade. We rely heavily on our hunters going out and getting the deer and our fisherman going out and getting the fish, our women weaving the basketry, we rely heavily on intact old growth forests. So, Mr. French, if you came to Kassan, with nothing on your back, I promise our people will take care of you, because we have salmon in our cupboard and we have deer in our freezers and we have fish

eggs in our freezers. And we ill pull it out and we will feed you until you are full and we will wait, we will stay hungry[mdash]we will not feed ourselves until you are full, because you are a guest on our land. And that's exactly what I mean. You are a guest on our land. On our land. The land that we have protected for over 10,000 years. The land that we have lived in, in harmony. We've lived with the trees. We've lived with the waters. We've lived with the skies, and we've had nothing but respect for them. I have one last question. Are you aware of our spiritual connection with the trees and our ceremonies with the trees?

I'm not aware of the specifics. I'm aware of the broader pieces of the culture, and there are others that have worked with us that are more aware than I would be.

Thank you for your comment. I would like the next time become aware. Become aware with the specifics because the specifics are exactly what matter. Don Young, himself, yesterday was saying this is nothing about timber, yet timber was the first thing mentioned in almost every single sentence here. Mr. French, this is all I have for now. Thank you very much. I appreciate your time.

Thank you.

[inaudible 00:00:55].

I appreciate your advice and your [crosstalk 00:00:58]. [inaudible 00:01:02].

[crosstalk 00:01:04] Hello. [inaudible 00:01:05].

Hello. [inaudible 00:01:14]. Hello. My name is Gene. I'm a [inaudible 00:01:18] from Annapolis, Maryland. I had a question about the comments. I know that other agencies have problems with comments being attacked by bots and troll farms paid for by industries. I'm wondering, how important are the comments, and do you guys have a way of weeding out those trolls? The second question is based on a photo of the president with the governor of Alaska on Air Force One with his thumbs up. That's when all our problems started. Does any of this really matter? I

mean, this man acts like he's a monarch and that this land is his now. Blue Wave 2020, thank you.

Chris French: 00:02:07 Thanks. All right, your first question. I'm not aware of any issues

we've had with bots. We get lots and lots of comments. Some of them unique and some of them postcards. Then, we also use alternate other ways to inform the process. Whether it's through hearings, written comments that we receive at meetings through our consultation processes, and then, the input through cooperating agencies. On the second piece, I'm very aware. I get asked that question quite a bit about the role of the president in the final decision here.

Chris French: 00:02:45 What I want to share with you is that we, as an agency, and in

my conversations with secretaries, this space we're in right now, we take comment back to hear what people think about what's been proposed and why is very important. No final decisions have been made. We have many examples of when we've gone through periods like this, and decisions can change based on what people say. I have done this sort of work for more than 25 years in Forest Service. We take our responsibilities very seriously in terms of making sure that folks are heard, and that we reflect those, and we make decisions that are reflective of those things that we hear. We accurately portray all of that says Secretary of Agriculture. I think you can probably see that in the alternatives that we provided based on the initial comments that we got. Hopefully, you can see yourself in one of those. Ultimately, when all of this comes in, that decision by the Secretary of Agriculture will be born by all of this.

Speaker 5: 00:03:56 Hello. I have a question about the Tongass. Multiple studies and

many anecdotes as you've heard here show and highlight the importance of Tongass of it being rich for wildlife. They also show that logging and boating outgrows and degrades the ecosystem and the habitat for wildlife. I'm wondering why the US Forest Services is moving forward with a proposal that would degrade the habitat and ecosystems where those animals live instead of strengthening protections.

Chris French: 00:04:32 Excellent. Our mission is multiple use. Yes, part of our mission is

to provide forest products, other renewable resources, and

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

natural resources that come from public lands. But it's also about ensuring that we are conserving those lands, preserving those lands in wilderness and in other areas, and ensuring that we are managing for long-term ecological integrity. We're managing for wildlife habitats, protecting endangered species, all of those. Your questions about if you look at the 2016 Forest Plan. It directly takes on those issues. It talks about those effects, and those effects when we do those other activities that are a part of our mission. It talks about how you do those, and the levels that you could do those, so that you could do it in a way that provides the sort of protections that are needed. It tells you where you can't do those, such as those watersheds.

Chris French: 00:05:31 We talked about the T77 that protects salmon fisheries and

things like that. That doesn't change in this world. I know that's tough. Because what this rule maybe really does is says what would be available that has prohibitions from [inaudible 00:05:50] but doesn't get into any of those specifics within the Forest Plan. The Forest Plan really is the piece that was redone in 2016 that drives those outcomes. What this does do is it changes what acres could be suitable for timber harvest. It doesn't change how we harvest it, the amount we harvest it, or the protections that we've included when that's done to minimize any impacts. But there are impacts. We talk about that and release it in the environmental impact stage. The biggest controlling factor is going to be those other pieces right now.

Michael Chilton: 00:06:26 Hi, my name is Michael Chilton I'm with the Tlingit People. I was

born and raised in Juneau, and currently living on Prince of Wales Island. I'm an uncle to 13 nieces and nephews [inaudible 00:06:47] my brother and sister [inaudible 00:06:48]. I look forward to them being in our traditional [inaudible 00:06:53] soon. I do understand there's a lot that goes with that. I'm learning the ways of how to live in traditional ways with our traditional harvesting of trees. My question is why do you see any effect to our third sources acceptable. Out of all the options there, there was only one that said no effect to our third sources. Why is any of that at all acceptable?

Chris French: 00:07:23 I appreciate your question. As part of this process, we're

required to look at a range of alternatives to meet what both the states petition the secretary for, as well as the input we got during this scoping period. The range of alternatives you see

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Washington, DC

was responsive to the full range of comments. Everything from keeping the 2001 rules in place, and through to full exception with various levels of protection in between. That's what we're presenting, and you're welcome to comment on. I appreciate very much the comments that we've heard today from the folks from Alaska about the importance of the forest to your food sources, and your culture, and your way of life. I really would look forward to hearing the comments that you provide so that we can make sure we include that input when we develop the final environmental impact statement and share what we've heard with the secretary.

Sorry, I don't feel like my question is really answered. I felt like it kind of got danced around. I don't know if anybody else mentioned that, but it's exactly [inaudible 00:08:28]. Does any effect to our food source sound plausible as an option, as opposed to no effect to our food source, which is currently coming back?

I think to Chris's point before about the requirement we have under the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act, we are a multiple use agency. There are effects to some of the things we do. We put Forest Plans in place to try to minimize those effects as much as possible.

Hi, my name is Greg Singleton. I'm from Springfield, Virginia. I grew up born and raised in South Carolina. After a full career in the military, I retired in Virginia, so I'm calling Virginia my home now. But one of the things I did in the military was I swore to support and defend the constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. The reason that I did that is because I love this great country, and part of what I love about this great country is our great and wonderful natural resources, which includes all of our national forests. At the very beginning, I would like to say I oppose any rollbacks of the Roadless Rule protections for the Tongass National Forest. One of the main reasons besides loving the national forests and wanting to keep them intact is that the Tongass National Forest is the United States of America's single most important national forest for carbon sequestration and climate mitigation.

Greg Singleton: 00:10:04 Today, I heard lots of comments that were very good about how

we respect the salmon and how valuable the salmon is for the sustenance of so many people that call Alaska their home, as well as those of us in the lower 48. But also, the deer that roam the forest and how they provide sustenance. I will tell you that we are approaching an age that not just me but about 190 other countries on the

Earth have agreed to, in Paris, one year recently, that said that we have got to get ahead of climate change, or it is going to eat our lunch. Climate change is not coming. Climate change is here. We have just experienced today and yesterday in this place, in Washington DC, unprecedented cold temperatures that have come down from the Arctic. In November, it's already as cold as it is in January. That's not supposed to happen. We had, in Alaska, these great people that traveled all the way here from Alaska saw forest fires, unprecedented forest fires in Alaska. This is not supposed to happen.

Greg Singleton: 00:11:20 This summer, there were 72,000 fires, burning simultaneously in

the Amazon rainforest. It seems that we can't get enough palm oil. What people are doing in the Indonesian rainforest is they're logging and burning the forest there, which are also helping to sequester carbon dioxide. What I would like to say that is valuable and has as much value, and in fact more value than a salmon is a tree. The trees I'm talking about are not your average Joe Blow pine tree growing in North Carolina. I'm talking about 800 year old, 12 foot in diameter, 200 year old trees. Those trees are all about keeping us protected from the future deleterious effects and destructive effects from climate change. I would even like to propose not only did I support alternative one, but I would support eliminating the entire ability of logging any trees out of the Tongass National Forest. Thank you.

Speaker 7: 00:12:31 Thank you. Thank you.

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:12:42 Hello. That's a good segue. Thank you for your comment. My

name is Osprey Orielle Lake. I am the founder of the Women's Earth and Planet Action Network. We work with women on the front lines of climate change around the world in different regions. The first comment in question I have is specifically around indigenous peoples. We know that 80% of all of the biodiversity left on Earth is in the lands and territories of

indigenous peoples. I think I'm a bit taken aback today by the responses to our indigenous representatives here. One, really respecting the fact that they have been maintaining these territories and their lands for time and memorial. They are telling us what is needed. They are telling us how they have lived on these lands and cared for them.

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:13:42 Ever since colonization, there has been a detrimental impact of

their lands and their way of life, and to the ecosystem. Because the ecosystem, the trees, the salmon, the land,

the river, and the indigenous people who live there are completely intertwined. I think you'd have to be completely deaf, dumb, and blind to not realize that that relationship needs to stay intact. I think we need to really honor our indigenous relatives and what they are telling us is needed, and to listen to them, and their request, and their demand for their rights and their territories. We need to start a much deeper conversation about decolonization, and a much deeper conversation about the fact that we are in an ecological and climate crisis, and indigenous peoples have so much to teach us about how to live with the land. 80% of all the biodiversity left on Earth right now is an indigenous territories and lands, and there's a reason for that.

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:14:48 I'd like to really make sure that their comments have a special

weigh in. One of the reports we read about the cultural analysis intact, it referred to indigenous peoples as visitors, visitors in their own territories. I think we need to really look at this attitude that, not just the US Forest Service but in general. People who have come to this land who are on, in essence, stolen, taken lands. Really looks toward indigenous peoples for their guidance at this critical time. I'm going to ask a second question. When you think about your response to that and your role of indigenous leadership in this moment, and their role in guiding this decision. The second thing I want to say is that, as it's been mentioned, we are in a climate crisis. I'd like to understand you as the leaders of our decision-making on forests in America.

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:16:00 I'm completely confused how there could be any question at

this point about old growth logging. We know that 80% of all carbon emissions in the United States through forests is happening in the Tongass. We are seeing huge destruction in the Amazon rainforest through fires. The sub-Sahara forests are

completely on fire right now. We're seeing fires. I live in California. I have literally run from two fires in the last two years that killed people. We are losing the tree people. We're losing the forests.

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:16:40 To even consider bringing this forward at a time when there

could be any sort of opening for there to be logging, when, we're talking about all of our future, all of our children right now. Literally, life and death. We're seeing millions of youth on the streets. Over seven million people have been mobilized just in this last few months, telling us that they're terrified for their future. And forests, as scientists are telling us over and over again, forests are key to mitigating climate change. How in the world can we be possibly considering any sort of damage to our forests, or harm. You keep saying, "Well, we're responsible for many different types of management and different kinds of activities on forest lands." This is a new time. We're in

a new reality. Something has to change. We cannot do business as usual, and we cannot continue to move forward as if we're not in a climate crisis. I'd like you to respond to that as well. Thank you.

Chris French: 00:17:53 Thank you. Your first question, we take our trust responsibilities

very seriously. I'm really aware of the voices we create from indigenous leadership in Alaska, and very clearly bringing those voices to the decision-maker in this case, the secretary. For those things that we can do better, I'm asking how we can do that. It's important to us. On the second part, in terms of climate change, in the agency, we recognize the clear importance of forests across the world and the nation's forests play right now in terms of what's happening with climate change. If you look at the 2012 planning rule that guided the development of the Tongass Forest Plan, and it talks very clearly about the ways maybe we can think about them.

Chris French: 00:18:59 The plan talks about the effects and the stressors within the

environment and how we should be thinking about them. That guides how would you network. In the analysis that we do for this and for any subsequent project, our researchers and our folks that are working on this, with their analysis, do you think we get it wrong? If you disagree, I encourage you to tell us. I'm open to that feedback, but I'm very proud of the research and the work that we are doing about the key role that forests play.

Again, I think this is that space where we're looking for those kind of feedback [inaudible 00:19:48], and if there's things that we can do better, that's what I want to see. Thank you here [inaudible 00:19:53].

Osprey Orielle Lake: 00:19:55 Well, I think people are telling you really clearly what they want.

I really do hope you're listening to the feedback. Thank you.

Leah Donahey: 00:20:04 Hi. My name is Leah Donahey, and I'm the Legislator Director of

Alaska Wilderness League. I wanted to follow-up to some questions that represent what [Gallego 00:20:12] asked you yesterday in a hearing that the House of Natural Resources Committee held. As you know, millions of Americans have been speaking out not just this year but in previous years about their opposition to any future logging in the Tongass National Forest, undermining the Roadless Rule. My question is during the scoping comment period, there was a content analysis report that came out from the Forest Service saying the comments were in opposition to the approach that you're moving forward with your preferred alternative. I know it's a suggested preferred alternative, but could you speak today or have Secretary Purdue speak as to how you came up with a preferred alternative that was opposite of the overwhelming comments you've received.

Chris French: 00:21:00 Thanks. There's a couple things I want to put in here. One is

under the Administrative Procedures Act, which we're following here, it gives wide discretion to the secretary about how they choose the final group. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, that provides the space where we disclose what the effects are and what the public input was. In this case, there's multiple ways that we haven't, in the public comments that we have, about 144,000 of that, about 1700 of them were unique comments, and the majority of those comments were in favor of keeping the status quo, keeping the roads rule in place of that total.

Chris French: 00:21:51 If you look at the unique comments and organizations that they

involve, there's different levels of support within that for different organizations. Then, you add to that input that we've received through cooperating agencies, the input that we received from the state through the Citizens Advisory Group,

letters that we receive outside of the comment period that came from a variety of elected officials, representing Southeast Alaska but also the broader state of Alaska, and then, [inaudible 00:22:23] elected officials throughout the continental United States, congressmen, and senators, those sorts of things. Then, there's the ongoing conversations where we're requesting initiate consultation that get that into this as well. All of that was used to inform the secretary on their final decision, at his final decision.

Chris French: 00:22:51 He felt that when he looked at that level of feedback that he

received and the different effects, and the preferred alternative was most responsive to what the state petition, the exemption asks for, and he's put it out as a preferred alternative to ask to what you think, and to get feedback and comments.

Elizabeth Brandt: 00:23:19 Hi. My name is Elizabeth Brandt. I live in Maryland, and I am

distinctly proud to have stood up for the Roadless Rule in 2002, when I lived in Sitka, and it was imperiled at that point, and I don't care to stand up again. Because what I really believe is the problem that we're seeing in this room is that you've put together a lot of work. You've made some great plans, but the person who decides is not in this room. I don't know how I can believe that Secretary Purdue is listening to these comments. One of the reasons that I feel that way is that we have with us President Joe Jackson. We have native leaders who can share directly with him their voices, and I just wonder would Secretary Purdue be open to having a meeting like

that?

Chris French: 00:24:13 I can't speak for Secretary Purdue and his choices. What I can

say is that Secretary Purdue asked Under Secretary Hubbard to meet directly during consultation of tribes, and we received feedback through that process asking for similar things. That information is being brought forward to the secretary.

Michael M.: 00:24:37 In addition to the many valuable perspectives that are

presented here today, I'd like to add the perspective of American taxpayers. My name is Michael [Merridose 00:24:45]. I represent Taxpayers for Common Sense. As you may be aware, the organization recently released a report stating that using Forest Service buffer data and receipts, on a cash basis accounting and adjusting for inflation, Forest Service has lost,

on average, $30 million over the last 20 fiscal years selling timber in the Tongass National Forest.

Michael M.: 00:25:10 After reading the DEIS, the proposed rule, the Regulatory

Impact Assessment, it's very clear that the operative word is that part of the preferred alternative, the Forest Service would have more, quote, flexibility to plan its timber sales in order to potentially increase their economic visions. My question is that in FY 2018, more than 23 million more feet of timber, which was statutorily required to be profitable for logging companies. It was offered and did not receive a single bid. Through the Qu sale, the [inaudible 00:25:55] sale, and the [inaudible 00:25:57] sale, why do you need more flexibility in order to offer timber sales that are profitable for loggers. More recent profitable sales have not gotten any bids.

Chris French: 00:26:08 Excellent. We're not saying we need more flexibility. We are

responding to the petition that we've gotten from others that say that this is something that is safe, and other folks say there should be more flexibility. In this space, we are showing the different alternatives that do it. The final preferred alternative, one of the rationales for choosing it as a preferred alternative is that it creates greater flexibility for that piece. I want to acknowledge both pieces. We have sales across the country that we don't give bids on, every national forest. It's driven by market conditions. It's driven by product bases, all sorts of things.

Chris French: 00:26:59 It really varies from year to year and place to place. It would be

in appropriate to look at this and say, "What exactly on this one? Why do you need that?" It is broad across the agency that we're going to have certain sales that people get on and some that don't. I haven't looked at the complete annual report. Some of the pieces that I've seen, that would be a dialogue I'd love to have when you go back. The way you looked at our budget numbers versus the way we actually use some of those budget numbers internally, and I think you'll find maybe some differences of opinion.

Michael M.: 00:27:34 Sure. Thanks.

Chris French: 00:27:35 Thanks.

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Washington, DC

November 14, 2019

My name is [Adam Mince 00:27:40], and I'm a retired economist. I'd like to follow-up on the question that the Taxpayers Association just asked. I'm trying to figure out how this proposal to abolish the roadless restriction results in an economic benefit to be the economy of Alaska. Because one of the key things you've said about all six alternatives is that they don't increase the level of logging in a forest. To me, what that implies is it changes the characteristics of the kind of timber that will be targeted.

When I read what the Oddball Society has said about logging in the Tongass in the past is historically the so-called high grade timber has always been a timber that is targeted. The high grade timber is the old growth timber that is big, between 4 and 10 feet in diameter. If a timber company wants to buy in a timber sale, they're going to go out and buy grade first. That's been going on for seven years I understand.

If you're going to keep the level of logging constant over these six alternatives, you're going to somehow still achieve an economic boost and yield logging activity that goes forward after you abolish the books. It must be because it will give you the flexibility to target the highest profit, high grade timber that has left impact. That is the old growth, high, the tall old growth, or it's 4 to 10 feet in diameter stand. I am speculating that that would be a real underlying motive here. If that is not the way that the analysis says, we're going to give a net boost, and economic activity, but keep the level of logging the same. How is that going to happen?

Chris French: 00:29:53 Excellent. I'll ask Christine to help me here on a few of these,

but yeah. The overall level of timber harvest will remain constrained by the Forest Plan inconsistently. By adding

different areas, you can have spans that may have greater economic benefit. There could be less pieces that fall out and things like that. But if you look at the analysis, the real driver on the economic benefit was less to do with the timber side of things. It was more about the other pieces that the state petitions spoke to, and the input that we had. That's a part that hasn't really come out in today's meeting. The Roadless Rule has some exceptions for the times we can cut timber or even build roads.

Chris French: 00:30:51 The ability for you to do some of those activities, other than

timber sales, are one of the prime reasons that folks asked us to look at this type of [inaudible 00:31:02]. It is perceived as any ... It creates some economic barrier, the process that we use for allowing some of those exceptions. What I mean by that is you're asking for us to basically access your memo right, which is allowed under the [inaudible 00:31:23]. We want to combine a memo right that you have. The exception is that you have to go through a separate analysis first that looks at how you do that. Then, you go through a subsequent NECO analysis that we would have to do anyway.

Chris French: 00:31:35 That extra analysis adds time, cost, and burden to the folks

accessing the memo [inaudible 00:31:41], as an example. And because we are managing those roadless characteristics we talked about, the way that we would provide you access to that may be not cost-effective in your view. We may be providing helicopter access, boat access, or a road access that is not the most [inaudible 00:32:03]. That's one example of the things that we've heard, and you'll see in the analysis that looks at these other cost factors beyond timber that are brought forward in the real thing. Do you want to add anything to that?

Male Speaker: 00:32:19 [inaudible 00:32:19].

Chris French: 00:32:20 Yeah, so the other thing about it is when you think about when

the Roadless Rule was written, 2001. Things have changed, and some of those exceptions are conclusive of some things that we have now. There's one example is geothermal energy. That wouldn't be listed as an exception. Whereas, hydro is but not explicitly is because it falls under another statute, and we have an exception there. There's these weird faces of when communities or folks that are trying to access different pieces, it adds a layer of process for a prohibition that doesn't allow it and is seen as an economic barrier. That's the piece that's really playing out [inaudible 00:33:03].

Adam Mince: 00:33:06 I'm just following up real quick. Does that mean that you can

expect high grade timber stands to be targeted increasingly because of the [inaudible 00:33:17] Roadless Rule where there will be no effect, and they'll still be protected because they are now?

Chris French: 00:33:22 The overlying regulatory framework for timber harvest is the

Forest Plan. The Forest Plan in 2016 sets out a transition period. It goes from old road logging to young road logging. Over a course of 15 years, we are supposed to transition all the logging on the Tongass from a portion of it being young growth and a portion of it being old growth towards it being young growth. That was why we revised the plan actually in 2016. This came from, at the time, the secretarial memorandum from the Secretary of Agriculture, Vilsack. That plan was re-written to that transition, the transition away from old road logging to

second growth. That transition remains in effect, and the entire regulatory framework around that remains in effect. What this does do is it changes some of the suitable acres within that where you could harvest, but that overall transition to young growth remains in effect.

Is that a yes?

No, it's not. It's not a yes. In the short-term, you would be able to access different stands. Some of them may be more economic than others, but the question you had to me was is that going to be driving? Are you going to go to these stands? The overall framework doesn't change. There are existing old road stands that you could, on the existing framework, access them.

If you look at the overall old road in the Tongass, it's a much

higher number that you step down to get to this. We could go through this, and we're going to talk about how [inaudible 00:35:10]. I could step you through how many millions of acres of old growth there are, what's actually ... There's about 386,000 in the plan about [inaudible 00:35:22] now. But that's over 100 years. That's something we could get into a much deeper conversation. I'm not sure how we're doing on time. We got about a half hour left. I want to make sure we get questions in, and I want to be respectful of everybody's time. We're going to have a pretty hard stop here in just about a half hour.

