

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/15/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Robert

Last name: Adjemian

Organization: (self)

Title:

Comments: First of all, when all is said and done, the purpose of the rule change is to in the end, gut the protection of the forests and allow for mostly unrestrained cutting of timber.

The utility of selling the trees/wood and the opportunity to make money is not denied. The argument here is that it is far cheaper to keep the forests whole for the benefits that it provides, including, but not limited to

1) Environmental - reduction of global warming and other weather change, hydrology, soil erosion, etc., all these are affected by the removal of trees in large quantity.

2) Financial - tourism, salmon fishing, stabilization of land. I'd like to put money values to a forest, but it's hard to do. What is the value of clean air, water that is properly managed thru a forest, jobs that forests provide that don't involve cutting down the forest? Trees are the best and easiest way to deal with climate change. What should be the value of each tree left standing? If the ocean rises 3 feet, what is the value of the damage caused. It goes on and on, and you don't want long comments.

Historically, large-scale industrial logging has damaged salmon streams. The Tongass is spawning ground for 40 percent of wild salmon along the West Coast. This should be protected, not endangered

The Tlingit, Haida and Tsimshian people rely on the land for cultural and traditional practices like hunting and fishing. It's about respect for their traditions.

The Tongass stores more carbon removed from the atmosphere than any other national forest in the country in its old-growth Sitka spruce, hemlock and cedar trees. It helps protect Alaska, which is warming more than twice as fast from climate change as our planet overall. The forest holds about 650 million tons of carbon or about half of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions in 2017.

I have visited forest areas that have been "harvested." The scene is utter destruction. There may be rules, but they are ignored deep in the forests, as they will be as a result of the proposed rule change.

The forests belong to the public, not to politicians who give favors to big donors that make money off of our forests, destroying them in the process.

[Position]