

Administrative

Comment # Comment

- 0001-002 The cumulative impacts on the entire Peninsula (Eastern Kenai) have not been addressed
- 0003-001 I have learned that the oil spill Council plans on turning 100 acres in Landlocked Bay into a State Park. I am a private owner in Landlocked Bay and strongly protest this! Please help me stop this fee acquisition. It will ruin my and the other private land owners use and enjoyment of our land. There are many more suitable bays in this part of PWS that do not have private land ownership that could be developed for a state park! PLEASE HELP ME.
- 0005-003 Qualitative impacts must be evaluated and not ignored, i.e. logging on adjacent lands to the National Forest.
- 0010-001 A portion of Chugach National Forest is located within the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage. Of particular interest to the Municipality is the Turnagain Arm area. The Municipality of Anchorage and the State of Alaska recently developed land management plans for its land holdings and areas of jurisdiction within this area. They are the Girdwood Area Plan and the Turnagain Arm Management Plan, respectively. We urge that any activities proposed for National Forest lands within the Turnagain Arm area be consistent with these two plans.
- 0010-002 The Municipality of Anchorage is also responsible for regulating the use of private land holdings and interests within Portage and Twentymile River Valleys. As such we are interested in any activities the Forest Service may consider on its lands that may impact the use of private lands in the area.
- 0012-002 Full public involvement before each unit of development (including logging or road-building).
- 0012-003 (If a Plan can say "The USFS will follow NGPA," it should!
- 0012-005 Management for biological diversity includes statistically designed monitoring--baseline before impacts, then follow-up. Require statistically-designed assessments before logging (even salvage logging)
- 0014-002 A second reason to withdraw the list is that much of the land covered by some of the listed areas is owned by the State of Alaska or by private parties. To include these lands in a federal restrictive designation is asking for conflicts and problems in the future.
- 0014-004 Fourth, covering private or state lands and valid existing rights (VERs), including mining claims, in W&SR designations will greatly increase the difficulty of the USFS to manage the affected areas of federal land. Every possible attempt should be made to not include VERs in any such designation, and existence of such VERs should be a strong basis for not including an area.
- 0014-005 Finally, the very act of studying areas in Alaska for addition to any form of conservation system unit (CSU), including Wild & Scenic Rivers, is illegal since the passage of ANILCA. ANILCA stated that there were to be "no more" set asides, unless specifically authorized by the Congress. Studying forests for new land management plans is allowed but studying the forests for inclusion in CSUs is not. Some would argue that only "studies... for the single purpose of considering the establishment..." are prohibited. Such a narrow interpretation would mean that any time a land management plan was being revised, the area could be considered for any of the six or more types of CSU designations. This was clearly not the intent of ANILCA. It is now our understanding that the notice of revision is also a notice of scoping for the EIS that will be written to support the Revision. This is not clear from the notice. Some of these areas have been mined almost continuously up to 100 years. We again urge you to withdraw this list.
- 0015-003 I believe Tongass & Chugach forest should be for multi-use, including recreation. I personally prefer recreation must include wilderness & not all recreation use be commercial - such as providing ski lift & boat ramps.
- 0020-003 3) Stop all habitat manipulation for fish and wildlife. This is not Forest Service responsibility, it is Alaska Fish & Game.
- 0020-005 Water quality is the responsibility of State of Alaska.
- 0021-004 #4. Of course the current travel mgmt. plan needs revision, the number of users wanting access via roads, trails, etc., is skyrocketing. Let the people (owners) get to their park lands.
- 0021-005 #3. Keep the 1.7 million acres from the '84 plan wilderness. Open up the other 4,000,000 acres. This is the people's land. Let them use it.
- 0028-007 The rising human population will add pressures on you and on the Forest and I see it as necessary that you anticipate
- 0037-001 Manage the Chugach Forest for fish and wildlife. Cooperate with the State of Alaska Department of Fish and Wildlife in protecting fish habitat and managing wildlife.

Comment # Comment

- 0039-001 Any forest management plan, especially one that involves a national forest with its competing interests, should manage for biological diversity as the utmost concern. Recreation, timber harvesting, etc. should play a secondary role to maintaining biological diversity. If diversity of life systems is considered most important, then the competing interests of recreation, tourism, timber harvesting or other uses will fall into place. If biological diversity is primary, then vegetation management will be done with a progressive point of view. The management will reflect what is good for maintaining the life systems, not what is good for timber interests. This sort of management requires reflection, honesty, and a concern for higher values beyond profit, greed bred by dishonesty and misplaced values. I worked for the Alaska Lands Act many years ago and have visited the state.
- 0043-002 Recreation should be encouraged but those who use the resources should pay for that right. The Forest Service should make a concerted effort to collect fees for recreation and tourism. Use that money to manage and protect area from abuse. Make sure there are controls in place.
- 0046-001 Definition, Separation and enforcement of motorized and non-motorized recreation use areas within CNF.
- 0049-001 Designations of "Wilderness Areas" and "Wild and Scenic Rivers" restricts management of the resources.
- 0052-004 Keep the emphasis on minimally developed recreation, wildlife & long-term conservation.
- 0054-003 Humans can not "manage" forests, fish or wildlife. They can only manage human behavior. Most life forms were doing better before humans arrived. As the human population continues to increase, open space with its fish and wildlife will be Alaska's most important economic resource.
- 0057-001 I responded for Anchorage Audubon. Please keep me on your list as an individual
- 0058-001 Mountain Bike & Hiking Trails Cabins in remote sites - put these back in Seward or Anchorage for Reservations. This new reservation system is absurd. I feel \$25 was very adequate for 1 night's use.
- 0060-001 Listed below, Gentlemen, IS POSITIVELY WHAT IS IMPORTANT TO ME AND IS ALWAYS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE OVERWHELMING MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, and they are NOT listed in the order of their importance. - The multiple use of our forest natural resources has been TIME-TESTED and serves BY FAR the best interests of the American people. Any propensity to the contrary - BY ANYONE - that serves special interest groups, especially those that espouse Socialist/Marxist ideologies contrary to free enterprise, can only result in furthering discontent, frustration, animosity and fragmentation of our social structure. And let there be NO DOUBT in anyone's mind this has already reached to a point in our beloved America to cause great concern to thinking people!
- 0061-001 Can't comment without the plan.
- 0069-008 The Chugach National Forest is truly unique among our National Forests. It is mostly composed of wilderness, yet is accessible to the largest urban area in the state and is visited by thousands of Alaskans and non-Alaskans every year. Keep it, as it is, as much as possible. Let nature take its course and manage it only to protect it from further
- 0070-001 The new plan should stress the long term recreational and tourist goals fostered by leaving the forest in as natural a state as possible. Roadless, unlogged areas, scenic rivers, no motors, hopefully fewer snow machines, minimal hunting, catch and release fishing (except salmon) are the true valuable resources the Forest can provide. Better management is costly and senseless - forget it.
- 0074-001 The National forests were created to ensure the Nation a continuing resource of Forest Products. With proper scientifically based management by professional foresters CNF can and should have this role. There are numerous additional uses which are compatible with timber/pulp extraction, such as hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, some mining, hiking, camping, boating and winter sports including snowmobiling and skiing. The protectionism commonly proposed by urbanites is not a compatible use for a National Forest. If CNF is to be managed for preservation/wilderness values then it should no longer be a National forest but instead be transferred to Park Services. If you want to manage a National Forest, then manage it AS a National forest - not as "a Park in Forest clothing". Management should be by professionals competent enough to ignore the hysteria of the masses, those
- 0076-002 (3) For the Chugach to take a more pro-active approach with the public.
- 0078-001 (1) Please hold scoping hearings in Valdez after the summer tourism & fishing seasons are over - i.e. after Sept. 20th.
- 0078-003 (3) Developing policies to resolve conflicts between fishing, tourism, loggers & the needs of local residents and a clearly understood decision-making process & criteria that the public can participate in.

Comment # Comment

- 0082-001 I would like to take this opportunity to tell you I am strongly against you developing new terrain at Turnagain Pass. I realize the need for services, i.e. toilets, but must you have a multi-million dollar glorified McDonalds! In the short run it saves you \$, in the long run it costs us our forests. I live in Moose Pass. When I leave Anchorage, there is nothing more welcoming then coming into Turnagain Pass and looking at that beautiful valley. Portage is already developed - Use It!- and it's only a 10 minute ride! If you MUST do something, why not use the parking lot on the East (skier) side. It is barely used - it's already paved - don't tear up Lyons Creek! I'm very disillusioned with the present Fore\$t \$ervice!
- 0086-002 There is a demand for more services at Turnagain Pass for use by recreationists and those just driving through. There is no need to develop a new site for these services, which could be provided at the current summit area.
- 0087-001 The proposal special use permit for a lodge at Turnagain Pass was not thought out very well. - It seems that all the Forest Service wants is to have somebody take care of their bathrooms - Decal the existing land & outhouses to DOT and have them do it. The F.S. should not be in the bathroom business.
- 0091-001 Thanks for this opportunity to comment. I think the most important item and probably the hardest to define is to be able to keep & use the land that was set aside for the people, not just to look at, but to touch it & use (not abuse) it as it was (is) meant to be. There are so many people that say 'this is your land but. . . you can't set a foot in or on it'. How can land truly be anyone's? If there are good guidelines for usage, then it should be used. If it is "locked up" then we cannot enjoy and grow ourselves and we will not be able to teach our children to use the land and the animals & plants that dwell therein wisely. If we cannot teach our children that, then we have lost a part of ourselves that can never be replaced no matter how much we as mankind progress.
- 0094-001 I feel it is important to manage the Chugach National Forest for it's wilderness characteristics, along with its importance for providing valuable fish and wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities within a wilderness setting. Wilderness and the opportunity to enjoy it will only become more uncommon in our increasingly over-populated world and our Federal Lands should be and will be the most important place to find this precious resource.
- 0098-001 Increased timber harvest and reforestation of timber areas.
- 0099-002 2. Immediate cessation of all extractive commercial activities (for all groups ie; native & other Americans) within the
- 0099-004 4. It's time to place limits on human impact in the Forest. NO MORE SELLING OUT!!!
- 0106-005 No new developments unless all your current facilities (trails, cabins, campgrounds, intrep, etc...) are up to par.
- 0109-001 I do not trust the U.S. Forest Service to take care of the U.S. Forest lands. The U.S. Forest Service is under the influence of timber, logging people. The U.S. Forest Service should consider the fishing industry, recreational users before logging - clear cutting forest lands. Also, the taxpayers should not be paying to have the U.S. forest lands
- 0115-001 Dear Friends, In the year 2050 what will my grandchildren find in the Chugach National Forest? Clear-Cuts? Roads, logging trucks, saw mills? Gunmen hunting down the wildlife for "sport"? Noises such as rifle fire and snowmobiles and other inventions that will be invented in the meantime to destroy the silence and terrify the wildlife? People, evermore people trampling the footpaths and roads? Campgrounds? Litter? No longer a Chugach ecosystem? Friends, I fear that is what my grandkids will find -- all of it, and more. And I dread it. Yet between now and 2050 you will be chasing after "goods and services", and therein lies the inevitable. I don't know how you can stop it; please tell me. All good wishes.
- 0116-003 Ecological ecosystem management.
- 0118-004 3) Large-scale commercial logging should be discouraged by limiting the size of timber sales and by eliminating road building subsidies. 4) Clear cutting should be eliminated.
- 0118-006 Selective cutting should be strictly enforced for certain tree diameters only where cutting is allowed
- 0120-001 (1) It is important that the Forest Service continues to keep an open mind and balance the use of the forest between all user groups. Any special interest group which is greedy and selfish to the point of wanting other groups banned from using parts of the forest should not considered since the forest is there for all to use and as U.S. citizens we should all have equal use of the land.
- 0122-001 Trails are very important to me. While I would love more of them, I am concerned that there won't be any money to maintain them.
- 0122-003 Something needs to be worked out with State of AK DNR to prevent a growing conflict between the cross-country skiers, snow machines & miners. Maybe some agreement like the one in Turnagain Pass might work.
- 0123-003 (3) Put resources into maintaining existing trails & cabins not into building more.

Comment # Comment

- 0127-001 (1) ILLEGIBLE carbon, which was recently burned down, needs to be replaced, as very other carbons ILLEGIBLE is added. Unfortunately the expense is prohibitive
- 0128-001 Don't give away the farm; that is, abandon the application of multiple use principals in favor of the imagined interests and needs of tourism and recreation (read preservation vs. non-extractive uses). The anti-use reactionaries are not representative of the intelligent public that is well informed as to the fundamental role of national forests and the economic as well as aesthetic resources they contain. As a forester whose entire career was interpretation related, I am well aware that, serious minded citizens, until they are tainted by the propaganda of the 'tree huggers', are supportive of the lands of many uses idea. That the public generally is becoming increasingly concerned that husbandry of all resources needs to be on a sound ecological footing is a plus, which, however, doesn't amount to much of a change from long established silvicultural practice. The Forest Service, in part through its research arm, has continually looked for and initiated better ways of managing the renewable, resources: Management prescriptions are constantly subject to change based not only on forest science but on the changing needs of society. There continues to be outstanding opportunities for managing large areas of the Chugach for timber production. While acknowledging that most observers of clearcut areas consider this a destructive practice (some people will never learn, or, rather, may never be reached with correct information presented clearly and competently) it would be prudent to limit timber operations to areas out of sight of roads and traversed waterways. Also, in order to educate the public about the science and practice of forestry, it would be prudent to establish demonstration timber harvest areas that are effectively interpreted and publicized. The imagery of incompetence, distrust, and insensitivity that is attributed by the reactionary preservationist crowd to foresters and the Forest Service generally is a deliberate distortion of reality. Because they don't know better, many of the most influential political leaders at all levels pick up the same cudgel as they join the anti-timber and other resource use camps. For this reason, it is essential that the Forest Service and its friends change this attitude by conveying through use of all media straight forward, honest, impressive accounts of appropriate and effective resource management. I see no mention in the Forest Plan material for a most fundamental need related to planning, management, and public use. This need is knowledge, education; interpretation. A constructive relationship between the agency and the public cannot be achieved without understanding. The Forest Service must be impelled to keep the public informed on a continuing basis and not as defensive reaction. From my point, of view, as a long retired federal employee, it is rare that I see an interesting, informative, and pleasing story about foresters, forestry, and national forests. Some Regions, the Alaska Region being one, don't even keep in touch with their retirees, who most certainly should qualify as advocates or, perhaps champions, of the outfit. As for the Interpretive Services function on the Chugach, the story told at the Begich-Boggs Visitor Center, while very interesting in itself does little to tell the larger story of the Chugach; Wherever appropriate, as aspects of multiple use the resources of timber, wildlife, water, minerals, and
- 0128-002 Does the Forest Interpretive Plan adequately incorporate all aspects of the Forest mission?
- 0129-001 To ensure by diligent participation and acceptance on the part of CNF that "Quiet" users deserve an outdoor experience devoid of unnatural and intrusive sounds such as from motors. Non-motorized recreationalists deserve equal and equally valuable (accessible, scenic, etc.) areas in which to enjoy CNF. Mapping and discussing these areas will be necessary, along with, I'm sure, some agreeing and disagreeing with motorized user groups over land designation. We'll look forward to working on this
- 0131-001 The name Forest Plan indicates that the main thrust is forest. In that context is the future of life for the forest; for life of this planet; for the life of earth's inhabitants; Therefore the chief issue is forests. Now to preserve forests, the source of life. This preservation is accomplished by not clear cutting. By elimination of pollutants by study and research in maintaining healthy forests. By permitting introduction of compatible species of all life within the boundaries and keeping of all current species, with prudence. Keep the main attention on maintaining all forests as the foremost program in Land Management.
- 0135-001 For the record... most important is that all lands within Alaska be turned over to Alaska (management & ownership). The USDA Forest Service & BLM should be removed from all 50 sovereign states. Federal land jurisdiction within the states are defined in the United States Constitution of America under Art. 1, Sec. 9, #17... any federal laws, statutes, or regulations do not pertain to the Sovereign Citizens of the Sovereign States. Remember that the constitution was written to "control" government not the people. The people are sovereign, government is the "people's" servant.
- 0136-001 Limiting Vehicle Access
- 0136-002 Limiting concessions in the park.
- 0136-005 If Applicable creation of a retriever area nonclosure of areas to special interest groups unless they are granted "user only areas"

Comment # Comment

- 0137-001 I am bothered by the use of "the ability of forest ecosystems to supply goods and services in response to society's demands." The greatest value Chugach National Forest has to society is in its undisturbed natural beauty. I believe it is important that this is understood, because it can help you determine how you will "manage" the forest. Came to Barrow to see the impact of unlimited humanity on the tundra. Go down to the lower 48 and imagine the beauty of the ILLEGIBLE states before civilization began its demands of goods and services.
- 0139-001 I am very concerned that for Exxon Valdez trust monies are being used to develop tracts of land in the sound-in Landlocked Bay in particular, for park purposes. This under the guise of "habitat protection". None of the impact statements I have reviewed make mention of this proposed development only "maintain habitat", "protect area and habitat", "prevent damage to cultural resources" "Protect subsistence uses" PLEASE HELP STOP THIS FRAUD AND UNDERHANDED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY! I am a landowner in landlocked Bay and request your assistance in this
- 0140-001 Good trails. Clean campgrounds & toilets.
- 0143-001 I am writing to make comments during the scoping period for your Chugach Forest Land Management Plan. Here are my comments: the Chugach is one of the few national forests without a single acre of designated wilderness. I recommend that you make protection of existing roadless areas and designation of them as wilderness a top priority in your planning process.
- 0144-001 As you proceed through your planning process, I feel it is extremely important that you recognize and integrate the Chugach plan with other land plans on adjacent and intermingled lands. In the Cooper Landing area these include: 1. Kenai River Special Management Area Plan, State Parks 2. Kenai Area Plan, State DNR 3. Upper Kenai River Plan, USFS, State Parks, Fish & Wildlife 4. Kenai Borough Land Plan, Cooper Landing Advisory Planning Commission Activities such as Timber Harvest, Recreation, Track & Roads, Fish and Game Management, and resource protection are not confined to one ownership, but must be coordinated with adjacent land managers.
- 0146-004 - The new forest plan should not be based on opinion polls. Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived impacts to the forest.
- 0146-007 - The Forest service should incorporate a tourism strategy into the new plan in order to accommodate growing numbers of visitors. The plan should provide for new visitor opportunities.
- 0146-008 - Currently 98.8% of the Forest or 5,376,400 acres is inventoried as roadless. The 1984 Forest Plan recommended Wilderness designation for 1,703,000 acres -- 31% of the Chugach. The entire Congressionally designated Wilderness Study Area, 1,972,200 acres, is currently managed to retain its wilderness values. Oppose federal Wilderness designations in the Chugach. Alaska already contains 57 million acres of designated Wilderness -- 62% of all federal Wilderness in the U.S. More federal Wilderness will mean fewer recreational opportunities and multiple
- 0148-001 I would like to see Congress from the Copper River Delta into a National Wildlife Refuge. Can the Forest Service help make that happen?
- 0148-003 I would like to see more educational & non motorized recreational activities happen through the Forest Service.
- 0149-001 Prince William Sound is changing; changing rapidly and not for the better. Every year the concerns voiced by our staff grow more desperate. Stories of trampled vegetation, trash, missing wildlife and overcrowding reflect the increasing pressure on the ecosystem. hopefully, the long awaited revision of the Forest Plan will play a significant role in reversing this trend. The preliminary revision topics successfully identify the critical issues threatening the health of the forest but there are specific topics necessitating close scrutiny in the development of the alternatives.
- 0149-003 Secondly, as a result of already significant use increases, there are limited options for remote wilderness opportunities. The Forest Service needs to take a proactive approach to uphold the qualities of the Wilderness Study Area. As a result of complex land ownership ILLEGIBLE, preservation of the Wilderness Study Area will require
- 0154-006 All National Forest lands should be available for suitable multiple uses, subject, of course, to necessary environmental stipulations.
- 0156-005 A concession for hut-to-hut skiing would be a great asset for CNF.
- 0158-001 If it ain't broke don't fix it. This country is being strangled to death with regulations. I am tired of losing my freedom bit by bit. My freedom is being lost due to things such as this crap. The Forest Service should take care of our forests and be left alone to do so. If the government could be trusted to keep promises it might be ok, but they cannot be
- 0161-004 You're trying to take away the rights of children & their children to utilize the land. Management of land is not only protection. I do not support any wild & scenic river designations nor any more restrictions of land use in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0163-002 I want an allowable sale quantity of less than 5 million board feet per year

Comment # Comment

- 0165-001 The Chugach National Forest was established as a multiple use preserve. It should continue to be managed that way.
- 0165-004 If recommended at all in this plan, new wild and scenic river designations should be recommended very sparingly. Although Congress may not act for many years on any such recommendations, for management purposes such a recommendation can be a de-facto designation, just lacking the act of Congress. The Forest Service needs to be fully aware that by recommending a new wild and scenic river designation within the Forest they may be precluding many other compatible types of multiple uses.
- 0165-007 The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council has acquired many Native corporation lands within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest. Most of these lands will be managed by the Forest. It would seem that as a component of its overall management plan the Forest should address specifically how these particular lands will be managed.
- 0165-009 The Forest Service should recognize that the primary estate is the subsurface estate. On the considerable land holdings where the Forest Service has acquired management over just the surface estate, it needs to have a working arrangement with the subsurface estate landowner. A plan for managing these split-estate lands should be a part of the overall land management plan.
- 0165-010 All too often in the history of Alaska actions have been taken by the federal government which have had inadequate preparation and analysis, and which turn out to negatively impact the local communities. Don't let that happen here. Please intimately involve your local communities and landowners as you make decisions on how the lands in their back yards will be used.
- 0171-001 I am a 17 year Alaska resident, a writer, videographer, naturalist and carpenter. For twelve of my years in Alaska, I have resided near enough to Chugach National Forest for many explorations into this beautiful and powerful wild region. Over the last year I have been active in public education and input regarding State Park developments at Bird Point along Turnagain Arm. I co-produced a short video: Bird Point -- A Rare Jewel in Our Hands which advocates for careful and sustainable developments at Bird Point. It is exciting that a now forest plan for the Chugach is being developed at this time. I have not had much time to research the current plan, or the course of development for the now forest plan. As a result I do not know what has already been established relative to my requests for new management opportunities and directions. Over the last few years I have been writing about the ideas outlined in these comments. This is the first time I am sharing them in writing beyond my computer screen. The work I have been doing falls within a public land management direction I call "soft land management." I believe the concepts and relationships I am describing here are fairly unfamiliar within the context of traditional public land management plans. Because of this a substantial portion of my comments is an explanation related to the specific request I have for the new forest plan. At this stage I will simply share these ideas with you in a general sense. Details can come later, as desired. As the process continues. I will be delighted to further correspond and meet with Forest Service management.

Comment # Comment

- 0171-002 What I want to see included in the new forest plan is a window, or an opportunity for future developments, of what I am terming: "Bioregion Research and Education Areas". A BRE area as conceived, is, a scaled down wilderness area designated specifically for public research and education. The focus is human and societal development through interaction with the aesthetic resources of intact wild regions. The long range vision is for individuals and groups to have opportunities to make personal journeys or pilgrimages if you will, into places of natural beauty and power. Here they will have a range of choices for professional guidance and infrastructure within fields of wilderness education, adventure, ecology, personal development, holistic healing. group dynamics, communications, mediation, wilderness survival and subsistence etc. BRE areas are conceived as public land use for training and education in many applicable disciplines or interests. As conceived, these BRE areas will be joint ventures involving federal and state natural resources agencies, public education and social service agencies, private sector businesses and nonprofits. The BRE areas will support local economies based on these joint ventures. I will use my own business as a hypothetical example of a joint venture project: A local small business called Evolution Communications works through information age technology and natural places of beauty and power to offer a variety of services in individual, family and community development. I and a consortium of other related small businesses work with the forest Service, and various State agencies to establish a retreat center and school of esthetics and whole human development in the natural setting of an intact old-growth forest ecosystem. Our clients range from business executives to high school drop-outs. The execs come to take off their suits and let go into a journey they forgot they've always dreamed of A magical journey under their own power into an enchanted wilderness where they reconnect with a sense of greater purpose in their lives, rekindle their spirit of adventure and discovery, and learn how to be kids again. The drop-out outs come to try on some new suits of personal power, integrity and interaction. The backdrop for all this is nature -- living, breathing evolving presence of being inseparable from ourselves, yet sometimes elusive in the lifestyles many people live. As conceived, the bioregions will be defined by natural borders of topography, waterways. ecosystems and habitats, and will be large enough to support a minimum level of peripheral human developments relative to nature research, education and interaction. The BRE areas will be complete watersheds of streams or rivers, from headwater ridges to ocean estuaries, inter-tidal zones and the coastal waters within National Forest boundaries. Each BRE will eventually have research and education facilities and low impact basic human need support services. The heart of the BRE is roadless, with minimal motorized access on the periphery. A primary research component of the BRE area is exploring, learning about and documenting the natural processes and functions of the bioregion in a whole systems methodology. The goal is for public immersion into the interaction of natural forces in an intact wild bioregion -- to understand and experience the interaction of earth, water, wind, energy and living things in a natural living laboratory. The focus is experiential learning and education about the natural forces around one and within. The BRE area is specifically managed for these purposes. It's tourism and recreation with a decided focus. The education component of the BRE area is the constantly evolving product of the research and development programs. As conceived, it will be an interconnected, modular and diversified education curriculum for various components of society. In a natural intact wild region there exists a powerful, beautiful, dynamic spiritual energy and presence. It is the living creation in which we all live. Within natural intact human beings there exists this same energy and presence. A primary goal of the BRE area and "soft management" policies is to assist people in establishing or re-establishing their connection to nature -- within themselves and in common with the people and world around them. This is a general description of a fairly extensive management direction and discipline. It is what I am inspired to involve myself in. I believe the time is right for such use of public land, and that an Opportunity is before us to pioneer these new directions with the revision of the forest plan for the Chugach. I am at your service for further developments along the lines of the scenarios I have described here. The important thing to establish now, and what I am asking for in the new forest plan is a written policy window enabling future designation of one or BRE areas (watersheds) in the Chugach, As the comments review team, WHAT DO YOU THINK? Please let me know your recommendations for how to proceed from here. Perhaps you can pass on these comments to various people in the Forest Service who would be interested in working with me on these management directions. Please write back to me with your feedback and recommendations. I will be
- 0172-002 I would also urge that you consider only actual established scientific data in your deliberations regarding the Chugach. Do not succumb to the easy rout of reliance on "popular science" designed for PR impact based on emotional appeals. The Chugach is too valuable as a multiple use area for all people to allow it's management to be influenced by unscientific suppositions of a few. Thank you for your time and consideration regarding these comments. Please place me on whatever mailing lists you have for future updates.
- 0177-007 Most importantly, the plan should require all environmental studies and statements to account for cumulative impacts of indirect effects, and actions should reflect them.
- 0178-001 11. Multiple Use -- the apparent direction of the Chugach National Forest has been towards management for a single or restricted uses; it is important that this revision of the plan identify areas that are appropriate for: management for timber harvest and the maintenance of forest health, - oil, gas and mineral development, - habitat management for a high level of subsistence hunting, fishing and gathering, - and destination
- 0178-004 3. It is increasingly important for there to be cooperative management agreements and cooperation between the Forest Service and the various Native corporations whose lands are adjacent to Forest Service lands. Provision should be made for coordinated planning for access and development where appropriate, as well as expedited property exchanges and use permits.
- 0178-005 4. The communities of Prince William Sound are dependent on the National Forest for many aspects of their existence; meetings to provide opportunities for effective input on localized elements of the plans should be held in

Comment # Comment

- 0178-007 - cooperative planning with both the State of Alaska and private landowners should be a priority of this
- 0178-008 - is emphasis should be, on access for multiple uses including future resource development
- 0178-009 Many of our shareholders live within the Chugach National Forest some of this Corporation's future business development will occur on lands adjacent to Chugach National Forest lands; it is therefore important that the revision of the Forest Plan incorporate management decisions that fully recognize the needs of those living and working within
- 0179-001 I am submitting the following comments regarding issues that The Tatitlek Corporation believes should be addressed during this Forest Plan revision process. 1. Multiple Use - the apparent direction of the Chugach National Forest has been towards management for a single or restricted uses; it is important that this revision of the plan identify areas that are appropriate for: - management for timber harvest and the maintenance of forest health, - oil, gas, and mineral development, - habitat management for a high level of subsistence hunting, fishing, and gathering, - and destination recreation.
- 0179-003 3. It is increasingly important for there to be cooperative management agreements and cooperation between the Forest Service and the various. Native corporations whose lands are adjacent to Forest Service lands. Provisions should be made for coordinated planning for access and development where appropriate, as well as expedited property exchanges and use permits.
- 0179-004 4. The communities of Prince William Sound are dependent on the National Forest for many aspects of their existence; meetings to provide opportunities for effective input on localized elements of the plan should be held in
- 0179-006 Many of our shareholders live within the Chugach National Forest, some of this Corporation's future business development will occur on lands adjacent to Chugach National Forest lands; it is therefore important that the revision of the Forest Plan incorporate management decisions that fully recognize the needs of those living and working within
- 0180-003 When river use becomes high not only is the system damaged and biological processes impacted but conflicts emerge among the user groups as well as antagonism toward the managing agency. I am sure that you are aware of some of these conflicts that exist on the Chugach and are attempting to deal with them, I hope to make you aware of others that exist now or will occur in the future.
- 0180-010 I also wish to offer that I am willing to serve on public advisory groups that you may wish to form, and I am always willing to talk with and meet USDA Forest Service staff concerning forest management and ecology.
- 0181-001 The name Chugach National Forest is just what it is - a forest that needs to be managed at a forest which includes harvesting trees. There can be multiple uses at the same time! There should be no changes made to set aside areas for wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, or roadless areas. We have enough of this nonsense now! If roads are built to access harvest areas, then they should be left to accommodate development opportunities.
- 0182-001 Concerned about the move away from multiple use on the National Forest - National Forest are for multiple use which includes, timber harvesting, and mineral development. Concerned that there is not a geologist on the planning team, would like to see a geologist on the team. Would like the Forest Plan to address minerals as a specific resource including planning for further access and development of mineral resources on the Chugach National Forest. Would like to see some areas of the forest designated for commercial logging, increased tourism facilities, and mineral
- 0185-001 Following are my initial comments in regard to the current "scoping" for a new plan for the Chugach National Forest. Like all things, the plan should "begin at the beginning". In this case any plans for the Chugach National Forest should be carefully scrutinized to determine if they conform to the basic mission of the U.S. Forest Service, which is that: No national forest shall be established, "except to improve and protect forests within the reservation, or for the purpose of securing favorable conditions of water flows, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for use and necessities of the citizens of the United States....." (from Organic Administration Act of 1897) Any alternative plan that takes away from this most basic requirement should be rejected. Please advise on the alternatives you develop, so I, as a practicing forester, can weigh the alternatives against this very simple criteria. The Chugach National Forest as a repository of replenishable natural resources, is in dire straits. Between lack of management, and mismanagement we are witnessing this once productive biome deteriorate in outputs of beneficial goods and services. We are witnessing in large areas the actual disintegration of the forest itself, in favor of some other form of vegetated landscape. This deterioration affects the economy of Alaska, and this nation, as negatively as it affects the physical environment. It is my sincere hope that good science (social as well as physical), and not bad politics, will come to the fore, and that the Forest Service, will recognize that they are stewards of lands that are expected to provide "many uses." (I really enjoyed the "Land of Many Uses" sips along the highways ... too bad they are gone).

