

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/17/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Faren

Last name: McCrehin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My name is Faren McCrehin and I live in Sitka, AK. I was born in Sitka Alaska and live in Sitka. I work for the state school district. 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 fishing, hunting, subsistence harvesting, foraging for wild foods, the peace and solitude I find in nature, recreating, practicing my culture, the status of the Tongass as a national and global treasure, the forest's ability to sequester carbon and mitigate climate change impacts, the conservation of resources for future generations .

Out of the alternatives described in the AKRR DEIS I support alternative 1: no action. The rule is working fine as it is by balancing the conservation of our fish and wildlife habitat with important development projects.. I depend on roadless areas in the Tongass National Forest for economic livelihood, healthy fish habitat, deer habitat and subsistence hunting, foraging and gathering wild foods, practicing my culture, recreating and enjoying nature, carbon sequestration and local climate change mitigation, 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 Baranof Island, Chichagof Island, Admiralty Island, the northern mainland above Port Snettisham (around Juneau), the central mainland from Hobart Bay to Stikine River, the southern mainland from Bradfield Canal to Dixon Entrance Kupreanof Island, Kuiu Island, Wrangell and Etolin Islands, Prince of Wales Island, Revillagigedo Island (near Ketchikan), Yakutat forelands, all of the inventoried roadless areas on the Tongass. 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 A full exemption is not brought to you by the majority of Alaskans and is not supported by the majority of Alaskans because the proposal is an antithesis of all that is healthy for the land, the people, and the culture. A full exemption or any change of the Southeast Alaskan Tongass is an unnecessary change that comes with a high universal damage rate. Here are some following examples: The Alaskan streams are the worlds main source of salmon, food for the food chain (which affects others animals, naturally). The streams are suffering as it is and the fishermen are struggling more so than in the past 10 years to catch (what used to be normal amount). The bears are becoming more and more hungry and wondering into town (as a result endanger people get shot) looking for food, which has been occurring more so in the last 5 years. Moreover, Alaska's native culture depends on hunting (literally) many families survive of the land and ocean.

The Amazon which is considered to be one of the lungs of the world for producing air (and is home to other native cultures) was a natural refuge. The Amazon has just lost 310,000 acres of that lung and we cannot afford

the loss of one of the only remaining natural resources of air production and habitat refuge--now more than ever.. 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 invest in creating and maintaining recreation infrastructure.

Thank you for listening.

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.

[Position]