

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 12/16/2019 9:00:00 AM

First name: Eben

Last name: Sargent

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My name is Eben Sargent, I live in Anchorage Alaska. I support Alternative 1, NO ACTION, on the proposed Alaska exemption to the Roadless Rule. I studied maps of all 6 alternatives at a recent forest service information session in Anchorage and believe the other 5 alternatives to pose a great risk to Alaska's growing tourism industry and fisheries while sacrificing a unique ecosystem that is of great national value as a biological reserve, carbon sink and area for recreational activity in an unaltered landscape. All this is being sacrificed to serve a tiny minority of extractive users, namely the tiny and failing southeast Alaska timber industry. I have read extensively on the history of logging in southeast Alaska and it is largely a history of economic failure and federal subsidy. Public comment shows overwhelming Support for Alternative 1, and the pursuit of any other alternative can only be assumed to be motivated by an ideological preference for resource development in this Administration as well as deep and long seated connections between Alaska's congressional delegation and governors and the Southeast Alaska timber industry. Why else would the desires of a tiny industry (as evaluated by the fraction of local jobs or economic activity) be prioritized over the concerns of the many other user groups the forest service is mandated to manage forests for? The current 10 year Tongass national forest management plan describes a transition away from the harvest of old growth lumber, and yet alternatives 2-6 include development of roads into many areas with remaining old growth forest. I would like to see justification that all alternatives would not result in anything but a reduction of old growth logging over current levels. It has been widely reported that Viking Lumber (the major local market for tongass timber) will not re-tool to focus on second growth harvest, and does not see a sustainable business logging second growth forests. Consequently any of the alternatives other than no action simply delay the inevitable collapse of this industry that has never been financially sustainable if forests are managed for multiple use and long term viability of the timber resource. Exempting the Tongass from the roadless rule temporarily benefits a small number of influential stakeholders while permanently, negatively, affecting many many more Americans with a vast array of invested interests in the Tongass, financial or otherwise. Finally I do not believe the environmental impacts of this major change has been studied in sufficient detail. At a minimum i think a separate EIS for each of the 6 alternatives is needed. This EIS must include a comprehensive, quantified analysis of the affects of this decision on climate change at a global level for all 6 alternatives. The fact that this exemption push has so far attempted to short cut public democratic process wherever possible should be seen as an obvious indicator that it does not benefit the average American, and rather is an attempt to give away public property to a small group connected to those with Federal policy influence.

[Position]

[Position]