

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/4/2020 10:13:50 PM

First name: Daniel

Last name: Baldassare

Organization: Niseko Winterlab

Title:

Comments: I am writing to support alternative 1, the no action proposal. Carbon storage in temperate rainforests is imperative to maintaining the health of Alaska's waterways, which is responsible for much of the economic activity of coastal Alaska. As illustrated in research such as: Projecting future impacts of cropland reclamation policies on carbon storage (Tang, 2020), forest loss is inevitable over the next few decades. However, maintaining high productivity forests allows for economic development in other regions. This project is short sighted and fails to take into account the larger picture of development in the rest of the United States. In this paper the authors analyze future forest loss and argue that maintaining high productivity, high carbon-storage forest is essential to offset development in lower productivity forest. In order to avoid ecological catastrophe and resulting economic catastrophe, projects such as this must not be allowed to occur.

Climate change poses an existential threat to coastal Alaska. The proposals other than proposal 1 will harm Alaska by releasing large amounts of Carbon Dioxide into the atmosphere for minimal economic gain. This will disturb the fisheries, contribute to more harmful weather and decrease tourism. More effort and thought needs to be put into ways to improve coastal Alaska's economic conditions in the short term without sabotaging Alaska and the rest of the United States in the next few decades and onward.