Male Speaker: 00:35:46 Right here.

Chris French: 00:35:50 Or back here first. Thank you.

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Washington, DC

November 14, 2019

Yes. My name is Pat [Pinchel 00:35:52], and I'm from Arlington, Virginia, which is pretty far away from this area. I know I speak for many people who were not hearing everyone's voices on the East Coast, but I want to say a lot of us on the East Coast care deeply about what happens on the West Coast in these forests. We do not want growths in those forests. Thank you.

Thank you. Thanks you.

Hi. My name is Katie Riley. I'm from Sitka, Alaska. I work at the Sitka Conservation Society, and also as a commercial timber woman during the summer. I'm also part of a unique network in Southeast Alaska called the Sustainable Southeast Partnership. It's a collaborative effort between Alaska native tribes, regional Alaska native corporations, municipalities, community development organizations, conservation organizations, health consortiums, landowners such as yourself to achieve regional economic ecological and cultural prosperity.

What we're hearing a lot here tonight is a lot of concerns about the Roadless Rule, and there's a broad perception across all of East Alaska that it's really frustrating and taking up a lot of people's energy, time, and investments. Speaking to the economic points that some folks have made here tonight, I would like to know what Forest Service is doing in Southeast to invest in visitor industry, repair, or recreation infrastructure, rehabilitate degraded salmon habitat, and especially invest in co-management approaches with the tribal governments.

Thanks. I'm going to have a talk with [inaudible 00:37:35], and my role, we have a regional forester, and forest supervisors, and district rangers that take on specifics. I know you're aware of that. I'm not talking about [inaudible 00:37:45]. As an agency, there's a few things that are key that we focus on in our mission delivery that are part of the 2016 Forest Plan and part of management in Tongass. The first one I'll start with is our Watershed Condition Framework. Looking at watersheds that need to be restored, protected, or key habitats, fisheries habitat.

Chris French: 00:38:12 If you look at the work we are doing in Alaska, there's a lot of

focus where we're putting resources and money into that

restoration work, working through partnerships with non[shy]governmental organizations about how we do that work. I can't give you all the specifics. I just don't have that at my fingertips. What I can say also though is that on the focus on recreation, which was another piece that we filled out, as an agency, we see recreation as the biggest driver of either people's connection with lands that we're seeing growing, or low [inaudible 00:38:50] GEP jobs that are being provided to those areas. We see that kind of across the system.

Chris French: 00:38:58 In our agency, one of the things that we struggled with is that as

the fire situation in the West has really changed. The budget that we spend on fire has grown exponentially. 15 years ago, 26% of our budget went to suppressing fires. Now, it's between 50 and 60%. We've seen a decline. Our budgets have remained stable, but we have seen a decline in other parts of our ability to deliver other parts of our mission. We get stable funding and recreation that I consistently see and hear that because of the fire piece that we're putting less and less in the field. We're relying more and more on partnerships, more and more on folks that are helping us do that work. It is a constant feedback that we hear that we need to do more. It's bringing work to us. I can't talk about the specifics in Alaska, but I can talk about it [inaudible 00:40:06]. Let's just do a few more. Then, we're going to break up and be in [crosstalk 00:40:09].

I would just like to follow up by saying that there's a lot of support for the work that you're doing in Southeast Alaska on these really important initiatives, and we look forward to your continued investment in them, and working with you to make sure that those objectives are accomplished.

Thank you.

Thank you. I'll defer to Mr. Joe Jackson, if that's okay.

I think I'll stand up, getting too sore here. I'll turnaround, [inaudible 00:40:44].

[inaudible 00:40:46].

Joel Jackson: 00:40:49 As you all know, we drive a long ways to come down here

because it's so important to our communities on the protecting our home lands that our ancestors have spent over 10,000 years. The stories I've heard growing is that we've always been on those lands. We are the people with land. When this thing came up again, Secretary Purdue came up to Alaska, he visited Prince of Wales island. He met with logging and mill operators there on Prince of Wales Island. We had to learn about it through social media. As being tribes of Alaska, we felt very disrespected that he came upon our land without announcing himself to the tribes of the Tongass. Very disrespectful to not even say, "I'm here in Alaska. I would like to meet with you to get your opinion."

Joel Jackson: 00:42:25 That's when I knew where this thing was going. I just had lack of

respect for the people of that land, our land. The Forest Service gave us lip service all the time over almost a year. I'm done. I tried to be respectful. I tried to be nice. That's got to come to an end. You can only push people so far. It's my duty, as the Tribal President, to protect my people, to speak up for. A lot of people don't like that, but I don't care. I don't care. Enough is enough. That's what our old people used to tell us, and that's where we're at now. I'd like express my thanks for you for coming and letting me speak, but you can pass that message on to Sonny Purdue. We did it for safety. Others are barely coming upon our lands, and not announcing himself. Very disrespectful to the native people. That should never happen, never. If you want to come to our lands and provide meaningful consultation, have him come. Have him come. Thank you.

Joel Jackson: 00:44:53 Hey, so I'm just going to add onto the subject of economic

benefits as this that we're going to come along with the changes to this, ostensibly, is that in this conversation, I think to myself, and I think a lot of people would agree that the discussion about alleged economic benefits is dangerously short-sighted. I want to say that in terms of, we're talking about what the overwhelming consensus is of about the importance of these trees at sequestering carbon, and just like the evidence is undeniable about the effects of ... the effects [inaudible 00:45:38] and worse. They give like economic benefits like ... The argument, and I realize there's a lot of things, I would agree, that is not being adamantly counterbalanced with, in the new future, the fact those the short-term benefits are going to be

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS
Washington, DC

November 14, 2019

vastly outweighed of economic and by non-economic

qualifications is not at all the justification. I think that ... I just wanted to say that in the long run, we looked at and saying what were we thinking, what, I can't believe they think that ... Yeah.

Chris French: 00:46:13 Thank you.

Hillary: 00:46:23 Hi. My name is Hillary, and I cannot possibly mimic all the

brilliant comments that I think I've heard here today. First, I'd like to say thank you to the many representatives that we have here. I know I've taken similar trips from Alaska to here, and I know that it's not a short journey whatsoever. I believe that's really important to hear your voices, especially people from the lower 48. You might not know about that. Thank you all for being here and speaking here today. I would like to just, for a second, refresh all of our memories of what the mission is of the Forest Service, just to really [inaudible 00:47:09]. To sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the nation's forest and grassland to meet the needs of the present and future generations. It's motto is caring for the land and serving people. Really quickly, with that mission statement, I just [inaudible 00:47:27] potentially will memorize. I'd just like to touch on a few things.

Hillary: 00:47:33 First of all, I hope that you feel that the Forest Service is

respecting the future needs and generations, and the present needs of the native people. Because I think it was very eloquently discussed much better than I could ever do, long before there was the Forest Service, long before there was national parks, long before there was even Alaska being a state, which only happened in 1939. These people were living on those lands. I think the United States has had a very long history of taking advantage of natives, especially Native Americans.

Hillary: 00:48:10 I think most of us in this room would consider maybe that time

should be passed down, and maybe we should be respecting, listening, and going to those places, and hearing their voices, and giving them better representation, which they deserved since the creation of the United States. Just knowing a little bit about these islands and all that stuff, I really hope but I'm sad to hear that when the secretary came, he didn't necessarily meet

with the native peoples. Maybe I just heard that. Because I feel like that's probably the most important voices that

you've heard. I know it's difficult to get to some of those areas, so a lot of stuff. There's Alaska. You obviously can only get on a flight plane, or on a little tiny boat. It's [inaudible 00:49:05], and it might be cold. Especially right now.

Hillary: 00:49:08 But I still feel like that we need to make sure that the Forest

Service is coming to meet those people. Not those people flying down here to meet me, or wherever they need to go, to meet the foresters to talk about their land. That's ridiculous to me. The Forest Service is here to help people. But it's here to, as we said, go back to the mission statement. [inaudible 00:49:34]. Health, diversity, productivity of the nation's forests to meet the needs of present and future generations, caring for the land and serving people. I feel like serving people is you guys going out to these native villages and going door-to-door, not coming here to DC. Although, it's lovely, and I'm glad that we've had this forum.

Hillary: 00:49:56 Secondly, and I would just like to take a minute to discuss the

salmon, just hedge on that for a little bit. I appreciate that we had some salmon representatives. I agree that trees are more important, but I was working as a salmon fishermen this past summer. I looked at all of the numbers from when my fishery started sustainable fishing in 1991. You can definitely see that there is a decrease in the salmon numbers. I've seen it for myself. I ran the numbers myself. If I see that, on the other side of Alaska, I will say, what do we possibly see in a native forest, in these native villages. It probably looks completely even more devastated than the number two forest right in the world, where I was living, inland. I feel like I saw just a tiny corner of what the actual reality is.

Hillary: 00:50:54 Then, finally, I just want to re-emphasize how important I feel

like ecotourism is to Southeast Alaska especially. I think we all know about the cruise lines that go from Ketchikan, et cetera. I have to say that lots of people, their dream, that I've met, they used to go to Alaska. When you go to Alaska, what you find is a lot of old people from the lower 48. Why do you find old people from the lower 48? Because Alaska is expensive. When you talk to these people, they say, my dream my whole life has been to go to Alaska, but I was never able to afford it. When they go,

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

there's all these cruise ships, which I'm sure help the local economy.

Hillary: 00:51:36 But I really feel that if you go on a cruise ship and you spend

$6,000 on a ticket, and then you get there, and there's a lot at the station, what does that say? Are you opening

up their land? Who are you opening up their lands for? It doesn't make sense to me. I especially wanted to say this because I had the opportunity to sail on a 32 foot boat from Port Angeles, Washington up to Ketchikan to Petersburg, and then up to Juneau. I saw those lands firsthand. This was three years ago. I went places where I thought no one had ever seen before, which is not true. But that's how you felt, and I felt such a great connection to the forest. I can't imagine being there when logging roads are being open. It completely boggles my mind, and it's sad, I think.

Hillary: 00:52:32 I don't have a question. I just wanted to make a comment and

make a personal statement about how I felt about it, and I hope that the natives know at least that there is a lot of support in the lower 48. It might be few and far between and not everyone, obviously, is here at this forum. But you do have support, and you do have people that have your back and are listening to you and feel terrible about how Native Americans have been treated for the entire history of the United States. Thank you very much, especially, you all for being here today. I

appreciate it. Thank you.

[inaudible 00:53:15].

Thank you for the comment. I'll just share a couple of things. We get a variety of things. What it means before this, what it means now in communities, and we've held hearings. We have ongoing consultation that's been going on for quite a while, and we've offered a cooperating agency status. What I want to be clear about is what I've heard through this last process from those folks. Because your concern is are you going at this. We did go to [inaudible 00:53:59]. We did go to those communities and not just [inaudible 00:54:04].

What I've clearly heard for many years is that some of that didn't work well and that the final preferred alternative that

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service

came out feels like the work that they did do with us leading up to that wasn't heard. I've heard that very loud and clear. But I want to be clear that there's been a lot that we've done to get those voices into this. That's very important to us in our practice as an agency that I take very seriously. It isn't me. Many of the leaders meet, and that this preferred alternative went out doesn't feel like they were heard.

Chris French: 00:54:55 On the ecotourism piece, absolutely correct. We spend a lot of

time actually talking with, working with, and understanding how those other guys in cruise ships, not just the big

ones but the small ones, on a cruise, things like that, where they're going, what's important, and how this will affect you. If we look at some of the maps, we see how those things were taken into consideration. I've also heard from some of them, as well as some of the fishermen that that work they did that they don't necessarily get booked, and I understand. I appreciate the comment. We're going to finish up here. Is there anyone that wanted to speak that hasn't? Can I, I think ...

Marina Anderson: 00:55:45 I actually was given the microphone, so I would appreciate this

time because I have traveled across the entire country, missed my entire hunting season, missed my salmon season, missed my various season. First of all, is this being reported, as publicly for the secretary? Yes or no? No. Okay. I have the recording. I'll send it to you. Second of all, while we're in this, I would like to let everybody know here that the United States Forest Service has burnt down our villages, to show that there was no

evidence of indigenous people in our area. We're still trying to get those areas back, so that's for the record.

Marina Anderson: 00:56:25 Also, I would like to inform everybody that the under secretary,

himself, said that the process of the DEIS did not go the way it should, and that's from the under secretary, himself. I'm trying to be quick here. Unfortunately, you've limited my time, and I don't know what I'm going to do with the rest of my evening because I can't go hunting or fishing. Another question, yes or no. Is it required to clean up slash in the state of Alaska?

Chris French: 00:56:52 I don't know.

Marina Anderson: 00:56:53 It's not required to cleanup slash in the state of Alaska? How

long after a clearcut project is done does the Forest Service water by the boat?

Chris French: 00:57:03 I could certainly get people that could answer that specifically,

but I don't know the answer to that.

Marina Anderson: 00:57:08 It's right away. It's right after the project just finished. I know

firsthand. When this happens, these roads are put in place. Clearcut lobbying takes place. Mining claims have easier access. In the meantime, our forest is devastated and all of these trees are dropped. My uncle quit his job

logging because they had logged over five acres, and they kept 10 trees. The rest are still laying there today. I can walk across every single one of those logs because they haven't been laying long enough to turn into nurse logs. With that, we have had two of the hottest summers on record, so hot that I'm considering moving down to Antarctica or Washington DC if it's going to keep it this cold.

With that, fire is a hazard, and I am worried about fires. But the fact that these roads are going to have access for fire is absolutely ridiculous because they're water guard. I know firsthand how dangerous these water guard roads are. If you're not familiar with a water guard, a water guard is a trench that goes through the road. We still use these roads because these roads have been put in place to clearcut the forest, and we have to get through the clearcut forest to get to the old growth forest.

We'll drive our cars and our four-wheelers through six foot water bars or up on banks, and we'll flip our cars. Some of us slide, and some of us get hurt. There's not much law enforcement or any medical. There's no hospital on the island or anything, but it's okay. We know how to put on a good funeral. Yes or no? Does it concern you that in some of the hottest summers, or even have you on record, there is dead dry wood with no access for fire to get to it, for fire safety to get to it? Does it concern you?

Of course.

Marina Anderson:00:58:57
Chris French:00:59:15
Elizabeth Higgins:00:59:25

Elizabeth Higgins:01:00:22
Chris French:01:00:47
Elizabeth Higgins:01:01:15

Thank you. I appreciate your time. Again, I would offer, I know that this is very hard for you. I do respect you. I know this is very hard for you. You wear the badge. This is your job, but you're welcome to quit your job anytime.

You're welcome to come to the stand. We'll take care of you. You don't have to wear those pinchy office clothes.

Thank you.

Hello. Thank you for taking another comment before you have to end here today. My name is Elizabeth Higgins. I'm lucky enough to get to live as a guest on the indigenous lands that the United States government calls Juneau, Alaska. I'm not from Juneau, Alaska, but I was lucky enough to get the chance to start to working out of Sitka on fishing boats in 2005 when I was in college. I love the Tongass sports and salmon fishery. There's so much that I worked really hard to be able to find ways to get a job and be able to move to Juneau permanently starting in 2012. Salmon is life in Alaska. But Tongass is the best place in Alaska as everyone from Southeast knows because of the rainforest that it's unique. It's amazing. Just the thought of seeing it go away just breaks my heart. But I'm just one person, and I have a question that I'd like to being back into this conversation you heard in Juneau on November 4th.

I have not read the entire DEIS. But someone there peaked my interest because she asked is it ... She said that she couldn't find anywhere in your DEIS where you considered a basic species from new roads and any new travel on the lands, and that's been a huge issue down south. Is there anything in DEIS about endangered species and the risks?

I don't know at this point. Here's what I'd say. If we're missing it and it's not there, and that's a common thing to give us. I mean, when we put out a proposal like this, we've done our best. But we know that people may disagree with our analysis [inaudible 01:01:08] to collisions that we may have analyzed some things that you didn't think we should have, or maybe gaps. That would be a good thing to point out in this [inaudible 01:01:15].

Thank you for that. I think you've answered my second question, which is no work has been done on that between

November 4th and now. Are you guys waiting to do updates until after the end of the comment group?

Yeah. Yeah, after the end of the comment period and other input that we get. Frankly, we've been kind of going from community to community talking.

Thank you, again, for your time. I'm not sure if everyone would agree with this, but I think one small step you can

make is that the rest of your meetings, you might consider taking indigenous comments first. Thank you.

[inaudible 01:01:47].

I have one very quick question [inaudible 01:01:52]. Did the meeting between Governor Dunleavy and President Trump on June 27th influence the decision to make a full exemption your preferred alternative?

I don't have firsthand knowledge of that. I know the secretary talks to the president, and I know what's been reported in Washington DC.

Then, the other question is why are there no meetings scheduled in the lower 48 besides this one when these are public lands that all America is clearly interested in protecting?

Thank you. We, if you look at our other statewide, our state rules rule-making, we're following a very similar process where we focus most of our public meetings in those local areas is consistent with the way we approach most of our rule-makings. We're following the same process we do at the beginning of this. Any last questions? Then, I think we're going to go ahead and thank you for your time tonight.

I need to get the last word.
It's okay.

[inaudible 01:02:52] me. Your slideshow, there's a slide in there that one with the matrix where you say, "There's no impacts." Like there's no distinction between any of the different

alternatives. That slide is infuriating. It was all I could do not to chime in and interrupt you. Mr. Finch, one of the things that you were saying is no big deal here because we have the Forest Plan. The Forest Plan has everything that we need, and it's a backstop. But you can amend the Forest Plan. You just change it. Why are we glossing that over? Yeah, you're getting rid of the Roadless Rule, but you do a logging project, you get public comment, change the plan, and then, boom. Logging projects happen just like that, so why are we glossing over the fact that you can just choose the Forest Plan?

Chris French: 01:03:45 Thanks. I'm not. In fact, amending and changing the Forest Plan

and revising it is a very long process. You can revise and change a rule, which is what's happening here. You can revise and change a plan. If you look at the process that we have for changing plans, it's guided by another

one, the 2012 Planning Rule. That rules states that it should be a three to four year process. It takes us much longer most times. You look at our record of plans we've revised. Most of our plans stay in place for more than 20 years, and it takes us a way long time to actually these. There is massive amounts of public comment, collaboration, and engagement that occurs in that process. That rule was founded on the idea that at all stages whether you're assessing what's going on in the forest, what needs to change, analyzing it, and giving the final sort of options, it is centered around the idea of doing that, and it handles the public, and that process going forward. We're not glossing over it.

Speaker 21: 01:04:57 I have [inaudible 01:04:58] the end process is only going to take

12 months to read through the whole Roadless Rules and plan the Tongass.

Chris French: 01:05:04 I'm telling you about our Forest Planning process. Yes,

administrative rules, and if it takes you [inaudible 01:05:13] amounts of time, and it's a different set of rules, like this. I mean, the original Roadless Rule was promulgated for 13 months in 2001, 13 months. This is more of a two year process. I can tell you that amending and revising a Forest Plan is a much longer process. You can look at any of our record on it. In fact, we get criticized on how long it takes us to do those things. I hear you. I get it, and I'd love to sit down and talk with you for a minute about that. But it's not just like you can change something like that. You just can't. Thank you for your time

today. I appreciate the passion. I appreciate all of you that traveled here to be here today, and I encourage you to comment. I encourage you to speak up about your views. Let us know what they are. I appreciate the time that you've spent with us today running through what happens. Thank you very much.

Seattle Community Public Meeting on Roadless Forests
REI Flagship Store (222 Yale Ave N, Seattle, WA 98109)
Saturday November 23, 2019, 1 pm - 3 pm

Hillary Sanders

Membership and Engagement Manager, Washington Wild

Thank you all, everyone so much for coming to the community public meeting to support our roadless forests. I want to start today by acknowledging the land that we're gathering on today. We are in Coast Salish territory and for me personally, I know it's been really important to be mindful of the land where I am, where I live, where I work, and where I come together with my community. So, I would really encourage us as we move through today, and every day really, that we be mindful of that and know our place or know where we are in the world and know that history and work and to understand it every day.

Next, I want to go over some event logistics and thank you for just taking that moment with me to remember where we are and the significance of that.

So, everyone who came in today, if you could please sign in. I think pretty much

everyone did, but there's a sign in table just right outside as well as a sign up for speaking. So, if you would like to make a two-minute statement today, there is a signup sheet for that as well. Please feel welcome to sign up for that. Please also continue to help yourself to food. We have donuts, coffee, water, and then we also had an amazing contribution of some salmon from up in the Tongass region. So thank you so much for that. Restrooms are just right outside these doors in to the right and if you look at the table just right over here, that is our comment writing tables. So, if you would like to submit a postcard, we have postcards you can fill out and drop in the box as well as paper pencils and markers for writing your own comments or drawing a picture. So please feel free to grab those things and grab a clipboard and go and sit down and work on that. Parking validation just to be clear is free for three hours today but if you wants to stay longer there is a parking validation station just right over there by the postcard Dropbox. So please feel free to do that as you leave. So I would like to pass it off to the executive director of Washington wild Tom Uniack

So I wanted to just welcome everybody. I see a lot of familiar faces. I see a lot of new faces. I know we have some folks here from as far as Alaska. I wanted to introduce our first speaker here and recognize this awesome space. It is cool to have this event here.

REI. REI is a company that has supported public lands and roadless areas over the last 20 years, whether through conservation Alliance or whether as a company. So, it is really appropriate to have this public meeting here. I'm going to interview Mark Berejka who is the Director of Government Affairs at REI and is also the Chair of the REI foundation.

Marc Berejka

Director of Government Affairs, REI

Thanks Tom. And thanks folks for dedicating some of your Saturday to not just coming to the co-op but coming here to discuss an important subject. And if you're a member, I really appreciate your membership. This is your,

this is your room, this is your space. And as Tom said, we're very proud of our heritage of supporting conservation. And so, your continued membership allows us to do things like what we're doing today. It's a privilege and honor to pause and welcome our keynote presenter and our special guest Senator Maria Cantwell. As all of you are very much aware, we live in interesting times. I like to sort of think of the times we live in as at an inflection point where life is bending either one way or the other, either upward or downward.

