

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

First name: Carl

Last name: Brodersen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Roadless Rule: Specific comments

Even though the outcome of this process is a foregone conclusion, the report compiled by USFS still needs to reflect reality. And because this is a foregone conclusion, there's no harm if the report does not support the final conclusion, right? because we all know Sonny Perdue's voice matters more than that of 130,000 Alaskans, so it doesn't hurt to at least get the record straight.

An analysis of the comments from the "should we look at this at all?" phase and the "here are 6 options phase" MUST be included if those comments are to have any meaning at all. It is highly relevant that the vast majority of comments are in favor of the Roadless Rule (and it is highly telling that at the Juneau presentation, y'all didn't know the actual number and had to guess).

The conclusions of "minimal adverse effect" are based on other rules protecting the Tongass not changing. Since this is a discussion about changing rules affecting the Tongass, all those conclusions must state that the conclusions on effects are believed to be the case "so long as the 2016 Tongass Management Plan [and any other relevant plans/regulations] stay in effect." Otherwise this is like handing a firearm to every inmate in a prison and then claiming there will be no effect because murder is still illegal.

The effects section should stipulate that it is looking at only about a 20-year timeframe.

Even better, the effects section should be omitted entirely. It is short-sighted and only considers a handful of surface-level impacts. It is meaningless to the point it should be left out. It even says that the elimination of protections will have a minimal impact on the economy -if you want to support your boss's decision, you can't have a section that says this isn't going to work.

People must be able to speak on the record, in person, to leave their comments. If staff are unable to discern what a speaker's position is after an oral statement, they can simply ask. Even if this whole dog and pony show is a charade because USFS will just do what they're told, it is especially unethical to disenfranchise us by not allowing verbal public comment. If you're going to bother maintaining the pretense that public input actually matters to the final outcome, do it right.

This process is a farce. I find it offensive and morally repugnant.

Sincerely,

-Carl Brodersen

[Position]