

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/19/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Adam

Last name: Hill

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I believe that we should definitely go with alternative 3 regarding the actions of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska. I believe it is the most effective way to reach a compromise with both sides of the argument having one for environmental recovery/conservation, and of course the other for economic growth and business. In a letter from the state of Alaska's Department of Resources to the USDA, they express the need to be exempt completely from the roadless rule so they can use the important resources for economic development. They explain, "Alaska outweighed adding more restrictions when roadless areas in the Tongass are adequately protected without the roadless rule." They are emphasizing that this rule really needs to take into account the people of Alaska and what they believe. On the other hand, this full on exemption from the roadless rule has potential to be very negative toward the rainforest. The Audubon society website explains that, "I would argue that if they can strip roadless protections from the Tongass, they can strip them from any national forest." This article also goes on to explain that "the forests here are home to stunning biodiversity and endemic species." Not only that, it is also the home for many indigenous people that have lived there for hundreds of years, and stripping them the sacred parts of their land is extremely unethical. Although there may be much economic opportunity and job growth with the alternative 6, I think it is important that we recognize both sides to reach a compromise and go with alternative 3.

[Position]

[Position]