

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

First name: Nick

Last name: Thomas

Organization:

Title:

Comments: HC3017

The following are my comments on the proposed Alaska roadless rule and the DEIS that was done to support it.

In the fall of 2018, the Forest Service announced it was initiating the preparation of [illegible] [illegible] for Alaska roadless rulemaking. You said your proposed action was to conserve roadless characteristics while responding to the need to provide more economic opportunity. How does the full exemption alternative conserve roadless area characteristics? Why did the proposed action change between the No1 and the DEIS, and how can you change that without a new scoping period? Weren't the issues and alternatives you developed supposed to be in response to the proposed action? At least that's what this presentation here said? So if it changed wouldn't that generate new issues? New alternatives? Shouldn't the public at least know you changed it?

You also told us that the Forest Plan would likely be amended after rulemaking was done in 2018- but when I look at the proposed rule now it seems to rely on the Forest Plan staying the same, you need to be honest. you know the Forest plan will be the next thing to get axed with this administration, yet the presenter just said The Forest Service isn't going to change The Forest Plan, "At this time there are no plans to amend the plan." This is dishonest, especially since the state of Alaska has already asked for it and the state apparently gets what it wants no [illegible] what the people who live here say or want.

You have already included a change to the Forest Plan anyway because the EIS says that lands that are unsuited for logging will become suited. This is also not what you said last fall . How can you keep saying one thing and keep doing the opposite?

I have a friend in [illegible] that told me about a [illegible] the tribe received from the Forest Service saying that alternative 3 and 4 were the preferred alternatives for the proposed rule. When did this change, and why wasn't the public, especially the tribes, told about it? Don't you ever have to be honest about things? That was a bait and switch and totally unfair to the tribes were you hoping they didn't notice?

How can you say that this will have, no effect on fish, no effect on streams? Don't you read your own reports on what roads do to fish streams? You should be ashamed of yourselves and embarrassed for saying that in this document, Forest Service, be honest.

The Forest Service never does anything to correct the lies that the state and senator Murkowski say about the roadless rule. It does not prohibit mining or renewable energy or recreation or hunting, there are already too many of them causing damage to fish and letting too many people have easy access to the deer and other things we need for our subsistence. We do not want more roads.

If the Forest Service doesn't understand that these things can already be done, then read the letters you've been given. The only thing this exemption will do is allow more logging of the last remaining good stands of old growth forest, which is needed for climate change mitigation, for healthy fish streams, for wildlife habitat, and for the [illegible] that it provides the tourists who come to see it. These are the things that will help our communities now and into the future. No more [illegible], not more roads.

It sounds like the Forest Service tried to do some things that would help some areas, like allowing roads for utility systems or recreation projects or cultural use? You don't need a full exemption for this, you could also support small mills, like the one here in [illegible] and the two in Hoonah by allowing small timber sales in your community

public areas that are in alternative? you could take care of everything it sounds like you heard in all those comments (over 100,000?) in the other alternatives. You don't need a full exemption for those things. You should be honest about why you are really doing this.

I support the No Action Alternative. If not the No Action, then please select an alternative that actually does what you said you wanted to do - conserve roadless areas. The exemption alternative does not do that. Nor does it help the communities you said you wanted to provide for. We don't want it. We have told you that. We don't need it.

Please listen to us this time.

Thank You

[Position]