Comment # Comment

- 0187-001 I work as an outdoor educator in Anchorage. I teach whitewater rafting, canoeing and sea kayaking mostly to people who live in Anchorage. I consider the following rivers and glaciers particularly important to recreational boaters: Sixmile Kenai River Columbia Glacier -- accessible by sea kayak Copper River (Upper & Lower) Since there are so many people that use these areas I would like to see managed growth. This includes: primitive camping areas, primitive launch areas, better river maps, more access to rangers, more human waste facilities (especially on the Kenai, Sixmile, at Chitna on the Copper. As a non-motorized boater (canoe & kayak) I am in favor of designated some rivers for non-power boat traffic only. It is also very difficult for rafters to raft through the fishing chaos on the Kenai during the summer fishing months. Sorry I don't have any solutions for this; I just recognize it as a problem. I'd like to see canoes and kayaks allowed on Portage Lake. Kayaks are allowed near all of the glaciers in PWS. I don't find mining and boating very compatible. I support all efforts to curtail mining on recreational rivers. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I am very glad to see the Forest Service becoming more involved in recreation and less
- 0188-001 Re: Land Management Plan for Chugach National Forest. As twenty-two year residents of Anchorage and frequent users of our state lands for recreation and occasionally business; my family is most concerned with the recent purchases of private land by the Exxon Valdez Trust money and other efforts to withdraw lands from their traditional multiple uses. Land in south central Alaska is in short supply when the recreational and commercial needs of our citizens are considered. We hope that your update of the Chugach National Forest plan will emphasize and encourage multiple use of these wonderful lands rather than following the "Exxon Valdez Trust" trend to use public resources to lock-up lands in preservation status. A complete social-economic study should be completed prior to any lands being withdrawn from multiple use status. We have locked away enough.
- 0189-001 Our primary concern is that the management of the Chugach seems to be turning away from the cardinal principle of national forest management - multiple use - and turning more and more to preservation and non-consumptive use.
- 0190-001 The current revision map does not appear to identify areas suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mining exploration. Is this an oversight? Or has the Forest Service already predetermined what is the best use of the land? Each year the Forest Service comes up with a new phrase for "Lock-up." Some years it is biosphere; at other times it "Wild and Scenic Designation." The residents of Cordova have hunted, fished and used the Chugach Forest for recreation as well as serenity. Any attempt by the Forest Service to further restrict access will be objected to by most of the Cordova residents. It is crucial that the U. S. Forest Service not impose a "Top Down" management plan. Each of the communities in the Prince William Sound is different and has different socioeconomic needs. I remain entirely unclear on how the Forest Service and the Exxon Valdez Trustees fit together. Because so little is known, the concern grows. How does this new partnership fit together? How do citizens fit in? The residents of the Prince William Sound must not be left out of the government's view of what is "best for them."
- 0191-001 Although the current revision of the Land Management Plan is intended to reflect the changes in environmental, social, and legal conditions that have come about since the original plan was initiated, there are several issues that need to be addressed. The current revision map does not address those areas identified as suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mining exploration. This information must be identified on information given to the public, so that the public can provide informed input into the revision process.
- 0191-002 The community of Cordova is home to the Tatitlek Corporation, and the Eyak Corporation and Eyak Village Corporation, subsidiary Native Corporations of the Chugach Alaska Corporation. It is imperative that the Chugach National Forest confer with these Native Corporations prior to the nomination of any river or glacier as eligible for Wild and Scenic status. The new conservation system units proposed by this nomination are prohibited by Title 1 and Title 13 of ANILCA. This proposition, as well as the roadless areas will result in less access to and through public lands in the future. The relationship between the Chugach National Forest and the Exxon Valdez oil Spill Trustee Council also needs to be addressed. The management of the acquired private land holdings needs to include the balance of increases in habitat protection with increases in resources available for development, as well as consideration of land exchanges with private parties to consolidate ownership within the National Forest. Residents of Cordova have hunted, fished and used the Chugach National forest for recreation for generations. The current revision needs to take this into consideration when the National Forest Service intends to place further restrictions. Gary Lehnhausen Chugach National Forest Planning Team November 14, 1997, Page 2 The residents of Prince William Sound need to be involved in the development of this plan. Each community will be effected differently by this proposed changes, and each community needs to have the opportunity to voice their concerns and recommendations. The current revisions to the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan must give the public the information necessary to provide the Chugach National Forest clear directive as to what types of access the Public deems appropriate and to ensure conservation and sound judgement when managing our public lands. The Chugach National Forest contains a vast wealth of natural resources, and all users of the National Forest must have the right to decide whether or not these resources are to be developed, and to what extent. The items addressed need to be taken into consideration during the scoping phase of the revision process. The current revision of the Land Management Plan will impact all residents near the Chugach National Forest. Your consideration of this during the scoping phase is greatly

Comment # Comment

- 0192-001 On behalf of the Valdez State Parks Advisory Council's committee on the Chugach National Forest Land Management Planning process, I am writing to request that the following information please be placed in the Valdez Library in a timely manner: 1) Forest Service directives or guidelines pertaining to Land and Resource Management Planning such as FSM 1900 - Planning: Chapter 1920 - Land and Resource Management Planning. 2) "National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning," Part 219: Subpart A- National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning, Federal Register, 36 CFR Ch. II (7-1-95 Edition); Federal Register 36 CFR part 211 subpart B, and any other materials pertaining to the land management planning process that have appeared in the Federal Register. 3) The most recent RPA Program for Region 10 including the Chugach National Forest. 4) The study showing the identification of purpose and need for revising the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan. (36 CFR 219.12(b). 5) The Planning criteria as developed under 36 CFR 219.121 (c). 6) The inventory data and information collected under 36 CFR 219.12(d). 7) Analysis of the management situation under 36 CFR 219.12(e). We are requesting that these documents be made available in Valdez because: a) Valdez is adjacent to the Chugach National Forest and the Chugach National Forest plays an important role in the town's economy and recreational opportunities; b) Since it takes 8 hours or more to drive to Anchorage in the wintertime, it would be a three day trip for Valdez residents to visit the Anchorage office and review these documents there; c) Since the Anchorage Chugach National Forest office is only open during week-days, it would be an economic hardship for most people in Valdez to take time off work to make the trip to Anchorage to see these documents; d) While people in Anchorage and the surrounding communities have been discussing the planning process with Chugach National Forest representatives for the past six months or more, no Chugach National Forest representative has yet visited Valdez to describe the process or solicit community input; and e) Valdez residents are interested in the Chugach National Forest Land Management Planning process and would like ready access to information available in the Anchorage office that can help them understand and participate more fully in the planning process. We appreciate that you have scheduled a meeting in Valdez for November 25, 1997. We request that you consider scheduling a follow-up meeting in Valdez for February or March to discuss the formulation of alternatives.
- 0193-004 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. Needs/desires of all aspects of our society IMPROVING THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION Think about the areas and issues of concern that you have just written about. With your concerns and interests in mind, identify an improvement to the Chugach National Forest management situation. An improvement may be an action, project, or management approach that you think would be both desirable and feasible. 1. Q. How could the Chugach National Forest management situation be improved? Is this a short term or a long term improvement? Describe the improvement - be as specific as possible. 1. A. Develop well planned access points for a broad range of individuals that would limit impact on the overall forest. 2. Q. Why is this improvement desirable? 2. A. Would provide controlled access and use by all citizens without serious impact on the existing forest 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? For example, who might be responsible for implementation? How might your improvement be funded? Be as specific as possible. 3. A. "National" forest would suggest federal funding, at least federal leadership 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? How might those obstacles be overcome? 4. A. Public misunderstanding of problem/lack of sympathy Federal Supervisors 5. Q. How does this improvement relate to other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation? 5. A. We see similar improvements in other locations as Seward highway
- 0195-002 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. Human beings are part of the ecological environment. Pass regulations protecting the environment but not restricting human access or use of needed resources. I want to be able to go camping or fishing or hunting. Build a campfire, walk on the land, not, just float by and look at it.
- 0195-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Animal habitat, watershed protection
- 0195-004 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. People who are willing to compromise. IMPROVING THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION Think about the areas and issues of concern that you have just written about. With your concerns and interests in mind, identify an improvement to the Chugach National Forest management situation. An improvement may be an action, project, or management approach that you think would be both desirable and feasible. 1. Q. How could the Chugach National Forest management situation be improved? Is this a short term or a long term improvement? Describe the improvement - be as specific as possible. 1. A. Allow for access with limited impacts. Allow campsites, campfires foot access off designated trails. Allow for road access in areas that would allow construction without (ILLEGIBLE) impacting animal habitat. 2. Q. Why is this improvement desirable? 2. A. People have the right to access their lands without restrictions as long as they are not violating pollution or animal use regulations. 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? For example, who might be responsible for implementation? How might your improvement be funded? Be as specific as possible. 3. A. Change the pro environmental viewpoint of the forest service land management plan. 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? How might those obstacles be overcome? . A. Current employee mindset. Change hiring policies to reflect the majority viewpoint.
- 0196-004 3. A. State/fed. grants B. Local/youth hire C. Local responsibility w/repairs or upkeep
- 0196-005 4. A. (1) Congress (2) Large eco terrorism groups
- 0196-006 5. A. See #2.

Comment # Comment

- 0197-001 Citizen Involvement - Land allocation decisions should be based upon human values. Once the public decides the best use for a piece of land then science can be use to specify how management is implemented Citizens will not support a management plan in which they have had no opportunity to express their values and hear how they relate to those of other people, to the law & to the capability of the land Significant effort must be made toward coordination with other Agencies so as not to be in conflict Native groups.
- 0198-001 1. A. Issues Portion, particularly New Motorized Rec & Fish Habitat
- 0198-003 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? For example, who might be responsible for implementation? How might your improvement be funded? Be as specific as possible. 3. A. Federally funded, local support. 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? How might those obstacles be overcome? 4. A. Money
- 0198-004 If this use is consistent with the desired "direction" of the lands and not contrary to habitat concerns.
- 0198-005 4. A. All views IMPROVING THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION Think about the areas and issues of concern that you have just written about. With your concerns and interests in mind, and feasible.
- 0199-001 The Specific Designations & Issues part of map are the most important
- 0199-002 Management Direction Citizens (input) & past Decisions have to be a part of the improvements
- 0199-003 You have to consider the users but looking at a 50 year picture you have to consider potential users also
- 0199-006 If NFS doesn't have a trail crew it could be done with volunteers as the state does in some areas
- 0199-007 Lack of will & money - It would be overcome by input deciding people wanted trails & money part could be mitigated by a volunteer program This would relate to the specific designations which might allow or not allow that kind of use.
- 0200-001 What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. Environmentalists/Fed/State regulators.
- 0201-005 Whittier Has very little Land, with AKRR./D.O.T. etc. . . we have a lot issues on our land improvements too many
- 0201-007 Community Input, How to Best design, for future Impact. 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. All Areas of Fed. State, Local
- 0202-004 views of community of Whittier (Do they want increased tourism supported by recreation opportunities. 2) Views of other proximate communities.
- 0203-003 A. Community needs, ie, development of Tourism or other industries close into local communities for the betterment of those communities. Community input for issues close into those towns
- 0207-001 Vegetation Ice field I would appreciate a new layer of data indicating Ice field and forested and the percentage of overall forest. Long Term Information accessibility is essential in easy reference for discussion
- 0207-004 A. US forest service political pressures to develop and produce needed resources. John Muir vs Pinchot - Direct study of preserved lands, conserved lands and Wilderness Areas. Chugach is massive being the 2nd largest. Why not be the best managed and the largest wilderness preserve within multiple eco zones.
- 0208-001 Managed as an ecological system instead of on a site to site basis - this is a long term improvement. Ecosystem Management will maintain health and natural resources into the future of the forest. A. Ecosystem management has been implemented in other forests - these could be used as models to follow. F.S. would be responsible, along with other agency biologists, for implementation Current mgmt practices are hard to change (ie old habits die hard). Possible lack of info on local system can make this improvement difficult to implement. - Dedication & positive changes by F.S. - gather necessary local info.
- 0209-001 Involve other governmental agencies (and organizations) in your learning-based search for better process. I assume that in the long run, the way you develop a management plan will be more important than the output. Socially, our problems are bigger than simply the Chugach, but you are making an excellent foray into better process that can be the seed of new paradigmatic thinking Seek alliances. Make room for people to be involved in your work at different levels (supporter, advisor worker . . .) with focus on learning good process. As the question becomes "How do we collectively improve the way we seek improvement?" we can expect a new quality of improvement.
- 0209-002 I'm concerned that people experience widespread meaningful involvement. I'm eager that "systems thinking become part of our common lexicon with positive connotations. So too for collaborative learning." I hope we all could become members of a learning - community. In the long run, your work needs to pass the non-gimmick test.

Comment # Comment

- 0210-001 Take the Landscape view - manage not only by watershed, considering all the issues collectively, but beyond even the borders of the Nat. Forest. For example brown bear habitat and logging (etc.) have to be analyzed in the context of the entire Kenai Peninsula. It is the only way to maintain the health of the ecosystem. . It seems that the primary change is in the perspective of the forest managers - the paradigm should be changed and this shouldn't cost very much - except for research . . . How might those obstacles be overcome? 4. A. Lack of understanding of system - need more research Lack of knowledge of other entities plans e.g. states' long term logging plans. Communication (interagency) very important! It can make connections with other agencies & organizations.
- 0210-002 All of the issues need to be addressed collectively/holistically in order for the Forest to be successful. For example, logging beetle killed spruce cannot be managed without considering brown bear habitat education of Joe Public during the whole planning process so that support is built over time. People who are currently out of the loop
- 0211-001 My concerns are that special interests with commercial use intent will become dominant force in management policy. Importance is our responsibility to preserve forest quality for future.
- 0213-001 Educate users as to how their use impacts Forest resources and other users. Forest Service implement education plan through schools, user groups, politicians etc. Change priorities, education is cheaper than remote restrooms, that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to build and maintain.
- 0213-005 Education a priority Promote good science over short term political gains
- 0214-001 (ILLEGIBLE) (More rangers) broken down into smaller areas. Both short & long. Each area could be (ILLEGIBLE) to manage.
- 0215-001 Continue a Collaborative learning process through the development of the Plan and implementation and monitoring phases of the Plan. People will come to appreciate that Public lands are theirs and mgmt. of those lands is also partially the publics responsibility. The Forest Service can support citizen participation groups with GIS Analysts, access to Forest Service Scientists and other materials & supplies. The main obstacle is that most people just don't have the time to be involved to a great extent in a 3 year planning process. All phases of Forest Mgmt. should be considerate of Human values, science and law. Citizen involvement that allows people to express their values for Forest resources and understand how they relate to others values. If sideboards of law and Bio/Physical limits are specified - then citizens should be involved in resource allocation decisions. Our public resource allocation decisions are (ILLEGIBLE) then the best science can be used to implement those decisions. How do we consider and involve and weigh the wants and needs of people in the lower 48? We must be able to coordinate with other land owners
- 0216-002 I have a home & business on the Kenai River. Environmental Education & concerns have always been important to
- 0216-004 All views should be considered - people with logical, rational concerns can hopefully reach a compromise.
- 0217-001 Change is occurring - so rapidly in our watershed that a meeting every 13 years is not often enough. Meeting more often on a specific issue might keep your job from being overwhelming. If we met in 1996 on logging and in 1998 on tourism, people might think/learn more completely about a subject. The 6th year, could be overview, then the 8th & 10th on issues again, like fisheries, transportation, etc. It would require working together with local governments, other agencies, nonprofits on a regular basis. Funding could be shared. Outreach to citizens would be a major goal, education on the issue would happen in small doses in a variety of media. Everybody has own turf & own areas of interest. It is the integration of expertise, interests & abilities that would make it work. People have to be allowed to think "long term" and "bit picture," and learn more, and make adjustments as prudent.
- 0218-001 A short-term improvement would be continued - dialog - with individuals interested in mgmt issues. This would involve developing some type of trust by demonstrated acknowledgment of issues raised. To get people involved from the outset rather than waiting until a decision is pending and then having outcries from anyone who hasn't been involved. Some mechanism by which people can see the results of coming to mtgs. (i.e. press releases i.e. T.V.,
- 0219-001 A. Agencies could agree to have different levels meet to draft a coordinated plan (while maintaining individual areas of expertise) A coordinated plan could address maintaining each (ILLEGIBLE) stability across boundaries as animals & people cross. Re: Education After listening thought - Go to senior citizen center as they can't safely get here for meetings . . . & think of the (ILLEGIBLE).
- 0220-001 Pay more attention to the unbiased (ie those not employed by a special industry) scientists on land use, planning, habitat, wildlife decisions etc. Agencies often have good scientists who know the areas/habitat very well. All too often their knowledge is disregarded in favor of an industry specialist who is paid to profess concepts/plans approaches that primarily benefit the industry needs.
- 0221-001 1. A. Discussion sessions need to be ongoing to keep up with constantly and rapidly changing forest use & need situations. 10 to 15 yr. intervals between management plan revisions will not keep up with changes.
- 0221-002 2. A. Undesirable forest activities will develop beyond the ability of management plans to control.

Comment # Comment

- 0221-003 3. A. Info gathering meetings could be held annually or biannually to encourage public involvement in evaluating success or failure of existing plan.
- 0221-004 4. A. It seems very likely that forest communities would be interested in frequent discussion sessions.
- 0222-001 By the use of Education. Long term improvement Making the forest and the situation knowledgeable to everyone - young & old.
- 0222-002 Out of site, out of mind - Everyone needs to be aware.
- 0222-003 Newspaper, Magazines, Schools, Workshops. Forest Division.
- 0222-004 None that I know of. Other than someone just doing it (time)
- 0222-005 Education would help & make the other points and issues clearer. Maybe finding answers.0
- 0223-002 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. That when plans & decisions are made, important issues are not considered. Just whats best for those involved forget the rest. Future.
- 0223-003 4. A. All. Not just those involved - All._save
- 0224-003 ORV registration fees. Tax on quiet recreationists equipment To a great extent, enforcement is a basic promise of a plan, and NFS should be budgeting for it, and prioritizing it over trail building, another visitors center, etc.
- 0224-004 Snowmobiles & ORVs sense that they are ill used by restrictions, and don't have enough access now. - Opposition to limits by manufacturers and industries that don't want areas to be designated "wilderness," or to take on those values in people's minds. Financial interests in Heli tour.
- 0224-005 5. A. None Comments of others: It seems reasonable to make some areas off-limits to motorized vehicles. There must be enforcement and the fees idea might pay for that. Closures are needed to reduce conflicts. Get motorized & nonmotorized together to discuss where each can operate.
- 0224-006 What each group needs - involve the forest service to develop management of access opportunities.
- 0224-010 What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. - Motorized recreationists & hunters - Industry supporting motorized recreationists - Tourist industry - Traditional lifestyle advocates - Communities dependent upon tourism - Essentially - all
- 0225-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Obviously whatever ends up in the CNF Mgt Plan will influence how these issues are addressed how they are resolved and to what degree they are impacted both on the CNF lands as well as adjoining public lands.
- 0226-004 Public participation & notification for both public meetings & IDT meetings. By fax or E-mail.
- 0226-005 More meaningful public participation in deciding outcomes on the forest. (salvage) It should be managed for long-term sustained use while maintaining the current values held by the current forest - or rather the integrity of the forest & the reason it is now a national (ILLEGIBLE)
- 0226-006 A fundamental way of thinking about national forest lands - overcome by public pressure - Realizing the Chugach is a different kind of forest, not a timber forest
- 0227-004 Establishing Important Migratory Bird Areas would be easy. Enforcing/policing would be harder, but (because of EVOs) there are many research vessels in PWS when USFS personnel could easily hitch transportation and visit PWS, and perhaps investigate adherence to buffer zone.
- 0227-005 Perhaps coordination with agencies involved with regulation of marine waters and tidal lands. By coordinate with other agency research efforts in PWS cost would be fairly minimal. This would also enhance coordination among those working in PWS.
- 0228-002
- 0228-001 The process of developing the plan - That developing the plants not included as an issue - River use, Kenai Lake use, tour boats out of Seward - More cabins, camp grounds: on road system, boat access -> Be able to maintain existing

Comment # Comment

- 0229-001 INDICATORS In this plan process, arrive at common ground of need for healthy ecosystems in the Chugach Forest. Develop indicators of how to monitor. Get agreement that these indicators are directly linked to ecosystem health. Indicators guide creation of management policies at all levels.
- 0229-002 More for concern & interest/talk w/others (ILLEGIBLE) Support of "big picture" of which is needed provides guidance to other agencies, user groups and even individual actions. Development of indicators is a substantive step in developing partnerships which are then key resources in maintaining ecosystem health in the forest. A circular & sustainable process. Attention (ILLEGIBLE) (ILLEGIBLE) goes to indicators & the overall health in view of competition
- 0229-003 It's hard for people to see the underlying patterns, structure in such complex issues. People don't know how to start. The vehicle is this USFS Plan Update Process - an expansion of the collaborative process to engage people in clarifying/identifying indicators.
- 0229-004 Look at watershed & watershed groups to create the plan. P.S. I'd like to have copies of existing plan available to get a sense of what works & what doesn't - what is left out & already included.
- 0229-005 A. EDUCATION across issues as an element of the FS mission, plan, management, budget, operations.
- 0229-006 Education is critical to move human attitudes toward sustainability & establish sense of place. Focus on communication with South central citizens rather than enforcement. Aim toward "peer policing" as our Coastal Trail now. Awareness of the big picture of why the CNF is a resource, a jewel, of global significance. Promotion of "ownership" by south central area. Establishes base for user fees & state agency contributions that can be significant fund (ILLEGIBLE). Provide volunteer opportunities that could (ILLEGIBLE) education like Earthwatch expeditions. Could be private (ILLEGIBLE). Education for tourists re wildlife & habitat values, contributes to global sustainability, Education of tourism vendors OVF values & needs so their ongoing use is sustainable.
- 0229-007 Time & budget for staff training & production of information pieces of staffing of citizen partnerships & public feedback about what is going on. Development of educational centers or partnership for use of existing facilities.
- 0229-008 AIM: Improve collab for the future of PWS. -> Hold an Open Space Mtg and personally invite known groups & interested parties as well as general public.
- 0229-009 Plan Revision can be catalyst & critical ingredient in educating re unique resource of CNF while simultaneously creating partnerships to support sustainability long term.
- 0229-010 One time event which seeds the air and will continue because relationships and contact are initiated. USFS can sponsor the meeting. All parties who came to these sessions should be asked to help by committing to get 5 or more other people to the meeting. Ask each USFS staff to personally invite/help reach out to the (ILLEGIBLE).
- 0229-011 Obstacle: apathy A way out: 1) make personal contacts & invitations 2) ask for a 1-time only participation - short term commitment makes it easier to come) (unlikely that those who come won't continue) to be involved
- 0229-012 Transformation - My concern: build community, change the world - Education about ecosystems - human interface with the physical & biological environment and training in systems perspective - shifts in attitudes to bigger scale (global) and bigger timeframe (multiple generations) includes: science interpretive work forest mgmt policy on role of
- 0229-013 Outdoor contact from perspective of significance and awareness of ecosystems has been demonstrated to be single most influential factor in changing attitudes and creating environmental (ILLEGIBLE). Ultimately, the greatest force in changing the future of the planet. Critical that USFS plan invite people to meet & learn sense of place. It does not happen by itself anymore in the (ILLEGIBLE) society. Move for mind map Talk w 4 others 40 min
- 0229-014 Research Writing/presentation Role of rangers & their training as communicators Underlying mission: to invite participation in the forest & its operations not to close it all up Budget - funding ideas & partnerships & interaction rather than (ILLEGIBLE) capital projects
- 0230-002 Dialogue between users. Understanding others interests.
- 0230-003 Set up a meaningful dialogue between different access proponents Examples might be: Snowmobile, ORV, helicopter, fixed way, nonmotorized, quiet rights. To seek meaningful resolutions. Might involve segmenting sections of forest or effecting timing, or, or . . .
- 0230-004 The collaborative approach applies well to many issues in the plan. The difficult part is segmenting these issues in a meaningful way & and into meaningful regions. For example: ORV use on the Copper River Delta is likely to have a very different set of constituents & user groups than say snowmobiling on the Kenai Peninsula, or helicopters out of
- 0231-001 Designate the headwaters of the Kenai River (under F.S. management) a special management area. Work with local citizens to determine what that might be.

Comment # Comment

- 0231-002 Local group offer to hold & advertise meetings inviting local interested organizations & citizen to agree in what a special management are for Kenai River headwaters may look like and how it will function. F.S. is always responsible for implementation but report for management approaches will come from local users. F.S. can help process by providing information & personnel. Local group should have own funding and should consider this
- 0231-003 Need to involve public in F.S. plan revision. -> Management of F.S. lands for protection of health of natural resources/ecosystem (among other things). -> Easier enforcement issues because of local buy-in.
- 0231-004 Management that protects ecosystem function to maintain biodiversity of forest & resources important to human communities (ie, salmon, tourism)
- 0231-005 Can the F.S. develop an education program that relates economic health to ecosystem protection.
- 0231-006 People -> community groups; diversity of users groups, ecologists, economists Views -> local uses of forest; how to maintain health of ecosystem, compatible economies uses & management
- 0232-001 Consider the possibility of charging user fees which would be kept by of the forest, i.e., fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing. This would mitigate the perverse incentives that now exist to choose logging/roading over other multiple-use activities & help promote ecosystem integrity. Under no circumstances would this approach be allowed to damage an ecosystem.
- 0232-003 Improvement would be self-funding but may require a change in federal law to get rid of road building subsidies & allow a wide variety of fees to be charged.
- 0232-004 This approach would have wide-ramifications which would allow the Forest Service to focus mgt. resources on service provision based on demand for services - i.e. amt. of fees paid in aggregate for a given service.
- 0232-005 Science Ecosystem integrity True citizen input to the planning process Ending federal subsidy to loggers for road building Collaboration among federal, state, native & local organizations in planning process
- 0232-006 A. Current incentives in Forest Service budgeting favor continued roading & logging & fire fighting rather than true multiple use of the forest.
- 0233-001 ZONING - Could happen in short-term. Designate areas that are quiet, and areas that are motorized. It allows both type of private and commercial recreational user to enjoy the forest, not just the motorized. No extra funding required, unless there is presently no funding for monitoring & enforcement. Lack of agreement that quiet areas should be designated. Talking together? Not only recreational user would be affected. Accessible wilderness, scenic beauty, and opportunities for quiet are rapidly being lost in southcentral Alaska. A large number of forest users are therefore being denied the opportunities to enjoy the forest.
- 0234-002 Multiple Use/No more wilderness (ILLEGIBLE) specifically says No More Wilderness
- 0234-003 Multiple use Native lands/development of long term jobs
- 0235-002 Focus on PWS - Work with others that are involved in PWS (Cities, other land owners).
- 0235-003 Divide Glacier District to have a management unit with a district ranger to manage PWS. To give info to USFS on current conditions, allow to monitor and manage for future.
- 0235-004 Help NOLS with bacillin studies on the campsite. in PWS. Cost share, foundation help. Allows use monitoring in combination with condition of land.
- 0235-005 Permit users in PWS who are camping - Fees to help pay for the management move. Teach specific outdoor skills and ethics to visitors. Increase Leave No Trace Education to users. I'm not sure - Forest supervision? Dividing current funds plus user fees for camping in PWS. USFS, NOLS, cost share, grants. USFS - camping fees. By cooperation with Leave No Trade, Inc., Foundations. By seeing the value in concentrating focus on PWS. Lack of funding at USFS. - Prioritize allocation - Partner with NOLS, Foundation. See the Value of Gaining Funding and Using Permitting to Provide Information on Use For Guiding Management Decisions. Lack of Knowledge about LNT, Inc. Lack of Funding Look for help - LNT Inc. Foundation.
- 0235-006 It helps simplify a complex set of issues that are on the Kenai and PWS by dividing them up for managers. It provides clearer information to base other decisions. It provides better information on use patterns and brings in funding. Helps in management - reduces need to clean up after users.
- 0236-003 Kenai - management of State/private land, they have the bulk of the problem.
- 0236-004 Provide additions, facilities, & access - disperse people.

Comment # Comment

- 0236-005 PWS - provide for commercial access/tourism but limit the numbers. F.S. does not manage the saltwater - states
- 0237-002 Scenery is not a sufficient goal. Scenery plus the whole outdoor experience of natural quiet, weather, wildlife needs to be in the equation. Scenery is what one gets from a tour bus and does not begin to describe the wilderness experience. Natural quiet needs to be in the management plan as a natural resource. Communities surrounding the
- 0238-001 Coordinate closely with state fisheries (wildlife and habitat managers) to incorporate the current understanding of issues (species) as well as coordinating future planning visions into the Forest Plan. This will allow managers from both federal and state to work together in planning and set a foundation for future issues resolution. Within this
- 0238-002 Fisheries and Fisheries management and activities that would affect fish habitat, access & mgt. I am the area biologist for sport fish division of ADF&G. In that capacity I need to be aware of activities and plans that may affect the major sport fish species. This will influence my decision and recommendations regarding research projects and management decisions. Logging -> habitat degradation Road building -> habitat concerns & increased (ILLEGIBLE) on specific population. Water quality. Tourism ("ECO") Access Motorized/nonmotorized Sport fishermen Guides & outfitter Logging industry Land owners/managers Floating lodges
- 0240-004 One improvement: The need to address consumerism as a way-of-life - as was done with cigarette smoking to reduce pressures on legislatures to allow non-sustainable timber cut quotas at expense of less destructive use values. Desirable Feasible Use an educational approach that shows the public exactly what is involved when stewardship of the forest is sacrificed to non-sustainable values. At stake is a national treasure which people from their particular view points don't see. If they saw the larger picture and how their use impacts it impossibly detriment always, they might be more willing to reexamine their practices to take account of the common as compared to their individual good. I think here we can learn much from the anti-smoking campaign which, in a relatively few years, focussed attention on the larger picture - the detrimental effect of second-hand smoke on the non-smoker. Once aware of the harm caused to air quality by smokers, public concern developed into a non-smoking campaign whose success, I believe, even surprised those who first proposed public smoking bans. Narrow vision & self-interest. Narrow vision - educational campaign as indicated above self-interest. Maybe leave a system of compensation in place for those whose living is impacted by a greater stewardship approach to the Chugach Forest. Make restrictions in use necessitated by stewardship more acceptable and palatable.
- 0241-001 Citizens - Present and Future Generations Wildlife all species - fish conservation for use by Citizens Recreation - both motorized and non-motorized - access in general Scenic Beauty through access and preservation. Polarization - pro-development vs. preservation not finding middle ground. I believe development forces have legitimate goals and can both economically and responsibly extract resources. Preservation will help to ensure future generations through wilderness etc. Limit such as no net loss. Science All concerned must accept compromise. One situation that must be addressed is litigation. Science that biologically looks at ecology of systems & species and disseminates information to Public. Set up some specific areas for commercial development - Salvage Logging, mining, road access development, motorized uses.
- 0241-003 Give citizens opportunity to exercise their rights without conflict, designation. It only involves small areas it would require compromise and create science for following phase. Stepping stone process. Trying to tackle too much at once. Mediation becomes necessary. Litigation must be removed involving principle and must address fundamental scientific concerns. They can be instituted to other areas of the forest and adapted to concerns specific to those
- 0242-001 The section of tourism that has gotten labeled "industrial" tourism, that occurs within Forest boundaries, that the Forest has no control over. It seems necessary to also communicate with the state or adjacent landowners to achieve some sort of shared vision for the area (particularly Prince William Sound).
- 0243-001 Citizen involvement - people only have so much time, it is only possible to coordinate schedules to some extent & people may burn out and get frustrated with how slow things move. Achieve informed consent in making resource allocation decisions.
- 0243-003 Wilderness Loss Zoning USA is one of a few countries that has public lands & Alaska is one of the few places where public lands still has wild areas that can be preserved into the future. It is near impossible to restore wild places once they have been developed.

Comment # Comment

- 0243-005 I hope that those members of the general public who cannot be involved feel like their interests and values are being represented by someone. I would like to have some form of rating system along the way to gauge how the public thinks each phase of the process is going. More quality and comprehensive citizen involvement in the planning process. Define study groups to identify alternative mgmt. scenarios that deal with some of the issues. Because it will improve alternatives developed in the plan, increase mutual trust and result in better decisions. Self appointed or group appointed leaders should organize these groups and F.S. will support as needed. The groups should not be made up completely of single interest members. These groups could remain in place to help implement the plan in the future as projects are implemented. Getting meaningful collaborative involvement from citizens. I don't know how citizens can commit to the time necessary to see that ideas, concerns & values are carried through the planning process to a final decision (ILLEGIBLE). If we fail in developing a method to allow for citizen collaborative throughout the planning process - then miscommunications will occur, mistrust will develop and the knowledge & experience of the general public will not be utilized. How can the Forest Service support citizens who are willing to work on Forest Management issues in a collaborative way? We must define the decision space then make sure that recommendation A. Community Leaders Conservation leaders Local Regional National Interest Groups Other Agencies & Land Owners & Native Corporations.
- 0244-003 Public Involvement Short term, life styles are always changing & we need to make changes to allow for this. Better notification, could some of these issues be voted on. It would allow those that take the time & effort to attend these work sessions see what impact they have.
- 0244-004 Open up access in areas that already exist & areas where the cost is fundable - Handicapped access User fees Rest Rooms. Handicapped access - there is a need.
- 0244-006 Need to focus on dividing areas to meet the needs. Motorized & Non-Motorized. Possibly expanding areas that are currently designated but allowing for change.
- 0244-007 If more access is available many of the issues that the people are concerned about, overcrowding, noise, Tourism, etc. would be addressed. Please keep me informed, & I hope to attend other meetings.
- 0245-003 You should purchase the land currently owned by Chugach Alaska Native Corp., and protect the entire watershed and eco-system. Chugach Alaska Native Corp. Buy the land as land swap. Is it possible to use Exxon Valdez Money
- 0245-004 The Chugach Nat. Forest should control all of the land in the watershed. This is a unique, pristine wilderness system and this entire area should be protected, Chugach native lands
- 0246-008 It seems important that our elected representatives somehow participate in these discussions by sending their staffers and occasionally participating themselves.
- 0246-009 I think it would be great if the Forest Service could somehow work together with local TV and with newspapers to somehow reach greater segments of the public. Public TV only reaches a specific audience. More input from the public at the beginning of the process is better than protests at the end of the process. Maybe have a call-in part of the program. Educating the public helps them make better decisions. Because public education & involvement in planning is so important to implementation of any plan. Talking only to organizations reaches only those people who join organizations and there are many other people out there who don't have a way they feel is useful enough to communicate their wishes so they feel they are disenfranchised. I think that in instances where government leaders educate & inform the public, the public becomes more involved. And when the public is educated about the other side of the coin, it becomes more reasonable. I know the networks or at least local radio stations will occasionally use their time for public issues. I guess it would be a public information officer who would implement the program with forest service specialists and others from the community addressing issues. Use sound bites on programs that viewers watch. Regular programming and profit-making would stand in the way. Perhaps the various interests could pool resources to defray part of the expenses. Educating and involving citizens relates to all areas of government. Understanding the needs and interests of other parties leads to more constructive problem-solving. Use internet Seek input early & often Recognize limits on citizens' ability to participate in time-intensive processes. Industries & special interest groups pay folks to participate - most others work, etc. A very big process does not guarantee citizen participation, may actually give bigger advantage to wealthy special interests.
- 0246-001 Keeping the forest in as pristine a condition as possible.
- 0246-002 It's also important to develop some recreational uses which allow people with different abilities and interests to enjoy parts of the forest.
- 0247-002 Duplication of govt. services in fish & wildlife.
- 0247-003 Cabin sites.
- 0248-001 By clearly and explicitly following ecosystem management principles. By properly measuring the economic value of forest resources, including non-monetary values. It needs to get (ILLEGIBLE) in terms of job created and begin looking at (ILLEGIBLE) costs (jobs lost). My general concern is that CNF follow an ecosystem management approach.

Comment # Comment

- 0248-004 Everyone's views must be considered, but (ILLEGIBLE) this mean the quality of response as well as quantity. With many public issues, I find outspoken advocates (ILLEGIBLE) non-issues.
- 0249-001 start managing the timber resource of the forest & restore SBB impacted lands (long-term) -
- 0249-004 I think the public wants a green healthy forest. Managing the vegetation in contrast to a most of the other issues, both good & bad aspects. can't manage the forest vegetation and other commodities over the long term without the public's acceptance that these are legitimate uses.
- 0249-005 without considering existing public land allocations @ federal, state & borough levels, there is a high probability of over-allocating some land uses and under-allocating others; i.e., example: wilderness, parks, wildlife refuges, if we already have a surplus, what are the legitimate reasons why more public land should be restricted to single,
- 0250-001 Abandon all plans for more wilderness/park designation or any further study (this would include wild & scenic river classification as well). There's more than enough wilderness/park land already set aside.
- 0250-002 RIF & change the administration. Simplifies them & levels the playing field.
- 0251-002 The issue is probably the weight to be placed on various user demands, i.e., should the tourism industry's desire for a snowmachine trail weigh equally with an Alaska cross-country skier's demand for a quiet area/experience. I do think recreational desires by individuals should be given higher recognition than the desire to make a buck, on public lands, when making a buck adversely impacts the individual's experience.
- 0251-003 Convene a working group of institutions - state government, native corporations, Coast Guard, etc. who have interests in PWS so as to coordinate/plan impacts on PWS
- 0251-006 It changes the discussion from competing "rights" to fulfillment of "multiple uses" which respect the values of a nat'l
- 0253-001 Chugach Nat'l Forest, State of Alaska (DNR & DOTPF & DFG) and Kenai Peninsula Borough should sign the Seward Highway Scenic Byway-Corridor Partnership Plan. This plan establishes oversight committee to maintain certain scenic values, recreation opportunities, and land use patterns along the highway corridor.
- 0253-002 Similar regional coordination for access, settlement, & visitor services in Prince William Sound.
- 0253-004 Best way to ensure a full spectrum of uses is to look at the entire public land base, at all levels of government.
- 0253-005 Agency heads must sign partnership agreements and commit to develop specific management plans. Lower level staff must be given funds (ILLEGIBLE) time to work w/ public on these mgmt plans.
- 0253-006 Finally, there must be an evaluation team that annually monitors whether the agencies are adhering to the plan.
- 0253-007 A. The land ownership pattern in several parts of the forest would benefit from management partnerships. Summary - Define meaningful sub-areas within the forest. Not always watersheds, because human & wildlife uses may span several watersheds
- 0254-001 1. A. Have Native leaders and delegates from the conservation community on the panel that determines the final plan. Don't invite, inform, then ignore.
- 0254-002 1. A. (1) Working closely with native interests (I notice no Native Alaskan reps. here today.) This forest plan involves them also.
- 0254-004 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. (1) Too often, the Native perspective is not taken into account in land use planning in Alaska. There is little voluntary participation by them because there has been (ILLEGIBLE) breaches of faith.
- 0255-001 Historic fire-suppression & "management" has created enviro. ripe for beetles & fire danger.
- 0255-003 1. A. Look at long-term impacts of short-term decisions like road-building, logging and motorized uses. - Provide for monitoring, and make actions' continuation dependent on favorable results. - Provide for independent scientific review of probable long-term impacts, and actual short-term effects.
- 0256-008 Wildlife - evaluate habitat needs, identify what is required for protection of habitat, especially for critical areas to specific species, then set limits that will protect the areas. Would have to work with private landholders & other
- 0256-009 Designations & Motorized/Non-motorized areas - Work to separate mot/non-mot areas. If places are trashed by motorized vehicle users, close them. Education of mot. vehicle users re minimal impact & the need to obey laws/limitations in place. -- Mandatory education re min. impact.