And there are many things that put us in that inflection mode, the state of our democracy, the state of civility, and obviously the state of our planet, of our environment. And as Washingtonians we couldn't be luckier than to have a leader in the Senate, Maria Cantwell, who's got her hands firmly on that collective steering wheel of the ship of state. And she has got a tenacious grip, and working with her over the course of years, I know that she is constantly pulling on that steering wheel and bending it towards environmental protection, bending it towards, environmental justice and the things that we care for so deeply. In particular she's been a tenacious defender of the Tongass, which we'll talk about more. But you know, one of the things also about steering the ship of state, if you will, is every now and then to accommodate the waves and the currents you give a little bit and then turn back.

She's also a tremendous deal maker, a tremendous producer of output legislatively. And nothing could be more emblematic of that than the fact that she and Lisa Murkowski who might not agree on this particular issue today, they were dogging champions of a landmark public lands package that passed just earlier this year and that was signed into law by president Trump. It includes things like a national heritage area for the mountains to sound Greenway just here down the road and over the mountains as well as permanent authorization of the land and water conservation fund. And so, while simultaneously gripping that steering wheel on the ship of state really hard and pushing it towards the things we care about, it's wonderful to also have somebody who knows when to jostle them, just ever so slightly to get work done. So, without any further ado, it's an honor for REI co-op to welcome Senator Cantwell here. Thank you.

The Honorable Maria Cantwell
U.S. Senator (D-WA)

You could have gotten me here today to just by saying it's the half yearly, sale or whatever, whatever it is or anything. Actually, I could've just gotten me down to REI, but thank you so much for hosting us and thanks for having this room so we can have community and talk about what's important. And I want to thank Tom as well. Thank you for helping to put this together and for everybody for just showing up. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart for caring about preserving such a special place on this planet and the fact that you're here today. I know you're going to give Testament to this in so many other places besides here today and that's what we need to be successful. I guarantee you in the future you can change a law, but you cannot change this if it's disturbed.

And that's what we're fighting for. So it's an honor to be here today and to talk about the roadless rule at large and how it applies to the Tongass specifically. You know, I came to the United States Senate in the year 2000 and was actually sworn in in 2001 and one of my first duties was to go before the judiciary sit on the judiciary committee for the uh, then uh, nominated attorney general John Ashcroft. And um, that was literally like my first week on the job. And I asked the attorney general a very important question. I said, you're going to be the attorney general for a new administration, but as attorney general, are you going to uphold the law of a past administrations administrative procedures act specifically the roadless rule? And John Ashcroft said "well, if it is the force of law, I will uphold it."

And you know, we didn't really like that question because as now I've come to know quite well, if you have an administrative law from a previous administration, it is good for so many days into the next administration unless

you overturn it. Now we've been able to stop a couple of bad policies that way. On the democratic side of the aisle. And now we have to work hard every single day at stopping bad ideas. But as the Bush administration got underway, we saw that every Friday afternoon they would just by executive order roll back rules and say they didn't apply and we heard rumor that they were going to do the same for the Clinton roadless area rule. So we had a little Ted OD Ted with the attorney general and we said, do you remember this discussion? Do you remember your testimony? Because you clearly said you would uphold the law if in fact it was the law and by that time it was the law and if you're not going to do it, you are basically going back on your own sworn testimony before the United States Senate. So guess what, there was no Friday afternoon support. Surprise in the Clinton rule stayed. So the good news is and why we're here today is because the roadless rule has been a fight every step of the way. It's common sense. Let me tell you, it is so common sense. All the rule is rule says is if you have parts of the forest where you don't have roads now or don't make sense to have roads, why go build roads? That's all it says and when you have other parts of our fours that definitely have roads that need repair or need

improvement, the fact that we would go spend money in other areas that don't make economic sense is just a really horrific idea. It's not good for the taxpayers. So we've been successful with the roadless rule and getting it implemented and keeping the

roadless rule, but now we have administration who wants to roll it back as it relates to literally, literally what is the crown jewel of our forest land, I would say across the globe and that is why today we're holding this hearing because they're not listening.

They won't give us an official hearing to discuss this policy and this issue. So we're having a hearing right here today in Seattle, Washington, and we're going to hear from people, we're going to hear from fishermen in Alaska who are going to tell us about why the importance of these waters and the Tongass are so important to salmon. We're going to hear from other people, give testimony about why these forests are so important to our climate and to our ecosystem at large. And I'm sure we're going to hear from Alaskans who are here, here in Seattle to make sure their voice is heard on this issue. So I just want you to know that I so, so appreciate. I've never even been to the Tongass. Okay. But as Barbara boxer said one day, this is another battle. You know, people have very deceptive battles.

We were fighting to preserve the Arctic wildlife refuge and a very famous photographer, basically had taken pictures of the Tongass and even though they were supposed to be at a national museum, somebody had stuffed him in the basement of the museum because they didn't want anybody to see how beautiful. And Barbara boxer took to the floor and started yelling about the fact that these pictures had been shoved into the basement. And somebody said to her, well, have you ever been to the Arctic? And she said, no, but I never been to the Grand Canyon either. But I can tell you this, I'm darn glad we've preserved it.

What we see here is the immense beauty of the Tongass that not everybody gets to go enjoy every day, but I guarantee you is a crown jewel of our forests. And that is why it is so important to preserve. So what is really now an end run attempt? I just want to say a few things about the process because trust me, it's like so many other things from this administration, short on morals and very long on trying to circumvent what is illegal. For example, in the Clinton era, there were so many hearings. We had 600 public meetings and 45 public meetings in the state of Washington alone on the original roadless rule. So it was discussed. People had ideas about what was going to happen. Now I have a suspicion that somebody landed on a tarmac in Alaska and cooked up this idea and now we're sitting here demanding that the critical issues of water and salmon and carbon all get addressed instead of like leaving this to a last minute decision by the administration.

I know that people here will talk as our fishermen are here, that a full quarter of West coast salmon catches come from the waters of the Tongass, that's 50 million salmon. This is clearly a land that we rely on in Puget Sound

and throughout this area and we deserve to have people understand that in the future, our preservation of this is about livelihood for the future. Now I can thank you for mentioning Mark about the land and water conservation fund, a bill that Scoop Jackson had authored in the 60s and then basically expired and we got permanently reauthorized. Why? Because we need to have open space. We need to have open space for lots of reasons. It can be hunting, it can be

fishing, it can be recreating, it can be spiritual. You know, people always say Washington might be one of the least church going populations in the nation. And I say not if you count the outdoors, I guarantee you we are the most church going population.

So we're here today to say that America's largest forest and the world's largest

remaining intact, temperate rain forest because of its beauty and abundance for clean water, carbon sequestration, unmatched recreational and tourism activity opportunities, wildlife and habitat is an economic resource for the future too. And just like land and water conservation fund, you'll see that the outdoor economy and the value of the outdoor economy and what we get from fishing and recreating and clean water and carbon sequestration is way more valuable than harvesting a few trees from this area. We're going to make this point loud and clear. Thank you for being here today. Thank you for giving me a chance to express my voice on such an important policy. And by God, you know we have a saying in Washington, environmentalist make great ancestors. I guarantee you the world will thank the people in this room if we can save the Tongass for us.

Thank you very much.

Joel Brady-Power & Tele Aadsen
Commercial Fishermen- Alaska

I seek silence, find solace in seclusion, but illusions of isolation can cloud judgment create separation where there is none. And so I can sit on this river. Watch it wriggle and wind its way down from snowcap peaks, glaciers through old growth forest and Muskegon. Watch its current spill out into fjords, sweep across bays and dissolve the ocean. I can lose myself in a Ravens song. The winds whisper the waters kiss. I can disappear into this wilderness and I can pretend this moment, this place, this piece is separate, is safe. Is eternal. I can pretend the minds upstream won't keep coming. I can pretend the timber won't keep falling. I can pretend my fishery won't be affected. From my perch I can't see big Buddhists or the hauling trucks. I can't smell the exhaust. I can't hear the primal scream of the chainsaw. I can't taste the bitterness of defeat, but my bones know a storm is brewing.

I can tell myself that people will continue to care, that their attention and passion won't succumb to distraction and dissolution. I can tell myself the world cares about wild spaces. I can tell myself we will learn from the carelessness of our greed. I can stand here on this Rocky shore. Listen to the ripple and roar of salmon surging upstream. As the shadows grow long, I can feel the sunsets warm, caress on my face and embrace the beauty and serenity of this moment. I can ignore the dark clouds on the horizon and I can pretend that just being present is enough. But if I'm not willing to leave my tears in this river and pull myself from this reverie, if I'm not willing to scream my lungs into this pin, set fire to this page and rise from the ashes of apathy to action. If I'm not willing to stand and fight for this river, for the salmon for my own life, then the strength of my conviction triples to complicity. Lost in the sound of my silence.

My name is Tele. My partner Joel Brady Power and I are both second generation Southeast Alaskan commercial fishermen, salmon shoulders. We are Washington residents and we're co-owners of the fishing vessel NERCA

and NERCA sea frozen salmon. We are two of thousands of people who engage in a seasonal Washington to Alaska migration with commercial fisheries, tourism and recreation, supporting the economies of both States. As children, the Tongass was our playground. As adults, it's our livelihood, our source of refuge and inspiration. Its stewardship is our responsibility. Intact, the Tongass is America's salmon forest, irreplaceable habitat for all living creatures, a nature-based counter to climate change. We support the no action amendment and the maintenance of the roadless rule in the Tongass National Forest. And we thank you for joining us in that

Dennis Tuzinivich

Environmental Coordinator, Patagonia

My name is Dennis and I am the Environmental Coordinator for Patagonia. Thanks to Washington Wild for having us and allowing us to give testimony today. At Patagonia, protection and preservation of the environment isn't what we do after hours. It's the reason we're in business and it's every day's work. We believe that the environmental crisis has reached a critical tipping point without commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, defend clean water, and air and divest from extractive industries that harm our public lands and waters humankind as a whole will destroy our planet's ability to repair itself. We aim to reduce, to use the resources we have to do something about it. That's the skewed parodies which elevate industrial concerns or public sentiment and environmental health are not only on display all over the country, but nowhere more than Alaska.

Spread across a 500 mile long coastal archipelago, the Tongass is one of the last intact temperate rainforests in the world. Existing roadless restrictions have been in place for two decades and were celebrated as a bipartisan effort, but we continue to pursue to clear cut trees, catch too many fish, spray too many chemicals and extract and burn too many non-renewable fuels. We diminish the roaming area for wolves and Grizzlies, warm the seas to temperatures hostile to humpback whales, and destroy habitat for songbirds. We put at risk the beauty and diversity of the world and endanger our own lives. Businesses have a critical role to play in protecting the natural systems for which we benefit. This goes hand in hand with creating jobs, building more local communities, and improving health and prosperity for all. Today, we are here to lend our voice and speak loudly for the preservation of the roadless Tongass national forest, which is not only one of the greatest gifts we can leave for future generations, is also a critical step toward tackling the climate crisis head on before it's too late. Thank you.

Rick Hegdahl

Pacific Northwest Director, Vet Voice

Thank you all for being here today. Thank you, Senator Cantwell especially for coming to speak to the people here. My name is Rick Hegdahl. I am an Iraq war veteran. I retired after 24 years in the Navy. I'm also the Pacific Northwest director for the Vet Voice Foundation. The Vet Voice Foundation mobilizes veterans to become leaders in our nation's democracy through participation in the civic process and the opportunity to continue serving their communities by finding a new mission in domestic and foreign policy campaigns. Those who serve our country, fought to preserve the American freedoms and lifestyles, almost nothing better encapsulates these ideals than the wild spaces and ecologically rich lands that have changed little since our country's founding. The 2001 National Forest Roadless Rule protected nearly 60 million acres of our last remaining old growth forests, intact watersheds and wild rivers. These are quintessential American landscapes.

For many veterans who've returned from deployments marked by desperation and violent conflict, nature and wildlife can be a critical source of strength and healing. That's one reason why Vet Voice Foundation upholds the roadless area protections, whether they be in Alaska Tongass National Forest or right here in Washington state.

The ability to connect with our public lands like roadless areas is essential to the American experience and provide important values to veterans. Like so many Americans, veterans count on our national forests, roadless areas for fishing, hiking, camping, and hunting. Some veterans turn to the outdoors to heal from the trauma of war and renew bonds with family members after long deployments. Protecting these lands is one way that American can give back to its heroes who have paid such a high price for our freedoms. Our parents and grandparents made it possible for Americans to enjoy such a strong outdoor heritage. We must continue to protect our roadless forests so we can pass this heritage down to our children and grandchildren. Veterans place a great deal of value in being outdoors and believe that we need to protect national forest roadless areas because they provide families with opportunities to be more active and enjoy the outdoors as an alternative to watching TV, playing video games or spending time online. Thank you very much.

Sara Nelson

Co-Owner, Fremont Brewing

My name is Sarah Nelson and my husband and I own Fremont brewing, which was founded in 2009 here in Seattle. First of all, thank you Washington Wild for convening this meeting and thank you. Thank you REI for hosting this. But most of all, most of all thank you Senator Cantwell for all of your support for craft beer. No, it's, it's really true. She has, she has helped establish a more level playing field between craft beer and corporate beer, more importantly, thank you so much for your work on the environment, land, and water conservation

I'm on the board of the Brewers Association, which represents 6,000 craft breweries across the country. And we always say, no water, no beer. And so obviously protecting clean water is an imperative for my industry. It's important for my business, my industry to come out and support the roadless rule and oppose any weakening of that in Alaska or anywhere else. So I was invited here to make that really direct economic link because that's what lawmakers need to hear.

So here I am representing 6,000 craft breweries, which create a lot of jobs. No water, no beer, no forest, no fauna, no flora, no fungi. And it's bigger than beer. It's bigger than my industry and it's about nature. Thank you very much.

Brad Throssel

Chair, WA Council of Trout Unlimited

I want to thank Tom for inviting me to speak here today. My name is Brad Throssel and I'm with Trout Unlimited. Those of you who don't know what Trout Unlimited is, we're a national organization. We have our headquarters in Washington D C we're also a state organization. We do advocacy in Olympia for fish and cold, clean, clear water, and we're also a local organization. We have 15 chapters throughout the state and those folks work on projects in their areas. I was talking to our representative on the ground up in Alaska yesterday and he made it very clear to me. He said, this is not a political issue as far as those folks are concerned there. We're not talking R's and D's. We're talking to people who make their living out of being up there. They guide, they take tourists out, they do all kinds of things and that's the lifestyle they've chosen. And that's the lifestyle they want to keep. And they don't need roads to do that. In fact, they don't want roads. They know that salmon runs are important. They know that wild animals are in charge.

If you backpack, you know, you go into an area like this and you're a visitor there, right? It's only what you can put on your back and then you have to leave. You have to go back out while the animals can stay there forever. And I, like the Senator, have never been to the Tongass, but I found out about two months ago that I'm going to

be a grandfather and I would really like for my grandchild to be able to go to the Tongass and hike someplace that I couldn't go. Thank you.

Heather Bauscher

Tongass Community Organizer, Sitka Conservation Society

My name is Heather Bauscher. I'm the Tongass Community Organizer for the Sitka Conservation Society. I travel all over Southeast Alaska in all the rural communities, working on fish habitat issues and working on the Tongass issue right now. I want to acknowledge the Tlingit, Haida, and Tsimshian people that have cared for the land since time immemorial and we're so grateful for that. Not only am I a community organizer, I also crew on fishing boats and actually I do a lot of my outreach either on fishing boats

while I'm crewing or using those methods to get around because we don't have a lot of roads. We travel by water. That's how we do it is by boat up there.

So, I wanted to say that's salmon is the lifeblood of Southeast Alaska. It is the thing that unites us across the Southeast, that unites us across Alaska and it connects us all across the Pacific Northwest. We are all salmon people and we all need to stand together right now. The story that the roadless rule impeeds economic development is a flat out lie. And this process is a sham. There are provisions for road building for hydro. We did it in Sitka. We can have corridors between communities, even infrastructure, even mining. Greens Creek mine is in a roadless area. This isn't about the roads at all, and these roads aren't gonna help us. It's about what is protected by these areas that are roadless. So 55% of the Tongass is roadless and that is our remaining stands of old growth and our most important salmon watersheds. And these trees are far more valuable kept for salmon production, than for being cut for short term gain and shipped overseas. So thank you to Senator Cantwell for your leadership because we are not getting the help we need from our congressional delegation in Alaska or our governor for that matter. And they're all working against us right now. So we are getting more help from you down here. And it is so great to see so many people here in Seattle that care about this. They're not listening to us and there's only so many of us and the full exemption does not reflect what they told us at the beginning of this whole process. And it's not what we need for the future of people in Southeast Alaska. So we need all the help that we can get. And the hope and the inspiration I see is how folks have been coming together all across the region, all across the state, all across the country, the Pacific Northwest on this. And we need more people to speak up because there's not enough of us on our own in Southeast. So thank you everyone for being here together. Thank you for talking to more people about this issue so they realize what's at stake. And we are so grateful to see so much love and support here. Thank you.

Rev. Roberta Rominger

Pastor, Congregational Church of Mercer Island

I'm Roberta Rominger. I'm the pastor of the Congregational Church on Mercer Island. Just want to say three simple things. The first is watching these photos is a powerful experience, right? And if you're actually there in those places and seeing those things with your own eyes and feeling the cold air- it's a powerful thing. I feel a fierce love and I just wanted to name that in the context of all sort of legal and other things that we're saying just to name that love. Because to me, that's what I know of God. That love is where it connects for me, and I feel we've got to protect it. We have to do this. I again would like to name that as God's hand on our shoulders or maybe it's God's kick up our backside, but we've got to do it.

That's what I know of what it means to be called by God to do something. And what people like me always stand

up and say at occasions like this is that it's right for us to

care for creation because it doesn't belong to us. We are stewards, we are caretakers. I wanted to acknowledge that we haven't always said that, that religious tradition has a lot to answer for because we used to say, "here, God made this for you. Go do what you want with it. It's all for you." We've woken up. It's not how people of faith look at things anymore and the responsibility on behalf of that fierce love and in response to that deep calling we gotta save this.

Thank you.

Tom Vogl

CEO, The Mountaineers

Good afternoon everyone. My name is Tom Vogl. I'm the CEO of The Mountaineers. I was thinking about Helen Engle, who as some of you know, passed away earlier this year. She was a Mountaineer and she was one of the best on the most powerful environmentalists in the history of our great state. She passed after 93 years. And I was thinking about what would Helen say if she were here today? And I think it's safe to say, those who even know Helen, she'd be outranged. She'd be absolutely outraged. And one of the things that I've always appreciated about Helen is that she saw the near-term issues, and in this case it's the Tongass. It's an issue that is worth fighting for the recreational value, the, the impact on salmon, the impact on clean waters, the carbon that is sequestered. Those are all really important things for us.

But the thing that I always valued about Helen is that she would take a step back and she would see the broader context. And the broader context here is pretty outrageous. The Tongass is 17 million acres, and of that 55% of that is roadless. Now it's about 9 million acres. To put that into perspective, 9 million acres is about the size of all the national forests here in the state of Washington. So could you imagine the outrage that Helen would have and the outrage that we should have over the 9 million acres in the Tongass that have protection now because of the roadless rule being attacked. We've got to fight this. So I really appreciate you being here. Not only to be a voice for the Tongass, but to be a voice for the attack on the climate crisis, the attack on our public lands in general. This is like a drip, drip, drip of toxicity by this administration. So this is not just about the Tongass, it's about stopping these kinds of attacks and ensuring that we're going to have our public lands that are going to be available not only for recreation, but for clean water, for our kids, and for salmon habitat. We've got to stop this. Thanks for being here. Thanks Senator Cantwell for being here and for REI hosting this event.

Tom O'Keefe

Pacific Northwest Stewardship Director, American Whitewater

Good afternoon. My name is Tom O'Keefe. I'm that Pacific Northwest Stewardship Director for American whitewater. I also serve on the joint policy shop for Outdoor Alliance. Our mission is to conserve and restore America's whitewater rivers and to

enhance opportunities to enjoy them safely. I'm also an aquatic ecologist and I did work at the University of Washington for several years and I managed a research program that had sites up in the Tongass National Forest, so it's a place I've personally spent a lot of time in as a research science scientist and also for outdoor recreation. American Whitewater supports alternative one, the no action alternative. We are strongly opposed to

the preferred alternative that would upend the protections of the roadless rule for this place for the paddle sports community. Sea kayaking among the islands and coastline of the Tongass National Forest is truly a world-class way to experience the Pacific coastal temperate rainforest. While our members are whitewater paddlers, when flows drop in summer, many of us become sea kayakers and some of us even paddle all the way to Juneau from Seattle through the spectacular landscape. For recreational users, the view shed in water quality, the camping experience and the wildlife are all spectacular values of this place. All are protected by the roadless rule, and the impacts are not adequately addressed in the draft environmental impact statement. American Whitewater supports the no action alternative and upholding the roadless rule for this place. Thank you.

Joanna Grist

Land and Water Conservation Fund Coalition

My name is Joanna Grist and I'm here on behalf of the LWCF coalition. This is a great opportunity to talk about the importance of connectivity and unfragmented landscapes. LWCF, the land and water conservation fund, has been called our nation's greatest conservation tool because it's been used for over 50 years to protect, connect, and expand our public lands. And this has included many roadless areas. It's also our best tool for consolidating inholdings and making strategic acquisitions. Like roadless areas, it works to connect these landscapes and enhance our watersheds. I wanted to thank Senator Cantwell, she has been, the single greatest champion of LWCF for the last few years. Last week there was a historic vote and some energy and natural resources to permanently fund LWCF, and provide full funding of 900 million a year. She also led the effort to reauthorize it earlier this year. Thank you very much for this opportunity and for your commitment to protecting our roadless areas. Thank you.

Harry Romberg

Co-Chair, Washington State National Forest Committee, Sierra Club

I'm Harry Romberg. I'm a volunteer but I co-chair the CR clubs, Washington state chapter national forest committee and I'm also on the national wilderness and wild lands team as one of the key organizers of our annual law public lands lobby week in Washington, D C every year where we bring volunteers and others from across the country to lobby for our public lands in DC. This past several years we've worked for codification of the roadless rule because it makes it more difficult for the administration to arbitrarily undermine the rules on a whim, such as this administration has been doing. Once again, I reiterate that Senator Cantwell has been a champion on this as she

has in many other good measures to protect our public lands.

