

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/27/2019 8:00:00 AM

First name: Gary

Last name: Sonnenberg

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Alternative 1 makes sense and should be the preferred alternative.

The Tongass National Forest might be different from other national forests but it should not be treated special because certain interests choose to exploit its resources.

The State of Alaska should not receive special consideration; the state has state forests to manage.

The "analysis" presented is essentially an economic analysis of the "timber" industry compared to a few other industries such as fisheries, mining, tourism, and to some extent recreation separate from tourism. The "analysis" lacks substance as to impacts to the environment that roads create. There is a claim that, "nearly all new roads constructed under the proposed rule and other regulatory alternatives would be closed following harvest." Closing roads is expensive and once opened often become controversial individually.

Alternative 6 lacks recognition of environmental degradation caused by road building, use, and even closing. Once disturbed it takes decades or centuries for ecosystems to recover.

Alternative 2 is a red herring added to "demonstrate" that the Forest Service considered expanding the roadless rule.

Perhaps the underlying purpose of the DIES is summed up in the statement, "Where restrictions are removed, or exemptions added, the greatest effect may be in making the permitting process for developers less burdensome, resulting in more a rapid permitting process - - ." Why should permitting for developers be less burdensome at the expense of "Caring for the Land (Ecosystem).

As a 45 year resident of Juneau and Ketchikan and 25 yr FS employee, I expected Alternative 6 to be preferred alternative. The FS is a political agency that bends to political pressure rather than adhering to its long time moto, "Caring for the Land and Serving People".

[Position]

[Position]