Comment # Comment

- 0256-011 agencies proactively to develop plans that are integrated to achieve mutual goals.
- 0256-013 3. A. Wildlife - FS should work w/ fish & wildlife, fish & game & other agencies to develop a plan that integrates w/ plans of others & extends throughout the state to lower 48 & Canada. For birds we're talking worldwide integration.
- 0256-016 5. A. Make sure all stakeholders are present at these planning meetings so that it is truly a representation of all interests. Or have designated individuals from the stakeholder groups as committee members. Talk to John Sturgeon about his experience with this type of collaborative learning process. Education programs in conjunction with other social/economic agencies relating resource issues to consumer attitudes & population growth (responsible family
- 0257-001 1. A. Clearly define the desired future condition for specific areas of the Forest. This would include veg composition, compatible activities & uses that would occur. The Forest plan would be unambiguous on how specific areas would be managed.
- 0257-002 2. A. The managers and the public would have clear expectations of what would be happening on the forest & what it is expected to look like in the future.
- 0257-003 3. A. The Forest IDT would have to work with the public to develop scenarios that clearly show how the Forest could be managed. Funding for agency involvement would come from normal appropriations. Citizen participation would be privately funded.
- 0257-004 4. A. There are conflicting views on how the Forest should be managed. A natural process view is incompatible with a managed view. Many uses are incompatible. More public interaction between conflicting views is imperative.
- 0257-005 1. A. Commercial activities versus noncommercial uses of the NF. This involves conflicts over roading, mining, vegetation mgt. large tourism operations and quiet recreation.
- 0257-006 2. A. There are different expectations about how the NF should be managed - natural processes versus managed processes. The conflicts between these two views create a lot of the tension and disagreement over mgt. of the NF.
- 0257-007 3. A. Laws - many of the laws relating to the NF are in conflict and (ILLEGIBLE) different interpretations & expressions of these views..
- 0258-001 1. A. Multiple use management of forest - mandate.
- 0258-003 2. A. The forest is not being managed or planned for multiple use. Access through the forest becomes continually more and more difficult as the biocentric philosophy of management is promoted via such avenues as wild & scenic rivers designations, etc. This is important to me as representing a private landowner requiring access and as a resident of southcentral AK. Good multiple use optimizes overall outputs from a mix of uses.
- 0258-004 1. A. Start managing the forest based on sound land management principles & multiple use and not on the politics of public opinion. For example an aggressive salvage program could enhance wildlife habitat, yet this is not being done.
2. A. Resource professionals are best qualified to manage forests & lands for desired outputs. The "politicization" of the forest services has compromised sound long-term forest and land management. The current "fish bowl" management is not effective.
- 0258-005 3. A. This would require national and regional leadership and possibly some legislative changes to NEPA. Funding could be reduced because the great staff resources that are currently expended in the hand wringing over public opinion. The money spent on EIS documents would be better spent on the ground improving the management situation. 4. A. NEPA is the biggest obstacle as it has been used and abused to empower a minority of citizens who want to exclude management from out forests that are mandated for multiple use. A major reform of NEPA is needed before real management can resume. Make so-called public interest plaintiffs pay legal costs of both parties if they don't prevail. 5. A.. Until a more rational process is developed the forest will be in gridlock and little real management
- 0259-004 3. A. USING TRAK & ICETA MONEY HIGHWAY PULLOFFS CAN BE CREATED (CONTACT STATE OF AK FOR CO-ORDINATION). THE C.S.F. COULD TIE TO THE PULLOFF WITH THEIR TRAILS OR CAMP SITES. THIS JOINT SYSTEM WOULD MAKE THE PROCESS AVOID THE RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON TRAK & ICETA MONIES.
- 0259-005 4. A. THE STATE OF ALASKA AND C.N.F. WORKING TOGETHER ON A PROJECT. THIS COULD BE OVERCOME BY THE CREATION OF A JOINT COMMITTEE TO IRON OUT THE DETAILS OF THE PROJECT AND TO ALLOCATE FUNDS FOR ITS COMPLETION.
- 0259-009 3. A. ESTABLISH LEVELS OF DEVELOPMENT. ALONG THE ROAD SYSTEM ALLOW MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT (REST STOPS, PICNIC AREAS, CAMP SITES, WIDE ACCESSIBLE TRAILS). THE NEXT LEVEL ESTABLISH USABLE CAMPSITES WITH EASY TRAILS FOR THE MORE ADVENTUROUS INDIVIDUAL. LASTLY, THE INTERIOR OF C.N.F. THAT IS MOST REMOTE, LEAVE IN A WILDERNESS CONDITION.

Comment # Comment

- 0259-010 4. A. APPROXIMATELY 20% OF THE PEOPLE IN THE U.S. ARE DISABLED. ABOUT 1/2 OF THE DISABLED PEOPLE HAVE SOME FUNCTIONAL DISABILITY THAT PREVENTS THE INDIVIDUAL FROM STRENUOUS ACTIVITIES. THE NUMBER INCREASES EACH YEAR AS THE POPULATION AGES. THIS GROUP DESIRES OUTDOOR EXPERIENCES JUST THE SAME AS THE HIKER THAT SPENDS EACH WEEKEND IN THE MOUNTAINS.
- 0261-001 2. A. Communities feel empowered to plan the future of their area to maintain the lifestyle that is attractive. Need to be able to work with the Forest Service since so much of the surrounding resource is managed by the FS - Communities should have a say in their development, planning for the type & amount of industry wanted but also realizing where the control is held by the Forest Service - and where it is controlled by 'outside' forces.
- 0261-002 3. A. Multiple uses. Forest Service System lands are FEDERAL - all people have some % of the stakeholder stake as the locals. - Forest Service has other political & legal forces that shape policy, dealing w/ other agencies & other
- 0261-004 2. A. Helps FS determine 'acceptable' location of projects near communities. - Helps communities w/ (ILLEGIBLE) - if that is what they want. 3. A. Forest Service holds CL-visioning meeting in CNF communities. Implementation & monitoring jointly between community & FS. Funding through S&P \$ for community development. State money - such visitor documents are 'required' for grants.
- 0261-005 4. A. Community agreement - desire to have a vision. Political power to stick to the plan. FS ability to achieve land allocation that matches community wants. Communities need to understand FS mandates and process and must consider all stakeholders. 5. A. Local economy, jobs, conflicts between residents - tourists, subsistence, local use,
- 0262-005 4. A. The forest is essentially closed to further timber harvesting, most timber management (ILLEGIBLE) has been re-assigned. The solution is to establish a broad based consensus among users, weighing input in order of priority as follows: 1) local residents (owners), 2) Economic impact population, 3) state residents, 4) visitors, 5) National community - Thereby establish the forest management priority of harvest and regeneration with multiple use.
- 0262-006 5. A. I am convinced that multiple use of the forest can be established which includes a thorough harvest plan, but allows for all other uses as well -
- 0262-008 2. A. A) Forest should be effectively managed, so we don't end up with a dead forest, either because of the spruce beetle, or because the growth is all mature or over-mature without renewal and new timber growth.
- 0262-011 4. A. in order of importance 1) people living in the immediate area 2) people who's livelihood depends on industry supported by/related to the forest (timber, tourism & support industries) 3) people in the entire State of Alaska 4) people who visit the state 5) The national community
- 0263-001 1. A. ecosystem - all issues balancing the various issues under the F.S.'s multiple use mandate; having a variety of use activities occur in a sustainable manner. this doesn't mean that all uses occur everywhere on the Forest or that amount of use is "equal" among various uses.
- 0263-002 2. A. seeing one use predominate to exclusion of other valid uses.
- 0263-003 working with interested parties to achieve multiple use & sustainable use.
- 0263-004 allow management plans to proceed if the science is sound & public involvement has created some sense of ownership in the plan (even if not in complete concurrence w/ all aspects of the plan). have mgt. by the agency & the people rather than by the courts. FS gets 'hogtied' by special interests using legal proceedings to prevent implementation of any ideas they don't agree with. This wastes taxpayer's (ILLEGIBLE).
- 0263-005 3. A. ALL OF IT. other groups, organizations, citizens, gvt. agencies. laws. science. forest plan. FS needs to accept other entities as partners in the planning process. Other entities must respect FS legal mandates & others' opinions. Management must be coordinated across ownership lines.
- 0263-006 1. A. honest, open dialog - commitment to the process & product of plan revision. Instead of groups with specific agendas fighting solely for their 'turf' & against (with lawsuits & other legal procedures) any proposal that doesn't meet their agendas, we need conflicting groups to dialog with one another & work together to resolve their conflicts & differences w/o the FS in the mediator role.
- 0263-007 2. A. When one group can hold management practices hostage by legal proceedings, other users are denied their right to public land management involvement. At best this is a win/lose situation; more often it's lose/lose, as even the 'winning group' loses - loses respect of other groups, has reputation of non-cooperation, financial costs, etc.
- 0263-008 3. A. collaborative process being implemented may be the right direction. However, the FS HAS to follow through & be willing to consider 'outside' input as valid & use it where appropriate. Special interest groups must be willing to work within the process & not sabotage the products of the process.

Comment # Comment

- 0263-009 4. A. special interest groups that defend 'their' interest at all costs. remove FS from mediator role. Put groups/individuals that are in conflict to work with one another to resolve (or reduce) the conflict(s) & fund common ground. FS needs to have enough backbone to stand up for its decisions when challenged by a specific group.
- 0264-003 1. A. 1) F.S. MUST FOLLOW MULTIPLE USE MGT.
- 0264-008 2. A. I AM A RESOURCE DEVELOPER/MINER. I ALSO ENJOY FISHING, HUNTING & BOATING. I DO NOT WANT TO SEE THE FOREST BE MANAGED LIKE A NATIONAL PARK! ACCESS IS IMPORTANT - LOGGING ROADS SHOULD BE RETAINED, AT LEAST AS TRAILS.
- 0264-009 3. A. ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN COMMUNITIES IN AND NEAR THE FOREST. MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON HEALTH OF RESOURCE, NOT POLITICS. EXAMPLE: ALLOW TIMBER HARVEST FOR HEALTH OF FOREST, BOTH HEALTHY TREES AND BEETLE KILL.
- 0264-010 4. A. CONTINUE MULTI-USE MGT. INCLUDING MINING, TIMBER, TOURISM, FISHERIES, ETC.
- 0265-001 1. A. Consider cumulative impacts on Forest Service. Lands and adjacent lands within the same watersheds. Long term improvement. If logging is happening on a large number of adjacent lands, then consider impacts on wildlife and ecosystem/watershed.
- 0265-004 3. A. Form watershed committees, similar to the (ILLEGIBLE) River Special Management Area.
- 0265-005 Generate funds from user fees (consumptive and non-consumptive). Or non-profit status? or dues?
- 0265-006 4. A. Large number of different agencies and land owners. Very different and conflicting interests. Overcome these conflicts by making sustainability of the ecosystem the "bottom line." Make choices based on science. Politics is an obstacle, but I don't know how to overcome it.
- 0265-007 5. A. Ecosystem/watershed approach ties together everyone w/in a watershed. It's in their interest to work together to protect health/sustainability of a watershed.
- 0265-009 seeing the Forest Service take an ecosystem/watershed management approach (i.e., "ecosystem health" vs. "forest
- 0265-010 considering cumulative impacts on FS land and other lands w/in the same watersheds;
- 0265-011 coordinating and cooperating with other management efforts on adjacent lands;
- 0265-012 consider and evaluate sustainable economic choices that can be made vs. unsustainable, short-term gains;
- 0265-013 balancing a wide variety of recreational users (including tourism).
- 0266-001 1. A. a. The big picture, specifically how will the forest (ILLEGIBLE) taking into account nonforest lands and uses occurring there.
- 0266-004 2. A. a. That private and state lands/(ILLEGIBLE) uses will duplicate uses on the forest (ILLEGIBLE)
- 0266-007 3. A. The current Natural Resource States and general trend as to where they are headed. Also the assumption that Natural Resource planning and management leads to a better forest; compared to human management.
- 0266-008 I.D. common values of different groups.
- 0266-010 d. Improve planning to incorporate other landowner plans. e. Improve planning to expedite process.
- 0266-011 2. A. By getting consensus on values planning may be a whole lot easier.
- 0266-013 3. A. (1) Get consensus on common values through more meetings like this; f. service; As part of planning.
- 0266-015 (3) Involve locals & all users in active management. If locals can earn a living off of wilderness (ILLEGIBLE) then they will buy into these basic values.
- 0266-017 b. Information/Education and have them involved in management.
- 0267-001 1. A. Recommend more areas for Wilderness Designation - protect different ecosystem types. See them through to designation. Work w/ other land agencies & private land-owners to assess cumulative impacts of developments on the Forest. Determine through this where & how much wilderness should be designated.
- 0267-003 3. A. CNF, VSFS is responsible for implementation. Congress also plays role. Funded through planning budget,

Comment # Comment

- 0267-004 4. A. Congress - in its present make-up. Members of public who oppose wilderness designation. Education, outreach, building broad-base support, electing new Congressional Delegation, dispelling myths - shift people's perspective (ie- economic arguments opposed vs. in support of wilderness).
- 0267-005 1. A. Specific Designations - Wilderness, Wild & Scenic Rivers issues involved (DONE IN GRAPH STYLE) Ecosystem protection Habitat Capabilities Wildlife, Fish Common/sensitive Brown Bears Water Quality subsistence Access Roadless Areas Industrial Tourism Commercial Activities Cumulative Effects scenic beauty citizens - local, non-local, groups, communities motorized vs. non motorized recreation education science, data needs spruce bark beetle laws, ANILCA, NEPA, ESA ect.
- 0267-006 2. A. The Chugach National Forest is the second largest national forest in the nation and currently has no wilderness designated on the forest. Over 90% of the forest is inventoried as roadless, which indicates an enormous potential for wilderness designated areas. This forest is easily accessible from Anchorage and receives many visitors and local users annually. With tourism (large-scale) developing at a quick rate in AK, the potential for impact to important/critical habitat and ecological areas of the forest is great. Degradation to Brown Bear habitat on the 3-4 Kenai, already in place, is a signal that we need large tracts of protected roadless areas in critical habitat areas of the
- 0267-007 3. A. Cumulative Impacts Analysis of Timbering, Mining, industrial tourism, and recreational (motorized) developments and viability of wildlife populations on the Forest. The bottom line is: use habitat viability and wildlife population viability (ILLEGIBLE) as the reference points. Allow developments to occur once the long term viability of wildlife pop's are addressed - ie, areas protected to ensure habitat capability.
- 0268-001 1. A. More definite designations of uses in areas. 2. A. Less misuse, arguments and ?'s on how to handle uses and problems.
- 0268-002 3. A. Define and implement rules, designations, funding? Needs a plan.
- 0268-003 4. A. Public involvement, more advertising, open meetings. Seems like its happening.
- 0268-004 5. A. Public involvement promotes overall user satisfaction, including those who want wilderness protected fully.
- 0268-005 1. A. A) Future generations (1) passing things on (2) how to protect today's ideas from tomorrow's ideas. b) (ILLEGIBLE) scales of benefits. Land allocation/specific designations and management direction. Issues involved are:
1. An ideal of conservation of resources (ie - land in it's natural state) when deciding on what and how much area to designate to which uses. 2. Some sort of "safety net" built in so designations to conserve won't be overturned by any future radical change in management direction.
- 0268-008 3. A. The forest is, of course, belonging for the public and needs to accommodate all types of uses, economic and recreational, and equally the lack of use as is important to many folks also. Of paramount importance is the creation of a scale of benefit for use - example - a logging company w/2000 workers benefit a calculable amount from forest destruction; it is almost impossible to put value on the cost to those who now and in the future have lost that
- 0269-004 less "management", more research;
- 0269-005 identification of public attitudes toward the environment nationally (USFWS has several recent survey results),
- 0269-008 3. A. The largest task, and most costly, facing F.S. staffer's is monitoring and enforcing regulations that will require people to leave the land alone. Time & expense related to preparing timber sales could be directed to monitoring & enforcement. USFS should consider carefully its own findings on public perceptions regarding the Forest. It should also examine findings of other agencies & independent research groups. The Forest Service should work with the state & Coast Guard to develop a "coastal watch" program. The Forest Service can identify other areas where places have been managed poorly - mining sites, logging areas, etc. to show how benefits have been provided to a few stockholders at the expense of the public and the "resource".
- 0269-009 4. A. Political pressure from economically powerful interest groups (i.e. timber industry, tourism industry, mining ind., motorized sports industry, etc). Those who stand to benefit the most from the exploitation of the wild places. Stand by public opinion and your role as public (not private) servants.
- 0269-011 1. A. Avoidance of adversarial relationships. The relationship between issues and the Forest Plan, including such things as the relationship between wildlife concerns and habitat quality, the role of citizens in contributing to policy & management actions, and the role of future concerns (how does the proposed Whittier Road affect mgmt direction?)
- 0269-013 2. A. I want to see the Plan reflect the desired direction of U.S. citizens - (incorporate such things as EXISTENCE VALUES into it's economic profile).
- 0269-014 I want to see the Plan, plan for future events by providing natural areas set aside for 2 planning efforts in 100-200 years, areas where the only "management" is no "management," just occasional research.

Comment # Comment

- 0269-015 3. A. CUMULATIVE EFFECTS, adjacent lands Since state regulates hunting/trapping, shore lines need to be somehow be protected - (wildlife) future events (impacts), global warming, EVOS, EVOS habitat acquisition (the purpose or intent), spiritual qualities and significance, historical sites, forest fire, glacial movement (the long-term picture), landfills and waste, State Parks recreation & mgmt, Non-human areas (WILDLIFE/WILDLAND SANCTUARIES)!!, air traffic, in-stream flow reservations (state/fed) on navigable waters, areas for model "eco-villages", HUNTING & TRAPPING restrictions, possible (ILLEGIBLE) listing (ex. Kenai Brown Bears).
- 0269-016 4. A. Lower 48 & International (UN?) residents, animals other than humans, trees, etc. [WHO SPEAKS FOR THEM??]
- 0270-004 3. A. a. Management direction needs to be compatible with objectives of meeting viable population levels. b. Need to zone the way people can interact.
- 0270-005 4. A. a. Need to work cooperatively with State/Federal agencies, interest/user groups to meet overall. b. Need to assess peoples attitudes/values about access. Attempt to meet wide variety of needs within specific areas or
- 0270-006 1. A. Zone watersheds for specific uses to meet the needs of society. Some watersheds could be designed to meet intensive uses, others could be managed less intensively or not at all. 2. A. Help resolve some of the concerns/conflicts of intensive versus extensive use. Don't think that can manage for all resources w/ each watersheds. 3. A. User fees to fund intensive watershed management in those watersheds that are heavily used.
- 0270-007 4. A. User fee new. Can't get people to agree to uses of specific areas.
- 0271-001 1. A. The Forest Service needs to get any planning direction that is available from land owners within the Forest Boundaries. That includes communities, Native corporations, State of Alaska (DNR, and state tourism agencies), Princess Tours. 2. A. We have to be able to assess the impact that the development that occurs through those entities is at least not incompatible with what the Forest Service may propose through their plan.
- 0272-001 1. A. (1) The part of the map that is of concern to me is the allocation issues, that when conflicts occur, that resolution of the conflict consider desires of users at the individual user level at an equal level to those of the more powerful corporation or state interests representing the large volume tourism interests. (2) That citizen connection to the Forest Plan. 2. A. (1) I'm concerned that large volume tourism could develop, basically without the Forest Service having any authorities over it, and thereby failing to take into account that growth that is going to happen anyway. (2) That citizen connection is essential for the plan to have any support once it's developed.
- 0272-002 3. A. I think the Forest Service should have as base information, any currently known intentions of landowners within Forest boundaries, directions of State Legislature in encouraging growth of tourism that affects the Forest, even growth plans from such corporations as Princess Tours.
- 0272-003 4. A. There's always the points of view of interests for those whose desired recreation type of experience is in conflict with the type I enjoy. There's the other side, is there a way for both sides to get something of what they
- 0273-001 1. A. Motorized versus nonmotorized uses of the forest. Helicopter access, snow machines, airboats, ATVs. 2. A. Conflicts between cross-country skiers and snowmobilers & helicopter skiers. Also conflicts over noise created by motorized users. Many people see use as either/or. They want total exclusion. There are many people that see exclusion as preventing them from being able to enjoy the Forest.
- 0274-001 1. A. Map showing where snowmobiles are currently using the forest. 2. A. Help define the situations where conflicts are real & where perceived.
- 0274-002 3. A. Snowmobile association work with GIS (ILLEGIBLE) to develop map. No funding needed. 4. A. Several people (knowledgable) need to be involved in drawing & checking the map - schedules. 5. A. Motorized vs nonmotorized use is hot button issue. One part of the conflict can be clarified by this idea.
- 0276-002 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. Tourists. loggers. miners. local residents (adjacent communities)
- 0277-001 1. A. Tourism. Issues: Access; specific designation. Commercial activities as applied to beauty and forest health. Education on the sciences and accumulative effects for interpreting to guests.
- 0277-004 - Science; accumulative effects must be tracked so the educational processes can introduce or interpret data to visitors/public.
- 0277-005 3. A. How "the plan" stands up to the areas or issues not covered by "the plan", ie, water access to uplands - who controls or coordinates neighboring issues. What prevailing laws or Acts exist which may be effected by the plan - other boundaries to cross, etc. (fees)
- 0277-006 4. A. Private inholders, other agencies in gov't (regulatory in nature), non-gov't organizations; like visitors associations and other user groups. Include as (ILLEGIBLE) (information resource). [Careful to temper the verbal

Comment # Comment

- 0278-001 1. A. The general public needs to be more aware that their forest management plan is under review and basically that there is a plan. Long term. More input from the non-user view may allow planners to include ideas from the general public, rather than specific users. 2. A. It would allow more national pride in public ownership of the Nat'l Forests & wilderness areas. It would help to capture the special value of the Nat'l forest ("and not being used (ie developed) must not have value") a perception? 3. A. Nat'l P.R. campaign by the (ILLEGIBLE). General funding or fee demo money. 4. A. The general public don't seem to know that a Nat'l Forest is theirs. In these modern days there's too many distractions and access for many is just not available. Internet virtual reality (ie. (ILLEGIBLE) Park) public service announcements. Like the old Smoky the Bear commercials. 5. A. It adds the question of social value of a Nat'l Forest and hopefully brings to light areas to better protect or ways to better educate the public about their forests. Create partnerships to enhance the educational processes - public schools,
- 0279-001 1. A. Establish areas or times where only one type of activity ((ILLEGIBLE)) can occur. 2. A. Eliminate conflicts between the 2 groups. 3. A. Through public meetings, work out agreement with groups. District staff, law enforcement & M & NM groups. 4. A. Attitudes of groups involved. Get them together to talk & learn from each other. 5. A. Wildlife. Soil erosion. Tourism.
- 0281-001 1. A. * Multiple use management direction * This involves a variety of issues whether its motorized-vs-non etc. It's extremely important to me that all uses are managed for wisely.
- 0281-002 My concern is that certain user groups may try to exclude other user groups on the forest. Some of this may be due to lack of understanding of the other users or bad experiences with different user groups. I enjoy doing a variety of activities on the forest and feel that I am a responsible user no matter what the activity and I don't want the forest to become a huge gridwork of you can only do this here and that there.
- 0281-003 Of course the legal aspect has to be taken into consideration as well as the capability of certain areas to support certain activities.
- 0282-001 How can we manage for something (forest health) if we cannot clearly define it? So we can manage our ecosystems wisely. Easy, get parties around the table & make (ILLEGIBLE) F.S. responsible. Doesn't need any funding. None, except the desire by some to have forest health defined as the "(ILLEGIBLE) the mature trees". . Key to management of Forests on the Kenai, which are the only forest lands the Chugach is considering for (ILLEGIBLE)
- 0284-001 The social values of the Forest. Alternatives will only involve recognition of measurable values - eg, economic value in particular. But the values are still real - as in, "What economic value do you place on your 86-year-old grandmother who is not "producing" - only "costing." Also, impact of forest management or community "quality of life" issues. The full range of social values of the Forest environment are not well understood. Further, there is little historical process for integrating these values into the development of mgt. alternatives. Thus, they won't be included as full "members" in development/allocations of use. This is important because legitimate uses of the Forest may not be considered if they cannot be measured in "commensurate" units. The realm of trade-offs involving "hard" land use allocation - especially uses which foreclose options to preserve important "soft" values. The full population (Alaska and other states) including those "users" who may not actually set foot on a forest but whom nevertheless care about what the Forest is like. Need to also include Alaska Native populations.
- 0285-001 Further work at identifying extent (ILLEGIBLE) geographic location of full range of public values. Methods could involve workshops (ILLEGIBLE) social surveys. Because would help establish commensurate ranking of full range of values. This would help lend status to values traditionally ignored because no information on their relative status existed. The Forest Service, in cooperation with others, could sponsor the investigation. Funding should come from the Forest Service as part of forest planning funds. Mostly old paradigm mindsets on the part of natural resource trained -ologists who are primarily interested in their functional area. There (is) are no functional area to deal with social values of issues other than as the other-ologists incorporate them individually.
- 0285-002 It is integral in the full ecosystem management perspective.
- 0286-001 At this point in time, (ILLEGIBLE). If degradation from land use starts to occur, I'd like to see some projects done to disperse people more from heavily used sites, by either providing tent platforms, or gravel pads. Improvements are needed (ILLEGIBLE) but few clear, flat, well drained places to just place a backpack tent on. Special interest groups could provide labor and materials, if permission was given to put in tent platforms. Authorization from the Forest Service is the only obstacle.
- 0287-001 By recognizing and integrating national interests/values in planning. This would be a long-term improvement. I DON'T KNOW YET Because it better incorporated national interests for a national resource. Doesn't leave decisions solely up to local populations with vested interest. I DON'T KNOW YET! However, that should not foreclose debate (or effort toward R/D) on the issue. This type of thinking has traditionally stifled innovative and practical development of analysis/decision-making processes for things not easily (though not necessarily properly) measured (or noncommensurate). J. Michael McCloskey says it is the vote Putting the Chugach in perspective with all the other federal land interests. How to adjudicate local vs. distant "votes." Even if we could (ILLEGIBLE) register our individual views, is it a straight vote? weighted vote? Etc. - By changing the way the society views its responsibilities to natural resources. Very "science-fiction-ish." It would affect most other parts and issues because it would change

Comment # Comment

- 0288-001 Balancing local vs. national level concerns about the Chugach, who controls the destiny of the Forest: Small number of local, vocal individuals or larger number of remote citizens. Compromising (?) the local knowledge of culture vs. national scale viewpoint, which group will dominate decisions - especially if the groups are at odds in terms of objectives. All or most all other parts & issues. However, may be especially relevant in terms of national preservation objectives versus local needs for subsistence or recreation. Do we - or how much do we - incorporate the larger national interest in the (ILLEGIBLE) decisions?
- 0289-001 Do we "sacrifice" any local economic/social values (ie, jobs, quality of life - which may include subsistence opportunities) for the good of national representation or "warm fuzzy" feelings of commercial interests or NGOs.
- 0290-001 I am primarily concerned that plan reflect the diverse views and needs of the public. I am concerned that public input is managed in a way that allows the best collective thinking on a particular issue such as ecotourism or resource development to be weighed by the public through a viable process; rather than have those ideas eliminated by an individual or small group. Care needs to be taken when grouping issues or ideas so that individual values of those managing the information don't have an overpowering influence. Always be mindful of the different viewpoint. Sometimes the best ideas come from the most unlikely places. When the plan is completed there must be a viable annual review and report to the public on efforts and results to implement the plan - a report card Accountability and public support It could be done by an independent Board representing diverse interests.
- 0291-001 The Alaska Forest Association and its member companies have been carefully going over the scoping information provided by the Chugach Land Management Plan (CLMP) revision team. I am writing to ask you to consider altering your revision schedule to provide a better scoping period prior to beginning the planning process in earnest. The scoping stage of the CLMP revision is exceptionally important since it is the period that defines the issues to be considered during the planning process and the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While we recognize the magnitude of the task before you and appreciate the effort your team has put into providing materials for public use in the scoping process, we have some concerns which have prompted this request: - Lack of maps. I asked for all available information, including all available maps when I visited your offices a month ago. Only one map was available, entitled, "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." I was also given a couple back issues of the CLMP newsletter, and a brief description of the CLMP team. When I asked again about other maps, I was told there were none. I am told that at the public workshops held in Anchorage and Cordova, there were several maps displayed. AFA would like to have an opportunity to study all available maps prior to the close of the scoping period. Please have someone contact me regarding the availability of additional maps. - "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." There are several features which keep this from being an appropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. For example, established rights of way granting public access across private lands are shown. Valid access rights across National Forest System lands to ensure access to private property, however, are not shown. This information could be very important in forming public opinion as to appropriate land use designations. Leaving this kind of information off the map will skew the process from the start. The map also fails to identify known mineral deposits, nor does it identify known anomalies and other areas of significant potential for mineral development. It likewise fails to identify the commercial forest lands on the CNF, settling for an ambiguous "biologically capable timber land" indicator. This makes it very difficult for the public to appreciate the economic potential which would be forgone if these areas are put into non-development land use designations. The map is also misleading in the way it treats land ownership. Non-federal ownership, other than state marine parks, is shown in grey. I know this is fairly standard with Forest Service land use maps. However, since a unique set of circumstances exists on the Chugach, derived from events in 1988, it is not appropriate in this case and helps make this map misleading as a basis for public comment on the CLMP revision. There is a world of difference between land owned by a corporation and intended for resource extraction, and land purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. As you know, the latter is to be perpetually protected (i.e., non-development use only). These usage differences are important if the public is going to have a realistic picture of what is likely to happen across the forest over the next decade or so. The coding on the map and the list of "eligible" Wild and Scenic River areas included in the November newsletter is not easy to connect. If the public is to know enough to comment on whether these rivers are appropriately being considered for nomination, there should be, at a minimum, a number key that connects printed information on each river (the name,
- 0291-002 Finally, I am puzzled by one item of information which the Forest Service is stating with respect to the Chugach National Forest. At the workshops, the team is saying that 98.9% of the CNF is unroaded or without "improved road access." Given that the Seward Highway bisects a significant chunk of the Chugach, I would like to know how this is calculated. Do you consider a half-mile corridor along the road to be accessed by the road? A mile? More? Less? How does the Forest Service plan to treat RS 2477 access? It would appear that at least one recognized RS 2477 right of way will be severely, perhaps permanently, impaired by a Wild and Scenic River designation. AFA believes that the information missing from the publicly released scoping documents is significant enough to warrant a new scoping period. Please consider, at least, issuing additional maps and information and extending the period for public scoping comments by four months.
- 0292-001 If you could answer a few questions I would appreciate it. Since the CNF was established its borders have changed slightly on and off. Has Valdez ever been inside the CNF? When you make rulings such as allowing rural residents to shoot does one month earlier than nonrural residents do the natives who live in Valdez qualify as rural or nonrural? Please send me copies of any rulings or any paperwork you have on this subject.

Comment # Comment

- 0292-002 What is a primitive 2 area and where in the CNF are any primitive 2 areas? Are primitive 2 areas already designated or are they part of the revision process?
- 0292-003 After reading what I can on the CNF 1 get the impression all users from total wilderness to logging and ORVers will be provided for. If I am wrong, please refer me to the right papers and pages dealing with ORVs.
- 0292-004 Also it seems and I have been told by people who have been keeping better watch over the forest plan than I have that big trade offs were made in the beginning concerning Indian logging and development with the big islands. Any info you have on this will help. I am neither an environmentalist nor a pro developer just someone caught in the middle. I am asking you for info on a small scale because its hard for some one like me to wade through all the paper work. Please keep this in mind and maybe try and second guess me and send what you think might help.
- 0293-003 - Let's protect the Copper River Delta. I'd like to see lines of protection that enhance ecosystems, not just "areas." -
- 0294-001 Address cumulative impacts in all areas of the forest land use plan and take into account what is happening on adjacent and proximal lands to the forest.
- 0294-003 In 1907 President Teddy Roosevelt created the Chugach National Forest primarily to protect the forest and wildlife of the Copper River Delta. The Delta, up to and including Miles Lake and Baird Canyon, with millions of birds and abundant wildlife, must be permanently protected through the new forest plan by recommendation for legislative
- 0294-005 Brown Bears on the Kenai Peninsula are being threatened due to declining habitat. Because bears are considered an "indicator species", the Forest Service needs to make habitat protection a priority in its plan. Please participate in any Brown Bear Task Force that is created on the Kenai Peninsula. In addition, work with other land owners to address cumulative impacts for Brown Bears and other species, as well as watershed issues.
- 0294-009 No new mining claims until a cumulative impacts analysis is completed for existing claims and existing mining
- 0295-004 4. MINERALS -- Many areas within the Forest have high mineral potential and good access to roads, the railroad, or tidewater. Areas with known mineralization and moderate to high mineral potential should definitely be given a minerals prescription, and no areas should be withdrawn from mineral entry unless they are included in an actual conservation system unit (CSU) that is totally incompatible with mining. Areas which are merely under study for potential inclusion in a CSU should not be closed to mineral entry. It is important that access to these areas not be restricted. The entire rail corridor, and areas bordering it in the Forest, should be available for mineral development. Refer to U. S. Bureau of Mines studies including OFR 83-81: 1979 USBM Sampling Sites and Analytical Results for the CNF and MLA 5-84: Mineral Occurrences In The Chugach National Forest, South-central Alaska for mineral potential maps of the CNF. It is important to point out that much of the CNF is very poorly explored for minerals and the level of geological mapping is very primitive in most areas. Just because an area is not rated as moderate to high for mineral potential does not mean that the area is not mineralized, it just has not been unexplored yet. The inter-disciplinary team for the CLMP plan development should include a geologist and a mining engineer. The present IDT contains no mineral professionals.
- 0295-005 5. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS OF VARIOUS WITHDRAWALS -- The cumulative impacts of the numerous withdrawals and proposed withdrawals of land from multiple use management in the Chugach National Forest is of great concern to the economic welfare of the region. Along with other withdrawals which have already been made, the cumulative impact of the Habitat Area purchases by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (EVOS) Trustees must be considered. These expanding "habitat areas" have a significant, detrimental, and cumulative impact on the available economic resource base. One of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service is to assist the development of rural economies. The rural economies of the towns and villages within the CNF are heavily dependent upon access to the resources of the Forest. The purchases of several hundred thousand acres in the Forest by the EVOS Trustees has reduced the need for additional Wilderness designations within the CNF, and will have a negative impact
- 0295-006 6. DECISION PROCESS -- The Chugach National Forest was intended to be managed for multiple use resource development -- including forestry, mining, oil & gas, recreation, commercial tourism, etc. There is great concern that the decision process has been biased by "pre-decision" thinking, toward "recreation only" uses of the Forest. The Forest Service was placed under the Department of Agriculture because Congress recognized timber is a renewable resource like any other crop which requires harvest and management to realize maximum economic benefits and yields of forest products to the citizens of the United States. The National Forest System was created to provide 21 continuous supply of timber, minerals, water, etc. for the use of the citizens of the United States, emphasizing multiple use management. Some of the CLMP informational materials are asking leading questions such as, "is it still appropriate for logging to continue in the Chugach National Forest?" This literature demonstrates an institutional bias on the part of the CLMP IDT not to have logging take place. The Organic Act and the other Forest Management acts mandate multiple use management of National Forest land, and the CLMP IDT is legally bound to adhere to the Forest Service management directives. The CLMP planning literature should educate the public about the multiple use mandates which the Forest Service must adhere to. C.L.M.P. comments Page 2

Comment # Comment

- 0295-008 7. EVOS HABITAT AREA EFFECTS -- Hundreds of thousands of acres of land in the Forest have been placed into de-facto wilderness, as wildlife habitat areas, purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill (EVOS) Trustees. These areas have been removed from surface economic uses such as timber harvesting and land development. The cumulative effects of these withdrawals which have occurred since the last CLMP plan was approved must be considered. These habitat areas have lessened the need for any further withdrawals, wilderness, or other special
- 0295-011 10. WILDERNESS -- I oppose any new Federal Wilderness designations in the Chugach. Most of the Forest is wilderness, and nearly 2 million acres are presently managed to retain wilderness values. Alaska already contains 57 million acres of designated Wilderness, 62% of all Federal Wilderness areas. The areas which are presently managed as Wilderness should be re-evaluated to determine whether the Wilderness management is still appropriate
- 0295-012 11. NO NEW PUBLIC USER FEES SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED -- Moderate fees for using certain improved areas in the Forest such as campgrounds and paved parking lots at Russian River are appropriate, however there is a new and worrisome trend in National Forests in the Lower 48 to impose new fees for access to unimproved parts of the Forests such as caves in Arizona and a so-called "adventure tax" in the San Bernardino National Forest in California. The Forest is PUBLIC LAND, and the public should not be charged fees to use unimproved areas of its own land.
- 0296-001 I support multiple use of National Forest Lands, particularly the Chugach National Forest, Multiple use should give equal consideration to mining, timbering, fishing, tourism and other economically productive industries. These uses are compatible with recreation, wildlife preservation and conservation. Because of their potential for favorable economic and social benefits, the Forest Service should strive to increase these activities in a sound and responsible
- 0296-005 The identification of 20 Chugach National Forest rivers for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers clearly asserts a specific-use preference and fails to acknowledge the multiple-use mandate. So-called management of this type is short-sighted and irresponsible. Wild and Scenic designation would further impede every preferred activity, from fly-fishing to mining, two activities which can coexist. Identification of all interests, mutual education by interested parties and a negotiated plan are suggested as a means to accommodate sound management of the Chugach National Forest.
- 0296-006 Tourism in Alaska suffers from a lack of facilities and infrastructure. We are missing out on a great opportunity by not better developing this important industry. Timing is important in every industry, and delayed and insufficient infrastructure has seriously impeded tourism and all other industries in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0297-001 I'd like to inquire about the most recent planning exercise that was undertaken by the Chugach National Forest staff. I'm referring to the recently completed salvage timber sale planning process. I understand that some 5.6 million dollars was spent and the entire plan was then abandoned, making this exercise for all intents and purposes, a total waste of time and, of course, money. Would you please let me know if this is correct and what the Forest intends to do about this? Regarding the CLMP Revision process, it seems to me that the focus of this effort should be to specifically define the mission of the Forest and then fit a cost-effective management team to this mission. In this era of scarce financial resources the Idea of planning for planning's sake and serial planning (i.e., immediately following one large scale planning exercise with another as has been the case on the Tongass) is unacceptable. I am aware of the federal laws that require the National Forest system to undertake plan revisions every five years. I am also aware that the requirement does not stipulate that each revision process last 58 months.
- 0297-002 As you know, it has been the mandate of the National Forest System, since its inception, to manage for multiple use. It appears that the Chugach has become a recreation-only National Forest. There is no mining, almost no timber harvesting (the ASQ is now zero and the remaining timber base is now in a wilderness study classification), and wildlife management receives very little emphasis.
- 0297-003 The forest has done a terrible job in dealing with forest health issues, dilly-dallying and stalling for more than a decade, and, as previously mentioned, abandoning a half-hearted, less than mediocre salvage plan that cost over 5 million dollars. The planning team is now, it seems to me, at a crossroads. The opportunity is at hand to restore multiple use management to the Forest, come to grips with the forest health issues and create a plan that utilizes the sum of the talent that you have on staff at the S.O. level and on the Ranger Districts. Or, you can ignore the multiple use mandate, continue the current course and complete the process of turning the Chugach into a recreation-only forest. The risk of this second course is that the Alaska congressional delegation and the citizens of Alaska may quickly realize that the current staff on the Forest is not needed to operate what amounts to a very extensively managed N.R.A. You will then be faced with massive staff reductions and the citizens of Alaska and the rest of the country will have lost the economic benefits which can flow from a properly managed, multiple-use national forest.