I've been advocating for the roadless role since before President Clinton signed it almost 20 years ago. I personally gathered four to 500 signatures on comments on the roadless rule. That's just a small percentage of the over well over 1 million comments that were submitted, which at the time, was the largest number of comments that had been submitted on any single administrative rule. The Tongass is our nation's largest national forest, and it has over 9 million acres of roadless land, one of the last remaining intact ecosystems in the world and the crown jewel of the entire national forest system. As such, it is by the best carbon storage value of all the national forests and has undergone relatively little logging over the years. Almost all of the forest of the Tongass is old growth. So the main purpose of building more roads is to increase logging. So what would they really be doing but logging more old growth? Which in this day and age in the climate change, that's outrageous. Furthermore, the infrastructure, namely mills and jobs processing those logs, is actually diminished over the years. So it seems likely that they'll minimally mill those logs so that they can export them overseas. So not only

where are we logging our old growth forests, we're shipping the logs elsewhere.

There were over 600 public meetings across the country for the original rule and now only one outside of Alaska. In reality, nothing has changed over almost 20 years, except that perhaps the importance of timber to Alaska's economy has diminished and the value of the intact forest has become even more apparent. Furthermore, the Tongass is largely a coastal forest that provides clean water and includes vital salmon habitat. That's important to both Alaska and Washington economies. As we know, many salmon runs here in Washington depend on Alaskan waters and our fish runs here are declining, Further disturbing their habitat through road building and subsequent logging on other develop or other development even all the way up in Alaska exacerbates that problem. The incredible scenery in Alaska includes much of the magnificent force of the Tongass, which is largely a coastal forest and much of that is on islands. The tourism industry now includes many thousands of people who cruise to Alaska from right here in Seattle. This cruise is actually on the bucket list for many people from around the world and it substantially contributes to the economies of both Seattle and many ports in Alaska. I actually worked for the cruise industry this last summer for the first time, and I did a rough estimate of how many sailings we had and how many passengers approximately that I thought we had and I estimated four to 500,000 people cruised out of the port of Seattle up into Alaska. But they didn't go up there to see clear cuts and roads everywhere. They came up here to see the natural scenery. And many of those people I saw were indeed from red States and I even saw a few "Make America Great Again" hats. I think the value is obvious. So in closing, the irreplaceable values of the Tongass can't be measured in board feet. And this rule ensures that these values are preserved for generations to come. The Sierra Club has a longstanding and deep investment in the roadless rule and the target is our crown jewel, and we need to seek further protections for these public lands. Not rolling back the ones we already have.

Mike Anderson

Senior Policy Analyst, The Wilderness Society

Hello, my name is Mike Anderson. I'm a Senior Policy Analyst for The Wilderness Society, and our organization has been at the forefront of the effort to create the roadless area conservation rule back in the late 1990s, and in the defense of the roadless rule during the Bush administration. And now under the Trump administration, it's one of our organization's top priorities. We are doing all that we can to activate our membership across the nation to defend the role of this rule. Senator Cantwell has been one of our great champions throughout the defense of the roadless rule, but you should also know that Governor Inslee, was when he was in Congress, the sponsor of the house version of Senator Cantwell's, roadless area conservation act. We have a very strong political support for this rule in this state. Going back some two decades, we have a very strong coalition both nationally and in Southeast Alaska working together for protection of the Tongass. The Tongass has over 9 million acres of roadless areas and these areas are the crown jewel of the nation's national forests. The salmon habitat, the wildlife habitat, the forest carbon is nothing short of supportive, and the Trump Administration's efforts to exempt the Tongass from this rule is nothing short of outrageous. There's no reason to exempt the Tongass. The timber industry is now less than 1% of Southeast Alaska's employment compared to 26% in the tourism and commercial fishing industries. Furthermore, the Forest Service spends more than $30 million a year subsidizing the logging and road building, road building and logging within the Tongass national forest. It is the most uneconomic national forest in the nation for a timber production. There's no reason for us to be going into the Tongass building more expensive roads. So we are strongly supportive of the no action alternative and I appreciate everybody coming today and let's fight and win this again.

Marlies Wierenga

Pacific Northwest Conservation Manager, WildEarth Guardians

Hello everyone. I'm inspired to be among these Washington voices who are standing with our neighbors to the North to say we also value clean water, abundant salmon runs and wild areas. Roadless areas are the best places that can still provide these treasures and they are becoming even more important as refuge areas of cold water, clean air and carbon sinks as climate change impacts. Bear down, my name is Marlies Wierenga and I'm the Pacific Northwest Conservation Manager at WildEarth Guardians. Like many of us here, we work to protect and restore wild places and rivers, wildlife, and the health of the American West and we support the no action alternative. I grew up in the desert landscape of Southern New Mexico where there were few trees, no salmon and little water. When I moved to the Northwest, it seemed like I had landed on a planet of abundance, but looking closer and listening, it was apparent that big problems exist.

Salmon are blocked from reaching their spawning grounds by culverts placed under roads. Drinking water providers often have to shut off their systems because of too much dirt in the water from roads or road landslides. Local, state and federal governments along with County stakeholders are spending millions of dollars to fix these problems. Yet roadless areas are still the places where the healthiest watersheds can be found nationally and nearly 30 million people rely on drinking water from watersheds that contain roadless areas. Streams in roadless watersheds have less sediment and better habitat than roaded watersheds. Wildfire caused by humans is almost five times less likely to occur in roadless areas and the Forest Service, Park Service and Fish and Wildlife Service should recognize that protecting and connecting roadless areas is an important action to enhance climate change adaptation. This is why the roadless rule needs to continue to protect the Tongass. I did not live in Alaska, but I value roadless areas in my own state as our neighbors do up North. Not only does this attack threaten clean water and habitat for salmon, but it sets a bad precedent that could lead to logging and road construction in remote wild forest areas across the nation. I urge the Forest Service to keep roadless protections in place and choose the no action alternative. Thank you.

Mitch Friedman

Director, Conservation Northwest

I am Mitchell Friedman. I direct Conservation Northwest. Been working for about 35 years to protect our wild areas, and I guess what I'll add is memories of the battle because it was a hell of a battle. Rolling back roadless protections in the Tongass or anywhere makes no sense policy-wise. Logging these areas made no sense. Even in the 80s, some of us can remember when we would go to our favorite places and they wouldn't be there anymore and the battles we had to go through and the arguments we had to make to get to this point. Congressman, Norm Dicks was the first to offer a writer appropriations bill, a restriction on logging roadless areas, and as a congressman from timber country.

These were the transitions we had to go through to get to the point that we're at now where we take these things for granted that the places we love will still be there and that we'll be moving forward not backwards. I can tell you that things feel different in timber country these days. We don't battle now over logging big trees or wild areas. We instead work together on rational policy and forestry that's often improving the stands. We now have in the Northwest, just a fraction of the timber mills that we had 30 years ago. Yet we process more timber in fewer mills than we did in the vast number of mills in the old days because of automation. Back before the roadless rule, all that was logged out of the Tongass was not just below cost, but it was being shipped off as pulp overseas to foreign markets and these days when you could log the rest of these forests and not generate jobs or economic benefits, there's no reason to do these things other than carrying on old political vendettas. We have to get past this. We have to protect our wild areas. Let's

come together.

Donna Osseward

President, Olympic Park Associates

Hello. I'm Donna Osseward, President of the Olympic Park Associates. We appreciate this opportunity to say a few words regarding the value of American roadless areas. OPA argues that the recently proposed USDA Alaska roadless rule would remove protections on watersheds and from the road building and timber cutting in the Tongass. The result would erode the 2001 roadless rule. OPA supports the EIS alternative one which would take no action and will leave all of Alaska under the 2001 roadless rule. OPA argues that this DIS would erode the protections in the 2000 roadless rule and set precedents detrimental to all national forests. Too often we as humans just disrespect the importance of nature to our welfare. As individuals, we take joy in hiking, fishing, climbing in these areas. However often we don't think of the value these areas bring to our lives, even if we don't set a foot into them. They provide the gifts of cleaner air and water, a place for animals far better than a zoo, a place where nature works mostly according to its nature, its creator's rules, thereby for providing a diversity of plants, fish and animals that can come from a place not weeded by humans.

They are laboratories for us to learn the processes that provide for our welfare. They are libraries holding that area's natural collection of plants and animals. Here we find nature's storehouse of genes. When a wild area is large enough, it contains the species of plants and animals that make up the natural sustainable ecosystem of an area. Each area is special because of its unique mix of climate, plants and animals. Each one adds to the variety that diversifies our lives. Most of our medicines come from nature found around the world. A few examples- the bark of the Pacific Yew becoming a valuable cancer treatment. Aspirin comes from the Willow. Penicillin was created by a fungus. Nature has performed 40 billion years of clinical trials and making these another cure is possible. We must avoid the tendency to assume we now know all we need to know. Wildlands make our earth livable. Native vegetation pulls pollution from the air and water. Its soils and plants filter rainwater, trees and vegetation, and sequester carbon by

using it, trading the carbon dioxide in the air with the oxygen we need. Undisturbed earth protects the carbon reserves lying below and it all helps to reduce global warming, oceans rising and ocean acidification. These areas hold the winter snow to slow release water in summer for the fish, wildlife, agricultural crops and ourselves. In the middle of the 1800s, Thoreau wrote wildness is the preservation of the world today. As we continue to learn, we come to understand how right he was daily. Our health depends on clean air, water, and an earth capable of producing the resources we need to continue to live comfortably on earth. Roadless designation does not lock up an area. It shelters the gifts we need for living well. It provides a future for our children and our tendency for monoculture. Natural areas, whole genes we may need sooner or later to provide genetic help for the plants and animals necessary for sustaining us on a changing earth. We humans have taken over and changed much of the world. We must protect ample samples of nature to maintain the natural structure that we are a part of. To do otherwise is a mistake our children will regret. Our roadless areas are a low-cost investment in our future wellbeing. Thank you.

Crystal Garner

Statewide Engagement Manager, Washington Trails Association

Hi, my name is Crystal Gardner and I'm the Statewide Engagement Manager for Washington Trails Association. Washington Trails Association has a 50 year legacy of protecting trails. We are supported by more than 15,500 household members and have an online community of more than 100,000 hikers. WTA enhances hiking experiences in Washington state by mobilizing a diverse and growing community of hikers to explore, steward, and protect trails and public lands. As the nation's largest state-based trail maintenance and hiking advocacy nonprofit organization, Washington Trails Association works to ensure that Washington's trails stand the test of time and connect people to the outdoors from everyday adventures to backcountry explorations. Many of these backcountry adventures take place on public lands protected by the roadless rule. Some of the best places to hike and backpack in the state are in roadless areas, including the dark divide on the Gifford Pinchot national forest, the Tiana way on the Okanogan Wenatchee national forest, and the Kettle Crest on the Colville National Forest. Miles upon miles of the Pacific Crest Trail intersect 20 roadless areas in Washington alone. The roadless rule must be protected and kept in place here in Washington state, up North, Alaska and the Tongass national forest and throughout our country. Washington Trails Association supports the roadless rule and wants to thank everyone here for helping to protect it. Thank you

Ed Henderson

Member, Board of Directors, North Cascades Conservation Council

Good afternoon. I'm Ed Henderson. I'm the Director of the North Cascades Conservation Council and we were founded in 1957 to protect and preserve the scenic, scientific,

recreational, educational and wilderness values of the North Cascades. We're strong supporters of the 2001 roadless rule and are concerned with a maintaining its integrity nationwide. We view the Tongass DEIS as a threat to this integrity and thus a threat to our own extensive roadless areas in the North Cascades. Washington has the greatest extent of unprotected national forest roadless areas in the contiguous 48 States. The roadless rule protects these forests. I have personally searched for the purpose and need in the DEIS. After 12 pages of obfuscation, I can only conclude that the implicit purpose is to cut trees and the need is to build roads for access to those trees and then to haul the logs away.

While the DEIS contains many disingenuous reassurances there will be little or no impact from logging and road building, it deliberately eliminates from detail analysis 18 issues that would evaluate these impacts. Removing the 9.2 million acres of the Tongass National Forest from the protection of the national roadless rule and depending upon the state of Alaska to safeguard the values inherited an untrammeled roadless forest is equivalent of asking the fox to guard the chicken coop. You can only expect to have feathers, or in this case stumps, left. North Cascades Conservation Council strongly supports a no-action alternative and maintain the national roadless rule in the Tongass. Thank you very much.

Karla Hart
Juneau, AK

Thank you. I came down from Juno, Alaska for a family vacation and the first thing I did is say "I need to go to this meeting on the Roadless Rule." Every day that the clouds allow, I look across Lynn Canal at the Chilkat Mountains. They're rugged snow-capped peaks and on the far side of them is Glacier Bay National Park. The Chilkat Mountains are roadless, the Chilkat Mountains, this summer for the first time in my lifetime in Juno, were bare. All of the snow was gone and you saw gray rock like I'd seen in other places when I traveled. Scientists at the University of Alaska Southeast think that it's probably the first time in 10,000 years that that rock has been exposed to us. So, I'm really aware of climate change. I'm really aware of so many things that are going on in Southeast Alaska. I'd like to recognize again the Tlingit. It's Tlingit land that I live upon and I'm very grateful to

them for their stewardship. And the tribes of Southeast Alaska have come out incredibly strong for protecting Southeast Alaska. The residents of Southeast, in addition to the tribes, came out extremely strong. I feel so heartened to see all of the people representing all of the organizations trying to help to protect the Tongass because it is our forest. I live there. It's my front yard, my backyard, my side yards. But it's our forest. All Americans. The no action alternative is the only real choice. Any compromise choices, which I fear they're setting up, will come at a great cost. They want it all. We want them to have nothing. They'll compromise and pick as a small compromise the places that they strategically really want. And so no action has to be the only alternative. Are we talking a lot about the trees and the trees are desperately important to me, but it's not just about the trees.

At the Juneau hearing, I saw sitting and listening, people who I know have very strong interests in the mining industry. They weren't speaking, they were listening, they were watching. All of the glaciers that are retreating are exposing potential mineral areas. The exploration is going on, the staking is going on under the 1872 mining act. So trees are important, the climate, all of that. But remember also if they compromise for areas that don't have trees, it's not good. Roads bring invasives- we're lucky that we have so much roadless area that has been free of invasives. The forest service has no plan to deal with the invasives. They have no way to deal with the invasives. I've volunteered for the Forest Service sometimes and for Southeast Alaska Conservation Council, which is our regional group. I spend time doing biological surveys within clear cuts, within wilderness, in a lot of different areas, and the reach of the invasive plants into the areas that are adjacent to roads is terrifying to me. Now, Reed Canary grass, a half a mile from a logging road in a muskeg meadow that I would have thought would never be exposed. So thank you all for your work and let's get it done.

Graham Taylor

Program Manager, National Parks & Conservation Association

Hello, my name's Graham Taylor and I'm a Program Manager with the National Parks Conservation Association. We're a group that advocates for our National Parks and that includes the little historic sites that celebrate our history as well as the large landscapes that really allow us to experience the natural world. I'm here today to support the roadless rule on behalf of NPCA and thank Senator Cantwell for her leadership and protection of the roadless rule, our public lands and our national parks. But you know, the parks are not islands. They are a part of a larger mosaic of public lands that are important to the integrity of our national parks. Everything is connected as John Muir said to us. And so by protecting the roadless lands, we also protect our national parks and the other areas connected to them. But really this scheme to undo the roadless rule-it brings me to a question about who is going to profit, who is going to profit from this, the few or the many? Because right now we all profit from the clean air, the clean water, amazing outdoor recreation experiences, and the climate impacts. We all profit right now. But if we undo this, if we mess with the roadless rule, if we trust this administration who has burned us at every single opportunity to undo the roadless rule, then we're going down a path that not just our children and grandchildren will regret, but that we will regret. Because right now we all profit but under this plan, undoing the roadless act, we all suffer. So NPCA supports the no action alternative because the roadless areas protect our watersheds. They protect our landscapes and our wildlife that make these lands special and the people that inhabit this earth. Thank you so much.

Rebecca Caulfield
Seattle, WA

My name is Rebecca Caulfield. I live in West Seattle and I'm a volunteer with the Center for Biological Diversity. I'd like to thank Senator Cantwell and Washington Wild for the

opportunity to give non-Alaskan residents the opportunity to speak up about the Alaska specific roadless rule. I am asking Secretary Perdue and the US Forest Service to select the no action alternative on the Alaska specific roadless role and protect all inventoried roadless areas on the Tongass national forest under the 2001 national roadless rule. The fact that the roadless rule is up for exemption in Alaska is nothing less than blatant disregard for the majestic forests such as the Tongass that provide invaluable ecosystem services to all life on earth. We are at a major crossroads with tackling the climate crisis. Thus the natural integrity of forests like the Tongass should be fully protected as an investment in our future. The Tongass, with its old growth trees, has been dubbed the "nation's climate forest" due to its unsurpassed ability to sequester carbon and mitigate climate impacts caused by humans. Alaska knows this all too well, as it just experienced is hottest summer on record. Alaskan forests host an abundance of wildlife such as moose, owl wolves, bears, eagles and salmon who have their part in keeping this forest healthy and vibrant. Where are their voices while we decide what to do with their home? Humans have been treating the planet like it is ours for the taking with very little regard to the consequences of our actions such as those from clear-cutting logging and mining. How about the radical idea of leaving our remaining national forests such as the Tongass as they are for the sake of life that happens not to be human. Alaska has an opportunity to show the rest of the world that it is a leader in environmental stewardship by protecting its precious forests. There is no better way to solidify American leadership than by upholding the current roadless rule. Thank you very much.

Deanna Hobbs
Juneau, AK

Hello. My name is Deanna. I'm a Juneau Alaska resident, but I also go to PLU over in Tacoma. I'm here today because I worked on the roadless rule this summer in Juneau and did a lot of really awesome work. I came here prepared to talk about some of the facts and statistics, but the forest service has heard it all before. While y'all were talking, I kept thinking about this one encounter I had the summer in Haines, Alaska, where I was engaging with people and telling people why the roadless rule is so awesome, and I was explaining it to this one guy from the East coast. And, after I told him all of this really good information, he didn't really care. And I asked him why and he said that he is very religious, and he actually didn't think that he needed to do anything with the environment. He thought that God would handle it and that he didn't need to do anything really or participate in the political process that was going on. We talked about this for a long time, and that's still just on the back of my mind when we're talking about this today because there's so many people who genuinely leave these decisions up to God or to politicians or to big corporations or people who know more, have more money. But really, it's up to all of us. I go to university right now and we'll be mobilizing on this, but I'm also just asking everyone in this room with all these titles that you have and all these friends that you have in this sphere of influence that you have to really be mobilizing and making sure that you're talking with your peers and talking with the

people that are under you and above you and next to you to make sure that everyone is here in this room when we have these spaces, or online submitting comments, or calling legislators, because it's more than just showing up this one time or submitting one comment. But we all need to be mobilizing. Thank you.

Sharon Burke
Seattle, WA

Hello. I am a volunteer with the Center for Biological Diversity and I'm not going to talk very long because there've been too many articulate people laying out why we need to support the roadless rule. But I have to say we need to somehow come together and take these issues, these great ideas, to the parts of the country that are supporting the Trump Administration and basically it feels like is giving us all the finger. I do agree that at the core it is just the few, it is just some very wealthy people who want to make the most of making money in the short

amount of time before climate change does irreparable damage. So I have been both angry and depressed with the Trump Administration at every turn. And it isn't just Donald Trump, it is the Republican party at the moment- killing the endangered species act, rolling back all of those environmental protections that have benefited all of us. So I wish I was a marketing genius as we are preaching to the choir here and we need to somehow get this message to the people that unbelievably have more political power than even a city the size of Seattle. I think someone

mentioned Utah has a population of 600,000 and and we have a city here of over a million and they have the same political power in the Senate that the state of Washington does. So we have to get out there to those other people before it's too late before this girl may actually say "I saw an eagle once, I saw a whale or a bear, but they are extinct now or you see them only in zoos" and that to me is such a tragedy. That's the depression part I feel. So thank you for letting me rant for a couple of minutes, but let's do something.

Kiersten Gmeiner
Seattle, WA

Hi, my name is Kiersten Gmeiner and I'm a family physician and a PCT hiker and I just wanted to go on record asking for a no action vote from the powers at be. I also wanted to thank everybody here. It's breathtaking, the decades of work that people in this room have put in. I'm just a member of all organizations you all run and I'm an ardent tree advocate. I'm in North Seattle and I'm part of neighborhood tree keepers where the developers are clear cutting one lot at a time. So everybody pay attention when you see them getting ready to clear cut. There is a Seattle ordinance that protects the trees. Not a good one yet but there is, so please be active in your neighborhoods as well as in the Tongass. There've been many more eloquent people than I today about the Tongass. The one thing I wanted to share is that as a family doc, I really do see our forests as the lungs of the earth. And I don't think it's a trope. I think it's absolutely accurate ecosystem wise and it just doesn't make sense to make a bunch of tiny cuts in any tissue. It just doesn't

make any sense. And if you think about our forest as the lungs, then the periphery might okay to put a few roads into for recreation access. But if you're talking about the real heart of the lungs, those cuts are much higher costs than the ones at the periphery. And so I think the Tongass is one of our last stands in terms of the climate. I'm with Greta Thunberg, I mean if you know that your behavior is dooming the younger generations, you just have to stop. So, thank you. Thank you. Thank you to everyone here. And unfortunately I think he would be really sad that this is just as pertinent now as it was when it was written. But unless someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing's going to get better. So thank you.

Rebecca Wolfe
Edmunds, WA

Greetings. I want to begin by saying how grateful I am for each one of you and the work you're doing. We need so many of us for the uninformed, the ignorant who do not know, they do not know how sacred this place is. So I just want to start with that and say that I have worked as a volunteer for many groups, Food and Water Watch, Sierra Club, Our Children's Trust, and Washington Wild on occasion too. And I've been to DC and I've lobbied actually mostly on the endangered species act to protect that. And a couple of years ago I went back to school and during studies at Vermont law school, I did a study of the rare , Alexander Archipelago Wolf, which is very, very endangered, very rare because it's lost its prey, the Sitka deer, and a lot of that has to do with logging and all of this, even though we don't like to admit it, it is political.

I want to urge secretary Perdue to join us in practicing democracy. We have not been allowed to practice our democracy under the current administration. We have to change that. And without going into specifics, you know

what I mean? And so I do support the no action alternative and I, with regard to working for Our Children's Trust, we are fighting the U S government for a better environment for a better atmosphere. And how does that relate to the Tongass? We have to protect the carbon storage trees. And so among other things that I'm grateful for, I'm really grateful for the people and all those young people. When I started working with Our Children's Trust, there were ages 9 to 19, and now those kids are in college and they are actively working furiously and desperately to save places like this. And we have some young people in Alaska who are working for this and in many of the States. They need our support. I did start working for democracy in 1960 when I was a Kennedy girl in high school and we got to meet Jackie Kennedy before he was elected. And it's not about being a Democrat, it's about just protecting our democracy so that we can protect places like this. I thank you all.

