Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/18/2019 5:50:38 AM
First name: Ellery
Last name: Stritzinger
Organization:
Title:
Comments: My name is Ellery Stritzinger and I live in Sitka, AK. I've lived here for 3 months, and am working for Sitka National Historical Park. I value the forests as critical to the cultural and geologic history of the region. In order to preserve the historic of our country's heritage, we have to preserve the land as well. Roads in forests have strong correlations with erosion and avalanches. I am writing a comment on the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS because I am concerned with how the Rule and the proposed full exemption will impact my foraging for wild foods, the peace and solitude I find in nature, recreating, the conservation of resources for future generations .

Out of the alternatives described in the AKRR DEIS I support alternative 1: no action. It is a workable compromise that allows for economic development and the protection of roadless characteristics. I depend on roadless areas in the Tongass National Forest for economic livelihood, foraging and gathering wild foods, recreating and enjoying nature, viewing wildlife, keeping public lands wild for future generations, fiscal responsibility and saving taxpayer dollars . A full exemption does not protect these values, nor does it effectively balance economic development and conservation of roadless area characteristics. A full exemption from the Roadless Rule and increased logging and roadbuilding will negatively impact the Tongass and what I and many others use and depend on the forest to provide for us.

The Roadless areas on the Tongass that are especially important to me are those on or around Yakutat forelands, Revillagigedo Island (near Ketchikan), Wrangell and Etolin Islands, Chichagof Island, Baranof Island, Admiralty Island. I want the roadless areas in these locations to stay in roadless status in any alternative selected by the Forest Service, and be managed to provide for the uses and activities I listed above. It is important to me that the T77 and the TNC conservation priority areas retain their roadless protections.

I do not support the Forest Services preferred alternative of a full exemption. A full exemption is not in the interests of Southeast Alaskans who live in and use the Tongass National Forest, because It's bad ethics, bad business. The State of Alaska says that a full exemption is needed for rural economic development opportunities. However, a full exemption would not help create more rural economic development opportunities, it would instead harm our existing rural economies that are based on the visitor industry and commercial fishing industry.

It would further harm rural economic opportunities because pursuing the same outdated economic model of old growth clearcut harvesting for export stifles innovation and possibility in other sectors, such as mariculture, sustainable young growth harvest, and rural agriculture. If the Forest Service wants to support rural economic development, they should improve and streamline existing permitting processes for important community projects rather than rehashing old conflicts.

NO action

I urge the Forest Service to prioritize the voices of Southeast Alaskans over those of our political representation and corporate interests. Choosing a full exemption will not create a long lasting, durable solution for roadless areas on the Tongass. It will only increase the legal challenges, uncertainty for businesses, and conflict on the Tongass going forward.