Comment # Comment

- 0298-001 The USFS is required to follow Federal Environmental Law regarding the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 USCA Section 1600 et seq.). I am concerned that decision processes will be biased toward preservationist opinion as opposed to the USFS obligation to provided for multiple uses of forest resources under 16 USC 1600 and as required by the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, (16 USC 528-531). Additionally, The National Forest System was created to provide products from timber, minerals, and water for the use of U.S. citizens by multiple use development. Required assurances are identified in Section 1604(e) and appear to include coordination of resource extraction with recreation, wildlife, and wilderness uses (see also 36 CFR 219). Therefore multiple use by definition, includes more than the exclusive designation of wildlife habitat, wild & scenic rivers, and additional wilderness on public lands. I trust that the USFS will follow Federal Environmental Law regarding this scoping process and not concede to typical preservationist bias that opposes multiple use development
- 0300-002 Resurrection Pass, should remain open to snowmobiles longer than Dec.-Feb. 15, As Feb, March are the ideal time of riding, i.e. Snow cover daylight hours etc.
- 0301-004 4. Montague Island: Obliteration of the Montague Island Timber Access road is a crime. Not only will the landowner (Chugach Alaska Corporation) need to re-open this road in the future, taking out this road will deny much of the access to the south end of Montague Island. Not everyone can afford to run around in helicopters. In the long term, obliteration Vs putting the road to bed in a normal fashion will probably cause more environmental
- 0301-005 5. The plan and the maps don't even show the obtaining of vast acreages through the habitat acquisition program of the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council. If these lands are designated non-use, other lands should be available for development. Also the sub-surface estates are not owned by the Federal Government. This needs to be addressed and land swaps to consolidate ownership's need consideration. In summation, it appears that the Chugach National Forest is trying its utmost to become the Chugach National Park. This is baloney! Multiple use also means responsible timber and mineral development, not just recreation and wilderness. Thank you for your time.
- 0304-001 Dear Sirs P.W.S. is an area where I hunt & fish & commercial fish. I understand that you people have a lot of control out that way. Please consider commercial fishermen & resident subsistence users when making plans new laws in P.W.S
- 0306-001 On behalf of the member groups of the Alaska Rainforest Campaign, I would like to thank you for meeting with our delegation on Monday December 8. I know it was an especially hectic day for you, with a long weather delay in your return from Juneau. We appreciate your willingness to keep the lines of communication open and share information with us. Having access to data such as the resource inventories (including timber) and the CD-ROM format of the comment analysis will be helpful to us and all other parties sharing an interest in the future of the forest. We were especially encouraged to hear that you will consider having hearings outside Alaska later this spring, when the concept alternatives are aired for public comment. The Chugach is the nation's second largest national forest, one that hosts hundreds of thousands of visitors from all corners of the country every year, so we believe you will find a good deal of interest among those living in the Lower 48. We will be happy to help your staff in any way we can to arrange locations, publicize these sessions and ensure a good turnout.
- 0307-001 What rivers, streams, lakes and Glaciers are being spoke of under the section covering "wild and scenic rivers designations". Can you provide us with one of the maps showing us which are involved. We also would like any documents showing or explaining what regulations and restrictions would be involved with this designation for these
- 0310-001 A management plan which recognizes the potential of CNF for a variety of year-round recreational activities, and a reemphasis on costly, nonrevenue producing timber operations which create long-term damage for all other uses.
- 0310-002 A recognition that areas of natural quiet are important in forest management and that recreational uses which promote natural quiet as a distinct forest resource should be encouraged in designated areas.
- 0310-003 The inventory and reopening (with voluntary labor) of the old CCC trails which were constructed in CNF during the depression.
- 0311-002 Continued collaborative learning workshops in which citizens of one region are transplanted into other regions to offer personal insights and common ground between regions.
- 0311-003 Gary Lehnhausen mentioned a possible nonpaying volunteer position working with the entire range of planning issues. I would be willing to volunteer 3 months of my time to do this. I would be willing and able to commit to January through March 1998 to volunteer to do this. (907) 283-6228 I am interested in the Inter Disciplinary Team approach to planning and I would be willing and able to commit to January through March 1998 to volunteer to do this. Yes,

Comment # Comment

- 0317-002 The Forest Plan I feel should not include any facilities such as anchors, marinas, roads, or made trails. Advertising & building "things" will cause PWS to turn into the new Kenia River. We have already seen a huge increase in user groups naturally. There are already charter planes & boats and plenty of access opportunity such as boat ramps fuel & hotels in Udz, Cdu & Whitt. Chenega could put in a fuel dock at their village. The direction I see the plan taking makes me envision pictures of wall to wall people lining the banks of the Kenai River or rafts of boats such as in Fort Udz when the hatchery fish return. This is fine in small areas such as Kenai or Valdez but the whole of PWS turning to this would take away the last large area where you can get away from overcrowding to a degree. As the world population goes up this is probably inevitable so I can't see speeding the process up. Many ILLEGIBLE users come
- 0318-003 I'd suggest a separate district or subdistrict for western PWS as it seems to get lost in the energy needed for Portage and the Kenai. The Whittier road will most likely increase use during the summer season and Western PWS desperately needs some long overdue attention.
- 0321-006 Maintain the Russian River in public ownership, don't give it to CIRI.
- 0321-008 You are doing a great job on maintaining your campgrounds and trails.
- 0324-002 Thank you for your letter of Sept 12, 1997 and Environmental Impact Statement for the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Plan. I tried calling you to discuss this matter and the absence of any reference to the development you and the state propose for Landlocked Bay in the documents you sent. I again would like to formally request that you do not transfer any land in fee to the State of Alaska for eventual development and resulting advertising of Landlocked Bay in their Marine Park System. I have reviewed the materials you sent and the Impact Statement is clearly deficient and inadequate for the following reasons: 1. The proposed action that must be revealed in this document, i.e. transferring land for the purpose of development into a Public Park facility, is not discussed anywhere in the documents you sent. 2. No alternatives analysis was done for this proposal. There are many similar, suitable Bays in this area of the Sound that do NOT HAVE ANY PRIVATE SMALL PARCEL OWNERSHIP IN THEM. 3. All the maps you have sent misrepresent the ownership situation in Landlocked Bay, This is extremely misleading. NONE OF THE MAPS ILLUSTRATE THE PRIVATE LAND HOLDINGS IN LANDLOCKED BAY. 4. You never notified me or contacted me as an affected party and landowner of this action. You never solicited any input or reaction from the private landowners in this Bay who will definitely be impacted severely by your development plans. Above all, I know this Bay intimately, and contrary to your stated goal and intent of "habitat protection" and preventing damage to "cultural resources" and protecting "subsistence uses", YOU WILL HARM THESE BY DEVELOPING THE BAY WITH AN ADVERTISED MARINE PARK. THE TRAFFIC YOU WILL CREATE AND INCREASED USE OF THE BAY WILL ADVERSELY IMPACT ALL OF THE THINGS YOU ARE TRYING TO PROTECT. YOU WILL DESTROY THE CHARACTER OF THE BAY AND THE CURRENT USE AND ENJOYMENT OF THE BAY BY THE PRIVATE LANDOWNERS CURRENTLY IN THE BAY. I have contacted my attorney, in Anchorage and are prepared to confront you and State Parks on these issues in the event you proceed with these plans. I again request you to please send me: 1. Your alternatives analysis for this selection. 2. Maps that accurately show the private land ownership in Landlocked Bay. 3. The plans for your proposed State Park in Landlocked Bay. Its location, size, mooring facilities, on shore facilities, etc. 4. An explanation of how this development and infusion of boats and people into this incredibly sensitive Bay will accomplish your stated goals of habitat, subsistence and cultural protection. I also request YOU circulate this letter to the State Attorney General's office, the State Division of Parks and all Trustee Council members. I lived in Alaska long enough to know you probably don't give a damn how some absentee land owner feels (even though my family has had an interest in this property since 1911) but this is a complete shame. You are not protecting with these actions, to the contrary you are going to injure me and others in the Bay and the resources you are trying to protect, and others you have not mentioned.

Comment # Comment

- 0325-001 I am transmitting this communication to advise you that I am appalled to learn about captioned. To capitulate to the public nuisance organizations like the rabid environmentalists and their ilk IS POSITIVELY NO MANAGEMENT AT ALL! The fact that your announcement came so soon after you had circulated your August 1997 Revision Process Document to the public and requested public inputs is most certainly distressing to say the least. I, personally, feel I wasted by time replying to your request for comments. I took the liberty to discuss your cancellation decision with your local forest ranger here at Seward. That telephone dialogue clearly impressed me of the Forest Service's token endeavor "to work something out with the rabid environmental look-up establishment" whereby at least some of the Kenai Peninsula's spruce bark beetle dead trees could be harvested. The preponderance of the evidence IS ABSOLUTELY profound to all Americans about the rabid environmentalists and their sinister one item lock-up agenda! All that any prudent, fair-minded American Citizen has to do is be cognizant of their incessant attempts to stop resource development wherever it occurs and it matters damned little to them if they have to file a law suit to obtain their objective! In my humble opinion, it would have been highly appropriate in this case for the Forest Service to file suit to stop the rabid environmental establishment from arbitrarily and callously interfering with the Forest Service's management policies. Moreover, a successful lawsuit's follow-up for punitive damages for the highest amount in monetary terms possible is the only awakening they will ever come to understand! CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST LAND & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN November 16, 1997 Page Two This writer is not so naive to understand that the multiple-use land and resource management policies of the Forest Service, which had served the American people so very well through the years, have been replaced by almost a single-use management concept. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Tongass National Forest, however, this writer is not so naive to believe the new anti-resource development penchant is dictated by the executive branch of our federal government. And, of course, that is not surprising because it comes from the most corrupt presidential administration in the nation's history! Yellow draft-dodgers and the Clintonite butcher-crowd of the Branch Dividian Compound IS ALL THE PROOF anyone needs of corruption! I rest my case!
- 0326-001 Quite frankly I am disturbed at the trendy and politically correct approach the Forest Service is taking on a national basis to placate the environmentalist fringe which certainly seems to be replicated in Alaska with the prospective CLUMP Revision. I find that the Forest Service's preplanning material is already biased in favor of additional Wilderness and Wild and Scenic River destinations - this in a State that already has over 60% of all the designated wilderness in the nation. I also feel that the legal mandate of multiple use of National Forest lands which was submerged in the 1984 CLUMP, is in danger of all but vanishing in the 1998 CLUMP.
- 0333-002 maintain a multiple use mandate in which national forest policy has long been rooted.
- 0333-006 Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived impacts to the
- 0333-010 The Forest Service has identified 20 rivers in the Chugach as eligible for inclusion into the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers. Oppose these classifications as they would diminish multiple use, access and potential mining
- 0333-011 The Forest Service should incorporate a tourism strategy into the new plan in order to accommodate growing numbers of visitors. The plan should provide for new visitor opportunities. - Currently 98.8% of the Forest or 5,376,400 acres is inventoried as roadless. The 1984 Forest Plan recommended Wilderness designation for 1,703,000 acres -- 31% of the Chugach. The entire Congressionally designated Wilderness Study Area, 1,972,200 acres, is currently managed to retain its wilderness values. Oppose federal Wilderness designations in the Chugach. Alaska already contains 57 million acres of designated Wilderness -- 62% of all federal Wilderness in the U.S. More federal Wilderness will mean fewer recreational opportunities and multiple uses in the Chugach. - RDC supports additional public access by road and trail for recreation use. Suggest where new roads, trails and boating facilities
- 0333-013 The 1984 Forest Plan recommended Wilderness designation for 1,703,000 acres -- 31% of the Chugach. The entire Congressionally designated Wilderness Study Area, 1,972,200 acres, is currently managed to retain its wilderness values. Oppose federal Wilderness designations in the Chugach. Alaska already contains 57 million acres of designated Wilderness -- 62% of all federal Wilderness in the U.S. More federal Wilderness will mean fewer recreational opportunities and multiple uses in the Chugach. - RDC supports additional public access by road and trail for recreation use. Suggest where new roads, trails and boating facilities should be built.
- 0334-001 Expand the current proposed wilderness boundaries as recommended by the 1984 Plan to include Knight Island and several road-accessible areas on the Kenai Peninsula. The Chugach is the second largest national forest in the country and the only one with no permanent protection, even though over 90% of it qualifies as wilderness.
- 0334-006 Stop the ill-planned Whittier Road, and instead upgrade the unique rail experience for tourists and visitors.
- 0334-013 Cumulative Impacts. Address cumulative impacts in all areas of the forest land use plan and take into account what is happening on adjacent and proximal lands to the forest.
- 0334-015 Public Involvement. Please keep on track, as you have already had a good start, to keep the public involved in this

Comment # Comment

- 0335-001 I am writing to protest the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act that is being proposed. Here are some of the reasons why. 1. Bear Creek, Palmer Creek & Six mile Drainage have some of the longest history of mining to logging in the state. 2. There is a permit system in place now that adequately covers use of the national forest. 3. This act discriminates against everyone who is physically unable to hike into these areas. 4. More places should be opened up, instead of closed, to relieve the congestion at the few recreational areas in south central Alaska. 5. This act could cripple Hope's economy. People come to Hope to goldmine, snowmachine, use ATV's & just drive around looking at wildlife. 6. The National Forest belongs to EVERYONE not just a few special interest groups. 7. There is nothing wild about the Hope-Sunrise area, man tamed it over a hundred years ago. 8. Half of Alaska has already been made inaccessible because of Parks, Preserves, Wilderness, special Use and Wild & Scenic Rivers Designations. 9. 98.8% of the Chugach National Forest is inventoried as roadless, therefore there is NO NEED for the Wild & Scenic
- 0335-002 I feel that the Chugach National Forest should remain designated as multiple use. There is no reason to revise the current forest plan.
- 0336-002 The present overall character of the forest can only be maintained through application of an active timber management program. Such a program includes vegetative manipulation through such means as prescribed burning, selective timber harvest and clear cutting. Different tree species require differing conditions for regeneration. If the goal is maintain the forests present species mix and composition, management activities must be planned and
- 0336-010 It appears that pressure from a highly vocal minority routinely turns the Forest Service away from science and active resource management and towards the role of an "absentee" landlord. Timber harvest is not incompatible with other uses of the land over the long term. Even the State Ferry System brochures that are designed to show Alaska's rare beauty routinely have regrown clearcuts in the background of nearly every one of them when examined by the educated eye. Some temporary displacement of selected uses might occur during and immediately after timber harvest, but that can in no way be represented as incompatibility over the longer term. What are the individuals and groups that insist on non-development of the nation's resources paying for the privilege of leaving these vast tracts of forest land untouched for their personal benefit? The Forest Service has become more like the National Park Service as an idle observer of nature, seemingly satisfied with watching the ongoing decline of the forests it as charged with stewardship of. This passive role plays into the present political arena well, but does an extreme disservice to the American people as a whole and Alaskans in particular both now and for future generations. We urge you to adopt a pro-active and responsible resource management role as a result of the upcoming planning process.
- 0337-001 One of my biggest concerns as someone who supports responsible development in Alaska is that the last filing we need is more federally owned lands within the state. It has come to my attention that as a result of some clandestine negotiations, the Chugach National Forest will be taking over management of several hundred thousand acres of land purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees Council. This is land owned by Alaska Natives that is being purchased by the Council and then transferred to the Chugach National Forest. The RDC already has stated that the impact on the economic resource base of losing these holdings represents a significant concern. As the RDC has stressed, the Forest Service should balance increases in land withdrawals with increases in land available for balanced resource development. Further to this, I want to emphatically state my dissatisfaction with the manner in which these negotiations are being conducted behind closed doors and with the lack of public input and comment on the U.S. Forest Service gaining hundreds of thousands of additional acres. As a lifelong Alaskan, I feel we do not need more federally controlled land in Alaska. From my perspective, one of the fundamental issues Alaska has consistently faced as we attempt to have a voice in our destiny is that the federal government already owns two-thirds of the land in Alaska.
- 0337-004 We need multiple-purpose use and access to our lands, as opposed to more restrictive, single-purpose
- 0338-001 1. A. Mngmnt Direction, which also includes specific designations. The issues relate to the burgeoning tourism/recreation industry, wild & scenic designations and how local traditional use can all fit together.
- 0338-002 2. A. With tremendous growth in tourism, i.e. tourist, hunters, fishers, from within & outside of Alaska, your job takes the takes on the look of people managers, not land mngrs. As an individual who has enjoyed a certain lifestyle in regards to his environment, impact from Growth/Mngmnt have a certain effect.
- 0338-003 4. A. One size does not fit all, what good for Vermont isn't necessarily good for CNF, local input needs to play a
- 0338-005 B) Keep public dialogue open throughout entire process
- 0339-001 Pete Dahl Slough Area Designated for possible RNA would possibly eliminate or curtail historic use of this area for recreational, subsistence and Cabin use. RNA will close the access to areas which have been historically used for generations. We have Parks and many other areas to which this type of research could happen. Local involvement and ideas mean a lot. We have the background and knowledge that special interest groups, eg. Environmental and non-local. Consider the views of everyone. Both locking up of land and over use can be devastating. Reasonable ideas that allow use of land without damage should be the final goal. Improve the Chugach by: Designated RNA areas could either be relocated or have boundaries changed to allow for historically used recreation/subsistence areas to remain open without restriction. This will allow the large amount of recreation/subsistence to continue

Comment # Comment

- 0340-001 That local issues and concerns are such a small part of the input to the forest plans. Trying to restrict or weight concerns of special interest groups that may rarely or never use the forest. I think that many people in groups follow the group leadership even when they have no knowledge of the particulars involved with a situation. These issues are important to me because I feel that some of the uses that determine why I live here would not be deemed appropriate by armchair experts. Maybe a citizen advisory board or committee that could comment as a recommending body to the Forest Service. I think the people who would most be against this are the contingent that wants to lock up lands and restrict access even if they are not going to benefit directly ie They never plan to come here, but when they do they want nobody else here and everything to remain untouched Taking steps away from Chugach National Forest becoming Chugach National Park. Put an advisory committee in place. To prohibit further drift in this direction To reflect community concerns. Be more supportive of developments of special use permits and
- 0341-001 Designations Determination of designations Closing of a area useable land Public awareness Justification for
- 0342-001 The Forest Plan & Management directions based on it. Issues involved include providing for all uses at this stage in the process, basing management decisions on science, and following direct of plan once issued. The Forest Service should manage for multiple use which includes timber harvest mining, access by motorized public, etc. The Forest Service needs to be held accountable for its actions or lack thereof - such as the bark beetle situation. Account for private land owners within the forest, the requisition of ENOS land swap acreage for mgmt. purposes, mandates requiring proper mgmt of renewable resources for fiber & economic support. The public beyond environmental groups - who dedicate entire full time staffs to effecting their agenda in the system. No one else can dedicate that amount of resources to this area. Education of the public on impact of various mgmt decisions & opportunities that exist on Forest education on possible output Education provides local groups & individuals with the tools to evaluate various management decisions & reduces power of special interest groups. Much of the "public" input to the planning process is by professional environmentalists with specific well organized preservation agendas Through use of existing system. Research. The current scoping documents do not fully represent all opportunities on the forest
- 0343-001 Deer Hunting, Motorized Recreation, etc. Hunting (3 or 4 wheeler) against! Hawkins, Hinckenbrook, Montague (exception Strawberry & Sanddune) Over the long haul 10-15 yrs deterioration of mossy meadow lands (Sight) Drainage to CreeksThe Dept. of Fish and Game could work with you on this. The nations mfg this machine who are packing sales in Alaska OK in some parts of Alaska But not a rain forest area Prohibit it on the Islands Hawkins, Hinckenbrook, Montague (Put the lock on the barn before the horse is stolen. (Damage to terrain) 3. The Forest Service. Through normal operations. Enforcement of the law. Peoples (residents) could care less, attitude
- 0344-001 motorized recreation concerned that motorized recreation will be further restricted or eliminated, thereby diminishing the quality of life of the local residences seasonal restrictions e.e. less area accessible during the summer months when tundra can be damaged & waterfowl are mating. More area available during winter months when there is a snow cover & birds have migrated South . Input from the local residence is extremely important because they will have to live with management decisions.
- 0345-001 Motorized Recreation. Limiting our areas to ride. Along Copper River Hwy. 6 ml-40 ml. Take away where we can ride. The good spots to ride. I love to go riding. New machine. I want to be able to use it. 3. A. Don't take all of the places away. Don't isolate us completely. Let us help decide where we can/can't ride. Look at all views. Be reasonable. Usually plants here don't grow in sand, so why isolate us from those places. - We don't usually ride in the forest (THICK FOREST) or really muddy areas - Consider the weather & seasons (PAGE MISSING) You save land from West of Snake River and over (WEST) give us ANILCA. From East Point of Montague over (to the West) you can have Give us from E. Point to the east. . We want you to have your land & be happy, but even more we want to have ours & be happy & go riding. It's just setting boundaries. If you take Montague, Give us ANILCA. (From Down Town CDV to the East Boundary Line. (No ## needed) . You just have to say ok & make the boundary. Easily. Just draw the line! You get your Forest. And we get our riding area. It solves the Motorized Rec. issue.
- 0346-001 Local. Local versus non local citizens when it comes down to Forest Plan in the area you live in local views should outweigh non local My family and neighbors being governed out of the Forest! I have 4 children the youngest being 5 yrs old. If I don't stand up and have a say, will we Cordovans have a Forest for use in 30 years! . Local people who live and use the forest on a daily basis! .
- 0347-001 Management Direction. Positive: Need to add multiple uses or replace "special designations Implementation of the plan is more important than the planning process itself
- 0347-002 The economic health of (illegible) communities Negative: Politics & environmental input is given too much weight/ Economics & science not considered adequately 1984 Plan was not fully implemented Risk of plan being modified w/o process Impacts of FS decisions on inholders & adjacent landowners
- 0347-003 2) Creating a balance of all users, not just recreation & habitat conservation
- 0347-004 Local community leadership Transfer decision-making process to the local level to the extent possible, that is, empower the individual ranger districts

Comment # Comment

- 0347-006 The districts are in a position to know how management decisions will affect local residents and local residents needs must be of a higher priority than desires of non-local people. Needs to be implemented from top to bottom through policy/procedure modification from agency or legislation from Congress. Political situation - central powers want more control Lack of balance of uses can be (illegible) local level, balance/appropriate uses can be (illegible) at
- 0348-001 Don't stop managing at the forest boundary. USFS needs to take a watershed approach
- 0348-004 As population pressure increases the U.S.F.S. should try to limit float houses in PWS and not build any more cabins. People are looking for a wilderness experience and cabins & float houses detract from that. Currently float houses are administered by the state. But they impact U.S.F.S. land. Lack of communication between agencies, ie state and federal Float houses are taking over all the bays in PWS. People can't put motor homes in campgrounds all season, why should they be able to park float
- 0350-002 Tourism, economy, protection of beauty, freedom of movement
- 0350-003 The Forest Service plan should be downsized,
- 0350-006 Montague Is. needs a break Install it in the plan, Forest Service already implemented most of it Wording used to put it in the proposed plan, put it in . Montague Is. closure will affect users from Whittier & Anchorage, What's wrong with the forest plan as it is now written, I'm in favor of addressing a few issues but let's not go overboard!
- 0351-001 Motorized recreation, Limiting places to ride. 6 through 35 mile. Keep good areas for riding open. That's all I do in my free time is go riding. Don't take away all of the areas we ride. We should be able to pick where we want to ride. / Can see why we can't ride in some areas due to nesting, etc. All the people who ride. We should be able to ride in sand. No wild life animal or plants are in sand. Why isolate these places? We don't ride in forests. And when it comes to the winter time, when we ride, we don't mess up land, snow is covering
- 0351-002 Keep current ORV areas open, but maybe close Montague to ORV use short term. To still keep most ORV riding areas, but close Montague since it is most susceptible to heavy damage use. It would be easy to do. Forest Service doesn't require much money. A lot of people use Montague. We should still be able to use almost all ORV areas.
- 0352-004 Allow ownership of Duck Cabins on Copper River Flats. ownership would solve the cabin problem. U.S.F.S. - Line Item Budget. Owners would buy 1/4 acre under acre.
- 0353-001 Give Local Ranger districts more leverage in dealing with local situations using basic guidelines of the National Forest. I would be more One on One communication Making it easier to resolve differences. By having the Interior Dept. so advise Forest Management Personnel It would put all Residents of Different districts be more understanding of each
- 0355-001 Conduct frequent & focused discussion sessions on specific topics & specific topics or to learn about situation work on developing an improvement Improved communications, shared responsibility, ownership R.S. & those interested in improving a situation Time, Commitment
- 0356-001 Multiple Use insure that there are a reasonable measure of different resource uses provide motorized/non historical mix Providing steady flow of timber for local use healthy forests Jobs
- 0357-001 The Forest service should make a point of explaining differences between them and (illegible) & government (federal & state) management areas at every opportunity - public meetings & media contacts. 2. A. If people have an understanding, hopefully there will be more support. 3. A. Forest Service can implement - with no funding required.
- 0357-002 5. A. It relates to people's attitudes. 2nd Improvement - Provide many different forums for public involvement as possible - from public meetings, to accepting input by letters, phone calls, e-mail 3rd Improvement - Follow up after Plan is done to demonstrate to people the relationship between their input & the results in the Plan.
- 0358-001 1. A. Sustainable Resource management - logging - tourism - aesthetics Fisheries & wildlife "wilderness" -
- 0358-003 2. A. Avoid boom & bust cycles w/logging, tourism, mining while minimizing impacts on fisheries and wildlife and aesthetic values. Allows fulfillment of current lifestyle.
- 0358-004 3. A. Most all - ORV's tourism operators, other agencies, current (ILLEGIBLE) direction, past uses and decisions. 4. A. Interest groups related to these issues - Again - most all.
- 0359-001 1. A. That section of the situation map that shows the relationship between attitudes and citizens as it affects citizen understanding and support of the new Forest Plan. 2. A. The concerns are two: 1) Do citizens have a sufficient understanding of the differences between National park Service, State of Alaska Designation and National Forest management under a multiple use concept. 2) Will citizens have enough confidence that input will make a difference in the final outcome of the Plan so they can support it. 3. A. Have to consider the impact of past decisions and public involvement that have created feelings that the Forest Service hasn't listened to the Public - What is the relationship of the involvement to the decision

Comment # Comment

- 0360-001 1. A. Management Div - Issues Cabin Lease structuring & appraisal - lease fees Amending ANILCA to permit transfer of leases. 2. A. Proposed lease fees do not reflect realistic prices in adjacent areas. Property has no real value as it can never be put up for sale.
- 0360-002 3. A. Taking in Access or Lack of Access when making appraisals Public has Access to all sites but Lessors are responsible for upkeep of site
- 0361-001 1. A. Provide better leadership and organization in the Planning process - getting the general public involved at the "big picture" stage is a little overwhelming. Can't sink your teeth into specific relevant issues. (arrow indicating continued on back, but no copy) 2. A. Better decisions will be made, and leadership perceived.
- 0363-002 1. A. Cut the cost for Government & Private Enterprise cut layers of Government. 2. A. So it doesn't discourage people for trying to do things. 3. A. Its feasible because it make sense. It saves money. 4. A. People - Government. Political Process
- 0364-002 1. A. Improve opportunities for non-motorized winter users to gain use of areas that are reserved for quiet use while still providing an equal amount of area for winter motorized users. Long Term solution would be to set closure orders in a staggering fashion to ensure both user groups a fair access to cabins & back country areas without overlapping. 2. A. Conflicts are occurring forest-wide due to lack of adequate opportunities for each group. IE: Lost Lake & Carter Lake effectively lost to non-motorized, RESS PASS after Feb 15 to motorized & prior to Feb 15 to non-motorized. 3. A. USFS should implement & enforce closure orders on trails to promote equal & separate access. 4. A. Mutual respect & understanding of each other's needs & a sense of Fairness in Acknowledging each's needs. Communication/Education and if necessary, Arbitration.
- 0366-002 Open up Resurrection Trail later as long as snow conditions and grown cover is good March is the best spring
- 0367-001 1. A. Joint ownership. Access to trails or possibly different trails for motorized and skiers. Very few skiers go where snowmachines venture. 2. A. Loss of motorized access Pure recreation
- 0368-007 3. A. Landscape level analysis, cumulative impacts, a definition of forest health that excludes human utility.
- 0368-008 4. A. ANCSA corporations native groups not necessarily same Govt. entities user groups conservation groups outdoor rec groups hunter fishers business non-local (this is a National forest)
- 0368-009 1. A. Improvement = seasonal closures (sharing) of areas to accommodate both non-motorized & motorized users. 2. A. So that all users get a chance to enjoy particular areas. 3. A. USFS would impose restriction Funding for any mgt. decision is a problem. No advice for you. 4. A. Non-motorized types appear to be unwilling to share the rec'n opportunities 5. A. Overall accomodation of all users - more of a multiple use approach
- 0369-001 1. A. Forest plan for the future that includes lasting ecosystems for future use.
- 0369-009 3. A. A balance that promotes an ecological balance for the future of the forest to last for generations. 4. A. Wildlife, habitat, good science, public use polling 1. A. It seems to me that a long term forest plan with the view of true ecological health of the forest rather than 10-15 year plans might benefit all involved. 2. A. The forest is something we hope will last forever Let's try to get a plan that addresses some issues for the future.
- 0369-010 5. A. Maybe by addressing such issues presented by increased use on all fronts such as tourism, motorized pressure, logging issues. Rather than offer quick fix to arising problems. Address the forest as forever.
- 0370-001 USPS has worked very, very well with Cooper Landing over the years. Thank You. The Changes and issues are coming very fast, you do a very good job of working with us (most of the time). You hit it on much better than many other government managers.
- 0370-002 1. A. Deal with mining abuse in Hope looking at the issues from a systems point of view, fast, work with MAPC
- 0370-005 Borough, Community, State (ILLEGIBLE) expansion 4) Seward/Storlig Hwy (ILLEGIBLE) scenic protection 5) Working with USFNS, State ... with Peninsula and Anch. AK as a whole
- 0370-006 6) Balance ski/snow machine use.
- 0370-010 Quality of life issue and that our future economy is tied to that here, protection of nca-h-mon flora/fauna values a high priority and should be so hard to stop, crafting the tools to build healthy communities in Chugach, ways to take the beauty of a process like this evening and get it past Don Young, the State Legislature and Grace Merkes in Sterling.
- 0370-012 Balanced multip use. Avoid the North Shore situation, with that must public concern it should never have gone
- 0370-013 Take tonight's process to the other agencies, 99% of the USFS employees are sharp as a whip, use that intellect and resource to follow through on main direction.

