

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/8/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Andrew

Last name: Wallis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My name is Andrew Wallis and I live in Oxford, Ohio.

clear cutting never is in the best interests of the people of the United States. It benefits certain businesses and they decide who gets the benefits and how much. We are left with clear cut ground. We need to learn how to thik longer time and apply the costs for that whole time. In other words we are blessed with these trees and how long does it take to grow a diversified forest. How much does it costs to grow one.....apply those costs to the price of the clear cut trees and assign them equitably.....wise up, it is not worth it.

I am writing to express strong opposition to efforts to roll back the Roadless Area Conservation Rule (Roadless Rule) in Alaska or elsewhere. The Roadless Rule was implemented with unprecedented public support to protect some of our nations most pristine public lands, including large parts of the Tongass National Forest. You must choose the No Action alternative. Any other choice would ignore overwhelming public support and harm Alaskans, including Alaska Natives, and taxpayers across the nation.

In Southeast Alaska, tourism accounts for 28% of employment and generate an annual \$1 billion in economic benefit, making it far more of an economic driver than the timber industry, which is less than 1% of the regional economy.

Any choice but the No Action alternative would also put wildlife and critical habitat at risk, threaten access to clean water, and be a step in the wrong direction on climate change jeopardizing Alaskans at a time when the state already faces severe challenges related to rising temperatures. I urge you not to abandon the Roadless Rule in Alaska and instead to put the public interest above corporate profits by choosing to keep the rule in place unchanged.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Regards, Andrew Wallis

[Position]

[Position]