

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/11/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Wade

Last name: Johnston

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Most of the arguments that I see in opposition letters hinge on the value of the forest for the carbon cycle. I think this ignores the nature of the proposed withdrawal, where only 168,000 acres of the total 9.2 million would be available for timber harvest. This is less than 2% of the forests. And, although it may be an obvious point to make, trees do grow back.

If we consider preservation of the environment to be paramount to our citizens' well-being, then no action may be preferred. I think that's a misanthropic attitude however; I see more benefit in adopting a policy of responsible use over enshrinement and worship that renders it useless to people other than for capricious recreation and aesthetic (mostly for visitors who don't call the area home). I would prefer to see responsible use that limits environmental damage and allows the people living in the Tongass, as well as the Federal taxpayers that own and finance it's management, to benefit from the resources and jobs that it can create. The communities of SE Alaska are economically downtrodden. Dilapidated ruins of the timber industry litter the towns, places that used to employ thousands. This is an area that was populated specifically bc of it's resources, for fishing, mining and timber. Withdrawing the Roadless Rule will afford these people prosperity which they do not have now. Nobody should be able to impose their will on those people and deny them that in the name of lofty idealism.

It is not a just policy for a Federal authority to be dictating what these people do with the lands where they live. The Roadless Rule imposes a set of values on them which it doesn't seem shared by the communities of SE Alaska. If they do share those values then the field offices will reflect that will of the locals through permitting, people will choose not to work in resource industries, and they can decide not to purchase the resources.

And one comment for people who complain of the damage to the aesthetic of the forest; I have no sympathy for people that feel inconvenienced by having to see the power plants, landfills, mines and timber cuts that they demand through their purchase of goods which make their lives of historically unprecedented comfort a possibility.

[Position]

[Position]