Comment # Comment

- 0370-014 No gas line up the Russian.
- 0370-018 Have a Cooper Landing Chugach P. Meeting. At Tern Lake on the viewing platform, the center station looks weird, I can't help it, it needs a little trim or a roof, or different angle, makes the whole think look bad Sounds silly, but it does. Am I the only on that this bothers? Do I have something better to do than worry about H?
- 0370-019 1. A. Managing the forest is a good thing, however [many of the unmanaged areas around Cooper Landing have great green new spruce regeneration] (ILLEGIBLE) in near back country OK, let mature, nature (ILLEGIBLE) in back country. Use Fire Look at USPWS management, and what works for them, even if their (ILLEGIBLE) are diff. there are lessons to be learned. Actually you're doing pretty good, actually very good. The eastern Kenai was defined with grace, and true multiple use for this whole century. The salvage Logging was a BAD issue and not handled well.
- 0370-022 Work with Borough and State to Min. Dev. conflict. The old Forest Service Policies and management (read Aldo Leopold) are very good (before industrial logging). 3. A. Much of this doesn't require large funding, much less than money spent on roading in scrub timber sales. DNR under Knowles is great. Borough with (ILLEGIBLE) is great. Cooper Landing, (ILLEGIBLE) and Moose Pass have good APC's 4. A. Young Mukowski and Stevens are an obstacle on habitat issues, and issues like salvage. Old tired idea's the world is changing, the public desires are changing. Need to work on relationships with Conservation Groups (build their trust) this programs is a good example Kufard Audubon. 5. A. It integrates all of the. We have no large mining operations on the eastern Kenai and indust. logging is not our future. Work with these groups like you do, be supportive, but these groups are a small part of our economy in the future and its not 1950 anymore. I actually think the USFA is doing a great job, its your ideas that have defined us so well, protected our rivers and mountains, allowed for balanced development. Old guard management though, needs to be tempered with the coming millennium with dev. on private, Borough and State Lands, you and the
- 0371-008 and general forest condition
- 0371-011 5. A. proactive look at desired condition
- 0372-001 1. A. 1) motorized vs. non-motorized issues 2. A. 1) user conflicts are increasing and will continue to do so if something isn't done 3. A. how motorized & non-motorized use affect other forest resources 4. A. improvements must ensure that both motorized and non-motorized uses have desirable places to go without having to worry about user conflicts & to ensure other resources aren't impacted to an undesirable condition. 1. A. motorized vs. non-motorized user conflicts will continue to increase in both the short-term and the long term. Keep existing designated areas & seasons that have been in place for motorized & non-motorized use (i.e. Turnagain Pass & Res Pass) Add additional designations of areas and seasons where conflicts currently occur (Lost Lake, Canyon Creek) and in areas conflict is expected to occur. 2. A. Keeps user conflicts in the field to a minimum. Can plan trips and know experience to expect various user groups would know which are their areas to use. 3. A. Feasible, as it is already being done on the Chugach and in the Lower 48, Recreation employees & public involvement would implement managing recreation to deter user conflicts should be a basic management function, so regular recreation funding should be used. 4. A. motorized groups that don't want to see any areas closed. Somehow, convince them that designated areas would improve their experience too. Many areas aren't suited to some uses, so closure it to those uses shouldn't be a big deal.
- 0372-002 5. A. Other resources the forest managers need to be manage in such a manner to protect the long standing recreation opportunities the forest offers.
- 0373-001 1. A. Open more trails & areas for year round motorized use 2. A. More people would be able to use forest lands more often 3. A. Very little funding would be necessary 4. A. Quiet Zone. Share areas equally. 5. A. Non-motorized/motorized users could easily share all areas possibly even week-on/week-off seasonally?
- 0374-002 motorized recreation; non-motorized recreation;
- 0374-005 2. A. 1) Develop Lost Lake Trail Snowmobiling route and other snowmobile trails near Seward.
- 0374-007 3) Develop downhill ski trails/mountainside at/on Tihaker Mountain.
- 0374-008 3. A. Potential conflict between snowmobilers and cross-country and between snowmobilers and downhill skiers. 4. A. Snowmobiles, cross-country skiers l1. A. Improve interfacing w/the public and "expedite," where possible and based on the merit of a proposal, the review and approval process.
- 0374-009 2. A. A downhill ski area on Tihaker Mountain (mi 8-12) from Seward, if meritorious, should be expedited so that some downhill use of the mountain be possible in 1998/99 winter region. 3. A. A local cooperative or limited partnership.corp. using private funds, ie Seward-Anchorage investors, could implement a pilot project. 4. A. Government red-tape. Meaningful discussions with Nat'l forest Mangmt personnel & others State/Fed agencies, solid business plan and environmental impact analysis. 5. A. Promotes tourism and develops character of Seward and recreational opportunities for Seward, Kenai Peninsula & (illegible). Could allocate nearby areas of mountain for cross-country skiing and snowmobiling. Minimal impact on bear or other wildlife habitat because limited to specific

Comment # Comment

- 0375-001 1. A. Keep upper trail Hunter River open to snowmachines & open
- 0375-005 3. A. Close upper Russia completely Close all Russian River save the Bears
- 0375-006 1. A. Open Lost Lake to ATV's. Trail improvements Lost Lake Trail Mi. 5.5 -
- 0376-002 Wildlife/Wilderness Forest condition logging/roads 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. That we will endanger existing wildlife & its habitat & create less desirable wilderness. 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. All people; motorized/non-motorized interests; tourists/locals; economic gain/no economic gain historic uses/increased usage; locals/non-locals
- 0377-003 how FS will use issues in determining objectives for certain segments of land Thresholds should be set which would then, depending on existing condition, drive projects. example: use habitat & bear capability index as LAC Threshold which would restrict development example: use demand for moose to determine % early (illegible) stage to meet subsistence levels in Hope
- 0377-005 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. see above
- 0378-001 1. A. Issues; balance of all interested parties. Can't please all the people all the time. In fact, the people are not the concern here, the RESOURCE is.
- 0378-002 2. A. The plan may be improperly managed or modified by specific local interests to suit their own agenda. Plan must be adhered to. ENFORCE
- 0378-003 The resource MUST prevail. It is THE most important factor involved. I am particularly concerned when I see local jurisdictions or citizens taking over and using public lands to their own benefit. Very dangerous precedent being set.
- 0378-004 I am not aware of a management plan. Perhaps a presence in Valdez would make the locals aware that there is mgmt. Even better, we would have a target to aim our concerns at
- 0378-005 We don't know we're involved until we read about it or see it on the news, after the fact.
- 0378-006 Regional Forester develops and office (presence) one year round person and fill staff positions with rotating
- 0378-007 A. Budget. Temporary people; use interns and volunteers, but back them up with a professional.
- 0378-008 All aspects of the mgmt plan can be addressed. At least concerned individuals would have somewhere to take their concerns.
- 0379-001 1. A. Specific Designations: Believe that zoning is important to protect the spectrum of multiple uses. Logging: it's ok but must be extremely judicious (is that contradictory?) Other organizations: USFS must work w/DNR.
- 0379-002 4. A. Do not believe that "locals" have superior rights in the forest to citizens elsewhere. As you note, it's a national
- 0382-003 1. A. Take politics out of resource management let good science prevail 2. A. The wrong people are making the decisions 3. A. Increase funding for proper decisions 4. A. Kick out Tony Knowles and his Republican cronies 5. A. They made the Whittier Road decision with no E.I.S. for P.W.S.
- 0383-001 1. A. Recreation, Tourism, Wildlife/Subsistence 2. A. See more Forest Service presence in Valdez in order to have plans for accessible Forest lands...trails, maine parks, etc.
- 0383-002 3. A. Acquire land around Valdez or designate areas with land which is not yet designated forest to stimulate interest & use (appears to be continued on back, but no copy) 4. A. Other state agencies people who own land which maybe suggested or ideal Forest Service acquisitions 1. A. 1) Acquire lands which are currently being logged/clear cut. 2) Also, acquire areas around Valdez to begin more active role. 2. A. 1) Because clear cutting is a sad picture in our Forests. 2) To enjoy our beauty in the N.E. Sound as well as other areas 3. A. It's hard to define feasibility of expansion when the Forest service is continually experiencing a reduction of funding. Expand to Valdez little by little (appears to be continued on back, but no copy) 4. A. Land owned by State & individuals & corporations
- 0383-003 5. A. as we see an influx of humans to Whittier via the new road system that issues of management will be tested like never before. Especially since we are traditionally underestimating volume of people from 1984 on!
- 0384-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Whittier Road = Recreation & economic development Logging = natives, labor, other landowners

Comment # Comment

- 0384-004 4. A. I think tourism will increase road or not. Logging will continue. So...important to implement planning tools to control NPS pollution, i.e. forestry BMPs, road construction BMPs. THE PROBLEM IS THERE ARE NOT SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO PLAN AND PROVIDE OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT OF BMPS BY ADEC, ADNDR, OR ANYONE ELSE. How to provide funds? User fees. Logging fees. Road use fee
- 0384-008 1. A. Work with ADEC water quality protection programs to adopt policies to protect habitat (F&G, DNR too), especially where increased development expected. Learn policies and provide oversight. 2. A. State funds have never been adequate to provide state resource agencies with field staff for PWS/Copper River Delta. 3. A. DEC to train forestry staff who get out in field. 4. A. Communication. Probably need more field staff for both fed & state agencies. Can the revised plan address forest service staffing?
- 0384-009 5. A. If you want all stakeholders to cooperate, they need to trust that policies in the plan will be monitored and
- 0385-001 1. A. Citizen involvement in the planning process. Meaningful, thorough 2. A. I believe that human values are most important in making resource allocation decisions -- science should be used to implement decisions. 3. A. How can the F.S. coordinate management direction with other agencies Land owners etc. and still be responsive to the desires of citizens. 4. A. It is important to understand the differences between Local community needs and Forest Users form the lower 48
- 0385-002 1. A. Long term improvement - Citizen involvement in the plan development & throughout implementation. 2. A. The public will begin to believe that the Forest belongs to them & their desires are valid. 3. A. Groups need to evolve around issues to be leaders. The F.S. can provide technical support. 4. A. Geographical Separation of Communities & time constraints of citizens. Internet, etc. More dedicated FS employees F.S. could advertise accomplishments of groups. 5. A. All aspects of Forest mgmt. would be improved if they were guided by diverse citizen groups.
- 0386-001 1. A. Motorized recreation 2. A. Where they can be used and where they can't, and why not. Because myself and other people use them 3. A. Tourism, wildlife, vegetation 4. A. All public, both recreational & non
- 0387-001 1. A. The development and management of the EVOS land purchase of the Tatiter Corp. Lands not showing access across private-native-lands 2. A. Own land at Snug Corner, logging has caused up growth in black bear density, existing roads from logging should remain open for recreation access of hunting, fishing & camping 3. A. Soft use on West side Harder use on East side
- 0387-002 1. A. Newly acquired LANDS... communicate directly with neighboring land owners during land management development to develop working relationship without developing problems. 2. A. The current land owners adjacent to new acquisition understand issue in regards to possible opportunities & best access locations, erosion problems, etc... 3. A. USFS should keep neighbor informed of possible management plans ask for suggestions & offer involvement to process. Funding is very low, low, very. NOTE - NEW LAND ACQUISITIONS - 4. A. Who is making the plan for this Tatitlek Land acquisition & its future management? I want to be part of this process/direction 5. A. It would provide a much need motorized vehicle use area in the Chugach Natl Forest. Would like to see a current breakdown of map on Internet of Evos Lands & proposed accesses
- 0388-001 1. A. Set up paired watershed study. Select 2 watersheds that have similar characteristics. Set up study where on watershed has active management, other left as natural areas. Use the difference between these areas to monitor whether a CTN management is meeting forest designed future conditions Use results to alter management direction 2. A. Need long term study of effects of manipulative management to answer some questions might help eventually resolve some of conflict 3. A. Active management fees could be put back into management A. People perceive any manipulative "use" of NF lands as unacceptable understanding how useful the 5. A. Will provide some long term
- 0389-001 1. A. ORV use right now you've 2. A. Although attendance at meetings like this are low I know a lot of people who want to see some ORV areas. I am stuck between keeping my activities quiet so to many people will ruin it by doing it & getting the #s I need to get a limited use of ORVs. 3. A. As you said any issue can affect other issues 4. A. While reading the Plan in the Valdez Library I was amazed by the small number of people & ORV's are involved. However after trying to get people to go to this meeting I understand the apathy the general public has for complex things like this. I don't think decision should be made on the opinions of a large group just because they could get
- 0389-002 1. A. A year to year look at open areas for ORV use - ie moving trails so huge mud holes are not created - multiple trails on big Islands so every one is not riding same place 2. A. Right now all of the CNF is closed except for small areas left for local needs. The areas Y rules I would propose affect a smaller area than any other use. I can explain if asked 3. A. I would gladly & have offered in person & writing to take CNF personnel out on my boat & machines & identify areas to ride & areas to avoid & rules to be followed 4. A. Apparently the way the current Plan is written ORV use for me is off limits in the CNF 5. A. Again many people feel ORV use is a negative & will fight it. I don't feel I tear up the country. I do make tracks. But with the right rules & working closely with CNF personnel I can be severely
- 0390-001 Look at the areas of that Situation Map that are important to you. 1. Q. What part of the Situation Map is particularly important to you? What issues are involved? 1. A. Wild rivers and their protection 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. Promotion of several wild rivers as candidates for protection Nellie Juan/River # 1/Bering/Martin

Comment # Comment

- 0390-002 Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. prioritization of river protection as a "highest use" above development 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. I am not sure, but certainly the Martin & Bering are candidates for logging operations. Q. How would you like to be involved as the revision process continues? A. I am available to be a resource providing first-hand knowledge of several rivers which are or should be under consideration for "wild" designation. Nellie Juan, Canyonck, Kenai, River #1, Copper, Martin & Bering. Q. Would you be interested in forming study groups on certain issues? A. Sure, tho I am probably most useful providing complete or draft river guidebook chapters on these
- 0391-004 Look at specific areas and find the best area for low impact, if any impact 2. Q. Why is this improvement desirable? 2. A. 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? How might your improvement be funded? 3. A. Trail user permit fees 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? 4. A. Existing policy
- 0392-004 By placing CNF offices & staff in the major communities to be year-long liaison w/local. Valdez need more permanency by CNF.
- 0392-005 2. Q. Why is this improvement desirable? 2. A. Education and access. More education will help people understand how vulnerable our forest is to commercial logging, overexploiting resources 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? For example, who might be responsible for implementation? How might your I know of no obstacles to this, except funding which will require public and private grass-roots push to EVOS, feds, state, city of Valdez
- 0392-006 Education is the best way to let people know how their public land are being managed
- 0393-002 3. A. Infrastructure support. 1. A. Increase visibility through interpretation and education of the value, uses, and opportunities in CNF. Long term. Support year round recreation uses w/ minimizing impact & improving infra support. 3. A. Visitor ctr. development in Valdez in partnered effort w/Evos and other agencies 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? How might those obstacles be overcome 4. A. Bringing the appropriate partners together. 5. Q. How does this improvement relate to other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation? 5. A. Improves community relations, establishes resources for other interest
- 0394-001 1. A. a) Wilderness b) Tourism & recreation c) public education d) Logging e) FS rgs.
- 0397-001 1. A. The College Fjord/Nellie Juan wilderness study area does not encompass enough low elevation, mature forest. Enlarge it by Including Andy Simon Mtn, Lark Mtn., Spencer & Bartlett glaciers. Also include upper Snow River, upper Ptarmigan Cr and Grant Lake and upper Falls Cr.
- 0397-003 3. A. You need to consider reducing the expectations of the logging industry for timber. They expect as much as they can process. You should also consider the amount of logging that already occurs on state & ANESA land that used to be Chugach National Forest.
- 0397-004 4. A. You must consider congress and its obvious lack of support for designating wilderness.
- 0397-007 3. A. Budget money to create a fire organization on SRD. Contract with State Division of Forestry for initial attack of wildfire in critical & full fire protection areas. Use SRD personnel for developing and implementing prescribed fire
- 0397-008 4. A. Leaders in the FS seem to regard logging as the best way to regenerate. The obstacle arises because the public doesn't like logging. Overcome the impasse by explaining fire to the public and getting pro- fire leaders.
- 0398-001 Our concerns can only be addressed through the continuation of the multiple use mandate which has been a cornerstone of Forest Service policy and set national forests apart from parks and refuges. The Chugach National Forest was intended to be managed for multiple use development, including timber, mining, oil and gas, recreation, commercial tourism and other resources. The national forest system was created to provide a continuous supply of timber, minerals, water and other resources. This policy should continue to be reflected in the new plan if the Chugach National Forest is truly to be a land of many uses. A number of RDC members are concerned the decision process will be biased by pre-decision planning for "recreation only" uses in the Forest. Multiple use means more than recreation, subsistence and wildlife habitat. These elements are all important, but must go hand-in-hand with responsible resource development. The Forest Plan Revision Map fails to address areas suitable for timber harvesting, mining exploration, destination tourism, or oil and gas development. The revision already appears predisposed to non-development, pro-wilderness designations. The new forest plan should not be based on opinion polls. Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived impacts to the forest.

Comment # Comment

- 0398-007 Land Withdrawals from Multiple Use: The cumulative socio-economic impacts of numerous withdrawals and proposed withdrawals of land from multiple use management must be addressed in the new plan. Moreover, the cumulative impact of large private land purchases by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees Council for the purposes of preservation must be outlined. This land represents a significant portion of private land holdings in the region, and the impact on the economic resource base of losing those holdings is a serious concern to RDC and its many members across Alaska. There should be a no net loss in the economic resource base. The Forest Service, in its new management plan for the Chugach, must balance increases in land withdrawals, with increases in resources
- 0399-001 As president of a stevedoring company which has experienced financial success since 1950, I contend that much of this success can be attributed to the extraction, use, and sale of Alaska's natural resources, such as oil and timber. These two resources, along with fish and various mineral resources, have also contributed to the success of numerous business operations in Alaska over the years. As the availability of these resources decline within certain areas of the state, I believe that there must be a moderate level of the multiple use of lands presently managed by the Chugach National Forest, allowing continual extraction and use of these valuable resources in a prudent and
- 0399-005 In conclusion, I hope that the CNFPT will apply reason and prudent judgment when considering any revisions to the Land Management Plan and not be unduly influenced by irrational environmentalists whose ultimate goal is to restrict the use of virtually all government and public land from access and use of its vital raw materials. A proper balance between preservation and use or consumption must be maintained. Without a moderate level of multiple use, the economic growth of this state will be adversely affected.
- 0400-001 The Chugach is a national forest of truly national significance. It holds the northernmost reaches of temperate rainforest in the United States. The Copper River Delta is the single largest undisturbed wetland for migratory waterfowl on the Pacific flyway. In the heart of the Chugach the Prince William Sound area has yet to fully recover from nation's worst oil spill eight years ago. Unlike most national forests, the Chugach faces little pressure to exploit it for timber resources. There are no communities that depend on supplies of Chugach timber to sustain their economies. Recreation, wildlife and providing subsistence food for rural Alaskans rank far higher among the uses a
- 0400-002 Despite the Exxon oil spill, these six million acres are among the wildest and least spoiled terrain in the national forest system -- and the Chugach plan should aim to keep them that way.
- 0400-003 - The Forest Service should adopt an ecosystem perspective and not focus solely on lands inside National Forest boundaries. The plan should consider the cumulative impact of activities on nearby lands (both public and private) and plan uses of National Forest lands accordingly. In general, Forest Service lands should be managed for a higher degree of environmental protection than is occurring on nearby private, state and local lands, to help mitigate the impacts of development activities on those lands. - The Chugach forest plan should coordinate with management plans that nearby public landowners have in the works -- the State of Alaska's Kenai area plan, the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan. -
- 0400-006 All alternatives in the draft plan must include provisions to ensure the survival of brown bear populations on the Kenai Peninsula. The Forest Service should initiate an inter-agency task force to protect the brown bear on the
- 0400-010 - The Forest Service should consider cumulative impacts, both for its own actions and the actions taken on nearby lands. This cumulative analysis should be sure to consider past activities and past Forest Service decisions. Activities that especially need careful cumulative impact analysis are mining, motorized recreation, and any small-scale, local-use logging that may be permitted. Individual raiing permits should be handled with Environmental Assessments that consider cumulative effects, rather than being approved under the current categorical exclusion.
- 0400-012 - Fire protection: The plan should recognize that fire is an integral part of the region's ecology and promotes forest regeneration. Fire management and suppression should concentrate on defense of inhabited areas. Backcountry areas should be reclassified to allow less intensive responses to wildfires. The forest service should map areas of high fuel load and identify places where all-out suppression is not necessary to protect public safety.
- 0400-013 - In crafting alternatives, the Forest Service should make clear that some uses cause inherent conflicts with other uses (such as motorized recreational access vs. quiet recreation; mineral entry vs. maximum fish and wildlife protection, etc.). In cases where one use interferes with other uses, the forest should be "zoned" into areas where that one use is predominant. -
- 0400-019 We'd also like to reiterate our earlier request and ask the Forest Service to hold public hearings on concept alternatives at sites in the Lower 48. The Chugach is truly a national forest of national significance, and the Forest Service should reach beyond Alaska so that people in the rest of the country have a full and fair chance to help
- 0401-001 In all honesty, other than the Salvage issue, I feel that the USFS has done a really wonderful job with the Chugach all these years. And even through the heat of the North Shore Road and proposed salvage sales, I know the USFS employees involved were trying their best to do the right thing.

Comment # Comment

- 0401-002 The future management of the Kenai Peninsula, and the Chugach National Forest will become much more complex with the coming millennium. The answers won't be as easy as in the past. In some ways though, your issues will be easier than those of the managers on the western Kenai. It's important though, for the USFS to work with the USFWS, NPS, State of Alaska, Kenai Peninsula Borough. Native people, and local communities both on the western Kenai and to the north of Turnagain and Prince William Sound.
- 0401-004 The issues of roading are in my mind probably of the greatest concern. With the construction of new roading on State, Borough, Native, and Private lands, I feel the USFS should move with caution on new roading projects. On the existing Seward/sterling Highway Corridor I strongly recommend following the guidelines in the 1998 Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan. This plan was developed under the four theses that: (1) Tourism to Alaska will continue to increase (2) The Seward Highway is composed of four distinct regions (3) The Seward Highway is a multi-purpose corridor serving resident and visitor, and commerce and the environment. (4) The successful management of the Seward Highway is dependent on the cooperation of existing institutions, resource managers and committed individuals. From these came three Keynote Ideas 1) The Seward Highway should provide a safe, aesthetic and world-class driving experience 2) Effective visitor management is necessary to ensure long term economic development and tourism. 3) Haphazard development poses the greatest threat to the highway's ability to attract visitors and quality development. I would urge the USFS to commit staff and time to the Seward Highway Partnership Board, and to integrate the above theses and keynotes into the Chugach Plan Revision. The Partnership Document can be a wonderful forum for development of the Eastern Kenai!
- 0403-001 This is a Petition to stop the Wild & Scenic Rivers Act that is Being Proposed for the Chugach National Forest. Some of the reasons are listed below. 1. Bear Creek, Palmer Creek to Sixmile Drainage have some of the longest history of mining & logging in the state. 2. There is already a permit system in place that adequately covers use our National Forest. 3. This act discriminates against everyone who is unable to hike into these areas. 4. More places should be opened, Instead of Closed, to RELIEVE some of the congestion at the few recreational areas in South-Central Alaska. 5. Half of Alaska has already been made inaccessible because of Parks, Preserves, Wilderness, special use & Wild & Scenic Rivers Designations. 6. This act could cripple Hope's Economy. People come to Hope to Gold Mine, snowmachine, use ATV's & just drive around looking at wildlife. 7. There is nothing wild about Hope-Sunrise area, man tamed it a hundred years ago. 8. The National Forest belongs to EVERYONE, not just a few special interest groups. Chugach National Forest should continue to be Designated as Multiple Use.
- 0404-001 We trust that the Chugach interdisciplinary team will use progressive science, and follow NFMA and NEPA while creating a plan for the future well-being of the forest and its inhabitants.
- 0404-002 MANAGEMENT DIRECTION RECOMMENDATIONS Cumulative Impacts Consider the cumulative impacts of all actions of all adjacent landowners in decisions made by the USFS.
- 0404-005 Monitoring programs A detailed and reliably funded research, evaluation and monitoring program should be in place for any action on the forest. No action should occur without a sufficient monitoring program.
- 0404-019 Some user fees (parking fees or a National Forest pass similar to the NPS Golden Eagle pass) would generate revenue to be used solely within the forest where it is generated.
- 0404-021 Cumulative impacts of adjacent landowners should be considered in all USFS decisions. The goal is species diversity and viability.
- 0404-026 The USFS should encourage public education and interpretation of fishery ecology as a means of providing for both public interest and fisheries protection.
- 0404-029 A systematic peer-reviewed monitoring program of actions that effect fisheries should be developed.
- 0405-001 I consider myself privileged to have had the opportunity to explore and appreciate the Chugach National Forest by hiking many of its trails and kayaking and camping in Prince William Sound. What a treasure the Chugach is! My vision for its future would be for it to remain at least as wild and biologically vibrant as it now is. Having worked at the Tetlin and Kenai National Wildlife Refuges and with the Forestry Division of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I am aware of increasing and varied demands being placed on our forests, and other natural areas. I urge you to ensure that the revision of the Chugach Land Use Management Plan provides first and foremost for the ecological needs of the forest. The Chugach should meet only those human demands that do not compromise its ecological integrity and should meet such demands in the most environmentally sensitive manner. I also urge you to ensure that the plan revision provides for low-impact, wilderness recreation to the greatest extent possible. Low-impact, non-motorized recreation is one of the most environmentally-benign uses of the forest. Further, given rising population and shrinking natural areas, recreation opportunities such as those offered by the Chugach are increasingly rare and should be guarded for both their economic and intrinsic values.
- 0405-005 Sustain the habitat of the Kenai brown bear population and work with other agencies and land owners to address the cumulative human impacts on all wildlife.

Comment # Comment

- 0407-002 2. Another mandate of the National Forest System is to maintain appropriate forest cover with species of trees, degrees of stocking, rate of growth, and conditions of stands designed to secure the maximum benefits of multiple use sustained yield management. Given the current condition of the spruce stands in the CNF, how will the plan address the mortality caused by the spruce bark beetle? These stands have been and continue to be in imminent danger from attack by the bark beetle. This situation has been largely ignored in the past. The plan should address this situation with silvicultural measures designed to restore and maintain forest health in order to benefit the other
- 0407-003 3. The CNF, as well as all other national forests, was intended to provide for multiple use, including timber production, other forms of resource development such as mineral and oil and gas development, recreational use, and development for tourism. How will the plan address these intended uses?
- 0408-001 I am a periodic Chugach National Forest user under my own power and occasionally hire commercial operators that have permits to conduct their business on the Chugach. I believe in the need to strive for a dynamic forest plan. A plan that recognizes advanced technologies for resource development and public lands access while providing recreational access for all user groups, motorized and non-motorized. Opportunity for commercial use by Alaska based businesses especially those recreational in nature are highly desirable for the Chugach National Forest. My desires for tourism related business opportunities are based strongly in multi use management of the Chugach National Forest. Additionally the USFS must defend the rights of citizens to access and develop the resources of the National Forest System. A few activists have been successful in undermining the basis of the National Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture. Some attack this institution's multi-use mandate on all development related fronts. Consistent intrusions by preservationist forces has; contributed to an unhealthy forest; restricted access by various user groups, both motorized and non-motorized; created chaos in several fisheries enhancement programs; and have prevented our government employees from achieving the goals of the 1984 Chugach National Forest Management Plan.
- 0408-002 Management Plan revisions should contain restrictions on the NEPA process. Permit applications by individuals for small Mom and Pop business cannot weather the lengthy NEPA process especially an application that attracts preservationist appeals. The Plan must allow activities to take place in areas of designation without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or biased opinion polls. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts, appeals should be limited to the same. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.
- 0412-001 As president of a stevedoring company which has experienced financial success since 1950, I contend that much of this success can be attributed to the extraction, use, and sale of Alaska's natural resources, such as oil and timber. These two resources, along with fish and various mineral resources, have also contributed to the success of numerous business operations in Alaska over the years. As the availability of these resources decline within certain areas of the state, I believe that there must be a moderate level of the multiple use of lands presently managed by the Chugach National Forest, allowing continual extraction and use of these valuable resources in a prudent and
- 0412-005 A proper balance between preservation and use or consumption must be maintained. Without a moderate level of multiple use, the economic growth of this state will be adversely affected.
- 0413-001 Since the last Land Management Plan was completed for the Chugach National Forest there has been a steadily accelerating decline in the health of the forest your agency is charged with managing. As an integral part of the revision process for the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan I urge you to adopt a pro-active management posture with respect to timber resource salvage and controlling forest pests in the future. It is imperative that your agency cut through all the political rhetoric and predictions of dire environmental disasters (always stated as fact by the preservationists - but never has any single one of them come about) and get back to the basics of truly being a "land manager". I appreciate the opportunity to provide my input.
- 0415-001 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed simplified fee system. As you know, we lead day kayaking and sailing trips from Growler Island Camp in Prince William Sound. All our guests overnight at the camp. We wonder why our type of day trip has not been included. It would seem to fit well with the Short-Stop/Flat Fee Proposal: Non-motorized freshwater float boat trips. Why is this category limited to freshwater? I note that there is a boat & Lodge based shore excursions, but we hardly seem to fit this category and note that our business was not included in the calculations here. I am curious how you reached an assumption that time on NFS ranged from 5 to 60%? I note that this is used for all 6 types of proposed flat-fee categories although it seems unlikely that they would all fall into this identical range. Is this based on information provided by the permittees? We provide this information when we file our permit returns. I suggest that the percentage of time figure be based on data provided in the past by permit holders. I also note that although you say 5 to 60% range, the fee is calculated on the highest estimated amount of use, not the average. If there is no documentation of the amount of quick-stop use on a day trip, then it would seem fairer to use the average than the highest estimate. In our case, I believe about 7 to 25% of our time is spent on Forest Service land. The average is around 15%. I look forward to learning more about this new proposal for calculating fees. Sincerely
- 0418-004 As the national forest proximate to Prince William Sound, the site of this country's most egregious oil spill, the Chugach holds a high profile in the eyes of many Americans. In the forest plan revision process, the Forest Service has a special opportunity to proceed with the recovery - both ecological and psychological that has begun since the 1989 disaster. I hope the Chugach National Forest will recognize this opportunity and draft a plan that offers exceptional protection to the area as wilderness and wildlife habitat.

Comment # Comment

- 0419-001 Since the last Land Management Plan was completed for the Chugach National Forest there has been a steady decline in the health of the forest your agency is charged with managing. As an integral part of the revision process for the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan I urge you to adopt a pro-active management posture with respect to timber resource salvage and controlling forest pests in the future. It is imperative that your agency get back to the basics of being a multiple use manager. The federal government has a role to assure the people of America have the natural resources to grow and prosper as a nation. The federal government is too large of a resource owner to ignore their role in providing these resources America needs.
- 0421-001 Planning Process Soliciting concerns from the public is an appropriate and necessary process. It is also one of the most important features of both our natural resource laws and of our society. Author John Naisbitt, in his best seller Megatrends, recognized the implications of our shift away from a representative democracy to becoming a more participatory democracy. The reasoning for this shift is that people whose lives are affected by a decision must be part of the process of arriving at that decision. However, I have concerns that this process frequently gives too much weight to a minority view simply because its advocates are very vocal or participate extensively in the decision making process. Neither should policy be developed solely upon the simple number of responses for or against an issue, or upon well-orchestrated media coverage. Public agencies such as the Forest Service are also held responsible to, laws and regulations that were developed via the representative democracy process. This checks and balances system becomes critical when dealing with complex issues that often pit competing resource interests against each other. This is one of the reasons why Congress has directed the National Forests to be managed for multiple use. The Forest Service should not lose sight of this directive and the reasons behind it. I have strong concerns that the new direction of the Forest Service, and the Chugach National Forest in particular, is increasingly towards the more singular uses of wilderness and recreation, and away from a more balanced mixture of uses. Much of this is due to unnecessary pressure and influence from Washington D.C. and others unfamiliar with the unique situations and huge Conservation Units already protected in Alaska. Modern resource development practices, together with continued monitoring and adaptive management, should be given more consideration in your decision making process than are views of very vocal opponents to resource development.
- 0421-002 Specificity of Plan The present 1984 Chugach Land Management Plan is very vague and should have more specifics. This is one reason why so many Forest Service projects end up in administrative appeal or litigation. Individual projects such as timber sales presently have very little planning guidance to tier to. A very specific plan is needed in order to avoid surprises and project delays, and to reduce the money and staff time spent on subsequent appeals and litigation. This would also clearly demonstrate how all projects and decisions meet the mission, goals, and objectives of the Forest Service. For example, the draft Plan should clearly identify areas on a map where timber harvest will be done over the next 10 years instead of simply listing a targeted volume by Management Area. This would not necessarily require planning at the same scale used for individual sales (a watershed scale may suffice). Similarly, the Plan should develop specific Visual Quality Objectives and Recreational Opportunity Spectra for all areas of the Forest. This should clearly identify the objectives, specific high value locations, and typical management prescriptions instead of relying upon more general guidance for the Forest as a whole. Consensus from all interest groups is probably not a realistic expectation for any forest plan. However, a very specific Plan may help achieve as much consent as possible because proposed decisions could be reviewed in a broader landscape context. By consent I mean that some groups may not like the decision but will not appeal it. The Forest Service may get consent for logging within a specific watershed at the Plan level if it is clearly evident that other specific watersheds will be managed primarily for recreation. The eventual individual timber sales would never be a surprise and should proceed more smoothly. Perhaps timber harvest areas should have been proposed during the scoping phase of the Plan revision (similar to how the Wild & Scenic River eligibilities were presented). This may have identified where timber harvesting would be acceptable to critics. Actually this would probably expose that no area is acceptable to many critics, and thus further weaken their litigation and frivolous concerns over individual sales.
- 0423-002 For the most part, I think you do a good job of setting forth proposed revision topics.
- 0423-012 C) The overall vision I would also like to see the Plan try to articulate an overall vision for the forest, one that transcends the specific topics discussed in the Plan and brings them all together into a coherent whole instead. Even with the multiple use mandate that the Forest Service operates under, the fact remains that different national forests around the nation have extremely different characters, and, consciously or not, have come to articulate some very different visions of what a public forest might be. It is important that the Chugach be guided by an overall vision of what it should be, and not simply have its character determined by accident. Some national forests have ended up being primarily high impact industrial in nature, as the gutted national forests of the Pacific Northwest sadly attest to other national forests have ended up being preserved primarily as non-industrial, low impact recreational forests, as is the case with the Los Padres National Forest in California, or the George Washington National Forest in Virginia. I for one would rather see the Chugach tend towards the latter model than the former; the Chugach is a prime Alaska tourism and recreational area, one that is well deserving of a comparable level of protection for these premier uses. Still, the overall vision of the Chugach needs to take into account what is absolutely unique about this forest -- the incredible amount of true roadless wilderness it has to provide. In this regard, the Chugach should not just be viewed as another recreational forest, but as something more. Something that is incompatible with any commercial logging, mining, or extensive development, and that represents a unique use value that both benefits large numbers of residents and the Chugach should be, and implements a Forest Plan in which the Chugach will be preserved as the rare world-class recreational and wilderness resource that it is.

Comment # Comment

- 0434-002 2. Lack of credible resource information in the scoping process. The information provided the public during the scoping phase of the plan revision has been lacking in data concerning various resource values across the landscape. Where are the maps showing beetle infestation extent, mineral potential, timber values, visitors days etc.? Does the forest lack this type of data or has the planning team determined that such facts are not relevant to meaningful forest planning? The comment map prepared by the Forest Service biases public input on Issues such as
- 0434-003 3. The planning team is violating ANILCA Studying the eligibility of Rivers within the forest for the sole purpose of nomination as a Wild and Scenic Conservation System Unit is in direct conflict with ANILCA and Is an Inappropriate undertaking for the planning team.
- 0434-004 4. The Forest Service mandate requires management for multiple uses. The organic act and multiple use mandate require the Forest Service to provide for true multiple uses including industrial forestry and mining. The forest plan is not the place to reinvent this mandate, as is apparently being proposed by the emphasis towards recreation and habitat as single use objectives of the forest. The question for the public is not whether timber harvest Is appropriate on the forest. Congress, not the administration, is the body empowered with implementing such sweeping changes in the management direction of these public lands.
- 0434-009 9. The forest plan must include a strict implementation policy to avoid the abuses in non-implementation as has occurred since the 1984 plan was prepared (such as the significant failure to achieve the target allowable timber sale quantity and the arbitrary withdrawal of any timber salvage attempts by the forest supervisor).
- 0435-007 6) Cumulative impacts. Somehow with all the various plans and regulatory processes and management decisions that are taking place on the Kenai Peninsula, we need to address the cumulative impacts of our decisions on the many various topics. And I know this is much easier said than done. In fact the success rate for addressing this issue elsewhere has been dismal.

