Point Baker Community Association P.O. Box 31 Pt. Baker, AK 99927

Dear Mr. Stewart.

I regret to inform you that The Point Baker Community Association is objecting to your decision on the Prince of Wales Landscape Level Analysis. We appreciate that your planning team accommodated our communities request that we have opportunities to be involved in the scoping and comment periods outside of the POWCAC meetings. Please pass along our thanks to your staff who made the effort to visit our Village.

We do however object to your selection of alternative 2, even with it's modifications, for several reasons.

We believe that the amount of old growth harvest planned over the next 15 years will be detrimental to our subsistence deer harvest. The mitigation measures which you included in your decision, those being, no logging of old growth north of the 20 road, or within VCU 5280 are not adequate to sustain our deer harvest. When we requested protections for those areas it was in conjunction with our qualified support of alternative 5. Crucial to our community is and has always been the conservation of the remaining old growth on the Island. We were willing to accept some old growth logging for small value added timber businesses, but we did feel that the "north of the 20 road" and VCU 5280 areas were very important to us and worthy of protection even with the much reduced old growth harvest of alternative 5. In short we would say that protecting our subsistence uses in those areas is mitigation for past over harvest on the north end of POW. Those protections are not going to mitigate future over harvest of old growth on the north end.

We also agree with the Alaska Department of Fish and Games assessment of the 5 alternatives in their June 14, 2018 comments. Of alternative 2 they comment that it "has the highest level of old growth harvest. Consequently, it will result in the greatest loss of productive wildlife habitat and have the greatest effect on populations that depend on that habitat. Considering that significant additional harvest is anticipated on non-federal lands in the POWLLA area and the full cumulative effects of that old growth harvest on wildlife populations and wildlife users will not be realized for several more decades, ADF&G encourages a more conservative approach". Of alternative 5 they say it "would have the fewest detrimental effects on old growth associated wildlife populations and users of those populations."

We think that the Forest Service should pay attention to the assessment of ADF&G wildlife and habitat biologists. We also think that you should pay just as much, if not more attention to the assessment of local residents. There are many very subtle and slow changes to the forest ecosystem and it's dependent wildlife that have been observed and experienced by generations of local users. Traditional ecological knowledge is now being recognized for it's value in resource management. Scientists study the environment, we live it.

We also object to another decision you made regarding the use of herbicides to control invasive species. We are very concerned about even the slightest potential of harmful chemicals being introduced into our food chain, either aquatic or terrestrial. We also

point out that since the discussion began on the use of herbicides there have been new developments concerning the risks from the main ingredient, glyphosate, found in the most common herbicide. Glyphosate was determined to be a likely carcinogen in a recent lawsuit against Monsanto corporation. Given this new information we urge you to reverse your decision on means to control invasive species.

Thank you for considering our objections.

Dave Squibb Point Baker Community Association Chairman

12/15/2018