

Date submitted (Alaskan Standard Time): 12/17/2019 8:57:28 AM

First name: Kim

Last name: Eisele

Organization: Kimi Eisele

Title:

Comments:

I lived in Sitka, AK for 2 months on an artist residency and spent much of my time in the forest, walking and making portraits, amidst cedar and spruce stands. I didn't realize I was in a state of mourning and the forest helped me tend to myself. I have since presented work about the forest and my relationship with it through performance and writing.

I am writing a comment on the Alaska Roadless Rule DEIS because I am concerned with how the Rule and the proposed full exemption will impact my the peace and solitude I find in nature, recreating, practicing my culture, the status of the Tongass as a national and global treasure, the forest's ability to sequester carbon and mitigate climate change impacts, the conservation of resources for future generations .

Out of the alternatives described in the AKRR DEIS I support alternative 1: no action. It shows the Forest Service is responding to the needs and voices of Southeast Alaskan communities. I depend on roadless areas in the Tongass National Forest for viewing wildlife, carbon sequestration and local climate change mitigation, recreating and enjoying nature, practicing my culture, keeping public lands wild for future generations. A full exemption does not protect these values, nor does it effectively balance economic development and conservation of roadless area characteristics. A full exemption from the Roadless Rule and increased logging and roadbuilding will negatively impact the Tongass and what I and many others use and depend on the forest to provide for us.

The Roadless areas on the Tongass that are especially important to me are those on or around all of the inventoried roadless areas on the Tongass. I want the roadless areas in these locations to stay in roadless status in any alternative selected by the Forest Service, and be managed to provide for the uses and activities I listed above. It is important to me that the T77 and the TNC conservation priority areas retain their roadless protections.

I do not support the Forest Service's preferred alternative of a full exemption. A full exemption is not in the interests of Southeast Alaskans who live in and use the Tongass National Forest, because It ignored the countless statements made already at public meetings about leaving things as they are, about the value of intact old-growth forests, about sustaining important ecological relationships, about keeping wildlife corridors open. The State of Alaska says that a full exemption is needed for rural economic development opportunities. However, a full exemption would not help create more rural economic development opportunities, it would instead harm our existing rural economies that are based on the visitor industry and commercial fishing industry.

It would further harm rural economic opportunities because pursuing the same outdated economic model of old growth clearcut harvesting for export stifles innovation and possibility in other sectors, such as mariculture, sustainable young growth harvest, and rural agriculture. If the Forest Service wants to support rural economic development, they should improve and streamline existing permitting processes for important community projects rather than rehashing old conflicts devote resources to support our fishing and visitor industries transition to second growth logging invest in creating and maintaining recreation infrastructure.

I urge the Forest Service to prioritize the voices of Southeast Alaskans over those of our political representation and corporate interests. Choosing a full exemption will not create a long lasting, durable solution for roadless areas on the Tongass. It will only increase the legal challenges, uncertainty for businesses, and conflict on the Tongass going forward.

Thank you,  
Kimi Eisele