

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 8/24/2019 12:12:59 PM

First name: Mary

Last name: Stewart

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My family and I are writing with concerns regarding the NEPA process of attending carefully to the Central Tongass Project review.

Our concerns are embedded in a number of questions as the the Forest Services lack of thoughtful, full, and inclusive considerations for input on Central Tongass Project review. Subsistence is an inherently location-specific activity rooted not only in access to resources, but in human geography, history, and clan relationships so comments need to be collected in a local and clear way in order to address the real concerns of all who are involved and closely affected by the Central Tongass Project. In addition, how can the agency expect the public and hunters to evaluate impacts of logging on the wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, and subsistence resources if the agency doesn't tell where and how the logging will occur?

More specific questions are below:

- Why has the Forest Service failed to provide site-specific road and cutting unit cards to the public to review before the public meetings and subsistence hearings?
- How are hunters supposed to examine and evaluate direct and cumulative impacts to their uses of those lands or offer alternatives that could mitigate those impacts?
- How can unverified unit cards that lack vital site-specific information be useful to the public and hunters if they are unavailable at the time of public review and comment?
- What value is this public process if the fieldwork and consultation regarding unit layout occurs after the short public comment period and after the agency approves the Out-year Plan?
- How can the Forest Service possibly evaluate actual impacts of the proposed action alternatives, if it has not yet identified precisely where the logging and roadbuilding will occur under each alternative?
- How can the Forest Service expect the public and hunters to evaluate impacts of logging on the wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, and subsistence resources if the agency doesn't tell where and how the logging will occur?

In overall, we are deeply upset by the poor agency effort of getting meaningful public input. Without site-specific unit detail about tree size and density, elevation, and connectivity or fragmentation of the surrounding stands, how can the public and hunters evaluate possible impacts to their wildlife habitat, recreation opportunities, and subsistence uses in those specific areas?

Please take our comments very seriously and vastly improve your relationship to public participation in the Central Tongass Project review.