

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/16/2024 4:00:00 AM

First name: Anon

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for listening to Southeast Alaska Tribes, municipalities and small business owners who requested that the USDA drop the language in the Notice of Intent that effectively exempted the Tongass National Forest from the same protections afforded to other forests. Unfortunately, the preferred alternative in the Draft EIS still does not provide adequate protections.

The updated language in the preferred alternative, intended to allow for implementation of the Southeast Alaska Sustainability Strategy, is ambiguous about allowable logging, which leaves room for exploitation and large-scale commercial logging of old-growth. Rather than using wording like 'de minimis,' more explicit language about exceptions would be more protective.

With the purpose of the National Old Growth Amendment to conserve old-growth forest conditions and recruit new old-growth in response to climate change, protection of the Tongass National Forest should be a top priority as our largest National Forest and greatest carbon sink. Due to its low temperatures and high annual rainfall, the Tongass is at low risk for wildfire, so it has a high likelihood of permanence and will continue to trap and store carbon in perpetuity.

Larger-scale commercial logging endangers fish and wildlife habitats, including:

- * All five species of Pacific salmon, whose spawning is impacted by stream health, which is impacted by the health of the forest around it,

- * Sitka blacktail deer numbers have suffered in Prince of Wales because of the impacts of logging across the Island.

Larger-scale commercial logging would negatively impact cultural and recreational uses, including hunting, fishing and foraging.

The elimination in the DEIS of Standard 1 from the original proposed action removes language that prohibits degradation or impairment of old-growth forests. Paired with language about management "for the purpose of proactive stewardship" and "no requirement that [old-growth] areas continue to meet the definition of old-growth when managed for the purpose of proactive stewardship," the amendment would allow for management actions that could degrade old-growth stands to the point of no longer meeting the definition of old-growth, counter to the goal of the amendment.

In addition, I have lived and worked in the Tongass. I know firsthand that federal logging activities in the Tongass are subsidized and the money does not go back into communities. I understand there is a nostalgia for the days and economic prosperity of timber harvest but those days are not now and holding onto this image is perpetuating false hope. How many times has the Thorne Bay Basin project been reimagined, repackaged and resold only to fail? How much money has been spent on conducting NEPA for the second, third, fourth time? How much money, time, and resources are being wasted to preserve this image of timber production? And if it does eventually get cut, how much carbon are we releasing into the atmosphere and for what? Out of state companies to profit? To reminisce on nostalgia? Stop exempting the Tongass.