

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/18/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Carl

Last name: Brodersen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Roadless Rule: My Eloquent Statement

Hi everyone, my name is Carl Brodersen and I intended to read this at the Juneau meeting, and was sorely disappointed when I discovered USFS would not permit it.

I am the third generation in my family to own a power troll permit. I live, work, hunt and fish surrounded by or directly in the Tongass, and from that introduction alone, you know the opinion I am here to put on record, because you know what eliminating Roadless protections is really about and what it would lead to.

I support the No-Action Alternative (Alternative #1) because eliminating roadless protections will have a harmful effect on fisheries, hunting, recreation, and the overall vibrancy of our forest. Plus clearcuts are ugly as sin and tourists don't like looking at them any more than we do. Also I object to the idea of millions of Federal tax dollars going to subsidize a small, fading industry, at the behest of a tiny handful of powerful men who don't even live in the forest. There are already 5,000 miles of road in a roadless Tongass. Cut that protection and they're going to expand like a bad rash.

This is going to lead to massively subsidized clear-cut logging in some of the only old-growth forest our nation has left. To claim otherwise is completely disingenuous. No one goes to this length to eliminate protections on principle without plans to act once protections are gone. You wouldn't agitate for the legalization of bazookas if you weren't planning to blow stuff up at a distance. Or, you wouldn't try to ease clean water protections if you didn't want to not be punished when you inevitably dump poison in the well. This is about cutting trees down. Trees that are worth more alive than dead to all but a small, well-connected minority.

I'm not here as a lobbyist for those people, or a member of any PAC, or committee, or as someone who has made an entire career of advocating for the elimination of environmental and health protections. I'm part of We the People. We the People testified overwhelmingly against even looking at this issue again. You looked anyway. Now testimony is overwhelmingly against scrapping the protection, and yet I know full well all of it will again fall on deaf ears. USFS should act on behalf of We the People, not the personal interests of their bosses.

I know the Forest Service personnel here are just doing their jobs, as are the few people who have testified in favor of scrapping the protections. But your bosses wouldn't be telling you to undo this if their bosses didn't stand to benefit somehow. And the testifiers who say they are against keeping protections wouldn't be saying that if they didn't stand to personally benefit somehow, too.

So if it's about personal benefit and not the greater good: I personally benefit from the roadless rule because it protects commercial and sport fishing, hunting grounds, and recreation in areas 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 310, 311, 330 and 331. Those ten areas are where I benefit personally (ate 306 deer just last night), and it'd be more than 10 if I had a larger boat. --And I have to tell you, from an aesthetic standpoint, too, I just hated looking at clearcuts when I flew over Icy Straight in the old days. I shudder to think there might be more of those in our future, and what harm they'll do to salmon especially, if you keep letting your bosses cram this down the public's throat.

The Tongass is a global treasure that must continue to be protected; not left exposed, to be picked away at, one small chunk at a time, on the taxpayer's dime, to the benefit of that small, well-connected minority. Our current president does not own the Tongass. Our current Governor does not own the Tongass. We the People do.

USFS and Sonny Perdue, listen to the people. We've already been down this road, and we decided on roadless.

Thank you.

-Carl Brodersen

[Position]