

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/17/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Anon

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Tongass roadless rule

Sent from my iPhone

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

Re: Tongass Roadless Rule

Comments are due tonight, December 17, 2019

Forest Service: <https://cara.ecosystem-management.org/Public//CommentInput?Project=54511>

And with SEACC this link: [https://www.seacc.org/usfs\\_comment](https://www.seacc.org/usfs_comment)

I have spent many years (over fifty-five years) hiking and carrying out research in the Tongass, terrestrially and on the waters of Southeast Alaska.

I support maintaining the Roadless Rule as it now applies on the Tongass. In other words, I support the No Action Alternative. The DEIS discusses carbon sequestration but fails to address the diminished sequestration that would occur if greater harvesting of old growth forests could occur, as it could under Alternative 6. Currently, the carbon sequestration is greater in old growth than in regrowth forests. These old growth forests should remain intact.

With so many forests in the lower 48 and in Canada going up in smoke as they become more vulnerable to wildfires (due to climate change and decades of fire suppression), it makes little sense to cut forests (such as the old growth forests in the Tongass) that are not currently at risk of catastrophic fires is desperately needed in the lower 48. Logging efforts should be concentrated on those forests, where logging can help prevent catastrophic fires AND provide wood. I speak from the perspective of having hand-logged windfall in Yukon Territory for twenty years. Our Fire Smart Program there effectively focuses on Management by thinning of forests that are at high risk of catastrophic fires.

In the Tongass we should focus on preserving all old growth that remains, and managing the regrowth forests for carbon sequestration and timber production.

In addition, the decision documents should include discussion about development of the National Forest for recreational purposes, rather than looking to timber harvesting as the best or only means of

[Position]