

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/7/2026 4:33:12 AM

First name: Zach

Last name: LaPerriere

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear foresters & staff,

I welcome the opportunity to revisit the Tongass Land Management Plan, but a read through of the plan looks to me like a top-down effort to ignore what has been stated by a vast majority of Southeast Alaskans over and over in public comments. Administrations come and go...but we live here. Our children live here.

Alaskans have been very clear on their priorities. Continued protections for subsistence hunting & fishing, fish rearing habitat, and remote recreation are what Alaskans have asked for so many times-and the proposed Plan looks like a restructuring of LUDs and opening areas to industrial scale logging.

Industrial scale logging has no place on the Tongass. The pulp mill contracts squandered far too much of our most valuable timber habitat. There should be zero room for any logging to export logs outside of SE Alaska. It's absurd, third world economic thinking.

I strongly support ultra small scale family owned timber operations. Automated sawmill operations are clearly too large to provide any longer term economic stability unless restricted to second growth timber. And it only makes sense that small scale timber operations can take place either in close proximity to existing road networks, or by means without making more roads. The thousands of miles of roads on the Tongass are already largely in disrepair, and have cost taxpayers millions of dollars.

Any logging of old growth should prioritize local use, and maximum economic return. I am a small scale logger as well as commercial woodworker of several decades in Southeast Alaska. I am currently buying premium old growth for up to \$17 dollars per board foot to make a set of four large doors. I have previously sourced stock for stringed instruments. I have made hundreds of wood bowls from Tongass wood, some artistic pieces at a value of up to \$100 per board foot, often from trees that had zero other commercial value.

We need to consider future generations of native carvers in these plans.

In short: Innovate! Don't go back to 1960s thinking.

I am also concerned about other commercial language in the Plan. Recreation cabins are NOT commercial, and I am baffled by such language in this proposed Plan.

And lessening of protections for areas such as Kruzof Island should go through extensive community scoping first-and only with wide spread public support, which obviously there is not.

Listen to the people. We'll be hear long after the current administration is gone.

Thank you.

Zach LaPerriere

Timberworks, LLC