Comment # Comment

0436-003

Implementing a Plan of Action to Provide for Regional Landscape Level Management. I am introducing an outline that provides a means of implementing regional plans for the management of forest resources based on objective forest conditions. This outline is intended to provide an overview of a means for cooperative development of management planning on a regional basis. The implications of adoption of such a cooperative plan are extensive and reflect on the heightened concerns being expressed throughout the region for a better, more effective means of conducting forest resource management to reflect the needs of the forest and society for a diverse, sustainable, and resilient forest capable of meeting a variety of needs for both today and the future. The responsibility for forest resource management involves a number of organizations. While it is their task to effectively manage their lands for management objectives, forest health and risks are factors that influence these lands on a regional basis which can negate or reduce the effectiveness of land management on smaller tracts of ownership. It is necessary that landowners both realize the importance of planning on a regional (landscape level basis) and have a means or decision-making process for implementation of such plans. Components of this outline: Description of the Environment (The Ecosystem Diversity Matrix): The USFS; has developed a mapping of forest areas in Alaska by Ecological Units. These Ecological units subdivide into finer habitat type classifications which can provide a basis for management planning and create an Ecosystem Diversity matrix. Establishing a forest inventory of habitat types which are based on identifiable site parameters is the first step. Forest canopy structure for each habitat type can vary depending on historical events including insect and disease incidence and fire. Research must provide forest growth and yield information for these habitat types. Wise management of the forest on a regional basis will require providing a balance of the forest structures within these habitat types. Failure to provide this balance can contribute to the long-term health decline and reduction of a diverse, and sustainable forest on a regional basis. A process has been developed for the balanced distribution of stand structures within habitat types as was recently outlined by Dr. Bob Pfister from the University of Montana. This process could be successfully developed as part of a region-wide natural resource management plan. Necessary information for each habitat type classification. Tree species and canopy structure for a given habitat type. (small tree single story, medium tree multi-story, etc.) Associated Stand Hazards Associated Site Productivity Classes Access Class Condition Classes (heavy insect activity, heavy disease, heavy fire risk, diverse vigorous stand, stagnated stand, wind damage) The Process of Integrating Landscape Ecology and Natural Resource Management. (The Decision-making process) Once the Ecosystem Diversity Matrix is completed, we can proceed with development of a process by which we can integrate landscape ecology with natural resource management. In order to integrate ecosystem management into a natural resource management plan it will be necessary to develop working groups dedicated to various natural resources such as vegetation, wildlife, society needs, and landscape level processes and provide a framework for their cooperative effort. This can be facilitated by organizations such as the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The integration of these groups will be further augmented with the utilization of a calibrated forest planning model such as Forest Vegetation Simulator Growth and Yield Model. The Alaska Cooperative Extension in cooperation with the USFS is seeking to develop a calibrated Stand Prognosis Model for the South-central and Interior forest region of Alaska. This model could become a valuable tool in the process of management planning integration. Tools For The Decision-Making Process: Ecosystem Diversity Matrix (identified above) Vegetation, Wildlife, and Landscape level processes working groups Human Dimensions Group (derived from a cross-section of the public and developed through the Cooperative Extension Program) Stand and Forest Growth and Yield Modeling Integration Planning Process to incorporate working group inputs Forest Natural Resource Management Plan: Piecing the complex Ecosystem Diversity Matrix together over time in order to provide a healthy forest through ecosystem management on a landscape level (such as is being conducted by the University of Montana for the Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Research Project). The silvicultural practices to promote and sustain a forest condition include a variety of tools including prescribed burning, natural processes, and various timber harvesting options. It is essential to realize that the bottom line is the maintenance of a long-term sustainable, healthy, and diverse forest condition. During the application of this decision-making process in Montana, it was found that using this approach rather than one aimed at a target commodity output actually achieve a combination of goals including better public support for harvest activities since the public is the body to decide the forest condition for which they want managed. The decision-making process will be aided by a decision-making body derived from the public that are trained by third party specialists in order to empower them to participate in constructive dialog on future forest conditions and process to achieve those conditions. In addition to the efforts to develop effective natural resource management plans for Alaskan forest areas it is also necessary that we do a better job of educating the public about ecosystem management. Examples of alternatives that could be supported to assist this process include efforts by the State of Alaska Dept. of Nat. Resources under support of the USFS to provide for Project Learning Tree in the public schools. Another recent example is the 4-H Forest Ecosystem Natural Resources Education Project developed by Julie Riley of the Alaska Cooperative Extension (ACE). This outline was presented to provide an opportunity to see a new horizon for natural resource management and with a hope that decision-making for the future forests for Alaska will be made in a manner to be looking to a future condition rather than simply attempting to correct past errors and which reflects the needs and desires of society. Bob Wheeler Recommendations for Action by the University of Alaska Fairbanks The University is poised in a position whereby it can participate in a substantial way in the development of forest management activities pertinent to the needs of Alaskans and the nation. Looking at the activities that are being conducted by other universities such as the University of Montana it becomes clear that a sense of purpose or mission orientation would greatly assist with the identification of the University and recognition of its involvement in natural resource management and serve as basis for arguments for further financial support. Alaskan Forest Ecosystem Oriented Research (AFEOR): The mission of this program would be largely to provide needed research on forest management activities that would become integral parts of the ecosystem management approach to providing desired forest health conditions. As part of this program, it might be considered to develop a Center for Social Dimensions Involving Boreal Forest Management which could be developed through our Resource Management Department. The following recommendations are made with the intent of designing a comprehensive regional forest management program oriented around ecosystem management (forest management prescriptions that promote

Comment # Comment

ecosystem values) to be applied on a landscape level or regional basis. The University will want to work closely with forest landowners and managers to assure that the goals of management are being met by the applied research being conducted. With the closure of the Institute of Northern Forestry, the University of Alaska Fairbanks is the primary institution that can conduct this needed component of the overall management of regional forests oriented towards providing long-term sustainable, vigorous, and diverse forests. In order to achieve these goals it will be necessary that regional planning be done cooperatively with landowners and managers, the university, and the public. Through this cooperative agreement, activities such as research needs regarding habitat units and natural resource management prescriptions would be identified and conducted. For the UAF this would entail not only research on growth and yield under different stand management prescriptions such as partial cutting or stocking level reductions but also regeneration considerations from fire prescriptions, the development and application of the computer Forest Vegetation Simulator Growth and Yield Model, the development and application of an Integration model to coordinate Landscape Ecology with Natural Resource Management, the application of GIS and GPS to facilitate management decisions for ecosystem management applied on landscape level, development of a program to educate and empower a body of public representatives to provide a means of meaningful dialog with natural resource managers about social values that will guide the decision-making process to determine social needs and values for jobs, natural resource access and management input, and to provide public school educational programs designed to improve understanding of forest ecosystem. It would also be of interest to conduct research on the

- 0439-005 The balance of the ecosystem must be protected. You can do this now. Timber giants who log our resources have nursed at the gov't breast so long./ They don't know any other way to rip off the taxpayer. Do this plan correctly and the rewards will be for generations future visitors.
- 0441-001 The Forest Revision November flyer and comments page reminded me of an item which should be addressed within this revision. If it hasn't been mentioned yet communication services on NF lands deserves some detailed planning and direction. Currently we administer numerous state and private permits for a variety of communication services on NF administered lands. We also have our own communications equipment. Typically these communication sites are located at key "high point" locations. The problem is that there is very little in the way of cooperative planning between FS, State, BLM, law enforcement, private, Coast Guard (or whatever). The result is a mish mash or comm. sites in a type of "urban sprawl" on these mountain tops.....and there is an ever increasing demand for more and more. How much is enough? How can we work together with other agencies and private organizations to meet all needs with a minimum of impact? Where should we continue to allow site expansion? Where not? Are there locations which should be added? There's a lot more to it than I've indicated but this is a start.
- 0442-001 It was good to see you all again. Thank you for making the trip to Valdez and sending us information for the library. I liked the format you followed, because it gave participants and opportunity to meet and talk with people holding different views. However, since the timeframe was so rushed, I feel that only the first step in discussion, listening, occurred, not the development of constructive ideas. That happened after your meeting here Dave Daniels, the Valdez fisherman who has been carrying on a with the Cordova office about the use of ORVs, and I met for the first time and shared a table. It seemed to me that he had a valid point about using ORVs on existing roads at the FAA station. I also referred him to the last Forest Plan and EIS in the Valdez Library and other documents you sent. Since then, he has stopped me on the dock and said, he's changed his mind: He'd rather have all wilderness and no ORVs. He hadn't thought of the impact on the Sound, even the FAA station area, if everyone who had an ORV decided to go there. It would have been more beneficial for your planning efforts if more time had been allowed for discussion and a chance to really think about the effects of individual proposals before you picked up the pieces of paper.
- 0442-006 During the last planning process, we were very concerned with the range of alternatives offered. For example, alternatives that we might have supported for several reasons were lumped together with options that we would not have supported in any alternative such as widespread prescribed burning for game species habitat improvement. We would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in considering the range of alternatives during the planning process. We also remain concerned about the status of the inventories on which the planning process according to the Fed. rgs. is based. As you know, this was a point of concern during the previous planning process. The recreation inventory, for example, had a statistical reliability of 0 and included all the ice, rock and glaciers; the timber inventory was based on aerial photographs and not ground proofed. This led to statements such as "There is an unlimited supply of recreation lands and a limited demand," as well as "There is a limited supply of commercial timber and an unlimited demand." We are most concerned that the analysis of the management situation, alternatives and economic analyses be based on accurate, statistically reliable inventories. We look forward to reviewing both the inventories and the analyses of the management situation. When this step is completed, we hope that you will make them available to the Valdez Public Library.
- 0443-003 The main thing we want out of the forest plan revision is a guarantee that ecologically significant portions of the national forest will be protected for the long term. We think of ecological significance in terms of sufficient diversity of native flora and fauna, and sufficient quantity of land to maintain healthy populations in the face of human pressures, non-human cycles/disturbances, and the likelihood of global climate change. We want these protected areas to include low elevation native forest-- we are not satisfied with what has become a standard "protect the rocks, ice, and tundra" scenario. We assume that protection on an ecological level, rather than merely a scenic level, would require protecting entire watersheds, which in many cases would require cooperation between the USFS and other land owners. We would like the USFS to use the revision process to initiate this kind of cooperation, recognizing that national lands are often the last refuge for wide ranging wildlife and mature native forests.

Comment # Comment

- 0443-004 As a first step, we would like the USFS to complete a landscape level cumulative impact analysis-- one that accounts for what has happened on the land since the last forest plan was put into place, as well as projecting land uses that are currently committed or planned for the foreseeable future. As well as studying national forest lands, this cumulative impact analysis should include state, borough, private, and municipal lands that are geographically or ecologically related to national forest lands (from standpoint of wildlife, water, and community users.) This analysis should cover changes in recreational use opportunities as well as impacts to wildlife populations, water quality, and
- 0445-003 Third, I would like to urge that the plan should consider the "Big picture"; that is, cumulative effects of any decision or action on all uses of the Chugach N.F. should be considered. I can not emphasize this too strongly!
- 0445-010 Tenth, and last (but not least!): I hope that you will remember, at all times, as you are revising the Chugach N.F. management plan, that this treasure is owned by all Americans, including many who will never see it but are nevertheless concerned about it's management and hence it's fate. There are many areas in our country that I have never visited, and never will; however, I want them to be properly managed and protected, and those that I'm a part owner of, as is the case with the National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and Public Domain lands managed by the B.L.M., I believe I have a right to expect that they will be! You have a responsibility as managers of the National Forests to be good stewards of the land, and not yield to those who would push the "lowest common denominator" approach. I urge you to carry out that responsibility in a conscientious manner.
- 0446-002 2. ANILCA. When Congress enacted the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act it stated that sufficient conservation units had been created, and mandated that no more studies be conducted for the; single purpose of establishing new conservation units except by Congressional direction. This is a clew prohibition against the creation of now wilderness and/or Wild and Scenic Rivers. Therefore, the USFS should not be considering the designation of or studying the creation of new conservation system units in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0446-004 4. Cumulative Impacts of Withdrawals. The cumulative impacts of the numerous withdrawals and proposed withdrawals from multiple use management in the Chugach National Forest is of great concern to the economic welfare of the region. Existing withdrawals, along with the habitat purchases by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees must be considered. These expanding "habitat areas" have a significant detrimental impact on the available economic
- 0446-005 5. Decision Process. The Chugach Nation Forest was intended to be managed for multiple-use development - including mining, forestry, oil & gas, recreation, tourism, etc. My impression of recent planning is that the trend is toward wilderness and recreation rather than traditional multiple-use.
- 0446-009 9. User Fees No new public user fees should be implemented other than for developed campgrounds or parking areas. Fees for access to unimproved areas of the Forest is not appropriate for land owned by the public.
- 0447-003 There are complex land ownership patterns within the Chugach National Forest Coordination and cooperation with all land owners (including private, state, and other federal lands) will be necessary for the Forest Service to effectively plan for the future. Coordinated efforts like the Kenai River Special Management Area can help to protect ecosystems and/or watersheds where there are different land owners and management agencies. The cumulative impacts from adjacent landowners' activities on Chugach lands must be considered as well.
- 0449-003 In light of increased number of tourists and visitor's and the importance of this industry to the State, related FACILITIES, includes campsites, cabins, boating facilities, leaseholds for private enterprises need to be addressed and
- 0449-005 For all these facilities GRAVEL and MATERIALS SOURCES should be identified and designated and multiple use planned for (example: gravel pit can be developed into a campground).
- 0449-006 In this age "lock-up" is no longer an option. Wise and carefully crafted use of our resources is the answer and the preferred course. We hope that this management plan moves in that direction.
- 0450-003 3. Wild & Scenic Rivers: I am in opposition to the inclusion of the 20 rivers proposed for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers. Classification of these rivers as "Wild and Scenic" will reduce the opportunity for multiple use management by segmenting the forest and fragmenting the transportation system. Rivers classified as "Wild and Scenic" essentially isolate parcels of land and reduce the number of management alternatives available.
- 0450-004 4. No Net Loss: The USFS should balance the effects of private lands being removed from the resource base due to purchase by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees. As in Southeast Alaska where preservationist claim that harvest on private lands must be factored into the timber harvest planning process on the Tongass, so should timberlands remove from production by EVOS be factored into the Chugach Land Use Plan. Since 1891, when the forest reserves were established, the primary purpose of the National Forest system has been to provide an even flow of Umber resources. The specific mix of resources has changed over, the past decades, but the primary product has been a healthy forest providing Umber, wildlife, recreation and water resources. The staff of the Chugach should develop a plan that applies the science necessary to maintain the health of the forest. The plan should not be tailor to placate those few zealots that would sacrifice the long-term health of the Chugach for short-term political gain. Without the implementation of a scientifically sound silvicultural prescription, the Chugach will face decades, if not generations of stagnation before the existing climax stage of succession can be achieved. This is not a popularity contest, sound silviculture must take precedence over political correctness when land management decision are made.

Comment # Comment

- 0451-002 2. Please don't make any new wilderness areas on Kenai Peninsula - leave it all multiple use.
- 0451-003 3. Leave all mineralize zones/land multiple use
- 0451-005 5. Hope residents demand that the VSFS manage the Forest to protect our subsistence activities of mining. fish & game utilization, use of forest products and access to all Kenai Peninsula! Hope is a Rural Subsistence comm.
- 0452-006 As an aside note, except for emotional effect, I have yet to figure how the EXXON Valdez oil spill directly ties in to logging or forest management.
- 0453-001 Although management of the wilderness seems like a strange idea to me - it is wilderness that has allowed the beauty and diversity found in nature to develop - I realize it can be done responsibly to benefit wildlife, human lifestyles, the land, and future generations. I urge you to take into account the intrinsic value of these forests and our responsibility to our children to preserve them. There are many uses and aspects of forests that make them
- 0453-004 If recreation will take place - and I hope it will - let it be without roads that cut through the heart of the wilderness, and be well monitored.
- 0453-005 Let the uses of the forest be highly sustainable ones that do not destroy the diversity, health, or beauty contained within. Please - if you must manage - do it the right way. Look to the future and the peace and beauty that future generations deserve.
- 0455-002 2) I support multiple use of the Chugach National Forest. This Includes retaining any access built to support multiple
- 0455-003 3) I support ANILCA Section 101, "Sufficient conservation units"; and Section 1326 (b) "No more studies" clauses.
- 0456-001 INTRODUCTION As a preliminary matter, I call to your attention the letter I filed with Acting Forest Supervisor Dave Gibbons on December 11, 1997 (attached hereto as Appendix A), requesting a revised scoping period and schedule (incorporated here by reference). In that letter, I cited deficiencies in the information available to the public during the present scoping period. As of this date, I have received no reply to the letter. AFA continues to maintain that information essential to meaningful public participation during the scoping period was inadequately represented in the documents readily available to the public during this period. I therefore urge the Forest Service to reopen the scoping period to correct those deficiencies. AFA reserves to right to add to the comments contained in this letter if the
- 0456-002 1. THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST IS MAINTAINED IN MULTIPLE USE STATUS THROUGHOUT THE LIFE OF THE FOREST PLAN The Forest Service has an obligation to the Alaska public to ensure that the Chugach National Forest remains open for the full range of multiple uses over the life of the forest plan. These include recreation opportunities and resource development options. A full range of alternatives which includes a variety of combinations of the various uses must be reasonably considered during the EIS process. There must not be a presumption that certain areas will be designated wilderness prior to the development of the plan. Only those areas designated as a Wilderness Study Area by ANILCA should be considered eligible for wilderness designation, but it must not be predetermined to be set aside for wilderness status. It should be thoroughly evaluated for its potential for other uses. Given the amount of land already designated as wilderness in Alaska (62% of all federal wilderness in the United States), it would be inappropriate to designate the entire 1.97 million acre Wilderness Study Area as recommended wilderness under the revised plan. It would be equally inappropriate to retain the wilderness recommendation on the 1.7 million acres so recommended in the 1984 forest plan. Such actions would only preclude multiple use management on those acres and reduce the opportunities for the people of Alaska.
- 0456-003 II. THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD INCLUDE LANDS DESIGNATED FOR TIMBER DEVELOPMENT TO ENSURE TIMBER DEVELOPMENT IS GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION AMONG THE VARIOUS MULTIPLE USES OF THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST Potential for commercial timber development in the CNF must be given substantial weight in the EIS and the forest plan, and lands which can sustain economic commercial timber harvests should be designated for that purpose in the plan. The "Public Comment Map" failed to indicate suitable forest lands (CFL) as required by 36 CFR 219.14. It merely indicates "biologically capable timber land." This seems to display a predisposition by the Forest Service not to manage the timberlands of the Chugach National Forest for commercial timber harvest. The plan should identify those areas of the CNF that contain commercial timber and designate sufficient acreage to sustain a timber sale program over the life of the plan, CFL designations and land designations set aside for commercial timber harvests should, at a minimum, include CNF land on the Kenai Peninsula which is currently accessible by road and contains many acres of insect damaged timber. The EIS should likewise consider putting the southern end of Montague Island into a land use designation that would make it available for commercial timber harvest, since there is both merchantable timber and existing infrastructure (a road and a Log Transfer Facility) to support economic timber sales. The revised forest plan should not only designate those lands that will be developed for commercial timber offerings, it should also include a timber sale schedule to comply with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA) regulations (36 CFR 219.16). The DEIS must also include statistically reliable growth and yield tables for all silviculture systems reasonably anticipated for use on the Chugach National Forest. This is required to meet NFMA requirements for determining sustainability of timber harvest on lands designated for such use (see 36 CFR 219.16). Without such tables, a determination that an alternative complies with sustained yield principles will be impossible.

Comment # Comment

- 0456-005 IV. THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY LANDS WITH HIGH POTENTIAL FOR OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT, AND PRESERVE ACCESS TO THOSE LANDS FOR FUTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT. Areas with known oil and gas reserves potential should be given an oil and gas development prescription and should be designated by the plan for future oil and gas development. Oil and gas development opportunities must be evaluated in the EIS, and a full range of alternatives which include opportunities to explore for and develop oil and gas reserves in the CNF should be considered.
- 0456-010 IX. CONCLUSION In summary, AFA requests that the Forest Service ensure that a genuine multiple use management approach governs the writing of the Chugach Land Management Plan revision and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement. The new plan should not preclude management options that will be important for the health of the forest and the health of the regional economy. It should enhance, not interfere with, the normal, natural and permissible uses of the forest by the people who live there, work there, and visit there, The Forest Service should strive to manage, not lock up, the Chugach National Forest so that it remains healthy and vibrant, and so that activities, including timber harvest, can be sustained on the CNF in perpetuity.
- 0456-011 The Alaska Forest Association and its member companies have been carefully going over the scoping information provided by the Chugach Land Management Plan (CLMP) revision team. I am writing to ask you to consider altering your revision schedule to provide a better scoping period prior to beginning the planning process in earnest. The scoping stage of the CLMP revision is exceptionally important since it is the period that defines the issues to be considered during the planning process and the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While we recognize the magnitude of the task before you and appreciate the effort your team has put into providing materials for public use in the scoping process, we have some concerns which have prompted this request: Lack of maps. I asked for all available information, including all Available maps when I visited your offices a month ago. Only one map was available, entitled, "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." I was also given a couple back issues of the CLMP newsletter, and a brief description of the CLMP team. When I asked again about other maps, I was told there were none. I am told that at the public workshops held in Anchorage and Cordova, there were several maps displayed. AFA would like to have an opportunity to study all available maps prior to the close of the scoping period. Please have someone contact me regarding the availability of additional maps. "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." There are several features which keep this from being an appropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. For example, established rights of way granting public access across private lands are shown. Valid access rights across National Forest System lands to ensure access to private property, however, are not shown. This information could be very important in forming public opinion as to appropriate land use designations. Leaving this kind of information off the map will skew the process from the start. The map also fails to identify known mineral deposits, nor does it identify known anomalies and other areas of significant potential for mineral development. It likewise fails to identify the commercial forest lands on the CNF, settling for an ambiguous "biologically capable timber land" indicator. This makes it very difficult for the public to appreciate the economic potential which would be forgone if these areas are put into non-development land use designations. The map is also misleading in the way it treats land ownership. Non-federal ownership, other than state marine parks, is shown in grey. I know this is fairly standard with Forest Service land use maps. However, since a unique set of circumstances exists on the Chugach, derived from events in 1988, it is not appropriate in this case and helps make this map misleading as a basis for public comment on the CLMP revision. There is a world of difference between land owned by a corporation and intended for resource extraction, and land purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. As you know, the latter is to be perpetually protected (i.e., non-development use only). These usage differences are important if the public is going to have a realistic picture of what is likely to happen across the forest over the next decade or so. The coding on the map and the list of "eligible" Wild and Scenic River areas included in the November newsletter is not easy to connect. If the public is to know enough to comment on whether these rivers are appropriately being considered for nomination, there should be, at a minimum, a number key that connects printed information on each river (the name, for example) with its location on the map. Finally, I am puzzled by one item of information which the Forest service is stating with respect to the Chugach National Forest. At the workshops, the team is saying that 98.9% of the CNF is unroaded or without "improved road access." Given that the Seward Highway bisects a significant chunk of the Chugach, I would like to know how this is calculated. Do you consider a half-mile corridor along the road to be accessed by the road? A mile? More? Less? How does the Forest Service plan to treat RS 2477 access? It would ear that at least one recognized RS 2477 right of way will be severely, perhaps permanently, impaired by a Wild and Scenic River designation. AFA believes that the information missing from the publicly released scoping documents is significant enough to warrant a new scoping period. Please consider, at least, issuing additional maps and information and extending the period for public scoping comments by
- 0457-001 Conservation and preservation are the most important ideas to consider when I think of the future of Chugach N.F. and Alaska.
- 0458-001 All proposed actions that require review/approval by the Forest Service must address overall cumulative impacts within CNF. -
- 0460-001 As the Chugach National Forest proceeds with the Land Management Plan revision process, I urge you to adopt a pro-active forest management posture. The health of the forested areas within the Chugach National Forest is deteriorating rapidly. Only a scientifically applied, active land management program can maintain the health of the
- 0462-009 Cooperative efforts with other agencies such as DNK and local land use planning advisory committees is critical.

Comment # Comment

- 0463-008 The Forest Management Objectives should reflect the potential for jobs and income from tourism. Management Prescriptions should allow for a spectrum of tourism activities as consistent with the character of the Forest, particularly emphasizing the increasing value of nature and wilderness-based tourism in an increasingly crowded and environmentally disturbed world. D. Existing and projected economic impacts of tourism must be accurately estimated and addressed. The tourism industry in conjunction with the State Division of Tourism has compiled detailed statistics and annual rates of growth by region, certain destinations, demographic characteristics, etc. that should be used as the definitive source. Demand forecasts and employment assumptions and impacts for tourism resources should be reviewed and verified by the industry. E. Site Specific Data Collection. Site specific tourism data must be collected in order to discern impacts and perform alternatives analysis. Towards this end, AWRTA and AVA are working together to initially develop maps depicting water use by different types of member boat use. If additional maps are needed to supplement the tourism/recreation data base, we are willing to work with our members to develop needed information. The Geographic Information System (GIS) data base layer(s) used to define tourism and recreation should receive industry review prior to development of alternatives. This should be integrated within a watershed by watershed inventory of the forest which would identify issues regarding water quality, riparian areas, wildlife and fisheries, and any harmed areas. This will help the Forest Service and the public better understand the impacts of future actions on the forest on a watershed level.
- 0463-009 Due to the proximity of the Forest to a significant portion of Alaska's population base, the Forest Plan must include the role of the motorized and non motorized private user in the future vision of the Forest. In order to get a complete picture of use patterns and subsequent impacts, the Forest Service needs to consider this growing demand on
- 0463-011 The proposed management of non forest land should be shown on base maps and considered during the alternative analysis. Identification of land ownership and management patterns will provide a more comprehensive overview of the regional resources. For example, the 1995 Alaska State Marine Park Management Plan outlines a substantial increase in developed recreational facilities. In order to prevent duplication and excessive growth in facilities, the Forest Plan must incorporate the State Park Plan as part of the access picture.
- 0463-013 The Forest Service should more actively promote the Leave No Trace education program to provide the science and the ethics to help people mitigate their adverse impacts to the environment. Both cultural and scientific education programs provide people the knowledge and the passion to fight for the long term preservation of these fragile
- 0463-020 Emphasize protection of fisheries resources through education and habitat protection. Forest wide guidelines should place greater emphasis on educating the public regarding proper conduct around salmon streams. B. Provide more services and incentives to private landowners to assist in protecting fisheries habitat on their lands, including research and information on the effects of logging and other developments on salmon habitat and water quality.
- 0463-021 Include a plan for monitoring the success of FS water quality best management practices in meeting water quality standards and fisheries protection. We are concerned that FS regulations regarding riparian leave strips and best management practices to preserve water have not been field tested to ascertain that they provide adequate protection for salmon and resident fish.
- 0463-025 Any analysis of possible timber harvest activities should fully address impacts on existing and likely future recreation and tourism uses. It should include a realistic and reliable timber inventory and make a fair and just cost/benefit analysis that fully considers recreation and tourism related values. AWRTA and the Alaska Visitor's Association (AVA) have begun working together in recent months to address tourism issues in Prince William Sound and the Chugach National Forest. We share a common interest, along with many other user groups and the Forest Service, in protecting the resources upon which recreation and tourism are based. We have shared information and perspectives, and collaborated closely with AVA in developing these scoping comments. We intend to continue to work together to ensure that tourism and recreation interests in the Sound and in the Chugach National Forest. We urge the Forest Service to include both organizations in discussions about tourism patterns and trends and needs,
- 0464-002 Consistent attacks on multi-use by preservationist forces have contributed to an unhealthy forest, restricted access by various user groups, both motorized and non-motorized, and have prevented our government employees from achieving the goals of the 1984 Chugach National Forest Management Plan.
- 0464-003 Chugach Land Management Plan revisions should define limits for the NEPA appeal process. Appeals need to be limited to legitimate science based questions of concern. The Plan must allow multi-use to occur without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or opinion polls with built-in bias. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts of a particular use, appeals should be limited to addressing specific impacts that were overlooked. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.
- 0464-010 CLMP revision alternatives must point to the benefits of multi-use, not continue to highlight the negative effects one user group has upon the other. Consider these points in drafting forest management alternatives: - Identifying access points for resource extraction should include analyzing potential for future use by recreational groups.
- 0464-017 Governor Knowles has said that Alaska is open for business and the USFS multi-use mandate must heed this openness. Alaska does not need more land restricted by access or locked up in wilderness. Chugach National Forest can provide us with natural resources while maintaining the wild character of Alaska.

Comment # Comment

- 0465-001 We specifically request notice of all opportunities for public participation, input, briefing, and review throughout the process, and copies of all publicly disseminated documents relating to the CLMP revision. In particular, we wish to remain as closely as possible informed and involved as alternatives are being formulated. It has been our uniform experience that additional communication at the alternatives formulation stage is repaid many times over in terms of later public acceptance of the process. If the revision does not develop multiple alternatives that are viewed as sound, science-based, and philosophically acceptable to broad segments of the conservation-oriented public, including out membership and that of the other groups constituting the Alaska Rainforest Campaign, it will become a
- 0465-002 Range of Alternatives The Chugach is in a position unique among national forests, vast and endowed with superlative natural values, yet largely unroaded and unencumbered by a timber sale program. The highest and best use of the forest is beyond dispute in the preservation of its natural values -- in particular its roadless character. The challenge of the plan revision process is to develop severed meaningfully different alternatives that all maintain the roadless and natural characteristics of the forest for the many local, regional, national and even international visitors who come to the Chugach for its unspoiled qualities. This must not be a planning process in which there is a single "amenity" alternative surrounded by proposals for degrading the forest through varying degrees of commodity extraction. the foundation of the planning process must be a solid understanding of what will be required genuinely to ensure compliance with all applicable legal standards.
- 0465-003 Prime among these are the Forest Service's obligation to maintain viable populations of all native (and some other) vertebrate species, well-distributed throughout their existing range on the Forest. A high level of confidence must be achieved that this requirement is met in all alternatives, and that no gaps will develop in populations. Using the alternatives review process to evaluate different approaches to wildlife viability, so that only one or two of the alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) really "insure" wildlife population viability (36 C.F.R. Section 219.19), would thwart the requirement that all reasonable alternatives be studied.
- 0465-004 Different DEIS alternatives should examine different ways of exceeding minimum management requirements, for example insuring that abundant wildlife and fish populations remain on the Chugach in perpetuity, but should not differ in meeting bare legal minimum.
- 0465-005 In addition to impeccably science-based approaches to ensuring legal compliance, alternatives are needed that present significantly different sets of standards for dealing with the following inter-related cornerstone issues: roadless areas, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, and abundant wildlife and fish.
- 0465-017 Conclusion in summary, as it develops the Chugach Land Management Plan, the Chugach Planning Team has a tremendous opportunity to develop multiple meaningful management plans that are responsive to public needs and serve the long-term conservation goals of the nation. By fully protecting; wilderness, roadless areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and wildlife populations and habitat, the Chugach can make itself the showcase forest for the new
- 0466-005 In summary, the management plan should honestly include management for multiple use, not just using the words for window dressing.
- 0467-005 Vegetation Management Proposed timber sales, salvage sales, etc., should be identified and cumulative impacts discussed. The Forest Plan should direct timber We analysis from a holistic (landscape scale) approach, identifying sensitive habitats, travel corridors, Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs), etc., before timber units are actually laid out.
- 0467-009 Timber harvesting on private lands should be included in analysis forest-wide to determine the full affects of each sale area in relation to cumulative impacts and direct loss of habitat.
- 0467-010 Management of log transfer facilities should be addressed, including monitoring and underwater site investigations (documenting the zone of deposition) and restoration of benthic areas and landing sites. The Plan should discuss direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative impacts of bark, shading, storage of logs, and other solid waste materials on aquatic resources and commercial and subsistence valued resources and identify actions to prevent and mitigate for these impacts. Mitigation plans should be encouraged forest-wide that address clean-up measures and timeframes for restoration actions to be accomplished for such effects as bark accumulation, mooring of logs, non-point surface drainage (i.e., bark leachate), erosion and sedimentation, improper disposal of solid waste materials (i.e., pipes, cables, oil drums, plastics), and chronic petroleum product spills.
- 0467-024 The Forest Plan should direct and include cumulative impact assessments at the landscape level to address losses of habitats and steps for assessing site-specific impacts throughout the Chugach National Forest. Forest-wide examination of cumulative impacts of past and planned logging activities should be analyzed.
- 0467-025 Survey information should be in sufficient detail to allow thorough evaluation of impacts of proposed plan. The Plan should include the number of or percentage of timber units covered.
- 0467-026 Maps should reflect this as well. Visual aids such as maps should be able to stand alone and be easily read. Key landmarks, names of topographic features, road numbers/names, etc., are most helpful. Additionally, catalogued fish stream numbers and names should be included.

Comment # Comment

- 0469-001 Non-Forest Service Lands/Cooperative Planning The Chugach Plan revision must be built around a realistic consideration of the likely uses of non-forest land with the National Forest. In-holdings include large blocks of state, borough and Native Corporation land, as well as numerous smaller inholdings of private properties, Native Village Corporation homesites, set net sites, hatcheries and other miscellaneous categories. In most instances, these lands are physically suited for and intended for development.
- 0469-002 The state's Prince William Sound area plan (DNR 1987) reached the conclusion that the large majority of new development within PWS was best accommodated on these private lands. In light of the likely magnitude of development on state. Native Corporation and other non-National forest lands, I think this is also a reasonable
- 0469-004 Ultimately, as has been shown on the Kenai River, some form of local government land use authority will be needed to guide development on non-forest lands.
- 0469-006 The Plan update also needs to investigate ways to manage recreation use, both private and commercial, on public waters, This will take an active cooperative effort with the Coast Guard, the state, and other parties.
- 0469-008 Likewise special effort is needed to ensure what ever policies are established are backed up by realistic enforcement capabilities.
- 0469-009 Monitoring and Public Information The plan update needs to establish clear environmental and experiential indicators that can be used to monitor change.
- 0469-010 These indicators, such as water quality, number of visitors, wildlife sightings, should be one part of a broader public information effort designed to capture and focus public attention on the long tem environmental health of this area. My own belief is that only by creating a deeply interested, curious public can the more fragile qualities of the forest be
- 0469-011 Fortunately, as a result of the EVOS process, a great start has been made at assembling information about the natural and cultural history of much of the Forest. The plan update should dovetail with this effort.
- 0473-001 It is important to put this planning process in perspective, as much of the forest surrounds Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska coasts oiled by the Exxon Valdez spill-- and still has not recovered.
- 0473-002 Since wilderness values of the coastline were harmed by the spill, and have not recovered in many areas, the Chugach forest should aid this recovery process by removing certain future industrial threats by recommending to Congress that large areas be permanently protected as wilderness.
- 0473-003 I believe that the most important purposes of the Chugach National Forest are to maintain wilderness and wild, natural forests for future generations.
- 0473-006 There should to be areas designated as quiet (non-motorized use) so that these kinds of experiences continue In the
- 0474-002 **MANAGE LAND AS ORGANIC ACT MANDATED!!** Multiple Use Not ACE, Single Use, Quiet "PARK" "Quiet AREAS.
- 0474-004 Most People Ski in a BROKEN TRAIL (If they are normal) I ski more than I snowmachine by 100 hrs to 1 hr at least but AM GLAD TO SEE A Snowmachine to break trail. KEEP Closures Manitoba & Turnagain Pass split Delete Res Pass Wildlife Impacts of Snowmachine.
- 0475-005 Given that bark can be, and is used for many purposes, allowing it to be discharged as a pollutant is a waste of a useful and valuable product. The Forest Service should adopt a policy that prohibits back deposits in water and directs any person allowed to take trees from the Forest to use the entire tree in a beneficial to take trees from the Forest to use the entire tree in a beneficial manner.
- 0475-007 The Forest Service should recommend for designation all potential rivers within the Chugach.
- 0475-008 This[copper river delta] is an area of immense natural beauty and abundant wildlife. The Delta is a fragile ecosystem that should be permanently protected.
- 0475-010 While the Forest Service may have no voice on patented mining claims, it can have one in approving, modifying, or disapproving what is done in the rest of the project area. Congress gave the Forest Service authority to regulate mining under the Organic Act which allows for rules to preserve the forests from destruction and the National Forest Management Act, which directs the Forest Service to prepare forest plans. Thus the Chugach Plan should include a standard that requires an Environmental Assessment or Impact statement to be completed for each claim.
- 0476-003 I believe that the total, cumulative impacts of any activity to be permitted on the Chugach N.F. should be considered before the issuance of any permits for commercial use.
- 0476-005 Third, I would like to urge that the plan should consider the "Big picture"; that is, cumulative effects of any decision or action on all uses of the Chugach N.F. should be considered. I cart not emphasize this too strongly!