Michael Shurgot

Alaska Wilderness League

Good afternoon. My name is Michael Shurgot and I've been a resident of Seattle since

1982 and I do want to acknowledge our friends from Alaska and say thank you for coming down and making the effort. Two quick points. In the early to mid nineties, I was chair of the conservation division at The Mountaineers, which is a volunteer position. There are several people in the room, Harry and Donna and Ed- Remember those days? They were very tumultuous. And one of the issues we tackled or attempted to was working on a roadless rule, especially Washington and Oregon. I should mention somebody who I don't think is here. Some of you probably know Charlie Brains from the Sierra club, he was so instrumental and of course, Mitch Freedman, who was up here earlier, did a tremendous amount of work. But two points about that process: number one, it was based on science. We had people in The Mountaineers in the Sierra Club who were doing research on how old-growth ancient forests reproduce themselves and sustain themselves. The other point that needs to be made to be made is that there were compromises built into the rule way back when. We met with members of the, Department of Agriculture, Fish and Wildlife, Forest Wervice, native peoples, communities, even logging people. And the plans that we worked out for Oregon and Washington did involve compromises. So if anybody says to you that the roadless rule does not contain compromises, it's a simply wrong statement.

The second point I would like to make is to make something explicit that I think has been implicit in a lot of what people have said here. Many of you will remember this book- A Sand County Almanac by Aldo Leopold, which I still think is the Bible of the conservation movement. The central essay is called the land ethic. And I just want to read the central sentence in the central essay "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise." I would submit that proposal to clear cut the talk is something that rises to that level, that this is fundamentally a moral issue because there is so much life in that forest that would be destroyed. And there's other people who have said, if you clear cut the Tongass, then you clear cut part of the lungs of this planet. So I urge, you: no cutting. Thank you.

Kyle McDaniel
Seattle, WA

Hi, I'm Kyle McDaniel from West Seattle. I'm something of a sleeping warrior. In the 1990s, I came to Washington state in order to stand against some of the timber sales that had been opened by the salvage logging rider signed by President Bill Clinton. As time progressed, I became more involved in nonviolent civil disobedience in our actual forest being cut and as an experience wilderness orienteer, I had the fortune of hiking into some of the trailless areas here in Washington state to observe a forest that may not exist anymore. Now, there's a very poignant feeling in a forest that may not exist anymore. It radiates with spiritual energy. Now, as a product of the Reagan and Sr. Bush era, I was typical of many gen-Xers devoid of spirituality, religion, patriotism. Deep within

the wilderness of the old growth forest, I discovered my spirituality and a sense of patriotism and a lot of that comes from the wilderness areas and the national parks of

our country. That gave me a sense of what it meant to be American, not to be displaced, not to be a rebel, but to be part of this great nation and to find a place within it. So, every year during the logging season, I would travel from Port Townsend, Washington where I lived down to Northern California. I was part of the defense of Headwaters Forest in the Redwoods. I used my skills in orienteering to lead activists through endangered forest to conduct nonviolent civil disobedience, including tree sitting. And I lent myself to that and it was a great passion of mine. And eventually I, myself, spent 23 nights suspended between two redwoods on a traverse line, living in a hammock.

We waited till mid-November of 1997 for a road bylaw to be unbuilt. We stayed up in those trees through cold, wet weather. And as the time passed, the loggers who had lodged a lot of hostility towards us began to respect us. They started leaving beer cans and chanterelles and other goodies at the bottom of the tree. They knew that we would sneak down in the middle of the night and get the goodies. So initially we made friends and then un-made the road and they went away. And the whole stand of trees, which was actually at right up against the Rockefeller forest in Noble State Park still stands today

I actually protested Bill Clinton when he visited Bellevue College back in 1996 and advocated strongly for the roadless rule, as we also opposed some of the timber sales that had come open because of the salvage logging rider. When it was finally signed and instigated by our, our then president, I saw that as a kind of a crowning chapter in a fight that I had involved my life in for many years. So 20 years later, after not being involved in the environmental movement, I see the crown jewel of all roadless areas, which by the way, should be a wilderness area. Here in Washington state, roadless areas have to be more than 3000 acres and a wilderness area more than 5,000. Why are these 9,000 acres not a protected wilderness area, much less than national park? So now as a father of a daughter who is an accomplished backpacker, I find that it's a duty to stand up now. I'm not part of any organization, but I plan to network and use my skills and communication and leadership to become more involved. And as we watch many of the things we hold sacred and dear in our country be whittled away and really under threat, this is where I must make my stand because the bottom of my heart, like I said, is the source. Wilderness is the source of my patriotism and my spirituality. It has given me such healing and it has allowed me to be a productive member of society. So when I finally moved to Seattle 20 years ago, I felt like I had fought a good fight and now I can go on with my life and be a normal person. And 20 years later, here I am again.

So one of my favorite movies, Frank Herbert's Dune, got me into ecology in the first place and there's one line and it goes "the sleeper must awaken," and that's, that's what must happen now. The sleeper must awaken. We can't just be preaching to the choir. We've got to reach out in our communities and make this known, and it may seem like a very dark time in our country, but this is a choice we can make. This is an opportunity for us to seize our humanity and seize our sense of what it means to be an American, our patriotism and this land that the Tongass as well as some of the other places I've never

seen. But knowing that the crown jewel like in British Columbia and Bella Coola, the spirit bear area, those areas really need to be protected for all generations. Olympic National Park would not exist if people like us didn't come together nearly a hundred years ago. Yes, President Roosevelt signed it into law, but there were people like you that helped him get there. So I employ everyone to do what they can and I'm really happy to hear everybody speak today. It's profound moment for me, so thank you so much and good luck.

Michael George

Seattle, WA

Hi, my name is Michael George. I'm very different than a lot of you. I came here because I was scrolling through Facebook and I saw an ad that said you needed statements for the roadless initiative. I don't have a history of working on these things, so I don't have as much prepared. As I was sitting here, I was really trying to get my thoughts together and forgot what it was that got me out of my house to this room. And really here it is: I can bring it back to when I was about six years old. I grew up in Boston, my family is from Colorado. We took my first airplane ride to Colorado, we went to my grandparents' house. I went, I walked out the door with my dad and he said something really profound to me. He said "you see your grandma's driveway? You're going to be amazed by this, but really think about this. That driveway connects to our driveway back home. It connects to your friend's driveway in Florida. We built this amazing thing that connects

everybody to everybody by concrete." I spent a couple of decades of my life really in awe of that. It was such an amazing accomplishment. I just thought it was so cool. Then I ended up moving to Montana to go to school and I really got into backpacking and got into nature. What had been this amazing thing to me, I started reflecting on, and it became scarier and scarier. I started realizing that there is this thing that we have made that not only connects us all but divides the very thing that I love and was beginning to love more and more, which is nature.

So when I saw this Facebook ad, I thought "you know what? I'm going to get out of my chair and I'm going to come down here and I'm going to stand up for something that I don't know a lot about, other than it is extremely important to keep, and is becoming rarer and rarer." When I hear things like 9 million acres, I didn't know that before coming here. I think to myself, that is amazing. We need to keep this. So as just a general person in the world, I am here to say that we need to know action on this. Thank you.

Johnny Fishmonger

Executive Director, Wild Salmon Nation

Okay. I'm not going to beat around the clear-cut. Just going to come out first to say, the no action is the way to go here. My name is Johnny Fishmonger. I'm the Executive Director of Wild Salmon Nation and most of our work is protecting wild salmonids up and down the West coast from the steel head runs that still run up little cricks in

Ensenada, Mexico to our wild salmon that are strained up and around the corner into the Arctic and populating all the way to the McKenzie river in Northern Canada. When I was 18, I graduated high school in Ballard and the day I got out of high school, I got on a Norwegian crab boat and headed north up to Bristol Bay on the Bering sea to go tender salmon. Our first stop was Ketchikan, our second stop was Sitka. We tooled around Craig and around Prince of Wales and for a kid that grew up in Northwest and had seen all the clear cuts up and down East Lewis County everywhere, I was flabbergasted. I was like "oh my God, they're cutting the hell out of this. This is unbelievable." And you know, here I was in the land of dinosaurs: dinosaur trees, dinosaur cars formations, this ancient geology, and ancient forests.

Frank Murkowski and Viking Lumber have never had to retool their plan because Frank Murkowski is not dead. Viking lumber exists because Frank is not dead because Frank Murkowski has a Senator in his pocket. Her name is Lisa.

So besides Frank and Lisa and all that, we ran up against was the Southeast conference, which is the chamber of commerce for all of Southeast Alaska and supposed to represent all business in Southeast Alaska and small business and tourists and lumber and fishing and guides. But what do they spend all their time doing? Promoting cutting and mining. We need to replace the Southeast conference with the new progressive chamber of

commerce in Southeast Alaska, that represents all of us that are looking forward and thinking progressively about Southeast Alaska. So if any of you are small business owners in Southeast, let's talk. There's a whole bunch of us thinking, we need to replace the Southeast chamber and then we will lead the re we need to replace a Lisa. So no action. That's the alternative.

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Public Meeting for the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS

Skagway, Alaska

November 26, 2019

Audio recorded by a member of the public and transcribed here using a paid online transcription service.

Speaker 1: Out of the suitability for timber harvesting and impacts. And so, lifting this regulation, it would add 185,000 acres to that suitable timber base is what it would do. Of that 185,000, 20,000 is young growth and 165,000 is old growth. And there's a map that has the timber suitability over there on the wall for [inaudible 00:00:22]. So signing at the end here, for more information, we got this website going, and I encourage you ... There's a lot of stuff on there.

Speaker 1: There's presentations on there. All the things, maps around there. So if you want to take a deeper dive, take a look. There's a lot of stuff on this website and it's being updated constantly. So I would encourage you to check that out. There's also we have a story map online tool. So if you want to see how this looks spatially or geographically across the region, you can turn certain layers on and off and you can kind of see, in a particular geographic area, probably a little where this alternative is made behind the particular landscape there.

Speaker 1: And then finally how to comment. Comments, got to be submitted in writing by December 17th, unless you're giving testimony tonight, we'll take those oral comments and we'll have them transcribed. So it's midnight Alaska time, December 17th. And there are a whole bunch of ways that you can do this. You can get on the Internet, go to that project website and there's a link there allows you to enter them in. If you prefer the stamp an envelope enough that you can mail it to us there in Juneau. There's an email and then of course we're taking a bit in conference here too, if you'd like to submit some comments tonight.

Speaker 1: And then finally the public comment period again, I'll say it one more time, closes December 17th. What we're going to do next step when we get those public comment period closes, we will start analyzing all those and we'll have to kind of summarize them into certain issue or concern statements, and them we'll respond to all those comments in the final environmental impact statement. We're going to continue to consult with tribes and Alaska Native corporations all the way to the end of this.

Speaker 1: And then, we can always come and do public outreach too. So I'd give a civic group or an organization that must invite us up, we can give kind of a presentation that way as well, and engage. And then, the final environmental impact statement. So we're looking for that at an early summer of 2020. We don't have a definitive date on that but that's

Transcript by Rev.com

when you would see a final role and a final environmental impact statement. I just want to also say there is no administrative review on this kind of decision.

Speaker 1: So if we get all the way to the end and people don't like how the decision is in the end, the only real recourse is litigation so you have to take it to the courts at that point in time. And that's it. So let's get this guy involved. [Frank's 00:03:08] going to help you keep track of who's in the queue and we'll kind of do our best for taking some questions and answers here and go from there. Does anybody... ? Just raise your hand. Go ahead and start.

Speaker 2: So I want to make sure I understood what you were talking about how the road Skag changes, but underneath that is your management plan. And I seem to recall coming to talk to me about that. And I remember they were talking about something like I believe a 15 year process on the management plan, which is now what? Six years old?

Speaker 1: It's about three years old.

Speaker 2: Three years old. So there, that exists, and it was designed to have a certain sort of time frame. Does that mean that that management plan will not be changed until that timeframe, or could it be changed next year?

Speaker 1: It could be. It's not easy to change a management plan though. So the lifespan of a management plan the forest kind is usually 10 or 15 years. The reality across the country? They're about 15 to 25 years old before they actually get revised or amended. If we were going to engage in a change in the forest plan, those processes usually take, they're designed to take between three to five years, but in reality, they take six to eight years to go through it.

Speaker 1: So it wouldn't be something that could happen overnight. We'd be coming back out, we'd be doing these public meetings again, and we'd be talking about potential changes to the forest plan. But right now, the last time it's been changed was 2016. All right. Other questions? Yeah.

Speaker 3: I see that you guys did a lot of hard work to ascertain use and management and that kind of got thrown out with the bathwater. I'm just curious, you mentioned like in the graph there, about the third slide to the last, that there's not a whole lot of effect in the difference between like fisheries, and you said no effect between alternative one and alternative six, or any of the other alternatives, saying visitors a minimal effect.

Speaker 3: And I'm wondering if you can ... And it's a quote not a whole lot of effect, but when you say there's not a whole lot of effect, but you say there wasn't a whole lot of effect and the differences between alternative one and alternative six. How is that quantified?

Speaker 1: Well, all of it's in the environmental impact statement. So you're looking at economics, we use a lot of existing data to support the conclusions there in the environmental impact statement. And that existing data, a lot of it comes from the 2016 forest plan,

which is pretty fresh data, as well as other economic data that's kind of out there and available.

Speaker 1: So I don't have the specifics in my mind, but we'd have you go to the forest plan. I would encourage you to take a look in there at what those specific data sets are that we reviewed to come to those conclusions. And if you have some further input like if we miss something or we got it wrong, we definitely want to hear that.

Speaker 3: Yeah. Just kind of following up on it, I'm just curious what the process was, and how you got to alternative six. I mean, there's so much work that went into alternative two, alternative three. They were a little focused on different user groups, on potential uses, and they were trying to juggle these various things. They all had their advantage and disadvantage. How do you go from that process to suddenly supporting alternative six? What percentage of comments were in support of other alternatives?

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 3: During that like year long process, just in the lead up.

Speaker 1: Yeah. When we went out for public scoping, that was that initial 45 day comment period, at that point it was a very open ended question. We said, "Okay, the State of Alaska is proposing an exemption." From there, we have the 2001 rule, what's it going to look like in-between? So what we were really looking for through that comment period was some real substantive input in terms of what an Alaska roadless rule should look like. What we got was a lot of people in favor of one or the other. So about 90% of comments that came in or so were in favor of just kind of keeping things the way they were.

Speaker 3: So 90% favor one, and then you have these other alternatives which were variables of that with different types of management practices. So what was the process by which you determined to select alternative six as the preferred one?

Speaker 1: Well, there was no other alternatives to consider in the 45 day public comment period. So we don't have any input yet. I mean, it's all coming in, it's raw data right now on alternatives two through five, so I can't answer what-

Speaker 3: But the preferred alternative from the first one was alternative six, right? We don't want to misunderstand that.

Speaker 1: Yeah. The preferred alternative that the secretary shows is alternative six.

Speaker 3: How did he come to make that decision [crosstalk 00:08:03] if 90% of input [crosstalk 00:08:03]-

Speaker 1: That's a good question for him. But I'll tell you, the public process goes is we develop the environmental impact statement, the forest service does, and we hand it off to the

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Department of Agriculture, and then it goes through another whole regulator review to the Office of Management and budget where other regulatory agencies weight in and provide their input into it. And then that all comes back to the secretary and then he makes his decision based on whatever criteria he's using.

Speaker 3: What is that criteria though?

Speaker 1: I don't know that.

Speaker 3: [crosstalk 00:08:22].

Speaker 4: I think the USDA is just to kind of tack on what [Cam 00:08:45] was just asking, USDA is obligated under private relations forest service manual under section 1563.02, to obtain an Indigenous Peoples informed consent when making decisions related to land that's traditionally theirs. And I see that you've got public outreach that's ongoing, and trying more outreach that's ongoing, and that you're collecting testimony tonight.

Speaker 4: Did I understand you correctly when you said there will be no administrative review at the end of this process so despite our tribes, our communities weighing in on the six options that are on the table, our voices will not be head because the decision's been made, and despite the information that you're collecting ongoing, we know that option six is what's going to be active?

Speaker 2: So right now's the time to give that input. So yeah, we're in this 60 day public comment period, so we're really actively working with the public during this comment period. And in terms of tribal input, that can continue on after the public comment period here through government consultation. So that opportunity is there, too, to continue the dialogue around it. In terms of what comes out in the end, I don't know what's going to come out in the end.

Speaker 2: Things have changed in the past. And right now what the secretary has put forward is kind of his preferred rule at this point of time. He wants to hear from people who are engaged in this process, the public tribes, and he'll take that all into consideration, right, for kind of what his final rule is. At any rate, there is no administrator under this that's for any rule maybe there is no administrative review for regulations.

Speaker 4: Even though tribal consultation chose and sought out prior to the moving forward, since tribal consultation should've been sought out prior to pursing any action in Indigenous People's lands. Is there an explanation for why tribal input wasn't sought prior to initiating this proposed action?

Speaker 2: No, I don't have an explanation for that.

Speaker 4: Okay.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 5: I just kind of to tag on to Jane's comment, but for example, what I think the forest service published with some of the comments on this received in the previous period, and I can't remember the number, but basically it said the majority of the comments were for keeping the roadless rules. When you talk about for the

majority saying they want to keep it, I guess I'm trying to see what weight does that hold at the end? Does the secretary still kind of say, "It doesn't matter, here's my decision," or does that hold some weight? I think that's kind of ...

Speaker 1: Yeah. So I want to go back to the original public comment period, the 45 day event. We didn't have alternatives to comment on. We basically said, what do you guys think of what an Alaskan roadless rule would look like. And we got about 144,000 comments on that. I think about 1,700, 1,800 were actually unique. The other ones were kind of form comments that just you click a button and it goes in. So you've got to really drill down into those numbers. And we don't normally look at them as kind of only one way or another.

Speaker 1: They kind inform the decision maker in terms of what people are thinking. I think this comment period is the one here, we've got kind of a fleshed out what alternatives are in the bill. He's disclosed what his preference is at this time, he's seeking comment on that. So I think it's really this comment period where he really gets some substantive input that will help inform him on how to move forward with this in a minor way. I think there was some questions over here?

Speaker 6: Yeah. I'm about halfway through the [inaudible 00:13:20] that was offered late October, I think last month, something like that. How much of that is actually going to be like expanded? Is it going to be longer, or shorter, or are there certain areas you're focusing on that [crosstalk 00:13:38] jump to?

Speaker 1: Yeah. Well, that's a good question. We're out drafting our impact statement now, so what we're seeking are comments on where we may have missed something in the analysis. So I'm hoping it's not a lot longer, that we didn't miss much, but you could have a whole new alternative in there conceivably, so there could be a lot more added to it potentially.

Speaker 6: Okay.

Speaker 1: All right. I think you've got a question back here?

Speaker 7: I get that you're just doing your job, this is part of the process of getting input, but I'm just wondering about the mining aspect. Because the first time I'm actually thinking, "Okay, the whole forestry and the state of fish and care about the environment," but now I'm starting to wonder if mining is really a big push between the governor and the secretary and that we're just kind of getting blindsided with mining?

Speaker 7: And also, I'm starting to feel like you guys politically have to ... I mean, does management of Forest Service of Alaska have an opinion, or do you have to kind of

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

kowtow what the governor's doing? Are you allowed to have separate opinions and keep your job?

Speaker 1: [crosstalk 00:15:15]. In terms of my view though, our legal interpretation of the 2001 roadless rule is if it falls under 1872 mining law, it's already statutorily allowed. So the roadless rule hasn't located any mining development activities. You know we've got Greens Creek mine which is operating in Tongass, Kensington, I think there are some other exploration projects, too, so. But in terms of, yeah, we got to follow up with the

secretary. It's kind of his decision to make.

Speaker 8: In regards to the future of all the alternatives for the roadless areas, you had mentioned that it could be some combination of what's provided there?

Speaker 1: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yeah.

Speaker 8: So hypothetically, with this outpouring of support for a combination for whatever the plan is, theoretically, hypothetically, the secretary can still go through and say, "This is the decision."

Speaker 1: Yeah. The secretary has pretty broad discretion on how to take this to the end. Yeah. You have a question? Yeah. Somewhere over here.

Speaker 9: Even like an alternative two you mentioned the road was priority, you said that there would be options for air and water rights and stuff and communities and stuff, and you didn't mention it at all, but on the slide it did bring up that there could be also some mining for oils and minerals, mineral mining and oil. And I guess it's ... Sorry, I let you answer that, but I guess that you're also saying EIS at the moment saying it's not going to have a lot of effect because the rule's just going to change.

Speaker 9: But so, have you actually looked at what would happen if a specific area did get picked up? Like yes, but you specifically said it's basically just a rule being changed. But so what's the point of EIS if it's not actually looking at what would happen in a specific watershed if it was picked up. Does that make sense?

Speaker 1: Yep. Yeah. It's a good question, yeah. And it's challenging to explain. So when you have a regulation, you have to go back to what's being proposed. And there's no proposal to say, "We're proposing to harvest 200,000 acres in this particular watershed." We're not proposing to build a road between I don't know Hoonah and [Holkham 00:17:51]. So the regulation isn't authorizing any of those types of activities, so therefore the only effects we can analyze would be any foreseeable future kind of things that we know about.

Speaker 1: And if you don't have any foreseeable future actions, which are called cumulative effects essentially, then that's about as far as you can go. You can go into speculation mode and say, "We're going speculate that this particular watershed as a result of the rule is going to have X number of acres harvested, or this particular [crosstalk 00:18:20]-

Speaker 9: But you pretty much know that it works?

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Actually I don't. Because the forest plan, the one thing the forest plan does, it caps the maximum amount, or the average timber sale allowed to be harvested at 46 million board feet. So whether you choose the no action alternative or alternative six, it's still 46 million board feet on average each year according to the forest plan, okay? I think there was a question ...

Speaker 5: Yeah. Correct me if I'm wrong, but to the points in the petition that the state submitted to the forest service, part of the stated attempt was to strengthen the forest wood products industry, so would that be speculation that that would be unaffected, this will make the change?

Speaker 1: No. It's disclosed in here. Basically what it's going to do is attempt to give more options where you can go find that 46 million board feet on average. So yeah, that is an effect that probably will let us do that like I get these have core groups, but positive effects in terms of the timber industry.

