

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/13/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Michael

Last name: Shurgot

Organization: Alaska Wilderness League

Title:

Comments: Alaska Roadless Rulemaking #54511

Good morning,

The below comment was recorded on November 23, 2019 at the REI Flagship Store in Seattle, WA as part of a community meeting regarding the Alaska Roadless Rule. Washington Wild was given permission by the individual to submit this comment to the United States Forest Service on their behalf. Please add their comment into the record.

Thank you.

Michael Shurgot, Alaska Wilderness League

Seattle, WA 98115

Good afternoon. My name is Michael Shurgot and I've been a resident of Seattle since 1982 and I do want to acknowledge our friends from Alaska and say thank you for coming down and making the effort. Two quick points. In the early to mid nineties, I was chair of the conservation division at The Mountaineers, which is a volunteer position. There are several people in the room, Harry and Donna and Ed- Remember those days? They were very tumultuous. And one of the issues we tackled or attempted to was working on a roadless rule, especially Washington and Oregon. I should mention somebody who I don't think is here. Some of you probably know Charlie Brains from the Sierra club, he was so instrumental and of course, Mitch Freedman, who was up here earlier, did a tremendous amount of work. But two points about that process: number one, it was based on science. We had people in The Mountaineers in the Sierra Club who were doing research on how old-growth ancient forests reproduce themselves and sustain themselves. The other point that needs to be made to be made is that there were compromises built into the rule way back when. We met with members of the, Department of Agriculture, Fish and Wildlife, Forest Service, native peoples, communities, even logging people. And the plans that we worked out for Oregon and Washington did involve compromises. So if anybody says to you that the roadless rule does not contain compromises, it's a simply wrong statement.

The second point I would like to make is to make something explicit that I think has been implicit in a lot of what people have said here. Many of you will remember this book- A Sand County Almanac by Aldo Leopold, which I still think is the Bible of the conservation movement. The central essay is called the land ethic. And I just want to read the central sentence in the central essay "A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability, and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise." I would submit that proposal to clear cut the talk is something that rises to that level, that this is fundamentally a moral issue because there is so much life in that forest that would be destroyed. And there's other people who have said, if you clear cut the Tongass, then you clear cut part of the lungs of this planet. So I urge, you: no cutting. Thank you.

---

Hillary Sanders, Member and Engagement Manager

She/Her

WASHINGTON WILD

wawild.org

[Position]