Comment # Comment

- 0476-009 Seventh, I would like to recommend that applications for mining permits should be subject to the environmental assessment process, with an opportunity for public input.
- 0476-012 Tenth, and last (but not least!): I hope that you will remember, at all times, as you are revising the Chugach N.F. management plans that this treasure is owned by all Americans, including many who will never see it but are nevertheless concerned about it's management and hence it's fate. There are many areas in our country that I have never visited, and never will; however, I want them to be properly managed and protected, and those that I'm a part owner of, as is the case with the National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and Public Domain lands managed by the B.L.M., I believe I have a right to expect that they will be! You have a responsibility as managers of the National Forests to be good stewards of the land, and not yield to those who would push the "lowest common denominator" approach. I urge you to carry out that responsibility in a conscientious manner.
- 0478-001 The above comment plan does not reflect the best interest of the Chugach National Forest.
- 0478-002 Please reaffirm the multiple use concept for the forest.
- 0478-003 It is possible to accommodate users of the forest without restricting access.
- 0478-004 I do not endorse the ten point form letter comment plan (attached) submitted to the unidentified special interest group.
- 0478-005 The forest needs to be used and of course respected to be a viable resource for all citizens.
- 0479-001 In summary, The Wilderness Society views the Chugach National Forest as a unique forest ecosystem for a variety of reasons, including its location, size, varying terrain, ecology, ecosystem types, wilderness and wildlife, impacts and demands for uses.
- 0479-012 The Forest Service needs to address transportation issues, including a transportation plan for the forest.
- 0479-015 inevitable growth of a large-scale tourism industry in southcentral Alaska poses significant threats to the forest, including road-building, structural developments, and increased access, both motorized and non-motorized, among other issues. These major threats to defacto wilderness areas, coupled with the significant impacts the forest and its resources endured related to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill in 1989, have the potential to indefinitely alter the character of the forest. The Forest Service needs to address these types of impacts and increased uses and demands on the
- 0479-017 Thus the Forest Service must address a wildlife viability/habitat protection plan forest-wide for the Chugach National Forest, giving special consideration to the habitat needs of the brown bear on the Kenai Peninsula. We encourage the Forest Service to work with other agencies in southcentral Alaska to create a Brown Bear Task Force and develop a Brown Bear Conservation Plan, which includes a habitat protection component for the Chugach National Forest and other lands on the Kenai Peninsula. The recommendations of this Task Force should be included in the Chugach Planning process. The issues surrounding the long term viability of brown bears on the forest should direct the Forest Planning Process toward favoring long term protection of critical habitat areas on the forest, such as Wilderness designations on the Kenai Peninsula and in the Nellie Juan / College Fjord Wilderness Study area, and recommending Wilderness designation for other roadless areas on the forest.
- 0479-019 This would be achieved with a number of designated Wilderness areas comprised of different ecosystem types: for example, Wilderness designation in the Nellie Juan/College Fjord Study Area and the Kenai Peninsula and Copper River Delta areas.
- 0479-023 We envision a balance of recreational and tourism uses of the forest.
- 0479-025 We envision large scale tourism developments only along highway corridors, and/or in already roaded areas, but not in backcountry, roadless areas.
- 0479-034 **Wildlife Viability:** TWS would like the Forest Service to review scientific information and habitat needs of sensitive species, or "species of concern" on the forest, including Brown bear, Black bear, Wolf, North American lynx, Northern Goshawk, Marbled murrelet, Kittlitz's murrelet, Harlequin duck, Olive sided flycatcher, Alder flycatcher, Grey-cheeked thrush, Blackpole warbler, and possibly others, and develop a wildlife viability / habitat conservation plan for these species which is incorporated into the alternatives developed during the revision process. In order to do this, the Forest Service must first develop habitat capability index models for wolves, Harlequin ducks, lynx, Marbled murrelets and goshawks, and for any other sensitive species or species of concern for which these models have not been developed.
- 0479-036 Finally, we encourage the Forest Service to participate in an inter-agency Brown Bear Task Force to identify and protect critical habitat for the long term viability of this population. We would like for information from the Task Force to be incorporated in the planning process for the forest.

Comment # Comment

- 0479-038 Cumulative Impacts Analysis: The Forest Service is required by NEPA to address cumulative impacts regarding significant actions taken on the forest. TWS would like the Forest Service to address cumulative impacts in the revision process for all major past actions taken and for any significant future actions and associated impacts which may be considered on the forest.
- 0479-039 In addition, we would like the Forest Service to work with other agencies and private landowners to incorporate a broader understanding of impacts to and from lands adjacent to Forest Service land, thereby accurately determining the cumulative impacts of Forest Service and other actions on the forest.
- 0479-040 This is especially important on the Kenai Peninsula where there has already been a recognized 70% reduction in brown bear habitat capabilities. Singular actions taken by the Forest Service, which may not appear at face value to have significant impacts, may in fact tip the balance for the brown bear population on the Kenai because of ever-increasing developments and road building on other lands on the Kenai.
- 0479-041 TWS would like to suggest the Forest Service approach cumulative impacts analysis in a two-tiered process, where Tier VIII would be cumulative impacts analysis on a "Landscape" or "Ecosystem" level, built up from the sum of all the Tier 2 "Watershed" level analyses. With this approach, the Forest Service would better understand its actions on a larger-scale or "macro" level and also on a watershed or "micro" level. Both levels of analysis will be invaluable to the long term sustainability and viability of forest resources.
- 0479-042 Watershed Analysis: TWS would like the Forest Service to do a watershed by watershed inventory of the forest which would identify issues regarding water quality, riparian areas, wildlife and fisheries, and any harmed areas. This will help the Forest Service and the public better understand the impacts of future actions on the forest on a watershed level. In addition, increased cruise ship activity in Prince William Sound and other motorized modes of recreation throughout the forest, such as jet skis, may well degrade water
- 0479-043 As part of cumulative impacts analysis, transportation planning and monitoring of impacts regarding tourism and recreation, the Forest Service needs to address changes in water quality and its affect on forest resources.
- 0479-046 Forest Health and Spruce Bark Beetle: In the past few years, salvage logging has been proposed on the Chugach to address so-called "forest health." Forest health has been defined by the former Chief of the Forest Service, as, ". . . a desired state of forest health exists where extant biotic and abiotic influences do not threaten resource management objectives now or in the future -- including ecosystem functions" (Thomas 1995). TWS does not find "forest health," as defined by Thomas, to be an acceptable term upon which to base forest management decisions. TWS would like the Forest Service to move away from using this narrow and controversial term (and the concepts heretofore developed around "forest health") in the revision process, and instead approach forest resource management from a more holistic perspective, where "ecology" and "natural forest cycles" have some value within Forest Service terminology and policy-making. We would like to suggest the Forest Service use the term "forest ecology" in place of "forest health." Allowing "natural forest cycles" and "forest ecology" to have value in Forest Service terminology and policy-making is not only consistent with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), but is especially important to TWS when addressing aspects of the Chugach National Forest such as the spruce bark beetle. We would like to see the Forest Service discuss the spruce bark beetle as a natural and inherent part of spruce forests, whose prevalence is affected by climactic conditions and stages in forest succession. When addressing the spruce bark beetle in the revision process, we would like the Forest Service to address long-term, ecosystem-based solutions for the spruce bark beetle, and not turn to logging as the only "cure" for the spruce bark beetle. Pacific Northwest scientists have released reports and recommendations which suggest that salvage logging may well slow the recovery of beetle infested forests (Beschta, R.L. et al., 1995, and the Eastside Forests Scientific Society Panel, Washington and Oregon). Given that salvage logging may well slow the recovery of beetle infested forests, TWS would like the Forest Service to turn its attention to alternatives other than salvage logging in recovery efforts regarding the spruce bark beetle, such as prescribed fire.
- 0479-047 Fire: Fire is the primary agent for forest regeneration, which for the Chugach could have important management implications at this time. Fuel load will increase as more trees die and fall from beetle kill. TWS would like the Forest Service to address this issue using prescribed fires as a solution to fuel load build up in the revision process, not salvage logging. We would like to see the Forest Service map out areas where concern over fuel load is high, and where prescribed fires are a viable solution. Clearly areas surrounding private lands and occupied dwellings may need alternative management methods, such as creating fire breaks.
- 0479-048 While some may believe salvage logging is a good management tool for fire reduction, TWS does not subscribe to this way of thinking. Events over the past two summers on the Kenai Peninsula suggest that logging activities, such as road building, and slash pile burning, which are inevitable aspects of current logging methods, actually increase the potential for uncontrolled fires. Slash piles which are left to burn unattended and increased human access to the forest due to road building, both of which are associated with logging activities, heighten the probability of human-caused, uncontrolled fires. Both of these situations have caused significant fires on the Kenai in recent years. Instead of salvage logging to reduce fuel loads, which to the contrary has caused uncontrolled, human-caused fires, TWS would like to see the Forest Service develop a prescribed fire management plan during the

Comment # Comment

- 0479-049 In addition, we would like the Forest Service to advocate for more forested areas away from private land to be classified as "moderate" or "limited" in the Interagency Fire Management Agreement, and we would like to see this change in policy reflected in the Chugach Forest revision process. The Interagency Fire Management Agreement is geared toward fire suppression, which may be appropriate close to private lands, but is not necessarily appropriate in the backcountry. We understand the boundaries for the various fire protection zones within the agreement are being redefined at this time. Allowing fires to burn, where they do not threaten communities or private property, will
- 0479-050 Chugach National Forest. Transportation: TWS would like the Forest Service to develop its own Transportation Plan in the revision process which would address all aspects of travel in and around the forest, including roads, marine highway systems, and motorized and non-motorized access and designated areas on the forest (motorized use includes cars, trucks, RV's, ATV's, motorbikes, snowmachines, fixed-wing planes, helicopters, jet skis, airboats, and other powerboats, and any other motorized means of transportation), and developments within highway corridors
- 0479-051 In addition, we want the Forest Service to work with the state and other agencies on the Prince William Sound Regional Transportation Plan so that the Forest Service can gain control over the level of projected use on the Forest, the impacts of that use and how the Forest Service intends to mitigate impacts of that use.
- 0479-053 Further, we would like to ensure that the Forest Service addresses and complies with all of the agreements made in the Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan (SCHPP) which is due to be finalized in January of 1998.
- 0479-056 3) Copper River Trail/Road: TWS would like the Forest Service to address the long-term plans for and associated impacts regarding the Copper River Trail / Road in the planning process.
- 0479-058 Motorized/Non-Motorized Access: Natural Quiet needs to be added to the list of primary resources" listed in the Forest Plan, such as fish and wildlife, recreation, and scenic beauty, etc.. Natural Quiet is a threatened and rapidly disappearing resource which deserves protection and specific analysis.
- 0479-059 A Resource Report regarding motorized use on the forest, including a detailed map of zones or designated use areas, the policies for use of motorized access (i.e. where and where not, when and when not, and under what other rules motorized vehicles are allowed to operate), and impacts of motorized use, such as pollution and increased access, should be developed for the planning process. Motorized use, from our perspective, includes: cars, trucks, RVs, ATV's, ORV's, motorbikes, snowmachines, fixed-wing planes, helicopters, jet skis, airboats, and other powerboats, and any other motorized means of transportation.
- 0479-060 All motorized uses in wilderness areas should conform to ANILCA and The Wilderness Act, and the Forest Service should work on developing "Limits of Acceptable Change" regarding motorized use on the forest.
- 0479-061 There needs to be a balance of motorized and non-motorized designated areas in both remote and more accessible areas, in all seasons -- fall, winter, spring and summer. The current situation heavily favors motorized use in the winter, and TWS instead would like to see equal opportunity for the two types of winter users. This can only be accomplished through the separation of users through either time or space zoning, and the 8 separation needs to be adequate in time or space to provide "Natural Quiet" for non-motorized users.
- 0479-062 The current ORV plan should be updated and incorporated into the Chugach Land Management Planning (CLMP) Process. Points Regarding Specific Types of Motorized Use:
- 0479-065 Fixed-wing airplanes: Common sense monitoring and controls should be established and addressed in the Forest
- 0479-068 The inevitable growth of a large-scale tourism industry in southcentral Alaska poses significant threats to the forest, including road-building, structural developments, and increased access, both motorized and non-motorized, among other issues. In order to get a complete picture of use patterns and subsequent adverse impacts, the Forest Service needs to consider the increasing number of private users on the forest. The Forest Service needs to address these types of impacts and increased uses and demands on the forest in its Forest Plan revision.
- 0479-069 In addition, the Forest Service also needs to monitor the impacts of large-scale tourism, develop baseline information regarding tourism and recreation impacts and develop limits regarding tourism and recreation, perhaps using a similar approach as "Limits of Acceptable Change." Developing limits for the Tourism Industry will help the Forest Service maintain sustainable levels of use on the forest.
- 0479-071 Mining: At this time, mining is permitted in virtually every watershed in the Chugach National Forest. TWS would like the Forest Service to do a cumulative impacts analysis regarding mining on the forest during the revision process. This would dovetail nicely with the watershed cumulative impacts analysis suggested above. TWS recommends that the Forest Service review all mining activity on the Forest to determine which areas should be withdrawn from any further mining claims to protect wilderness and wildlife values on the forest, and which claims should be acquired to

Comment # Comment

- 0479-076 We believe large-scale tourism with its associated developments and impacts, including road-building, facility development and increased access and use of the forest pose some of the most significant threats to the forest. Therefore, TWS would like the Forest Service to address the following topics as outlined above in the revision process: Wilderness, Roadless Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Other Special Designations on the Forest, Wildlife Viability; Subsistence; Cumulative Impacts Analysis; Watershed Analysis; Timber/Salvage Logging; Forest Health/Spruce Bark Beetle; Fire; Transportation; Motorized/Non-Motorized Access; Tourism & Recreation; Air Quality; and Mining. We appreciate the opportunity to submit these initial scoping comments, and hope our comments will be
- 0483-004 Now plans are under way to expand this type of activity (logging) under the guise of forest health and ecosystem management without performing any extensive, meaningful cumulative impact studies.
- 0483-009 and perform a full EIS on any future mining claim or expansion.
- 0483-011 To date, most lands "managed" by the USFS have ended up being degraded with impaired watersheds and fisheries, fragmented wildlife habitat, invasions of exotic plants and increasing risks to sensitive and endangered species. It is time the USFS change its focus or it is time to abolish the USFS.
- 0484-001 Knowledgeable and responsible use of our recreational resources is of prime importance, especially on Kenai Peninsula where we live.
- 0484-004 It would even be nice to see some side roads opened up that allow driving away from the main road to access some of the valleys. The key being balance between "over-accessing" and "under-accessing." Under accessing would mean an Alaska that one drives through and exists only as scenery viewed from a car window. Much of the appeal will be lost if all the pull-out roads are gated off (as most seem to be along the new Sterling Highway) and there are
- 0485-005 Only through federally mandated preservation, can a land or waterway receive some protection. And I stress the word some since protection, such as with the designation of National Parks or Wild and Scenic Rivers does not guarantee absence of human caused damage from remote or neighboring sources.
- 0485-010 Alaska remains the last frontier and it must remain that way. To this, I stress the need for protection of as much land and waterways as is possible. I urge you to help prevent the destruction of the pristine character of Alaska, and maintain Alaska as our last frontier for the enjoyment of current and all future generations.
- 0487-001 1) A recognition that Natural Quiet is a Natural Resource and a specific human value just as scenic beauty is a resource and its appreciation is a specific human value. This has been extensively documented in recreational and
- 0487-002 2) A listing of Natural Quiet in every resource list and value list. 3) A listing of Natural. Quiet in every survey or questionnaire. 4) A plan for long term protection of the Natural Quiet Resource.
- 0487-003 5) A recognition of, and plan for identifying, the carrying capacity and limits of acceptable use in all areas of the Forest. The current method of responding in a piecemeal fashion to each demand will ultimately destroy what now
- 0487-004 The impact of large tourism and a growing local population will overwhelm the resource unless the Plan puts specific limits on human activities of all kinds in every management area.
- 0487-006 7) A recognition and plan for the right of communities neighboring Chugach National Forest to peace and quiet.
- 0487-014 15) In addition to a plan for fair and balanced non-motorized and motorized recreational use, a plan for topographical and/or temporal separation of snowmachine use from non-motorized winter recreation is needed. The current separation in places such as Turnagain Pass does not provide a sound barrier.
- 0487-017 19) A plan that requires speed limits, registration of vehicles and monitoring and enforcement of any areas open to machine use. 20) A plan that includes monitoring and enforcement of areas closed to machine use.
- 0488-001 1. Multiple Use - The entire Chugach needs to be designated and actively maintained for multiple use. In addition to recreation uses, the plan must include the commercial uses such as mining, timber, tourism and potentially oil & gas.
- 0488-002 2. Mineral Activities - The Chugach is home to extensive mineralization. Areas of known mineralization or potential should be given a minerals prescription. Mining is one of the oldest commercial and recreation uses of the Chugach, establishing many of the roads, trails and communities. This historic relationship needs to be continued.
- 0488-003 3. Timber - Manage the forest to provide sufficient quantities of timber, both salvage and quality trees for full-time commercial operations.
- 0488-004 4. Access - There is a growing need for increased access. Increased use by individuals, recreation, tourism and other commercial users has placed a great need on the importance of maintaining and expanding access to the Chugach. We need to protect, expand and promote roads, trails, landing strips, docking spots, and helicopter access within the Chugach. The plan should consider new access routes and locations along with increase motorized uses. This will allow the greatest number of users to enjoy the Forest and not limit the region to a small

Comment # Comment

- 0488-005 5. Wild & Scenic Rivers/Wilderness - Just say No! The Chugach Forest does not need lands reserved for single-purpose uses like Wild & Scenic Rivers or Wilderness. Maintain the Chugach Forest for multiple use and oppose all efforts to designate Wilderness Areas and inclusion of Chugach water-ways in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers System.
- 0489-005 We strongly support the following in the Chugach NF: 1. increased construction of public facilities (toilets) and rest areas at existing trail heads and elsewhere along the existing road system. This is becoming a very real and very unfortunate problem on the Kenai as more and more folks are forced to visit the bushes. This is becoming a serious public health issue and merits immediate attention.
- 0490-001 Also, please understand that I want all these categories to be addressed within the framework of cumulative
- 0490-013 I believe in a sustainable yield on Forest items, fishing and mining (not to the detriment of the environment) & getting people out into the county for their enjoyment.
- 0491-008 No new mining claims until a cumulative impacts analysis is completed for existing claims and existing mining
- 0491-012 Please address cumulative impacts in all areas of the forest land use plan and take into account what is happening on adjacent and proximal lands to the forest.
- 0492-002 The number one use of our nations national forests is driving for pleasure. To this end the Chugach National Forest has failed. My comment is to keep roads open. If this cannot occur then they should be left and allowed to convert naturally into trails. This is how the limited amount of trails in the forest has come into existence. Remember to days development leads to tomorrows recreation areas. With 98.8% of the forest without means of access the majority of the public are denied use, handicapped and elderly are discriminated against by policy.
- 0492-005 This forest should be returned to multi-use management.
- 0492-006 As many areas as possible need to be harvested and replanted. The majority of the population of South central Alaska believe that harvesting and replanting is best management practice.
- 0492-007 The scoping process needs to be revised so that it is not contaminated by the intimidation techniques. The radical environmental groups with a membership of less than three thousandths of Alaska's population are currently setting
- 0492-008 Development must be not only allowed but encouraged. This encourages local economic growth. This can be used to increase the current road system and provide more tourism and recreation areas. Stop and consider if those that came before us had been so shortsighted that they had not provided us with the access we now enjoy. All development should be encouraged including but not limited to oil and gas development.
- 0493-005 It make's sense to protect the Chugach. It seems of utmost importance to protect the Chugach National Forest since it has been heavily damaged by the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989 and since the forest provides habitat to brown bears, salmon, and many other wildlife species.
- 0495-005 3. Quiet areas in which no motorized vehicular travel is allowed should be established, and the determination of these areas should be based strictly on maintaining the overall quality the whole forest.
- 0495-008 6. Provide permanent protection status for all of the Chugach Forest, and expand it's protection into Copper River Delta for all of it's established species of wild life as well...
- 0495-009 7. No mining claims should permitted without a detailed oversight plan, environmental assessment studies and a review of watershed impact analysis.
- 0532-001 No more corporate profit from public lands Protect public lands from exploitation and destruction for the many generations to come.
- 0558-001 leave as is I would like to see it left as is. multiple use gives everyone access to the forest, not just few. We need to protect our incipient rights for the use of the timber, rock, hunting, and mining by changing the status of the land around Hope.
- 0572-001 Instead of designating quiet areas, consider inventorying & designating appropriate primitive, non-motorized recreation
- 0580-001 Please include the following comments in accordance with the scoping process of the Chugach National Forest Revision. Also, please understand that I want all these categories to be addressed within the framework of
- 0627-001 I want to see this National Forest managed so the environment comes first.
- 0649-001 Mining should only be permitted with double the rules, restrictions, supervision & check ups if allowed. I am opposed to mining in this area because "you" have foolishly allowed this commercial job without a cumulative impact assessment already.

Comment # Comment

- 0654-004 CNF should continue working more closely with interested citizens in its planning efforts. Meeting held on this Forest Plan were very positive. The National Forest should continue seeking public input-possibly through an advisory committee-to avoid large conflicts such as the recent salvage logging debate.
- 0654-005 Please work with Kenai Peninsula borough officials, state Dept. of Fish & Game, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge personnel, and private landowners on the Kenai to make a Brown Bear Conservation Plan for the Kenai an official section of this forest plan. The CNF has GJS data and the best resources to make this happen.
- 0654-007 Do watershed analysis for major projects/planning efforts.
- 0655-004 You folks at The Forest Service are doing a great job responding to and meeting many differing viewpoints. Thank you for your efforts.
- 0656-001 Thank you for listening to the residents of the area in the past 2 yrs. I believe these recommendations will help keep the area useable to a greater number of People & Habitat
- 0659-001 Please, please protect it - our grandchildren will need it.
- 0671-001 Activities on adjacent State & private lands need to be tracked & given full consideration during the planning process. At present "the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing"--this adversely impacts ecosystems which cross boundaries created by man.
- 0699-001 Alaska has the chance now to preserve our forest, fishing streams and its pristine beauty spots. Save it for the future generations. I have five grandchildren all born in Alaska & in March will have five great-grandchildren, all youngsters. Please consider it for them 7 thousands of others to enjoy when they grow up. We also need stricter rules for tankers and fishing ships.
- 0704-001 I wish I had the time and knowledge to address these issues in more detail. Suffice to say that forests are more easily destroyed than created, thus whatever we do with them must be done with care.
- 0705-003 The watershed analysis is essential to the health of our salmon streams.
- 0712-002 Replace Juneau cabin on Resurrection Trail and plan other cabins that would provide similar access and use to
- 0716-001 Something's should be left alone on Mother Earth, and Chugach N.F. is one of them.
- 0725-001 The wild world exists in a state of siege. As stewards of lands that belong to all of us, you should manage them in such a way as to assure that in 50 or 100 years when our world will be a greatly different place from what it is now, people can say, "How farsighted they were to protect this place from themselves."
- 0735-001 I agree with all the above! God gave us this gorgeous area to keep & use with Conservation!---not to destroy. I think Mother Nature is telling Modern Man to back up and slow down a little, recycles!
- 0738-001 Remember - once we spoil our forests we lose all the beauty of this mountain, mud slides and loss of salmon streams follow with erosion.
- 0739-001 Please protect the forest.
- 0760-001 Protect potential avalanche starting zones from logging. Logged-out starting zones can allow previously non-existent avalanche paths to form which create even more devastation.
- 0763-001 Each of these points is extremely important to me. This is what Alaska is all about and what most tourists come to see. Please do all you can to save it! come to see. Please do all you can to save it!
- 0765-001 Pull in any legal requirements that prohibit destruction of forests and endangered or threatened species. The more law we have on our side to protect Chugach the better.
- 0775-001 The Protection of Prince William Sound & should be a very high priority.
- 0777-001 CAC owns or has valid selection rights to over 625,000 acres of surface estate, subsurface estate and oil and gas rights within the Chugach National Forest, making CAC by far the largest private landowner within the national forest boundaries. Most of CAC's economically viable land is adjacent to or surrounded by federal lands administered by the Chugach National Forest. The attached Land Holdings map dated March 1997 shows the extent of the intermingling of CAC and Chugach National Forest lands. Because of the considerable impact that Chugach National Forest actions may have on CAC's ability to realize the economic benefits of its ANCSA lands, particularly the potential of the Forest Plan revisions to frustrate the intent and purpose of ANCSA, ANILCA, and the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement, CAC seeks the maximum participation it is entitled to in this Forest Plan revision process.

Comment # Comment

- 0777-002 we address our concern that the Chugach National Forest, while revising its forest management plan, does not alter the fundamental balance struck by Congress with its passage of ANILCA. Second, we address our concern that the revision process has thus far not satisfied the mandatory participation requirements of 36 CFR section 219.
- 0777-003 Third, we address our concern that the Chugach National Forest Planning Team has not provided the public with complete, concise, unbiased and readily usable information, and that the scoping stage of the Forest Plan revision process accordingly should be extended until the Chugach National Forest publishes complete information for the public to use in the planning process.
- 0777-004 ANILCA Represents a Lasting Balance Between Conservation and Development Needs that Should Not Be Upset by Revisions to the Forest Plan ANILCA was the most significant single land conservation action in United States history. It resolved years of debate and uncertainty regarding federal land status in Alaska, thereby providing adjacent landowners and inholders with the means to successfully plan for the use and enjoyment of their land and resources. By authorizing protective designations for approximately 105 million acres of federal land in Alaska, Congress struck a lasting balance between the competing needs for economic development and conservation of
- 0777-005 Section 101(d) of ANILCA makes clear that Congress was satisfied with the conservation system units established under the Act, that they afforded "sufficient protection" for the national interest in conservation values, and that "the need for future legislation designating new conservation system units, new national conservation areas, or new national recreation areas, has been obviated thereby." Consistent with this clear congressional intent is the section 1326(b) prohibition against "further studies of Federal lands in the State of Alaska for the single purpose of considering the establishment of a conservation system unit, national recreation area, national conservation area, or for related or similar purposes" absent express congressional authorization. Accordingly, any revisions to the Forest Plan must be consistent with ANILCA's mandate and should not disturb the lasting balance Congress sought to
- 0777-006 Wild and Scenic River Eligibility Determinations The Chugach National Forest has studied close to eight hundred rivers and glaciers in the Chugach National Forest and identified nineteen rivers and three glaciers as meeting the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers. Because Congress did not expressly authorize this single-purpose study, it is inconsistent with ANILCA section 1326(b) and therefore should not be used to support or justify suitability determinations, interim value preservation efforts, classifications to other forms of administrative designation, or to formulate alternatives in the Forest Plan Revision process. The designation of a river or glacier as "Wild and Scenic" creates a "conservation system unit" under ANILCA section 102(4). However, ANILCA sections 101(d) and 1326(b) prohibit the Forest Service from taking actions toward the designation of new conservation system units unless expressly authorized by Congress. Given Congress's clear intent to obviate the need for more conservation system units in Alaska, the Forest Planning Team should not recommend any "Wild and Scenic" designations as part of the Forest Plan revision, particularly when the recommendation will be the product of an unauthorized study. During the scoping workshop held in Cordova on November 22, 1997, a member of the Chugach National Forest Planning Team stated that the Forest Service intends to manage the lands found eligible for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System to preserve the values that make it eligible until Congress acts on the Forest Service recommendation. This practice will defeat the intent and purpose of ANILCA section 101(d) because it will effectively create conservation system units without obtaining the necessary congressional approval for those designations. If Forest Service management of a nominated river or glacier will impair public use and access until the designation is approved by Congress, which ANILCA's mandate makes highly unlikely, the Forest Service is creating defacto conservation system units in contravention of the intent and purpose of ANILCA.
- 0777-007 For over a decade the Chugach National Forest has managed the College Fjord-Nellie Juan Wilderness Study Area and several Research Natural Areas in just this manner without congressional approval. The revised Forest Plan should bring management of this area into compliance with applicable statutes.
- 0777-008 The Forest Planning Team must implement management practices that accomplish and further the intent and purpose of ANILCA.
- 0777-010 Roadless Area Inventory The Chugach National Forest states that it has inventoried 98.8% of its land as "roadless." While it is not clear what the Forest Service is attempting to accomplish by performing this Roadless Areas inventory, 36 CFR section 219.17(a) states that roadless area inventories are to be conducted for recommendation of those areas into the wilderness system. Because ANILCA obviated the need for further wilderness designations in Alaska and prohibited unauthorized studies whose single purpose is to consider their establishment, the Forest Service should neither evaluate nor recommend land within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest for any new roadless area or wilderness area designations.
- 0777-011 EVOS Trustee Council Land Transfers The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill ("EVOS") Trustee Council has purchased and is in the process of purchasing a tremendous amount of privately-owned surface estate within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest. These surface interests are being brought into the public domain as part of a comprehensive habitat restoration program, and they represent interests in a significant portion of the private land holdings in the region. As the owner of the subsurface estate, CAC has significant rights in the lands being acquired. The Forest Service must implement management practices that acknowledge and are consistent with CAC's valid rights in lands the surface of which was acquired through the EVOS habitat restoration program. The Forest Service, through its Revisions newsletter and comment maps, has made no mention of the significant addition to its land base that the EVOS land transfers represent, nor has it indicated any provision to offset the loss of

Comment # Comment

- 0777-012 Consistent with ANILCA'S intent and purpose, the Chugach National Forest must balance increases in habitat protection with increases in public access and resources available for multiple use development elsewhere in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0777-014 The recommendation of new protective designations in the proximity of CAC's land holdings would frustrate efficient management of the forest because it would place the Forest Service in the conflicting position of being legally obligated to both facilitate and restrict access across the same forest lands. The Forest Planning Team should avoid recommending protective designations or implementing management practices that will cause legal conflict and confusion, frustrate efficient forest management, or diminish valid private rights of use granted under ANCSA, ANILCA, or the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement.
- 0777-015 While it is appropriate for the Forest Service to periodically revise its Forest Plan to stay current with changing conditions, it is not acceptable to change the fundamental balance Congress sought to achieve, and the certainty it sought to give private landowners in the proximity of federal lands in Alaska, through the enactment of ANILCA. The Forest Service must revise the Forest Plan in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of ANILCA.
- 0777-016 The Chugach National Forest Has Failed to Satisfy Mandatory Regulatory Participation requirements with Respect to Local Communities, Village Corporations, and Chugach Alaska Corporation The management policies instituted by the Chugach National Forest have a profound and often negative impact on communities, inholders and adjacent landowners in the proximity of the Chugach National Forest. For this reason, there must be adequate opportunities for affected local communities to develop those portions of the Forest Plan that directly affect them. All communities and villages in the region need to be deeply involved in developing the policies and objectives of the Forest Plan. There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative socioeconomic analysis of the Forest Plan. The National Forest System Land and Resource Management Planning regulations address this need by providing, in addition to the general public participation process, heightened participation opportunities for those landowners that will be most affected by the revisions. Pursuant to 36 CFR section 219.6(k), forest planning activities are to be coordinated with "owners of lands that are intermingled with, or dependent for access upon, National Forest System lands." Pursuant to 36 CFR section 219.7, the Forest Service must specifically notify those Alaska Native leaders whose lands are expected to be impacted, review their planning and land use policies, note their objectives, impacts and where they conflict with Forest Service planning, respond to those impacts, and devise alternatives for resolving any conflicts. As Native corporations with substantial land holdings intermingled with and dependent for access upon Chugach National Forest lands, Chugach Alaska Corporation, Chenega Corporation, Eyak Corporation, and Tatitlek Corporation are entitled to the coordination provided for in the Forest Plan Revision process under each of these provisions. Accordingly, we do not view our participation in the public process as sufficient to satisfy the Forest Service's obligation to coordinate its planning activities with ours. The revised Chugach National Forest Land and Resources Management Plan cannot be responsibly implemented if it has not recognized, reviewed and accommodated our land and resource management plans. To date, the Forest Planning Team has not recognized our special status under either of these regulatory provisions. The Forest Planning Team must ensure, pursuant to these coordination requirements, that it has the concerns, plans and recommendations of CAC and the village corporations before it and that they are given careful consideration in the Forest Plan revision process. At a minimum, we expect that such coordination will consist of contacting and meeting with CAC to (1) discuss the potential impacts that the Forest Plan revisions will have on CAC's land; (2) review CAC's plans for the use and enjoyment of its lands; (3) discuss the objectives of both the Forest Plan and CAC's land plans; (4) analyze how the plans impact one another; (5) identify where the plans conflict with one another; and (6) create alternatives in the Forest Plan to resolve any conflicts with CAC land plans, including the development of land exchange
- 0777-017 The Chugach National Forest Must Provide the Public with Complete, Concise, Unbiased and Readily Usable Information throughout the Scoping and Forest Plan Revision Process The Chugach National Forest is currently in its "scoping phase" of the revision process. It is critically important that the Forest Planning Team give the public the information necessary to provide the Chugach National Forest with informed, diverse and meaningful input into the revised Forest Plan at this stage, and that it remain objective in its information-gathering role. This includes accurately educating the public as to the Forest Service's mandatory and discretionary activities.
- 0777-018 Unfortunately, the Chugach National Forest appears to have been somewhat pre-decisional in its planning. For instance, the comment map and Revision newsletters appear to lean heavily in favor of habitat preservation and dispersed recreational use. The current comment map does not identify those areas within the Chugach National Forest that are suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mineral exploration. In the May 1997 newsletter, the Forest Planning Team asks whether commercial timber harvest is appropriate on the Chugach National Forest. This sort of question tends to mislead the public into thinking that timber harvest, commercial or otherwise, is a discretionary activity of the Chugach National Forest. Yet another example of the Forest Planning Team's failure to provide the public with complete information concerns the public comment map dated August 19, 1997, which failed to show the access guaranteed to CAC under paragraph 8 of the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement. Even after a Chugach National Forest official assured CAC that future maps would show this access, it did not
- 0777-019 Nor does the power site classification in place on Nellie Juan Lake and River appear on the planning maps, even though this very lake and river system was found eligible for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.
- 0777-020 The Forest Planning Team did not include or describe any EVOS land acquisitions in the comment map or the Revision newsletters.