Speaker 3: So just a followup there. The EIS is based off of any current plants to do timber sales or that nature, but since the road and schools are effected right now, there aren't any plans, correct?

Speaker 1: Essentially yes.

Speaker 3: So you don't have anything to build an EIS off of because there's no rule protecting that activity, would the expectation be once that rule is taken back, back to be initiated, [crosstalk 00:20:12]-

Speaker 1: Yeah. Like in order to initiate that activity you would have to go through the legal process. We'd have to come back and help them do these kinds of meetings and the area that would be effected by the potential timber harvest.

Speaker 10: So kind of like a store that has the doors locked saying, "Well, there's nobody robbing our store, there's nobody in it," so how could anyone rob anything from the store that's closed? Like once you open the doors and there's customers then they can, right? So it's like if a store is over here sitting there saying, "Oh, nobody's robbing the stuff. Might as well not buy any cameras." And then letting everyone in. I guess you're not basing the EIS off the potential for projects, which you have to be because there are no projects right now because of the rule in place.

Speaker 1: Right. The best potential we have disclosed is in the 2016 forest plan. And that designates wherever there's timber harvesting across the landscape, areas that were suitable for that. And it also provides an average annual timber harvest limit of 46 million board feet. So that's the best we can speculate out in terms of what those effects would be.

Speaker 3: Just to kind of followup on that, so under the timber plan there would be 185,000 acres are opened up as suitable. 20,000 as young growth, 165,000 as old growth, but in terms of the impact to the visitor industry, and the fisheries industry, you came to a no effect

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

or a minimal effect because currently you cannot analyze what the individual timber harvest would be, what the effect of those individual harvests would be, has a substantive effect because of just the change in regulation, is that correct?

Speaker 1: You got it.

Speaker 3: So even if I break it, by changing the regulation, you guys are supposed to be determining for a minimal effect, but in reality timber sales are going up. There would be another EIS specifically for that period that determines the impact. Is that correct?

Speaker 1: Right. Yep.

Speaker 3: In the visitor count is truly based off you're economy, is that correct?

Speaker 1: Yep.

Speaker 3: Explain then your process and what you are analyzing in terms of that if opening up those certain areas, 165,000 acres in Holkham specially has there been any polling within the operators in the visitor industry, or actually cruise passengers that come in upwards of little over a million people per year. Has there been any polling of them to see if they would feel like there could be a direct impact to their experience, and is there any plans to do so?

Speaker 1: Short answer is no. No we haven't gone out and polled or looked at any original public data results other than what we're talking about in these public comment periods. So it does describe the effects on the tourism industry would be some displacement in areas, so there is a minimal or moderate adverse effects. I can't remember exactly what-

Speaker 11: Minimal.

Speaker 1: Minimal okay. And if you read the civil rights, there's a regulatory impact in that so that goes along with this and it talks about that minimal impact, and it talks about what that amount of impact would be on the recreational and tourist industry. Where a lot of that happens is areas where kind of the smaller cruise ships, mid size cruise ships are using that are currently in these developing parts in the forest plan.

Speaker 1: So a lot of that is not in the central Tongass area [inaudible 00:23:56]. So but in terms of the big cruise ships, the million passengers, probably the biggest contact they have is the scenery, the scenery along the way, and the 2016 forest plan has a lot of protections in terms of cruise ships along those corridors and impacts. Okay. Let's see. I'm having a hard time keeping track of who's next. All right, you have a question sir?

Speaker 10: About the 2016 plan. And that plan you said is sort of directing what you do if this option six gets selected right? But that plan was sort of evolved of when there was a roadless rule in effect, and at that time it seemed at least when that plan was in 2016,

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

there was no end in sight to the roadless rule, yet the plan calls for an end to the roadless rule. I'm just curious how that came to be.

Speaker 1: Yeah. So the 2016 plan amendment, really what I'm assuming it focused on two areas, the transition of our timber program from old growth to predominantly young growth, and so that's stilL in play and that's what would happen after a 15 year transition where we get out of the old growth logging and predomInately get into young growth logging. And that transition is still on track.

Speaker 1: We're still working that as part of the plan. The other thing that was in that plan was renewable energy. If you look at the EIS for that forest plan, they did analyze an alternative with no roadless rule in effect, because this thing has gone back and forth so many times in the quarter, we did put an alternative in there to see

what that would look like.

Speaker 10: [crosstalk 00:25:40] was when work off of is option six was.

Speaker 1: Right. Yeah. Yeah. And I don't know how that would play out right now. There's no plan to tinker with the forest plan or make any changes other than the suitability change that's expected.

Speaker 10: Yeah. So I'd like to mention on the 165,000 acres. I really appreciate that. 165,000 acres of old growth that would be added in the preferred alternative six. I wonder if you would speak a little bit to that. I understand they're added by administrative change. But I was hoping you could speak a little bit more to if alternative six is selected, the powers that the regional forest service will have under administrative change, and under these new modifications, being able to modify some of these areas, that's suitable timber, right?

Speaker 1: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 10: And specifically I'm concerned just about the political pressure. It's very apparent there's a lot of political pressure on this decision. And if the preferred alternative is lifted, you're going to have a lot of political pressure on the regional forest service to include some of those additional 165,000 acres of old growth in the existing timber sales that are now on the forest, the Prince of Wales landscape while everyone else is central Tongass project, south of [Wasilla 00:27:08] and specifically when you look at those 165,000 of old growth, 75% fall within the Prince of Wales district, the [Wrangle Peteresberg 00:27:15] district, and the Ketchikan district. When I look at that, this looks like not transitioning to young growth A, and B it looks like gearing up for a handout to add additional over layers to those instead.

Speaker 1: Okay.

Speaker 10: There's a lot there.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: There's a lot there. I'll try and work through that. So they're building an administrative change, right? And I talked about they're basically using that protocol line up with the forest plan regulation and the law. So you've got to have that. So the roadless rule disposes in there that there's going to be a direction given to the forest supervisor to do that administrative change and making 185,000 suitable. How it effects the Prince of Wales, the timber sales, the ongoing timber sales-

Speaker 10: In the future we'll be able to look at beyond just the preferred alternative then, or do modifications [crosstalk 00:28:04]-

Speaker 1: No.

Speaker 10: ... and future administrative changes?

Speaker 1: No. Nuh-uh (negative). Not long after 185,000, if this was to go through all the way. If it was one of the other alternatives, it would probably be something less than that. I can't remember what the numbers are on

the other alternatives. So the current timber sales that are being planned right now, there's one on Prince of Wales Island called Prince of Wales global assessment, the Central Tongass Project is what it's called. I know for sure Prince of Wales didn't analyze any timber or any growth in this area.

Speaker 1: So it didn't even look there. Central Tongass is doing the same thing. We're reading [crosstalk 00:28:43] if they wanted to amend those decisions to go in and roll those areas, we'd have to use supplemental tracking on our environmental impact statement, go out into the public, and do this all over again for those projects.

Speaker 10: So 185,000 acres, they were going to do those supplemental ... those amendments to those projects. Those are 15 year projects. They wouldn't be able to amend those projects to add those 185,000 acres.

Speaker 1: Not without going through the legal process, yeah. Not without doing the supplemental environmental impact statement. Yeah. Question? Yeah. Go.

Speaker 12: I want to say thank you for being here and answering all our questions. I know that it's not necessarily your personal opinion, but that's your job, kind of like Tina was saying asking you to explain it and I appreciate you being here. I kind of have two questions. One, looking at alternative one versus six, it looks really scary because everything goes from being green to being sort of more of the brown tones, but based on my quick look at it, the darkening areas in the original ones are these designated roadless areas, and when you look at alternative six, they are mostly, otherwise there are some exceptions, the yellow which correspond with non-development land use designations.

Speaker 12: So my first question is aside from the name change, what is the actual management difference between those two, and the second question that's what I'm really concerned about it how susceptible under alternative six would those areas be to future changes. Like if we just do a name change now but there's a small behind the scenes thing, could a future Alaska governor petition to have them open up for change the

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

regulations even more even though right now it looks like they might be [crosstalk 00:30:31].

Speaker 1: Yeah. So we're at this regulation state right now which is if you kind of look at it as a layer cake, it sits above our forest plan. So the governor can, I guess, could petition anything. The state could. But really, the focus right now is Alaska regulation. He did ask also to do a change to the forest plan, too. And the Secretary of Agriculture didn't agree to go there. So we're really just strictly looking at regulation at this point of time.

Speaker 1: And if that regulation, if alternative six happens, that regulation doesn't exist anymore. So that's where you're seeing the differences there. The regulation is represented in the dark green in alternative one, and then with alternative six map is describing basically what the effect is on the ground in relation to the forest plan. So you peel a regulation off, and you have the forest plan that's there. And I describe it in terms of development wise, to non-development wise.

Speaker 1: Development wise, which are the darker color red over there, that's where the potential timber sales could happen in the future. That's where that 185,000 acres of suitable is. If you're going to look at the furthest map on the right, to find those two little acres you almost need a magnifying glass because they're little green

blotches within these blotches of red that are in there. Does that help clear it up?

Speaker 12: I think so. So it would change the rule now, but it sounds like in the future, a future governor could petition again, but they may decline to even go down that route depending who the Secretary of Agriculture is at the time?

Speaker 1: Potentially, yeah. I mean those are things at the political level that I don't really get involved in, so. Yeah. Yeah?

Speaker 6: Forgive me if you've already answered this. You just mentioned that the governor

petitioned to change the forest management and the secretary said no.

Speaker 1: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 6: Which to me seems like a pretty savvy political move if you're trying to push through something controversial like this. So what is the protection if we repeal the roadless rule to stop Sonny Perdue from waking up the next day and saying, "Oh, hey. Now we're changing the forest management plan."

Speaker 1: Nothing.

Speaker 6: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Yeah. It's not going to change. But it's a six to eight year process normally to change a management plan [crosstalk 00:32:55].

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 6: [crosstalk 00:32:57] right?

Speaker 1: All right. Did you have another question?

Speaker 2: Yes. Back to this data between the regulation and the plan, sounds like a lot of people are concerned about. It seems to me that perhaps you already have an example of that dance in the fact that you described, if I got that right, you described it earlier, the roadless rule disappeared for a while. And then it came back.

Speaker 2: And I don't know exactly what was going on with your planning during that time, but during that time a significant part of road became roaded. Which seems to indicate that that kind of change does happen even if there are protections in place in the management plan or can you explain that better?

Speaker 1: Yeah. So this roadless rule lays over areas that the Tongass Forest plan allows for timber harvesting activities. So once you take that off, then the forest plan still allows those areas to be subject to timber harvest activity. So that's exactly what happened between 2003 and 2011. The rule didn't apply, so the forest plan just strictly fell within its plan direction. So the regulation lays restrictions on areas of a landscape that the forest plan might give out essentially for timber harvesting.

Speaker 2: So you're saying that those roadless areas became roaded under the forest management plan.

Speaker 1: Correct.

Speaker 2: And would they not have done that if the roadless rule had been in place?

Speaker 1: They couldn't do it if the roadless rule was in place.

Speaker 2: So within the plan, it was already the structure to turn those roadless areas into roaded.

Speaker 1: Correct.

Speaker 2: And so I kind of hear you trying to reassure us that understand the management plan embedded in these areas that would still have protection, but I'm also hearing the last time this happened lot of roadless got converted to roaded.

Speaker 1: Yeah. 110,000 acres of 9.2.

Speaker 2: Yeah, so that kind of brings me back around to the folks who said well you say there's minimal impacts, and yet you give us these big acreages and you say well, just because those acreages are in there doesn't mean it's going to happen. But it sounds like it happened.

Speaker 1: Those are really good comments to bring in. I mean, the other thing, we can really have a cup of coffee and go all night I'm sure, but if you really offer what's in those 9.2 million acres, a lot of it is rock and ice. Only a small portion of that is really proportionable timber.

Speaker 2: [crosstalk 00:35:53] it's very-

Speaker 1: Exactly. I know. And it provides a very unique habitat. But anyway, that would something we'd really kind of focus in on the EIS is that relationship between what would happen if the regulation gets lifted off, and whether the Tongass be then subject to potential management activity such as timber harvesting and that kind of thing.

Speaker 2: Is that information clearly presented in the EIS?

Speaker 1: Yeah. I think it's really clear on the maps in my opinion, and we can talk a little bit in-between with the maps to articulate that. Yeah. Yes, sir in the back?

Speaker 3: You guys know we passed a resolution here on the assembly line that was backing alternative logging, approaching it primarily from the industry perspective according to the EIS has a minimal impact on visitor experience. I guess transitioning into that, I was talking to Dan Blanchard he's the CEO of UnCruise Adventures I'm sure you know him. He is Alaskan born and bred, started with a small business, turned it into a

cruise company that's going to be directly impacted, significantly impacted by the clear cutting the cabin areas [Halibut 00:37:11] Cove I think it was one of the ones you references [crosstalk 00:37:14]-

Speaker 1: [crosstalk 00:37:14].

Speaker 3: Right. So again, that's a direct impact to the industry. UnCruise doesn't compare to [inaudible 00:37:20] all over there's the potential for them to come here in the future. So I guess what I'm wondering is in comparison if he ... he's kind of a bootstrap kind of guy, right? Born and bred in Alaska. Never got a government subsidy in his life.

However, the history of logging in Alaska is that it's a heavily taxpayer subsidized industry.

Speaker 3: And so, the reasoning here if all of this is opened up and you have now industry coming in and competing with an Alaskan industry, or industry that we make our living up here in the Skag, that's the whole reason we put that whole resolution forward. Now if you're getting studies done about industry comparisons based on like what is essentially unfair competition, why should a taxpayer subsidized industry suddenly be given carte blanche to compete with an industry that has no advantage in that same way?

Speaker 1: Yeah. I don't know we're going to study or look at it from that kind of angle, so. Yeah.

Speaker 3: Just followup on what Wayne was asking there. So when the roadless rule was lifted before, that was the previous forest management?

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Yep. It was probably the 2003-

Speaker 3: [crosstalk 00:38:32] Sure it was updated in 2016, right?

Speaker 1: Yeah.

Speaker 3: So in that 110,000 acres that was opened up when the roadless rule was lifted, and now the forest management plan has changed for 2016, would you say that the areas within the roadless areas in the current forest management plan is less restrictive or more restrictive than the 2003. Do you see where I'm getting at?

Speaker 1: Yeah. Yeah. So in terms of the land area, so the land use designations didn't change. So it was an amendment, in 2016 there was an amendment. So it didn't draw new boundaries on where the forest plan would allow development activity versus non-development activity. So those have actually been kind of stagnant since 1997. That's when those were put into place. When 2016 came around, the whole purpose of that amendment was to transition from an old growth forest management regime to a young growth forest management regime.

Speaker 1: The standards guides are updated, a lot of the recreational management area standards guides are updated things going on all the way through there. So history shows that as we learn more in terms of how to manage a temperate rainforest, things have been getting more restrictive with the successive plan changes that have happened, I would say in general. So I think the answer is yes, in terms of is it more restrictive now in the

2016 plan versus the previous one. I would say in general, yeah, it probably has more protective standards in some areas.

Speaker 3: Thank you.

Speaker 1: Yep. Back here?

Speaker 10: Yeah. I have a question. You said there's 165,000 acres of old growth.

Speaker 1: Correct.

Speaker 10: Potentially in this option. And we all know it's not all 9.2 physical rock do you know how much old growth that you mean?

Speaker 1: I used to have that number off the top of my head. I think I got in here. I think I want to say there's about 900,000 acres of old growth across all of the Tongass or something, of high productive old growth acres. But then, it might say high productive, that doesn't even come from Muskeg and that old growth kind of scrubby stuff that's out there. So I don't want to talk myself into a hole I can't get out of because I don't know the facts off the top of my head. So [crosstalk 00:41:07]-

Speaker 10: Just curious about that there's an understanding of 165,000 acres of the 9.2-

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Yeah. So right now we have the current '16 forest plan advising there's around 300 to 330,000 acres as suitable. So this would add 185 for that purpose.

Speaker 6: I used to live and work at a fishing lodge on Prince of Wales just outside Kasaan, and while I was there Sealaska logging came in and did some selective logging in the area that I was living. Basically, they send out timber crews, marked trees, came out in the spring, picked those specific trees to come down, helicoptered them out, so there wasn't a need for roads. And part of the reasoning behind that besides the roadless rules they were explaining that a lot of the timber on Prince of Wales was really suitable for what they wanted. It was mostly in our area were suitable for pulp.

Speaker 6: It wasn't especially lucrative. And so, this was the way that they were able to sort of sustainably log the area, get the trees you need without disturbing the surrounding habitat as much as clear cutting. So to me it seems like there are these more sustainable alternatives to clear cutting that don't necessarily require building roads. So am I wrong in assuming that the main impetus in lifting the roadless rule is to start clear cutting again?

Speaker 1: No. I don't think it's necessarily just that. I mean, when you look at the purpose of me for doing the project, I think it really is looking at that interdependence of economic dependence on the national border that sits out there. And that may be from timber. We all know that timber has played a pretty declining role in terms of the economy portfolio in south eastern Alaska. Just a real small proportion of mining, fishing, tourism. Those are really kind of our backbone of the economy.

Speaker 1: So I think what I'm hearing is it's more about timber? Yes, to some degree. But also access to the land that's being used. So no, in terms of helicopter logging and that type of thing, there's different systems, different ways. The roadless rule doesn't apply to Sealaska lands or it doesn't apply to private lands, or Native corporation lands. So it really only applies to national forest in there.

Speaker 6: So this feasibly is also just a way for outside entities to come in and compete with Native corporations that already have harvest rates in these areas, or?

Speaker 1: No. I don't believe so. We didn't disclose that. That's not part of the analysis, we haven't described anything in terms of-

Speaker 6: I guess what I was trying to ask was if Native corporations already have harvest rights in some of these areas, opening them up would just mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but that just means that other organizations, for-profit organizations would be able to come in and harvest in the same areas as well. So that just to me seems like competition with Native people that already have rights to harvest?

Speaker 1: Yeah. So again, the roadless rule in our work is only on national forest systems land. So what happens on Sealaska or native corporation lands. So that's where their-

Speaker 6: [crosstalk 00:44:47]-

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: ... decision made. It has nothing to do with us. So they use the same distances that use the national forest, too, for logging activities. And if I'm going to go back to really kind of more of an economic purpose, I guess I'm going to go to the 2016 forest plan and that whole transition from old growth to young growth. It talks about needing to kind of have that economic reach. So the timber industry can make that change without using the infrastructure that they put in place.

Speaker 6: And that's going to fall [crosstalk 00:45:15] ... So if the design is to transition to young growth, that young growth primarily seems like it exists in areas that were already clear cut, and those are already half growths like Smith Cove on Prince of Wales as an existing logging road system to a giant pack of new growth, so again, what purpose would repealing the roadless rule serve towards harvesting areas that are already accessible by road?

Speaker 1: [crosstalk 00:45:48] those areas aren't roadless because they have roads now, yeah.

Speaker 6: So they're the roaded roadless.

Speaker 1: Yeah. There's a lot of them even before the 2003 roadless rule, there's a lot of acres that have managed to be timber harvested out there, and those aren't within the [crosstalk 00:46:00].

Speaker 6: Okay.

Speaker 1: Yeah. Okay.

Speaker 6: What's the name of this plan for these roads that are giving private access to communities once the logging operations are done?

Speaker 1: The rule does propose to build any roads, so [crosstalk 00:46:15]-

Speaker 6: I think I read that most of them will be decommissioned, right?

Speaker 1: Well, yeah, it probably does say that. A lot of the strategy nowadays is more temporary road construction.

Speaker 6: So once the logging's done, our decommissioned roads that are not getting anything [crosstalk 00:46:28] communities.

Speaker 1: Well, if the road was specifically for timber saling, then that would be apt. But there could be roads for other purposes such as developing this whole watershed water source, or communication site, or tourism activity, other things out there. So there's other purposes for building roads other than for accessing [crosstalk 00:46:49]-

Speaker 6: But the logging roads are pretty much done when the logging's done?

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: It depends from sale to sale. I mean, you'd have to take look at each individual sale and what the long-term plan is. Because nowadays we're doing a lot of stewardship work, the restoration and whatnot, so the road may be needed for longer term, and then we're going to ask other tourism activities if access to that fishing place or a tourists or something that there could be a purpose to keep those roads up.

Speaker 10: [crosstalk 00:47:16]. That's a joke.

Speaker 13: [crosstalk 00:47:19] have time for a question.

Speaker 1: One more question?

Speaker 13: Yeah.

Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Who wants to get the last question?

Speaker 13: What's your favorite color? Green?

Speaker 1: Green forest.

Speaker 13: [crosstalk 00:47:37] what actually spurs the creating of this new proposal? Is it something in the schedule within the existing plan, or is this the effect of industry logging and-

Speaker 1: In terms of the regulation itself, what started it?

Speaker 13: Yeah. What spurred that creation?

Speaker 1: Yeah. Well, there's been a long contention in Alaska about the application of the roadless rule here. Ever since the beginning. In 2001 when they wrote this rule, when it came out as a proposed rule that exempted the Tongass. And then there was a period where the Tongass was going to not be exempt, it was going to apply for the Tongass, but it was going to have a three year period before it actually applied. And then when the 2001 rule finally came out and got finalized, the Tongass, it didn't apply to the Tongass.

Speaker 1: So I think there is some sense that that decision making, how it went from it was exempt, originally that was the plan, then it was going to have some space, then all of a sudden it just kind of came down, hasn't set well with some people, and I would say the state of Alaska. So this thing has been important since day one, and that's why you get this kind of back and forth, and I think the State of Alaska saw an opportunity to engage in some rule making.

Speaker 9: It's not really a question. Can you just explain exactly what was happening between seven and nine, because I think there's a lot [crosstalk 00:49:12]-

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 1: Yeah. I can do that right now. Okay. So what we're going to do, we're going to take a 30 minutes break, and what we're going to do at 7:00, it's called a [crosstalk 00:49:24] subsistence hearing is what it is. So as part of developing an environmental impact statement, we need to look at what are the impacts to subsistence resources? So impacts could be your build would need to access those subsistence resources, or there's actually the management of access and availability. So what we do during this period of time that's prescribed in the [Milka 00:49:50] we kind of set up a hearing is what we do.

Speaker 1: And we've got some microphones, and people come up, and they read their testimony. Some people just speak freely, some people have prepared statements, however you want to do it. Depending on how many people actually sign up, we may have to meter out how much time, because if we have 100 people and two hours, we want to make sure everybody has an opportunity to speak. And what it does, we'll take those recordings and you're officially on the record at that point in time, we give them to a professional transcriber, they transcribe them up, they go into public comments specifically for [crosstalk 00:50:22].

