

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/16/2019 8:16:23 PM

First name: Joseph

Last name: Stratman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My name is Joseph Stratman. I hunt deer, fish for salmon, trout, and char, gather mushrooms, and pick berries. A portion of what I harvest is preserved to subsist on in the winter months. In the areas slated for "vegetation management" in the Central Tongass Project (CTP), I conduct the aforementioned activities in the Mitkof Timber Analysis Area (TAA) in the Bear Creek (also locally known as Big Creek), Canyon Creek, Ohmer Creek, Sumner Creek, Falls Creek, and Cosmos Creek watersheds; in the Tonka TAA on Leprechaun Creek and Colorado Creek; in the West Kupreanof TAA in the Breiland Slough and Little Duncan Canal areas; and in the Thomas Bay TAA in Icy Bay, Browns Cove, and the southern shore of Thomas Bay.

The old growth logging in the Bear Creek/Canyon Creek watershed is of particular concern to me. I've previously expressed my concerns with additional old growth logging in this watershed during the scoping for the Overlook Timber Sale. Though it's very difficult to determine from the maps in the CTP Draft EIS just where the old growth logging units are, it would appear that many of these units overlap with proposed units in the Overlook Timber Sale, which was, I believe, invalidated by a federal court in December 2018 in part due to an inaccurate assessment of old growth logging on deer habitat. I believe that further logging of old growth in the Bear Creek/Canyon Creek watersheds will affect my ability to harvest deer and salmon there which I preserve for later consumption, so I would respectfully request that the forest service not harvest timber in the Bear Creek/Canyon Creek watersheds. If timber must be harvested in the Bear Creek/Canyon Creek watersheds please limit this activity to second growth stands.

For some comments on the CTP at large, I submit the following:

1) I support the No Action alternative (Alternative 1) for the CTP. Our old growth resources on the Tongass are too valuable in other respects (carbon sequestration, tourism, fish habitat, etc) to be used largely for round log exports.

2) I support identifying timber units specifically as had been done with previous timber sales. The lack of specifics on areas slated for timber harvest, and maps in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) presented in a scale that makes specific areas difficult to identify, is less transparent and makes it more difficult for stakeholders to comment on specific areas of concern.

3) I support completing the "transition to second growth timber harvest" once and for all. It seems like this transition period has been drawn out, and while in this drawn out transition period it seems like the agency's emphasis remains the harvest of old growth timber. Please limit timber harvest to second growth stands.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Stratman