Speaker 9: And specifically that's assistance for hunting, fishing-

Speaker 1: I would say that's the intent, but people have talked about A to Z in terms of what they want to say here. But the intent is to provide some assistance and information. We're good on that?

Speaker 14: Question on that. So is it kind of like our own testimony, we can comment, it's all people?

Speaker 1: It's all people. Yeah. It's all people. Really the testimony we get, we'll first look at it in terms of impacts to sustenance resources and the environmental impact statement, but if there's other information in there we'll just treat as public given comments and in the end consider that, too. But they don't have any more weight one way or the other. Just some people like to speak more than write, so.

Speaker 14: And when you define subsistence, it is livelihood, or like I mean the forest provides oxygen [crosstalk 00:51:21]-

Speaker 1: Yeah. So there's a rule preference for subsistence users protected under federal law. So Skagway is one of the communities designated as a rule community. So residents of this community have the right to take subsistence resources whether that's deer, or berries, or gathering firewood, all these things that can be done under the conservatory subsistence authority.

Speaker 13: And folks, just to remind you that we are taking public comments, and any type of written comment, bring it back here and we'll add it into the reference pool.

Speaker 1: Okay. All right. Are we all good? 7:00? All right.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 16, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 13: Real quick, we've got someone from the southeast conservation council brought a little banner here in support of alternative one like I am, we're going to take a quick photo up here in the front if anybody wants to get in the photo [crosstalk 00:52:07]. Oh, good. Yeah. [crosstalk 00:52:07].

Speaker 5: Where are we going? Do we go up front?

Speaker 15: Oh, you would know the best place. We can do it right here. [crosstalk 00:52:38].

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Haines Alaska Roadless Rule Public Meeting: Recorded on December 7th, 2019

Ken: So in January of 2018, the state of Alaska petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture for a full exemption of the Tongass National Forest citing the need for economic

development opportunities. As you know, the Tongass National Forest is extremely unique. It's unique in size at 16.7 million acres, the Tongass is the largest national forest in the national forest system. Also the percent of roadless areas, as I said before Tongass has 55% of it's considered roadless areas. That's fairly unusual for a national forest to have that much roadless area.

Ken: Also, the local community dependence on the Tongass is unique. About 80% of Southeast Alaska is comprised of the Tongass National Forest. In addition, 32 communities throughout Southeast Alaska are completely surrounded by a national forest system. That makes whatever occurs on the Tongass extremely important to these communities.

Ken: Then also lastly, the unique statutory considerations is very unique to the Tongass. Specifically, we have the Tongass Timber Reform Act and then the National Interest Lands and Conservation Act that apply to the Tongass as well as other areas, but it's pretty unique for a national forest to have those kind of statutory considerations.

Ken: So, when we received the petition ... or the secretary received the petition in January, he felt that an Alaska specific Roadless Rule would be a good platform to develop a long term and durable approach for managing roadless areas and also managing it in context of Alaska's unique social economic and ecological situation.

Ken: And so, in June of 2018 the secretary directed the Forest Service to begin working on the Alaska Roadless Rule. In August of 2018, the Forest Service issued a notice of intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, which initiated the entire rule making process and it also initiated a 45 day public scoping process which occurred last September and October.

Ken: Based on that scoping process, we received about 144,000 comments. Based on those 144,000 comments, we started working on developing the alternatives that are now included in the draft Environmental Impact Statement, which we issued in September of 2019. And then ... or we issued it in October of 2019 and we issued the notice of availability for the draft Environmental Impact Statement as well as the proposed rule and that initiated the 60 day public comment period which we're in today. It ends on December 17th.

Speaker 2: Can you characterize those comments you've received?

Ken: Well, it's really hard to ... I can get into that a little bit too here, but that question comes up a lot and I would say that the majority of the commenters supported a no action alternative.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 3: What, in terms of majority, what kind of numbers were presented [inaudible 00:03:50]?

Ken: I would say like 90%. That's hard to really characterize be the majority of those 144,000 comments are what we call form letters and so that means one side had a very effective form campaign to get the people out and commenting on it.

Ken: Based on those ... as you know, the proposed rule that we identified in October is the alternative six, the full exemption alternative. What that means is there's going to be no regulatory prohibitions on timber harvest, road construction, or road reconstruction within the 9.2 million acres of inventory roadless areas on the Tongass National Forest. However, that doesn't mean that there's no direction or constraints on any activity on those 9.2 million acres. Those activities would be guided by primarily the 2016 Tongass Forest Plan as well as the [inaudible 00:05:03] of other environmental laws, regulations, and policies that we had to follow.

Ken: Also on alternative six, on the Chugach National Forest, the 2001 Roadless Rule would remain in place. However, there is an administrative correction and boundary modification process that we're proposing for the Chugach National Forest. And so, based on 20 years of experience of implementing the 2001 Roadless Rule, we found a need for an administrative mechanism to be able to change minor boundary modifications based on

change conditions, new mapping, and also just finding errors in our matter.

Ken: So one of the other alternatives that we considered is the required no action alternative. That means the 2001 Roadless Rule would remain in place on both the Chugach and Tongass National Forest unchanged. This is a required alternative. Between alternative one and alternative six, we kind of considered that the book end of our alternatives, of our range of alternatives that we considered.

Ken: This kind of gets at your question about some of the nature of the comments we got, based on the 144,000 comments we received during scoping, we identified three key issues that helped us drive the development of the alternatives and also helped us frame up our analysis. Those three key issues was to conserve the [inaudible 00:06:42] characteristics, which seems fairly obvious. Then second one was to support community socioeconomic well being. This also includes Alaskan native culture and rural subsistence lifestyle is built into that issue. Then lastly, the last issue that we heard people were concerned about was conserving terrestrial habitat, aquatic habitat, and biodiversity.

Ken: So what we did with those comments and those alternatives, we needed to develop a range of alternatives that addressed those three significant issues. One way we did that was to develop a range of management approaches to apply within roadless areas. Going from most restricted to least restricted, we developed one to five different roadless area management categories, with watershed priority being the most restrictive.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: We've developed this watershed management category in response to what we heard was people did not want the key watersheds to be impacted and there was a high level of concerns towards fisheries. So what we did is, we developed a management category that's more restrictive than the 2001 Roadless Rule. When we say more restrictive, that means there's less exceptions that could occur, less things that you could do within these areas that we identify as large in priority.

Ken: We applied those to key watersheds that were identified in the 2016 Forest Plan. Those key watersheds were also known as the Tongass 77 Watersheds and the Nature Conservancy Autobahn Society Conservation areas. We applied that to those watersheds within roadless areas. There is another category that we applied and it's called LUD Two priority. This management category within roadless areas essentially mimics the statutory requirements for LUD Twos, and LUD stands for Land Use Designation. The LUD Two areas were established by congress to be managed for wild land character.

Ken: It's very very similar to roadless area management, however slightly different. So, we had with the 2001 Roadless Rule, we had a statutory requirement that we have to meet and have no discretion not to meet as well as another layer on top of the 2001 Roadless Rule. Those two directions are similar but different. It was kind of confusing to both the public as well as land managers. So, to simplify that we tried to boil it down just to the statutory considerations or requirements.

Ken: The roadless management category, roadless priority, is very similar to the 2001 Roadless Rule requirements, however it's just a little bit less restrictive in that we allow for Alaska specific concerns that we heard such as development for hydropower access and tree harvest for native cultural uses and ... I think those were the big ones.

Ken: Then, there was another category that we developed called Community Use Priority. We developed that in response to specific communities wanting greater flexibility around their communities but didn't want the large scale timber harvest that occurred 20 years ago near their community. So, I'll get into that a little bit more.

Ken: Then lastly is timber priority, which is essentially there's really no restriction to road construction, timber harvest, or road reconstruction, although it is within roadless areas. So we applied those differentially across the alternatives, alternatives two through five. With the watershed priority, we applied that to alternatives two and three. The community use priority we only applied that to alternative three. The LUD Two priority, we applied that to alternatives two, four, and five. Timber priority is only applied to alternative four. And then, the roadless priority, that was kind of our catch-all management category and that applied to all the action alternatives that were not the book ends.

Speaker 4: Can you say before you go on, the colors, it's a little hard to see the key.

Ken: Yeah. So this is the timber priority and this is the acreage. So this shows the percentage or the relative difference of how it's applied. These green ones are the roadless

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

priorities, this is the watershed priority here, timber priority is that one, the community priority is this one, the LUD Two priority is right here. And those are the same acreage because that's defined by statute.

Ken: So like I said before, there's these nine roadless areas characteristics that were

identified in the 2001 roadless [inaudible 00:12:41] are typically found in inventory roadless areas. The state of Alaska had a citizen advisory preview of a group of people that helped informed their input to the process. The Citizen's Advisory Committee, when they reviewed the roadless area characteristics, they felt that it was not reflective of the conditions in Southeast Alaska.

Ken: They recommended that we change those. In all the action alternatives other than alternative six, the roadless area characteristics developed by the state's Citizen Advisory Committee will be applied and it's not exactly what they provided but we had to take their input and make it operational, so we adjusted it slightly to make it usable for us. How the agency uses these roadless area characteristics is when we propose a project in roadless areas, we analyze the effects of the project against those roadless area characteristics to determine the effect or the impact on roadless area.

Ken: So to go into a little bit more detail on these other alternatives, the non book end alternatives, alternative two is the most restrictive of the action alternatives. Really, it provides just a little bit more timber opportunity. We do that by removing these areas that we call roaded roadless areas. Like I said before, we do have some roadless areas that have roads in it. We have about 110,000 acres across the Tongass National Forest that we consider roaded roadless areas.

Ken: With this alternative, we removed those roaded areas from inventory roadless designation. Those would have no restriction for road construction or timber harvest within those areas. In addition, we applied the

watershed priority to the Tongass 77 watersheds and nature conservancy alongside of your conservation areas. In addition to that, we applied essentially the old growth restriction on those key watersheds outside of roadless areas. We applied that so that would become a regulatory requirement if this alternative were selected. Then the LUD Two areas which are statutory required areas to be managed in a certain way. We applied that management category and then the rest of the areas received the roadless areas priority.

Ken: So alternative three is very similar to two in that to provide the additional timber opportunities, we dropped the roaded roadless areas from the inventory roadless areas, but in addition to that, we have areas that are adjacent to the roaded roadless areas. We call those the logical extensions of the road system. These are areas that we felt were the most likely areas to be harvested or the most economical areas to be harvested because they're in close proximity to an existing transportation system.

Ken: Those areas which we them out to a watershed boundary, those areas were dropped from roadless area designation. Then also, we only applied the watershed priority to this alternative and then the remaining areas received the roadless priority. We also applied the community priority and the community use priority area, like I said before, it was

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

based on comments that people wanted additional flexibility around their communities, however, they were concerned about large scale timber harvest.

Ken: So what we did here is we allowed small scale timber harvest within these community use priority areas and we define the small scale timber harvest as less than one million boards each per sale. We only looked at it in context of if it were requested by a municipal government, a tribal government, or a non profit community association as defined by Alaska's statute.

Ken: We applied it to Juneau, Ketchikan, Sitka, Wrangell, Allakaket, Kake, and Hydaburg. We would consider applying it to other communities if requested by municipal government, a tribal government, or a non profit community association.

Speaker 5: I have a question.

Ken: Sure.

Speaker 5: In the roaded roadless areas in the extensions that you talked about, what consideration is given to not fragmenting old growth? When you look at those areas, did you consider that at all?

Ken: We did not. It was just purely the areas that were currently roaded and the areas immediately adjacent to those. There's about 110,000 roaded roadless and another addition 110,000 adjacent or the logical extensions. So about a total 220 I think.

Speaker 5: Thank you.

Ken: Alternative four provides a little bit more greater opportunity for timber harvest. Here based on the 2016

Forest Plan, they identify or they mapped out across the landscape, areas that they were considered okay for development. We called those the Development LUDs or the Development Land Use Designations. What we did here is we applied the timber priority, and if you remember that pretty much allows timber harvest and road construction within those areas, even though they're roadless areas.

Ken: We applied those to the two development LUDs that were identified in the 2016 Forest Plan, specifically the timber priority land use designation, the timber development land use designation, and the modified landscape land use designation. This alternative also drops the logical extensions and the roaded roadless areas from roadless area designation. Then, we also applied LUD to the remaining are received that roadless area priority.

Ken: Alternative five is very similar to one of the citizens advisory committee alternatives or options developed and basically there's three land use designations that were identified in the Forest Plan for development. All those would be removed from roadless area designation. That would be the timber development, the modified landscape, as well as scenic areas.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: In addition, during the 2016 process we identified areas with mineral potential. That mineral overlayed those areas with mineral potential were also dropped from roadless area designations. So, obviously we have a range of alternatives with alternative one being the most restrictive and all 9.2 million acres remain in designated roadless areas all the way to no acres in alternative six being designated as roadless areas.

Ken: You might look at, it generally follows ... this is most restricted to least restricted. Then you kind of look at these acreages and go, "Well, it doesn't really follow." There's some reasons for that. Even though we dropped some roadless areas from alternative two, like that 220 or 110,000 acres of roaded roadless areas, we also added some. So, we looked at the 2003 and the 2008 wilderness inventories and we looked at the areas that were greater than 5,000 acres and we added those areas back into the roadless inventory.

Ken: In addition to that, the 2001 Roadless Rule did not consider small islands and did not designate small islands as roadless areas. What we did is those islands that were not roaded, we added those into the roadless inventory. Yes, sir?

Speaker 6: How is the selection for the Citizen's Advisory Committee representatives, how is that made?

Ken: I do not know because that was a state process and the state did all that. I wish we had somebody from the state here. I'm not familiar with how they did that. Yes, sir?

Speaker 7: What was the habitat like with the conditions of the islands? How did you ... what islands were appropriate and which weren't-

Ken: It was just whether they had roads or not. Roads and timber harvest. Those two things were the driving criteria. Then you also look at this one, alternative three and you go, "Well, why is this less than alternative four?" We were saying that this is more restrictive than this alternative. The reason why is because of those LUD Two designations. Those LUD Two designations, we dropped them from alternative three because they already have statutory protection. So, we felt it was unnecessary and it was also very confusing to have two layers of direction,

a statutory and a regulatory set of direction within here. We feel that the LUD Two areas, even though they are not included in this alternative still receive protection, and they do through the statute. So, our draft of Environmental Impact Statement, we summarize the impacts ... yes, sir?

Speaker 8: I'm sorry.

Ken: No problem.

Speaker 8: The LUD status versus the other status, the statute status, how do those things ... how can they change? You say you eliminate the LUDs but what are the conditions it would require one to change the LUD?

Ken: The LUD Two?

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 8: Yeah.

Ken: So, we don't really eliminate it, we just don't designate it as roadless areas, but it still has the LUD Two designation and requirements. The only way we can do that, the only want anybody can do that is through congress because only congress can change a law.

Speaker 8: Thank you.

Ken: In terms of the impacts, once again we have a range of impacts but we've received a lot of criticism about our environmental effects analysis and one of the reasons people have been criticizing us is they look at this chart and they say, "Clearly alternative six, you're dropping all the roadless area protection across 9.2 million acres. How can you have such little effect?" The reason we don't have a lot of effects across all the alternatives is the 2016 Forest Plan is kind of the back stop to the effects.

Ken: All the impact, the majority of the impacts to roadless areas, which are timber harvest, road construction, would be driven by the level of timber harvest. That level of timber harvest does not change across any of the alternatives. That is why you don't see a large difference in environmental impact. So, the 2016 Forest Plan identified 46 million board feet per year that the Forest Service should be offering up for sale.

Ken: That number, that 46 million board feet is based off of the Forest Service estimate of demand which we're required to, by law, to product through the Tongass Timber Reform Act. That number does not change in any of these alternatives and we can't ... we're never going to go above that unless the demand changes and we have a process in place with the 2016 Forest Plan to modify that as needed. Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 9: Considering that that could happen, that there could ... it could change, why is it that now that we know what we know, why isn't carbon issues, aren't they listed as impact? In other words, the effect on the planet.

Ken: The carbon storage issue ... we've received a lot of criticism on that too. Once again, it's all related to the level of harvest. From our perspective and when you look at it as Tongass wide impact, it doesn't matter if you're getting 46 million board feet of timber in non roadless areas or a mix of roadless areas and non roadless areas.

You still have the same amount of carbon removal and the same amount of sequestration.

Speaker 9: I guess what I'm wondering is, haven't we progressed enough that it should actually get its own little box? That's what I'm saying. Even if the answer for it is the same as what you said, because we're already limited by how much timber is being taken, why doesn't it appear?

Ken: Mainly it's our process, the way the National Environmental Policy Act basically says we should focus in on the significant issues. If it doesn't change across alternatives, we don't consider that to be a significant issue therefore, we shouldn't spend our time doing a lot of analysis. That is one way we try to make our analysis more efficient is by

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

not focusing our analysis on things that don't change across alternatives and we believe that that does not change across alternatives.

Speaker 9: Today.

Ken: Today. Correct. Yes, sir?

Speaker 10: So you're assuming that the impacts are the same because the volumes are the same. If you're talking about reroading or new roads into old growth, that was the assumption that you had to make then?

Ken: Yeah. So the-

Speaker 10: That the impacts were the same? That doesn't seem at all appropriate.

Ken: So the 2016 Forest Plan estimated amount of roads absent a Roadless Rule and I think they estimated it to be 24 miles of road that would be constructed across the next hundred years and we felt like that was fairly insignificant. When you look at it in context of Southeast Alaska, essentially that's no effect. Yeah. We are going to relook at that because like you said, we've got a lot-

Speaker 10: There's a lot of issues associated with that that you're not considering [inaudible 00:28:50].

Ken: Yeah. Then also, the second part of that is the key watersheds are protected as well as the environmental constraints that we have that are identified in the Forest Plan such as riparian buffers and beach buffers, et cetera that still apply across all the alternatives. Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 11: It's not just carbon, it's warming, it's erosion, and roads are going to impact that even if the level of volume of timber harvest stays the same. We're living in a country now where we ... our homes may be threatened by major forest fires, fisheries are already being impacted and we're doing something right with this roadless area that we have right now and that's why you've gotten so many comments to keep it. I feel like what you're presenting here is not inadequate enough.

Ken: Yeah. Well, I appreciate that. Please submit your comments to tell us how we could do it differently. In

terms of the effects, right now we feel fairly confident that it's fairly minimal based on the fact that the level of harvest doesn't change. Our perspective is if you're cutting an acre in non roadless versus an acre in roadless, it's similar effects.

Frank: Let me just help with that a little bit because one things you guys remember, in 2016 Forest Plan, we wrote that because we are continuing our transition to young growth. Young growth stands already have roads in them and that's why we're not building more roads. We're going to continue migrating to young growth and so we hope to have it all young growth within the next 15 year. I mean, that's our plan. That's why ... Ken

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

keeps talking about the back stop, that's our Forest Plan. That's what we're holding to. Just remember that that's where we're going to continue to head down that road.

Speaker 13: So, what happens with the next Forest Plan? It might not be the same people writing that plan, there might not be the same kind of input. You could see a totally different Forest Plan and then that might not have that back stop.

Ken: I'm not going to say that you couldn't. There'll be an associated public involvement process with a Forest Plan revision. Who knows when that's going to happen? We don't know.

Frank: Just remember, it takes almost eight years to move through a Forest Plan. It's not a fast process. But you're right, it could change.

Ken: Yes, sir?

Speaker 14: I think unto that point, the Citizen's Advisory Committee which is this organization established by I assume the governor's office or Chris [inaudible 00:32:14] they're putting their priorities and in a sense they're preempting a more down at the ground level public process so that their alternatives have greater wave in fact than what the public input is provided to you.

Ken: We consider alternatives two and three, I think they represent a lot of the people that were more towards the no action alternative or didn't mind a little bit adjustment to the 2001 Roadless Rule. Alternative two is very similar to and offers quite a bit of protection for roadless areas. The real difference in alternative two versus the 2001 Roadless Rule is about 110,000 acres really. Yes, ma'am.

Speaker 11: That's double, right? The 110 to 220,000 is like double.

Ken: Yeah. From alternatives two to three.

Speaker 11: No, from one to two.

Speaker 15: No, one to zero.

Ken: One's the [inaudible 00:33:24].

Speaker 15: One is no change.

Ken: No change.

Speaker 11: Right. But for what's available now. Didn't you say that there were certain number acres available now or did I misunderstand?

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: I don't quite understand your question. Let's talk after the main session, maybe I can help clarify that because I didn't understand. Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 16: I'm trying to get a picture for determining when something is labeled as roadless. In other words, say a road is cut through this area, how far away from the world does the classification roadless begin? In other words, how much acreage is that road determined to impact?

Ken: That's a good question.

Speaker 16: Somebody must have had that answer in order to figure out the number. So, what is it?

Ken: I think it's 1,000 feet, I think. Alaska's different than the lower 48. In the lower 48, it was 200 feet but I think in Alaska it's 1,000.

Speaker 16: So it's 1,000 feet away they're saying, "Okay. We won't take ..." But you can take all of the trees all of the way up to the edge of that 1,000 feet, so the road's not effecting it but the cut is effecting this particular area. The beginning of being labeled roadless starts at about 1,000 feet on each side?

Ken: Yes. Generally speaking. That's not exactly true, it's not 100% true across the ... because a lot of the mapping is old, a lot of the mapping is not accurate from the original 2001 Roadless Rule designation.

Speaker 16: But in order to determine the numbers, did somebody draw a map [crosstalk 00:35:05]?

Ken: Yes.

Speaker 16: This road would cut through this must and then all this [crosstalk 00:35:13].

Ken: Yeah. In terms of what we did for alternatives too, we took it up to a watershed amount. Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 11: So, what cost benefit analysis have you done on how much subsidies are required for opening up more logging and help for the industry.

Ken: Yeah. Maybe you can help with this but the forest service, the timber purchasers have to pay for [inaudible 00:35:42] roads. You hear about how across the ... everybody's been talking about how the forest service subsidizes that, but a lot of those caught ... it depends on how you look at costs of a timber program. They

include our entire timber budget in that calculation when they say we're losing money and subsidizing it. A lot of those funds are used for administrative purposes, a lot of those funds are used for timber sales never are offered or sold, and a lot of it's for the analysis associated with it. But the actual timber sale itself, we have laws that require us that they can't be below cost.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Frank: And it funds a lot of our restoration work. All of our, well not all but a good amount of our restoration work is funded by timber sales.

Speaker 11: You need less restoration if you cut less. Make fewer problems, correct?

Frank: We're fixing stuff that was clear cut 60-70 years ago.

Ken: Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 18: I'm just wondering, since the 2016 plan how many million acres have been cut annually?

Ken: Do you know that? I do not know that. It's around 30 million. It's not very high.

Speaker 18: So it seems like you are having fewer impacts over the last few years, which if you increase to your alternative where you can cut whatever and you have roads, you will have the maximum cuts possibly and have many greater impacts.

Ken: Potentially. However, the base line we're considering is the effects permeated at 46 million board feet of harvest per year. That's what we consider our base line, our no action alternative.

Speaker 18: But it seems like as soon as you increase the amount of area you can road, you're going to have-

Ken: Maybe and maybe not. A lot of it's demand driven. The tariffs are reducing demands so that's having an effect on the amount of volume we sell. Yes, sir?

Speaker 19: You touched on criticism regarding costs, economic costs of these sales. I wanted to ask you a little bit more about that. There's a non partisan group based in east coast that's been around looking at the Tongass for at least 40 or so years, Taxpayers or Common Sense. It came out with a report in October of this year and it's saying there's a lot of ways to look at costs versus benefits.

Speaker 19: They have an array. They look at several different perspectives but the best I can determine from looking at all of those is that it costs the federal treasury $20 for every dollar that they take in with the timber program. I guess my question is, is there anything in federal regulation that requires these timber sales to actually make money for the federal treasury and if not, where's the cut off?

Ken: Yes. There is a regulation that we can not have a below cost. It doesn't necessarily have to make a lot of money, but it can't be below cost. I'm not the best person to talk to that. Are you versed in the [crosstalk 00:39:42].

Frank: No. I don't know. I can't answer your question. I just know the cost [inaudible 00:39:47] they have to be able to show apply. Black and red. It has to be a positive sale.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 19: Even 20 or 30 years ago, this same organization came up with similar inclusions about the Tongass. That's been worn out. A lot of people have looked at the economics of these things. I guess what I'm wondering is who's getting the money from this? Somebody. If the government's paying 20 bucks for every dollar that they take in, somebody's getting rich. Is it the multi billionaires? It's not us.

Ken: Like I said before, a lot of it depends on how you account for this. The office we're in is being paid by ... some of it by the timber appropriations that are made by congress as well as the other things. I think it gets spread out. It gets spread out in salaries, leases, contracts, other things. Yes, sir?

Speaker 20: So the 46 million board feet, which is the 2016 Forest Plan harvest volume. Yet, you said over the last umpteen years you've probably cut 30 million. So maybe on the Tongass right now we're cutting 10 million a year?

Ken: No it's 30 probably average.

Speaker 20: Oh, 30 average. Okay. The 30 average is actually timber that's going to a mill. It's actually cost effective in the sense that a sale is offered and then there has been bidders that have bid on the sale and then cut the timber?

Ken: [crosstalk 00:41:51] We kind of got stuck here. Let's see. Like you said, we're almost done here. There's multiple ways you can get additional information. We have two websites, the project website and a general forest ... our roadless website. There's a handout over there with the website addresses. We also have a story map online that you can go to. This last tab is probably the most useful tab because that last tab you can turn on and off all the alternative layers as well as certain data layers and you can zoom in and out. So, you can go to a specific area of your interest on the Tongass to see how the alternatives mesh with that area that you're interested in.

Ken: There's multiple ways to comment. You can go to the regulations.gov website, comment there. We have a project website. I would say that this project website is the best way to comment because it has all our fields that we're interested in and you can just fill it out or you can send a hard copy to that address and we would consider it that way. We also have a inbox, an electronic inbox that you can send comments to. Or you can provide comments to us here, written comments to us at this meeting and we'll make sure that they're entered into the system for consideration.

Ken: Next steps, the public comment process, this 60 day comment period ends December 17th. We will need to have your comments by then. We're wrapping up the public meetings and subsistence hearings. We were supposed to have them wrapped up last month but we're still trying to wrap them up now. I think this might be the last ... well no, we've got one more next week. Then we will, once the comment period closes, we will begin work on the FEIS, the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Ken: During that time, we will continue our Tribal and Alaska Native Corporation consultation, government-to-government consultation, as well as we will continue to

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

meet with the public and address your concerns and if you want, we can come back out and help you ... we'll meet with you if you want and discuss your concerns. Then hopefully, we plan to have the Final Environmental Impact Statement out in late spring of 2020. After that, the Secretary of Agriculture will review the Final Environmental Impact Statement, make a determination on what should become the final rule and in summer of 2020, we plan to issue a final Roadless Rule and a Final Environmental Impact Statement. So, let's go to this guy on the left.

Speaker 21: Couple of questions. One, as this process was going through in the fall, which alternative were you thinking you were more leaning towards until our governor basically sat down with Donald Trump on his airplane, Air Force One, and Trump basically gave the edict I guess to Purdue that we need to go for the maximum total exemption. Was there any ... how did that gerrymander your process making?

Ken: Well, we're just process people. We developed a range of alternatives that were responsitive. We knew that the Secretary of Agriculture, the responsible official in this, could select any one of those alternatives that we developed. It's not up to me to decide which alternative is selected, it's up to the Secretary of Agriculture to decide that. He weighs a lot of different things as well as the information contained in the drafted Environmental Impact Statement as well as direction from his boss.

Speaker 21: I have one other question. As the sales are ... I think that there's been the cry that a lot of these sales for years has been losing money for the government, the government basically has tried to gerrymander a lot of the ways these sales are structured for yellow cedar, red cedar, because a lot of those things could go in round log export. It seems to me that if you build these roads in these areas, it's basically is going to increase the ability to cut old growth, which again basically goes as round log export, which is throwing money away in my perspective because a lot of that money basically ends up going to China. Granted, we do have tariffs now that have been conservation issue or basically provided some conservation.

Speaker 21: That's really one of my concerns is that you start punching more roads in, not only the expense of the roads but you're also ... that's sort of a gerrymandering way of actually increasing the potential sale of area of a particular sale.

Ken: I won't disagree, it does provide greater flexibility for the agency.

Speaker 11: There's a document online that kind of summarizes the public comments today and there was a list of issues that maybe 15 that you identified as significant issues identified by the public to date. I thought those were all really good important significant issues, but there was nothing in there about climate change or global warming or our ocean acidification, all those things that really are strongly impacting us in this community where we live and that the Tongass, being roadless currently, is literally our firewall.

Ken: I'm not going to dispute the fact that climate change is a big issue across the world. From our perspective, that doesn't really change with any of the alternatives. It's still a big issues worldwide. However, in terms of the

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

that, we do not believe that effects the carbon sequestration concern because, once again, that's based on the fact that the level of harvest doesn't change throughout any of the alternatives.

Speaker 11: I'm an aquatic ecologist okay, and I know that when you put in roads, you warm the land. When you cut trees, you warm the land. Every single thing we can do to protect our healthy whole forest is significant. For you to say it isn't, I don't know where that's coming from.

Ken: Definitely provide that as input. Let me get, yes sir, in the back?

Speaker 23: I heard you repeat this now a couple of times the idea that because you're looking at a specific volume of board feet that's going to a mill that you are equating that somehow to an absolutely equivalent effect in terms of carbon sequestration or carbon release in the logging activity and that's just scientifically false. That's flat out false. I think you probably even know that.

Speaker 23: You know that obviously, completely clear cutting an old road forest and removing a certain amount of volume of board feet, you can log in a very very different manner and get a very different amount of carbon release maybe over a wider area, but less carbon release per acre and get a similar amount of board feet. The idea that you're just equating those across the board is just scientifically false. It doesn't seem fair to present that information to the public or present it as information because it's not actually correct information.

Ken: Okay. Appreciate that. Yes, sir? Right here.

Speaker 7: You say you'd get to the question I had regarding the 350,000 roughly acres that were not included.

Ken: Okay, yes. I thought I address that. As I said, we did look at the ... I'll kind of try to describe how we decided what acres were in and out. We looked at the Road Rule list, the logical extensions, we looked at errors, land exchanges, all that. We removed some and then we also looked at the 2003, 2008 roadless area inventories and we added some stuff in there. What you have there is plus and minus. You saw that one chart that had various acres. The alternative two actually had more designated roadless areas than the 2001 Roadless Rule designated. I don't know if that answered your question or not. What specific 350,000 acres are you talking about?

Speaker 7: There's a variety of places down in Tenakee, that's one in particular, where there's a number of drainages there that're not included.

Ken: There's what?

Speaker 7: A number of drainages were not included there, for one. There's multiple places across the Tongass that are not included and I'm just wondering why they were excluded from the inventory.

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: In terms of ... I can't tell you specifically a specific area. We looked at the ... there's other areas that were not included in the 2001 roadless inventory and that were part of the 2003, 2008 inventories and if those areas were greater than 5,000 acres, we generally included them as part of the new inventory. Yeah.

Speaker 25: You made a comment at the beginning of your presentation when you were asked how many letters did you get disposed and what the percentage of those letters basically leaning in one direction or the other and you made the comment that of those, a certain percentage of those were form letters. It sounded like you dismissed that that is a typical way of weeding out particular comments. Is that true and if that's so, how do you weigh somebody who basically may have a job that can't sit down and attend a full on meeting like this, full on comments, and they do rely on an organization that may provide them a quick way of responding to something?

Ken: The National Environmental Policy Act process, the process we're using here, it's not a voting process. What it is is, we look at the issue raised and we follow the process outlined NEPA to essentially address the merits of the issue. We don't consider it in context of number of people that are a vote essentially. In terms of the NEPA process, it's not a majority rules process. However, that doesn't mean that that doesn't get considered. I just don't consider that. The Secretary of Agriculture, the responsible official, has broad discretion to consider a wide variety of things and that may be part of what he considers ultimately. In terms of our process and my end of it, that does not come into play. The number of ... how people are leaning one way or another. Our job is just to articulate the effects really based on the issues that people raised. If somebody raises an issue 50,000 times, it's still one issue to me and that's the way we consider it in our process. Yes ma'am, you had a question?

Speaker 26: Yeah. But that just raised another one though. In other words, if the majority of Southeast Alaskans do not want to get rid of the Roadless Rule, they wanted alternative one, that wouldn't matter?

Ken: It might matter to the Secretary of Agriculture, the responsible official. But in terms of the process that we use to feed into his decision, the environmental impacts, it does not.

Speaker 26: Okay. Well, different question. I got the impression from Nicholas who brought up there are different ways to cut and you're going to get different impacts. I'm wondering if opening up ... you're saying if you have 46 million board feet allowed per year, it doesn't matter how you cut is what I'm hearing from you.

Ken: No. It does matter how you cut. However, that's a project level concern so at the project level is where they would consider that. This is a programmatic analysis where we mean to stay broad and we aren't going to prescribe how a project should be cutting timber because there's too many variables. It's just generally not a good policy decision to be very prescriptive, so we're going to try to remain broad. The 2001 Roadless Rule was specific to the prohibition of timber harvest, road construction, road reconstruction, and

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

we're trying to remain at that level at this level of policy development and leave those, the how-to's, to the local decision makers.

Speaker 26: But isn't it obvious that if you're going into a roadless area, you will have myriad effects?

Ken: Yeah. You will have myriad effects.

Speaker 26: And they would be greater than if you're going into an already roaded area. Isn't' that an impact that you need to consider?

Ken: It is but based on the 2016 Forest Plan and really our analysis shows when we ... if we selected alternative six, the bottom line effect is it does ... it would open up 185,000 acres additional areas for potential harvest. We know that all those 185,000 acres are not going to be harvested. Based on the 2016 Forest Plan, the estimate of potential road construction is very very small when you consider it in context of 24 miles across the next hundred years. A lot of that's attributed to the fact that we have this young growth strategy that will remain in place, the transition strategy, and the majority of that is already rooted and we will still be moving towards that young growth transition strategy. I think there was a question back here?

Speaker 27: Another federal agency, the Bureau of Land Management recently had to withdraw a bunch of oil and gas lease sales across the west in order to consider the cumulative impacts of releasing those sales on the carbon crisis and how it relates to the carbon that's released from those sales, so knowing that deforestation has a huge impact on climate, wouldn't it be smart for the Forest Service to also reconsider all of its deforestation activities on national forests in light of the current climate crisis and biodiversity loss crisis?

Ken: Maybe. I don't know. That's a good question. Definitely put that into a comment. I don't really know how to answer that, sorry. Yes, sir?

Speaker 28: [inaudible 00:59:22] ask a question but I'll just make a statement. Following up on what Clay said about the number of form letters versus other means of communicating, it does seem like a very unfair characterization on your part to indicate that somehow the form letters are less valued because any group, whether it's pro industry or some religious group wants to cut trees or doesn't want to cut trees, they can do the same type of organizing, present the same number of form letters in the same manner that people how are critical of the plan presented. I think it would really behoove you to just say you've gotten so many comments and this is the percent that favored the various alternatives instead of just trying to say, "Well, this is just the form letters." [inaudible 01:00:27]

Ken: You're correct. I apologize if I'm demeaning the form letter commenters. That's not my intent. I think all the input is valuable. What I'm trying to say is that from my stand point, a form letter really is like one thing. However many issues that form letter raises, say it raises three issues, we address those three issues in our EIS and we don't consider

how many times it was submitted. Yeah, I don't mean that that's not valuable, so I apologize for that.

Speaker 28: Okay because I've seen several [inaudible 01:01:21] at least one time in my experience characterize vast majority of comments that were against a policy as those that were [inaudible 01:01:29] and self selected. [inaudible 01:01:29] I hope that those days are over.

Ken: I definitely don't believe that and I think everybody's input is valuable. Like I said, the stuff I'm responsible for, I don't consider numbers. However, the responsible official has broad discretion to consider various factors including how many people commented and how they commented.

Speaker 11: In Alaska I've seen a slate of original comments and then I've seen the resulting summary or extraction of those into issues and I find that there's a lot lost in that translation.

Ken: I don't disagree with that. That is a really hard process and so I'll just describe how we do that. We have a contractor who's looking at all 180,000 that we have so far, comments, and they are putting them into buckets and trying to characterize that and then they give it to us. We've been working with them for the last month trying to make sure that the ... how they articulate those comments are reflective of the true intent. It's a really hard process-

Speaker 29: Who is this contact? And how are they chosen?

Ken: Basically, through a bidding process.

Speaker 29: How is the contact?

Ken: Tetra Tech.

Speaker 29: Who?

Ken: Tetra Tech. Yes sir?

Speaker 30: How would you rate the governor of Alaska, if he wrote a letter to you representing the people of the city of Alaska. Would he be looked at representing seven or eight hundred thousand people here or do you look to him as one?

Ken: In context of how I would consider it is I don't even consider who it's from. It gets filtered to me by what the issue is and we address the issue. However, that doesn't mean that the responsible official ... I'm sure the responsible official looks at that differently than I do.

Speaker 30: Would it be the Secretary-

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: Secretary of Agriculture. Yes, sir?

Speaker 31: Who actually has made the decision that alternative six ... I know the secretary will make the final decision, is that correct?

Ken: That's correct.

Speaker 31: Okay. Who is submitting this proposal six, alternative six as the preferred? Is it a collective group, is it all of you guys, is there an individual?

Ken: There's an individual.

Speaker 31: An individual. How do we know he's basing his assessment on that alternative, on the information you're providing him essentially.

Ken: The Secretary of Agriculture is the individual who selected the proposal alternative.

Speaker 31: He's made the proposal for six?

Ken: The state actually proposed it in their petition.

Speaker 31: Sure, yeah.

Ken: But the Secretary of Agriculture makes the proposal and he considers not only the information we provide but he has broad discretion to consider other things too. In this case I'm sure ... in the proposed rule, he said ... gave deference to the state. I think ...

Speaker 31: You were next?

Speaker 32: One of the ... maybe it's a step beyond this, but the issue that we end up exporting raw logs and then buying it back as lumber after a whole bunch of other people made money is just ... even before the tariff wars is just giant bullshit because we make the sacrifice, we take the risk in our whole ecosystem and then we buy inflated price things and the money is not recycled in our economy and here we are sitting thinking that we have to depend on oil and really consumptive resources. It just seems like the wrong people have to give and the wrong people get.

Speaker 32: To be honest, as far as who gets to make the decision, my guess is the collective scientific knowledge in this room is greater than that in the Secretary of Agriculture that we have right now. So, it's really hard to bear that what we say and how we think doesn't count. I certainly in a million years wouldn't want Dunleavy to speak for me because I've studied natural resources and continue to stay involved and so do the people in this room. I hope people are listened to. I don't know if there's any other way we can amplify what we think because it's not coming from a place of emotion, it's coming from ecological understanding.

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: With this administration and probably the secretary I would say you could amplify it through your elected officials. That's probably the best approach is through your elected officials to amplify your voice. Yes, sir?

Speaker 33: Thank you. How long before ... let's say they take alternative six or whatever option they take. How

many years or who can repeal or go back to Roadless Rule?

Ken: It could be repealed with the next legislation.

Speaker 33: Our next president? [crosstalk 01:07:33]

Ken: Yeah. But these processes take a long time, cost a lot of money. Who knows what could happen if a different president were elected and we had selected alternative six whether we would go back or not. Yeah, regulations can be changed.

Speaker 33: My next question or comment is, why are you saying that US forest sales can't be exported raw log spruce, maybe cedar can be. From my understanding watching lately they've been trying to avoid bringing in the cedar stands. I thought raw log export was prohibited.

Ken: There is some sort of exception for that. I don't know how that works. Do you, Frank?

Frank: You're exactly right. There is ... there are exceptions and to tell you the truth we haven't shipped anything lately because of the tariffs.

Ken: Lately what? In the last year?

Frank: Yeah.

Ken: But prior to that, there's a fair amount going out of the nation forest that was being exported and it was yellow cedar and red cedar because there's an exclusion by Frank Makowski from 20 years ago or whatever it was, I don't know.

Frank: Yeah. I don't know who it was.

Speaker 33: It wasn't cedar because we had plywood go to Port Angeles and we bought red cedar and yellow cedar from the mill, from people that're harvesting it. They're from [inaudible 01:09:12]. Cedar is the only one that I ever said in my hundred years of being involved in this log industry to be exported. Spruce and Hemlock have to have the primary manufacturing requirement.

Speaker 34: I don't think that's true.

Speaker 33: I'm not sure.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Ken: Those are important issues but the roadless regulation, we're trying to keep the focus narrow on just road construction and timber harvest appropriated in the [inaudible 01:09:46] roadless areas. Try to keep it narrow and the whole export and log issue is a separate issue that we don't want to mix and match the multiple issues because they're all important and complex. Yes, sir?

Speaker 35: I believe you mentioned earlier that there was a prohibition on below cost timber sales, is that correct? Is there a location, whether it's a website or some place where these large sales are analyzed so that the public can actually watchdog what's happening as far as the economic analysis that goes into that determination?

Ken: I don't think that there's a website but each individual timber sale goes through an appraisal process. I do not know if that appraisal process is open to the public.

Frank: Once it finishes the appraisal process, there's a summary of a report that gets pushed out. I don't know exactly where it goes, I'd have to look it up. I know it gets published, it's public.

Speaker 35: Summary of the appraisal.

Ken: That's every individual sale.

Frank: [crosstalk 01:10:50]

Ken: Yes, sir?

Speaker 36: Go by me.

Ken: Yes, ma'am?

Speaker 36: Oh. I know what I was going to say.

Speaker 37: I forgot what I was going to ask. I'll think of it.

Ken: We can come back.

Speaker 36: It was a comment. I know you guys, we make all these comments to you guys but you guys are the soldiers basically marching your orders out and I understand that but I think that the way that the sales are being designed are basically ... the value of that sale is being enhanced by including round log export and maybe before the tariffs and are targeting species that can be the more valuable species like red cedar. For a while, red cedar was garbage, they were leaving it. But now, it's completely changed around and a lot of these trees in southern southeast that are being cut are 1,000 year old red cedar trees. That's not a renewable resource, that's mining. Anyway, that's just a comment.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Speaker 37: I was wondering, who does the economic analysis of all the different factors that you need to include? Is that within your department and-

Frank: Yes.

Speaker 37: And-

Frank: It depends. What are you ... are you talking about these timber sales?

Speaker 37: For this whole thing.

Ken: For the Roadless Rule? Yes.

Speaker 37: Social economics, [inaudible 01:12:19], all the impacts and then you said you don't look at the warming issues, the effect of CO2.

Ken: We have a requirement to look at the economics. So in terms of the NEPA process, it is suggested that we only look at the significant issues. But then in regulation rule making, you're required to look at the economics and make a determination on the economic impact. We have somebody on staff who did our economic analysis in conjunction with our contractor.

Speaker 37: I guess it still bothers me that you kind of are speaking to if you're allowed to take 46 million board feet a year, all of this stuff doesn't really matter because that's what you're allowed and you're not there. The roadless won't affect it, the road won't.

Ken: I understand that. We have to make our set of assumptions based on our Forest Plan which is our only guidance on how to frame up the existing condition. That's how we did it.

Speaker 37: When is the next Forest Management Plan review? Is it every 10 years?

Ken: No. It's supposed to be every 15-20.

Speaker 37: Every 15-20.

Ken: But you probably know more than I know on that.

Frank: But no, we did our last in 16. Depending upon what happens with this and any other changes particularly administrative guidance, we could have to ... we might have to enter in a forest planning cycle. They're supposed to take four years. Historically, in the last 20 years it's taken most forests about eight years. The Tongass I guarantee will take longer.

Ken: Other questions? It's about 10 minutes to two. Probably don't need much time to set up.

Transcript by Rev.com

This transcript was exported on Dec 12, 2019 - view latest version here.

Frank: People might ... anybody want to do one-on-one, look at some maps or ... I'd like to talk to you.

Speaker 38: Me?

Frank: Yeah. If you don't mind.

Speaker 38: Sure.

Ken: So, why don't we take 20 minutes?

Frank: Twenty minutes? Is that good, folks? Then we'll try around one or two-

Ken: Two ten.

Frank: And we'll start testimony. If you would like to do testimony, I've got one person here, Thomas Eli. If anybody else would like testimony, if you could fill one of these sheets out, I'll get them placed in the record.

Speaker 39: Let me ask one more question.

Frank: Sure.

Speaker 39: Even if you can't use certain raw log export, I thought you just need to [inaudible 01:15:19] and then.

Frank: Yeah. That's-

Transcript by Rev.com

[Position]