Comment # Comment

- 0777-021 It also failed to include other ownerships on several maps used at public meetings, thereby representing the entire area as under Forest Service jurisdiction. It is difficult to believe that thoughtful and informed public comment can be generated when the base information given to the public is so incomplete and potentially misleading.
- 0777-022 All potential land uses must be identified on the information that is given to the public so that the public can provide informed and balanced input into the Forest Plan revision process. The Forest Planning Team must be completely unbiased in its presentation of potential land uses and proposed land management objectives, especially at this important stage of the process.
- 0777-023 It should educate the public about the multiple use mandates to which the Forest Service must adhere,
- 0777-024 should properly identify ownerships on all maps used for public meetings. The Forest Planning Team must also inform the public of the significant addition to the Forest Service's land base under the EVOS land transfers, of the corresponding loss of private land in the region,
- 0777-025 Its obligation under ANILCA to balance any land withdrawals with increases in access and development opportunities elsewhere in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0777-026 Currently, the Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map is an inappropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. Because it is still early in the revision process and the concerns we raise are significant, the scoping phase should be extended until the Chugach National Forest publishes complete information for the public to use in the Forest Plan revision process.
- 0777-027 The Chugach National Forest Must Take an Active Role in Managing National Forest Lands under Its Jurisdiction The Chugach National Forest Must Fully Implement the Land Management Plan It Adopts through this Process The current Forest Plan was never fully implemented, and when a revision has been deemed necessary, it has been accomplished without public notice or participation. For instance, the withdrawal of all salvage logging by the Forest Supervisor without public notice or process was such a unilateral revision. The Chugach National Forest is once again encouraging Alaska residents to commit enormous amounts of time and energy into developing the new Forest Plan. This expenditure of resources must not go to waste. The Chugach National Forest must ensure that the Forest Plan is fully implemented, and that any subsequent revisions are the product of an appropriate public process.
- 0777-029 The new Forest Plan must apply proven forest management practices to its timber resources to improve the supply of raw materials to local communities and industry and to restore and improve the basic health of the forest.
- 0777-030 The Chugach National Forest Should Consider Land Consolidation as Part of Its Management Plan for the Forest The pattern of land ownership within the Chugach National Forest, along with additional surface acquisitions from Native village corporations through the EVOS habitat restoration program, creates a very difficult management situation for all landowners in the region. Because management strategies will invariably conflict, management of either the surface or the subsurface in a coordinated and mutually agreeable manner will be difficult, if not impossible. The Chugach National Forest should consider land exchanges with private parties to consolidate ownership and simplify
- 0777-031 The Chugach National Forest Must Manage the Forest in a Manner Consistent with Its Multiple Use Mandate The Forest Plan revision process thus far appears to be severely predisposed to non-development, pro-dispersed recreation designations for most, if not all, of the forest. This is in direct conflict with the National Forest System mandate of multiple use. Multiple use means more than recreation, subsistence and wildlife habitat.
- 0777-032 The National Forest System was created to provide a continuous supply of timber, minerals, water, and other resources. The Organic Act and other forest management acts mandate multiple use management of National Forest land, and the Forest Planning Team must seek to adhere to the Forest Service management directives.
- 0777-033 The Chugach National Forest Should improve the Public's Ability to Access Public Lands within the Forest With over 5 million acres of land, most of which is inaccessible except by air or water, and with clear and substantial public demand to use much of this land, the Chugach National Forest should be seeking ways to increase public access, both motorized and non-motorized, to meet that demand. With so much land available, the Forest Service should be able to accommodate all user groups.
- 0777-034 The Chugach National Forest's proposal to completely obliterate the existing road across the south end of Montague Island from MacLeod harbor to the Nellie Martin River at Patton Bay is an unfortunate example of the Forest Service's recent management decisions that seem to ignore its multiple use mandate. This road travels through some of the most unique and spectacular scenery in Alaska which would otherwise be virtually inaccessible to the vast majority of the public. The private company that built this road offered, at no expense to the public, to convert the road to a non-motorized trail and maintain it in perpetuity through an endowment established specifically for that purpose. This road has the potential to provide a unique recreation experience and should be converted into a non-motorized trail.
- 0777-035 The Forest Planning Team should consider providing enough areas forest-wide to meet the demands for all access needs, including designating the former Montague Island road bed as a non-motorized trail.

Comment # Comment

- 0777-036 With the first draft of the revised Forest Plan scheduled for early 1998, it is important that the Fores Planning Team meet with CAC as soon as possible to start coordinating our respective land an resources management plans and
- 0778-001 In general, I support the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan as it currently stands. Especially as it pertains to ORV use. ORV's should not be given assess to any more Chugach National Forest Land.
- 0779-003 In future revision newsletters, I would like to see point/counterpoint opinion pieces about fire and forest health. I would like to write one in counterpoint to logging as the response to the changes beetles have wrought in the forest.
- 0781-016 Wildlife: We are fortunate that the Chugach National Forest has intact large tracts of pristine wilderness which support an abundant wildlife population. Several sensitive species or species of concern reside within the forest and ACE would like the Forest Service to analyze potential impacts to each of these species in the different alternatives. ACE would like the Forest Service to fully consider current scientific review and programs
- 0781-019 all forms of logging should be merged into one number for purposes of determining an appropriate level of logging within the forest plan. We would like to see the following types of logging merged for this purpose: green sales, salvage sales, personal use firewood, permitting for commercial use firewood, campground and roadway thinning, and other form's of logging we may have inadvertently left out.
- 0781-022 Of special concern to ACE is the ongoing fragmentation of Kenai Peninsula wildlands, especially as they affect brown bear habitat. ACE would like to see the Forest Service participate (and perhaps play the lead agency due to the timing of this revision) in a Brown Bear Task Force that leads to the creation of a conservation/protection plan. Due to the particular concerns expressed by inter-agency biologists about these bears losing habitat on the western Peninsula, ACE believes that managing the forest with habitat viability as a priority is critical. We would like the Forest Service to consider potential impacts to brown bears in management alternatives, with particular attention paid to the negative impacts, associated with additional road building.
- 0781-028 Mining: Most watersheds on the Chugach have current mining claims, yet the public has no information in which to gage what potential risks these claims pose to fish and wildlife habitat, to watershed health and viability, or to biological diversity. Negative visual impacts are the only way in which the public may gage the impact of a mining operation. Many streams and rivers within the boundaries of the Chugach have extremely high fishery values and high visual and/or recreation values, yet these are not taken into account when mining permits are granted. This process is incongruous with how other uses are analyzed. A cumulative assessment of watersheds, as outlined earlier, should be conducted to include past and present mining operations and its impacts. ACE would like to see the Forest, Service include recommendations in its alternative's for mineral withdrawals.
- 0781-029 ACE would also like the Forest Service to review, by way of environmental assessments, all mining claims prior to them, being permitted. This will give the public the opportunity to be involved in the determination of an activity which impacts their resource.
- 0781-030 In conclusion, ACE would like to see the Forest Service continue to give wildlife habitat and recreation the priority in its management, We are most interested in seeing the Forest Service address cumulative effects as its baseline management technique.
- 0781-001 We urge, the Forest Service to continue to manage these lands to maintain these qualities by prioritizing low-impact uses on the forest. While we realize that legislative designation for wilderness may not be possible with the current Congress, ACE and its membership urge the Forest Service to manage it as such. Over 90% of the forest qualifies for wilderness designation.
- 0781-004 We would like the Forest Service to conduct a landscape level cumulative impacts analysis to address changes since the, last forest plan as well as projections of future land uses. We would like the Forest Service to work with state, borough, municipal and private land owners in order to significantly address many of the impacts that have either taken place since the last forest plan or are iq the foreseeable future. Changes to the area since the 1984 Chugach land plan include the Exxon Valdez oil spill, a notable increase in cruise-ships and other tour operators, increased number of visitors, dramatic increase in motorized, recreation, and large tracts of development, road building, and significant, logging (primarily on lands near the forest) have undermined brown bear habitat capability. Possible future impacts include the road to Whittier, a new interior on the Kenai, a 25 mile road from the Copper River Delta to the Bering River, increases in cruise ship traffic, a possible deep water port north of Cordova, and the Forest
- 0781-005 ACE encourages the Forest Service to use the planning process as an opportunity for coordinating with other agency plans currently in the works, such as the Kenai Area Plan, Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan. In addition, ACE would like the Forest Service to take a lead role in coordinating a conservation plan for brown bear habitat. The Forest Service has indicated its desire to work with vegetative mapping to better understand on a cumulative level what the lands in and

Comment # Comment

- 0781-006 In northern climates, such as Alaska, regeneration standards set for the Service as a whole are inappropriate. Regeneration is much slower in Alaska. ACE would like the Forest Service to acknowledge this fact and address regeneration in Alaska specifically in its draft alternatives. Also, ACE would like to see the Forest Service address regeneration in Alaska under the cumulative impacts portion of logging proposals (in environmental assessments, i.e.). Forest Health/Insects, Disease/Salvage Logging:
- 0781-008 Regeneration in Alaska is a slow process to begin, with. When coupled with a policy of a five-year window for replanting once a logging operation is complete, one must question whether or not regeneration is actually promoted. Additionally, sites vary immensely due to local ecological considerations and making general predications and forecasts is inappropriate. One clear example of this is at mile twelve along the Hope highway. This clear-cut was defaulted on by the first timber operator and eventually finished by a second some eight years later. Five year's time from the completion of the job has not yet expired and reforestation has not yet taken place. Another example is that of Kern Creek. This area was logged some 15 -- 20 years ago and left to natural regeneration. The area has been "colonized" by alders. To date, conifers have failed to grow back within the site. These cuts, then, are both within legal limits for regeneration although it is certainly arguable that neither have promoted regeneration nor improved
- 0781-010 Additional human interference may not have the end result desired. In fact, some studies indicate that salvage logging may slow first recovery cycles (as reported in Beschta, R.L. et al., 1995).
- 0781-011 ACE would like the Forest Service to replace the piecemeal approach to the forest, which divides it along lines of so-called forest health (and practices such as salvage logging), with long-term sustainable forest practices that view the forest ecosystem as a whole. Additionally, ACE would like to see the Forest Service utilize prescribed burns in this holistic view, rather than as another separate category of so-called treatment.
- 0781-014 Watersheds: ACE urges the Forest Services to inventory watersheds on the forest on the basis of riparian zones, water quality, fisheries, wildlife, mining impacts, and other potentially harmed areas. Recognizing that watershed quality underlies ecosystem health, these analyses will assist the Forest Service and the public in guiding actions which may have an adverse affect. Prince William Sound, at the heart of the Chugach, is the site of recovery from the nation's worst oil spill as well as large scale logging on private lands. These impacts must be weighed with the increase in tour boat activity. In particular, should the Whittier road be completed, we understand that Princess plan's on moving a large portion of their operations from Seward to Whittier. With watershed inventories in hand, the Forest Service will be better equipped to address the potential of these impacts on surrounding forests, wildlife and fisheries, and to water quality. Additionally, the western forest is home to much of the headwaters of Cook Inlet. Important spawning habitat lies within the forests boundaries. Healthy and viable streams in the western forest play a significant role in ensuring a healthy fishery in Cook Inlet and in the world-famous Kenai River. Just as important fisheries exist in the eastern forest where abundant salmon runs from the Copper River Delta support numerous local economies, both from commercial fishing and sport-fishing.
- 0783-001 1. Legal Mandate - The first item in the Plan should be a summary of the applicable legal authorities that apply to the management of the forest and specifically the Forest Service Organic Act and how this mandates multiple use of the forest. It is important for the public to know the reasons for which the Forest Service was created.
- 0783-002 2. Inclusive Plan - The Plan must evaluate all areas of the Chugach National Forest for multiple use. The Plan must not start with the presumption that any given area will be designated as Wilderness. Only those areas within the ANILCA defined Wilderness Study Area are eligible for such designation but even these areas must be considered for multiple use purposes as part of the planning process.
- 0783-003 3. Prohibition Against Study for New Conservation System Units - The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) stated that the need for federal Conservation System Units had been met and it mandated specifically that federal government agencies (including the U.S. Forest Service) were not to even study areas for CSU designation unless specifically authorized by Congress. Congress has not specifically authorized any such study and therefore this Plan cannot include considerations. In addition to prohibiting study for National Parks, Preserves, Monuments, and Refuges, this prohibition covers designations for Wild & Scenic Rivers (W&SRs). It is therefore illegal for the Plan to consider W&SR designations.
- 0783-004 4. Minerals Prescription Areas, with known mineralization should be given a specific minerals prescription and designated for mineral development. Minerals opportunities should be given a specific chapter in the Revised Plan. The minerals prescription areas should also include all areas where mineral production has occurred in the past. USGS and US Bureau of Mines publications will be of major value in defining both mineralized areas and past production areas. The BLM historic mining claim records will also provide a source of this information. Specific items that need to be included in the chapter on minerals include: - geologic maps showing all mineralized areas; - maps showing all identifiable past mining areas; - a narrative description of past mining for each general area/drainage; - a narrative description of past mining for each of the specific mine for which such information can be found; - a bibliography listing all known published material on the Chugach Forest area. 5. Minerals Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must be a certified minerals geologist or a registered mining engineer. Additionally, at least one minerals geologist from the USGS and one mining engineer from the UAF School of Mineral Engineering should be engaged to participate in development of the minerals prescription and the minerals chapter. Minerals are an important aspect of the Chugach Forest and it is essential that someone on the Planning Team have personal education and experience with minerals development.

Comment # Comment

- 0783-005 6. Production of Forest Products - The Plan should include evaluation of both salvage logging and logging of quality trees at sufficient quantities to allow commercial operations. This too is an element of multiple use mandated by the Forest Service Organic Act. The potential fire dangers of not logging or ineffective forest management should also be covered. 7. Forest Products Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must be a logger with training and experience in the industry.
- 0783-006 8. Commercial Tourism Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must have training and experience in commercial tourism
- 0783-007 9. Access - A specific chapter should be devoted to access. All historic access throughout the Chugach National Forest should be shown on all maps. Access was historically, and remains today, an essential element in use of the forest. Without ports, roads, trails, and airfields use of the forest is limited to a very small part of the general public and only a small portion of the uses mandated by the Forest Service Organic Act. Roads and trails should be identified, numbered and a history of usage included for each. It is essential that historic access and historic activity be shown to insure that the public knows the history of the area. The Plan should define new roads that will provide access to meet the needs of logging, mining, and destination tourism. The Plan should include evaluation of keeping Logging roads available for the general public after the logging operations are completed. There is a tremendous need for access roads to meet the growing needs of the recreating public. There is need for more road access to help disperse the public activity on the Forest and reduce the current crowding. These same roads benefit both the recreational and commercial segments of the mineral industry. 10. Access for General Public - One part of the Chapter on access should focus on access needs of the general public. This should include motorized access for tourism of all types. A growing segment of our society involves the elderly and their needs for effective access must be considered. Many areas of this state are closed to the elderly because they are not physically able to stand the physical rigors of remote hiking and associated boating. It is not fair for these Americans to also be excluded from use of the Chugach Forest. The Chugach is located near several of the few population centers that exist in the state and the Chugach is therefore the most feasible area for providing effective access for the elderly segment of our society.
- 0783-008 11. Cumulative Impacts on Multiple Use - The Plan must evaluate the cumulative impact of all land actions in the area of the Chugach National Forest. This must include the impacts due to loss of private surface ownership and private timber due to EVOS (Exxon Valdez Oil Spill) purchases.
- 0783-009 12. Cumulative Impacts of Wilderness Designation - The Plan must also evaluate the cumulative impacts on the economy due to Wilderness designation. The economic value of various levels of commercial activity must be considered. Specific alternatives should include: 1) Wilderness designations as allowed by ANILCA; 2) No Wilderness designations; 3) Logging equal to the replenishment annual growth level; 4) Commercial tourism destinations throughout the area; 5) Opening the entire area, including the Wilderness Study area to mineral entry such that if mineral deposits are found it will possible to develop them; 6) various mixes of the above uses.
- 0783-010 13. Wild & Scenic Rivers - As noted above, it is illegal to even study areas for designation as W&SRs. No W&SRs should be proposed for any stream or river outside the areas to be designated as Wilderness. If W&SRs are considered, which is contrary to ANILCA, the impacts of any W&SR designations must be defined clearly. W&SRs will block access, reduce future management options, restrict public access, etc. and these impacts must be defined in a way that the general public will understand. Case histories of W&SR designations elsewhere in the state and specifically in the Fortymile should be included to show the danger of such designations.
- 0783-011 14. Destination Tourism - As with other commercial activities, opportunities for destination tourism must be considered. Most of the population of this country is not able to practice strictly remote/primitive tourism or recreation and this segment must be considered in the plan.
- 0783-012 15. Scoping Data Ineffective - In many ways the scoping data does not effectively prepare the reviewer. Access routes, rights of way, including RS-2477s, are not shown. Past mining and logging area are not shown. Private Native lands where EVOS monies have restricted the surface use are not shown. The rivers being considered for W&SR designation are not named and shown in a way that allows the reviewer to see the impacted areas. The result of these deficiencies is that the reviewer gets a very different picture of the forest as compared to the actual
- 0784-001 I represent 8,000 residents of the lower Kenai Peninsula, many of whom utilize the Chugach National Forest for their livelihood and for their recreation. Any management plan for the Chugach National Forest, should provide for recreation, subsistence, and wildlife habitat, as well as a continuous supply of timber, minerals, and water. A multiple-use mandate has long been the foundation of national forest management policy.
- 0784-003 More importantly, there is a growing concern on the Kenai about the potential fire hazard associated with the beetle-infested timber. Many residents in my district stand to lose substantial property and maybe even their lives should fire strike. Logging of beetle-infested timber must take place to lessen the potential loss of life and property

Comment # Comment

- 0784-005 The Forest Service has identified 20 rivers in the Chugach as eligible for inclusion into the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers. Thirty-one percent of the forest, the entire Congressionally-delegated Wilderness Study Area, is currently being managed to retain its wilderness values. Further federal wilderness and conservation unit designations will cripple the forest's capacity to provide for multiple uses. The Forest Service must consider that Alaska already contains 60% of all wilderness areas in America, 90% of all wildlife refuges, and 70% of national parklands. The Forest Service must balance land withdrawals with an increase in resources available for development. Again, I urge the Forest Service to consider multiple use in future planning efforts for the Chugach Forest and for logging of beetle infested timber to decrease the fire hazard.
- 0786-002 Q. Are there any improvements that you would make to the workshop that you participated in today? A. Not this one today. I went to the meeting with my ORU Issue #1 in my mind. I now understand that the process is best served by the rules set down at the beginning. It also helps knowing how the different issues affect my issue & area.
- 0787-001 I would like to, see the forest managed primarily for fish and wildlife viability. To me this is an important indicator as to the overall health of the forest, and thus surrounding economies and the state. It is the fish and wildlife which provide for economic livelihood of the peoples of south-central Alaska and Prince William Sound areas.
- 0787-013 Prince William Sound needs further protection to help recovery from the 1989 oil spill of 11 plus million gallons. Please do not allow marinas to be built on public lands and no more mooring buoys. I would also like the public to be informed of the interdisciplinary team meeting
- 0789-002 A RECREATION AND TOURISM STRATEGY for the Heritage Tourism Industry must not be left out of this plan as it was in 1984. The consequences of ignoring the inevitable growth and demand of the world's largest Industry could be detrimental to the future multiple use management of Chugach National Forest. Environmentalists claim that there is not room for everyone else on the forest now that they have secured their ecotourism slots and venues in Prince William Sound. The grand buzz word is "sustainability", which by its very definition suggests that most other activities are "unsustainable." In multiple use management, such a term seems to border on heresy! The very word is another triumph of image over reality! Confusion in forest management has come from a reluctance to view the whole nature of the ecosystem. Forests are more than units which produce timber, minerals, outdoor recreation and commercial products. They deal with intangible values which feed the spirit and mind of humans. These intangible values are sold within the heritage tourism industry, an industry which can partner with the forest to invent experiences specially designed, for forest visitors. Moving beyond traditional roles of outdoor recreation, the modern and international tourist has different needs and expectations which the forest planner must understand. Sightseeing and flightseeing are valid uses which directly relate to the forest unit. 3. A Integrated Resource Interpretation Study (IRIS) and Visitor Use Plan should be undertaken early in the planning process to understand the now relationships forming on designated forest lands. While this approach is somewhat foreign to traditional forest management, such planning for the future visitor is the only way to avoid conflicts between the tangible and intangible resource sale demands emerging in the 21st Century.
- 0789-004 Human values systems found within heritage tourism, resource interpretation and outdoor recreation are integrated links in MULTIPLE EXPERIENCE USE. Indeed, heritage tourism and resource interpretation can not be fully separated. In "Caring for the Land and Serving People", this multiple experience use model may fit within traditional forest boundaries where commodity production, conservation of resources and well-designed, human experiences interact within the whole system. There has never been a better time for the Chugach National Forest to step into the next century with a clear and concise vision for increased public use and for better understanding a remarkable resource
- 0792-001 Due to poor forest practices, roadless areas in the U.S. are becoming more and more rare. The Chugach National Forest, over 90% roadless, is a national treasure. I urge you to implement Wilderness designations on all parts of the entire forest that could possibly qualify for Wilderness designation. In particular, the proposed Nellie Juan/College Fjord Wilderness Study area must be retained for Wilderness designation.
- 0793-001 Given the close proximity of the Chugach National Forest to Alaska's major population centers and with consideration to the cumulative impacts of a burgeoning tourism sector, it seems imperative that to the greatest extent possible, the Chugach National Forest must be preserved in its natural state.
- 0798-001 The Chugach is described on the USFS website as "primarily a recreation, fish and wildlife forest." I hope you will manage this forest in the future not only to preserve in this manner, but to enhance these qualities. Specifically. 1) The Nellie Juan/College Fjord Wilderness Study Area (WSA) should continue to be managed as a WSA (that's the law if I am not mistaken) and full wilderness designation should be sought. 2) Chugach should establish other WSA to enhance the above-mentioned qualities.
- 0800-002 Forest Health Forest health problems continue to appear across the CNF. With leadership, imagination and creativity, existing problems can be addressed and future problems avoided through management on those parts of the forest that will allow such management. The consequences of doing nothing can be seen over large areas of the CNF.
- 0800-004 It is a proven fact that forests providing habitat types through the various developmental stages offers the maximum benefit to the widest diversity of wildlife species. This, due to the nature of the CNF, can only be achieved through management. It is further a proven fact that there is no long term impact or threat to water quality or fisheries that results from such management if done, properly.

Comment # Comment

- 0800-005 Balanced Use It is important for all to understand that only a small percentage of the CNF is available for forest management. The impacts on all other uses will be small with the development of a well managed harvesting program. However, this approach offers a balance that does not now exist on the CNF and addresses the important issues of long term forest health, wildlife and the economic future of Alaska.
- 0801-001 We have enjoyed working with the staff of the Chugach and found the 19,84 Chugach Forest Plan document to be workable and fair. Please consider the following comments in the up-dated Chugach National Forest Plan: 1. Multiple Use - The entire Chugach needs to be designated and actively maintained for multiple use. In addition to recreation uses, the plan must include the commercial uses such as mining, timber, tourism and potentially oil & gas.
- 0801-005 5. Wild & Scenic Rivers/Wilderness - Just say No! The Chugach Forest does not need lands reserved for single-purpose uses like Wild & Scenic Rivers or Wilderness. Maintain the Chugach Forest for multiple use and oppose all efforts to designate Wilderness Areas and inclusion of Chugach water-ways in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Please include me in any future notices and documents related to this process.
- 0801-006 5. Wild & Scenic Rivers/Wilderness - Just say No! The Chugach Forest does not need lands reserved for single-purpose uses like Wild & Scenic Rivers or Wilderness. Maintain the Chugach Forest for multiple use and oppose all efforts to designate Wilderness Areas and inclusion of Chugach water-ways in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers System.
- 0802-001 Please include the following comments in accordance with the scoping process of the Chugach National Forest Revision. We hope that all these categories will be addressed within the framework of cumulative impacts.
- 0802-006 Conserve Brown Bear Habitat: Brown Bears on the Kenai Peninsula are being threatened due to declining habitat. Because bears are considered an "indicator species", the Forest Service needs to make habitat protection a priority in its plan. Please participate in any task force that is created and initiate a Brown Bear Protection Plan on the Kenai
- 0802-012 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them as part of an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions, which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which
- 0802-016 With large-scale clearcutting of private and state lands near the Forest, it is especially important that lands on the Chugach be given added protection.
- 0802-018 Our members support protecting the Chugach's pristine forest and want the Forest Service to develop a plan that permanently protects this unspoiled wilderness.
- 0802-019 Please consider a management plan that accommodates the public's interest and stops the destructive management practices of the past.
- 0805-002 - Preserve current character of Prince William Sound.
- 0806-005 We support the Chugach National Forest's decision to put-to-bed all roads across Chugach Forest Lands following the completion of logging on native land on Montague Island. We feel that this was a commitment to those of us who opposed these roads that led us to withdraw our opposition. It would be unfortunate if the Forest Service were now to change its policy. During the last planning process, we were very concerned with the range of alternatives offered. For example, alternatives that we might have supported for several reasons were several reasons were lumped together with options that we would not have supported in any alternative such as widespread prescribed burning for game species habitat improvement. We would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in considering the range of alternatives during the planning process. We also remain concerned about the status of the inventories on which the planning process according to the Fed. rgs. is based. As you know, this was a point of concern during the previous planning process. The recreation inventory, for example, had a statistical reliability of 0 and included all the ice, rock and glaciers; the timber inventory was based on aerial photographs and not ground proofed. This led to statements such as "There is an unlimited supply of recreation lands and a limited demand." as well as "There is a limited supply of commercial timber and an unlimited demand." We are most concerned that the analysis of the management situation, alternatives and economic analyses be based on accurate, statistically reliable inventories. We look forward to reviewing both the inventories and the analyses of the management situation. When this step is completed, we hope that you will make them available to the Valdez Public Library. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- 0807-004 4) We have worked with ADF&G and the Board to conserve Dolly Varden and to initiate biological studies of dollies in the Upper Kenai River Drainage. Some has started but much more needs to be done.
- 0807-005 5) with the help of ADF&G, we have been dealing with land managers, most problems with the Kenai Peninsula Borough, to insure that fish and wildlife habitat is considered during planning and before development. If the Cooper Landing AC can be of any help, let us know.
- 0808-001 As you plan for future uses of the Chugach, I recommend that you consider optimal resource use for diverse interests of Alaskans and other citizens of the United States. Enhancing opportunities for multiple use is best.

Comment # Comment

- 0808-003 1, as a fisherman, am particularly concerned about maintenance of fisheries habitat. We can accomplish this, I believe, by following Alaska's Forest Practices Act as well as appropriate other restrictions that you require.
- 0808-004 Please be careful about relying too heavily on comments generated by national campaigns by so-called environmental organizations that really do not have Alaska's best interests in mind. Instead, consider well-balanced advice from seasoned veterans of managing Alaska's forests and others who have lived and worked in this state for a long time.
- 0808-005 More wilderness designation is not necessary to protect this valuable forest. Proper management is.
- 0809-001 For this reason, we offer the following recommendations for consideration prior to release of a final CLMP.
FOREST HEALTH: The Spruce Bark Beetle epidemic has been multiplying over the past decade to the extent that it is becoming a safety hazard to those individuals and communities in the Chugach area. While we understand that forest management includes conservation of said forest, we would hope that the plan would also include the use of timber harvest as a means to offset the potential hazard of fires in the area. It should be noted that the use of timber harvest in the area serves two purposes: to offset the threat of catastrophic fires and maintain the multiple use mandate for which the National Forest System was originally mandated. Timber harvest also gives professional foresters a management tool to aid in controlling the growing spruce bark beetle epidemic. Without such management of these areas and maintaining various species and age classes, the reforestation process cannot begin nor sustain
- 0809-006 The Chugach National Forest must apply proven forest management practices to its timber resources to improve the supply of raw materials to local communities and industry and to improve and restore the basic health of the forest.
- 0809-007 There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative analysis of the plan.
- 0809-009 In addition, will there be conflict with local native corporations over their subsurface rights to certain areas of the Chugach National Forest? We understand that the Chugach National Forest is gaining vast surface lands due to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council even though the regional native corporations still have ownership of the subsurface properties. Such a dual-ownership situation makes well coordinated surface and/or subsurface management
- 0810-007 B. Land ownership Patterns: The proposed management of non forest land should be shown on base maps and considered during the alternative analysis. Identification of land ownership and management patterns will provide a more comprehensive overview of the regional resources. For example, the 1995 Alaska State Marine Park Management Plan outlines a substantial increase in developed recreational facilities. In order to prevent duplication and excessive growth in facilities, the Forest Plan must incorporate the State Park Plan as part of the access picture. Similarly, as a result of the EVOS Trustee Council Habitat Acquisition Program, Chenega Corporation now has the financial means to develop private lodges on acreage within the Forest boundary. The federal government should not compete with these private interests and should continue the past policy of encouraging private developments on
- 0810-008 C. Value of education: Everyone who goes out of doors can make better decisions. The Forest Service should more actively promote the Leave No Trace education program to provide the science and the ethics to help people mitigate their adverse impacts to the environment. Both cultural and scientific education programs provide people the knowledge and the passion to fight for the long term preservation of these fragile ecosystems.
- 0810-018 X. PUBLIC PROCESS AWRTA and the Alaska Visitor's Association (AVA) have begun working together in recent months to address tourism issues in Prince William Sound and the Chugach National Forest. We share a common interest, along with many other user groups and the Forest Service, in protecting the resources upon which recreation and tourism are based. We have shared information and perspectives, and collaborated closely with AVA in developing these scoping comments. We intend to continue to work together to ensure that tourism and recreation interests in the Sound and in the Chugach National Forest. We urge the Forest Service to include both organizations in discussions about tourism patterns and trends and needs, and in the development of alternatives.
- 0811-001 FOREST HEALTH The Spruce Bark Beetle epidemic has been multiplying over the past decade to the extent that it is becoming a safety hazard to those individuals and communities in the Chugach area. While we understand that forest management includes conservation of said forest, we would hope that the plan would also include the use of timber harvest as a means to offset the potential hazard of fires in the area.
- 0811-002 It should be noted that the use of timber harvest in the area serves two purposes: to offset the threat of catastrophic fires and maintain the multiple use mandate for which the National Forest System was originally mandated.
- 0811-006 The CLMP identifies 20 additional rivers which it feels should be included with Wild Rivers designations. We do not feel that these additional classifications should be made for it will only diminish multiple use, access and potential mineral activity. Simply nominating these rivers for exclusive protection does not preclude the regional Forest Service from choosing to manage the areas for such protection. Essentially, the Chugach National Forest managers are creating a de-facto Wild and Scenic Rivers and restricting public access even without the needed Congressional
- 0811-008 There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative analysis of the plan.

Comment # Comment

- 0811-009 Chugach Land Management Plan Scoping Page 3 ADDITIONAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION The petroleum and mining industries also might have a future stake in the outcome of CLMP. For this reason, they should be noted as future stakeholders and added as a factor. What will be the impact of these industries, both environmentally and socio/economically?
- 0811-010 We believe that a subsurface analysis should be conducted.
- 0811-012 It should be noted that we support forest management as a tool that takes both the health of forested areas and the socioeconomic health of surrounding communities into account before making long-term decisions
- 0812-001 We believe a dynamic forest plan, which recognizes advanced technologies for resource development and public lands access, is highly desirable for the Chugach National Forest. The USFS must defend the rights of citizens to access and develop the resources of the National Forest System.
- 0812-002 Some continue to attack this institution's multi-use mandate. Consistent attacks on multi-use by preservationist forces have contributed to an unhealthy forest, restricted access by various user groups, both motorized and non-motorized, and have prevented our government employees from achieving the goals of the 1984 Chugach
- 0812-003 Chugach Land Management Plan revisions should define limits for the NEPA appeal process. Appeals need to be limited to legitimate science based questions of concern. The Plan must allow multi-use to occur without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or opinion polls with built-in bias. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts of a particular use, appeals should be limited to addressing specific impacts that were overlooked. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.
- 0812-007 - Wild and Scenic River designations which lie outside of Wilderness Study Areas should reduce wilderness managed areas to equal a no net loss of acreage for multi-use activities and the economic resource base. - Of the 760+ rivers and glaciers in the Chugach National Forest, approximately one third, or 250+ are in Wilderness Study Areas. Wilderness management provides these glaciers and rivers the protected status sought by Wild and Scenic River classifications. Giving the Wild and Scenic status to a river in a wilderness area is redundant. - Designation of rivers and glaciers outside of the Wilderness Study Areas creates additional, unwarranted wilderness protection and unjustly prohibits certain user 2 groups. Wild and Scenic River designations go beyond the protection necessary for roadless areas in the Chugach.
- 0812-010 Logging, in turn, allows point of access development in concert with recreational demands of all forest users, a vital requirement of the forest visitors. CLMP revision alternatives must point to the benefits of multi-use, not continue to highlight the negative effects one user group has upon the other.
- 0812-011 Consider these points in drafting forest management alternatives: - Identifying access points for resource extraction should include analyzing potential for future use by recreational groups.
- 0812-013 Not all areas of the forest need to be designated in this revision process.
- 0812-014 Areas that are selected for motorized and non-motorized uses need prescriptive monitoring programs to ensue future designations are well planned.
- 0812-016 - Development reserves must be identified for areas deemed to have high potential for tourism and recreational activities. Reserves may change general location or anticipated prescription as demand for activities change, however, the need for identified reserves is critical for planned development. All ranges of visitation identified in the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum must be accommodated by planned visitor center developments.
- 0812-023 Governor Knowles has said that Alaska is open for business and the USFS multi-use mandate must heed this openness. Alaska does not need more land restricted by access or locked up in wilderness. Chugach National Forest can provide us with natural resources while maintaining the wild character of Alaska.
- 0813-001 The development of the Whittier Access Road has raised concerns regarding the need for planning to deal with future tourism and recreational growth, particularly in the western portion of Prince William Sound.
- 0813-002 The Chugach Forest Plan will play an integral role in determining the future of the Sound. We view the Chugach National Forest as serving a wide variety of uses. A large portion is under study for Wilderness designation; some areas may be designated for timber harvest and still other land may be designated multiple use. It is within the multiple use areas that the majority of competing land uses are likely to occur. The Chugach Forest Plan needs to be specific enough in it's allocations to create degrees of future certainty to encourage investment in and adjacent to the Chugach National Forest for tourism operators. The Plan also needs to provide for a broad spectrum of tourism operations from wilderness opportunities to more developed sites able to accommodate larger numbers of people.

Comment # Comment

- 0813-003 The issues that need to be addressed from a tourism perspective in the Chugach Plan Revision are identified below, in no particular order. 1. Tourism and recreation need to be adequately defined and distinguished in all planning phases, and their unique needs must be considered. While there is overlap that must be considered between tourism and recreation land uses and activities, each segment has unique and special needs. The revision plan must address tourism in its present form and provide for future growth on an equal footing with minerals, timber, fishing and other land uses. Tourism must be acknowledged as a legitimate use of the forest. Recreation, by contrast, generally refers to leisure activities pursued by local residents. It is distinguished from tourism because recreationists pursue these activities for their own enjoyment rather than financial gain.
- 0813-006 3. The USFS should tap into the expertise of other agencies and organizations such as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and hunting/guides. Detailed information on fish and wildlife resources and their use should be included in the GIS inventory system. Cultural resources and geological artifacts should also be documented. This type of information will further identify important areas for tourism and recreation and identify other resources such as minerals and timber important to fulfill the multiple use management mandate. Sea bird colonies (including nesting sites for semi-palmated plover, arctic terns, etc.), waterfowl and migratory bird resting and staging areas, harbor seal pupping beaches, harbor seal, sea otter and sea lion haul out areas, or killer whale rubbing beaches should be identified and protected, as needed. By ensuring the comprehensive collection of the best data available, the plan will more accurately estimate the affects of various alternatives, build greater consensus among all
- 0813-007 4. Land Use Designations (LUDS) and Management Prescriptions should include detailed standards and guidelines on tourism as a viable economic activity in the forest, comparable to minerals, forestry, etc. LUDS and management prescriptions specific to tourism should be developed. Activity specifics as to wilderness lodges, wildlife viewing areas, large group excursions, small group travel, hut-to hut hiking, trail systems, aircraft landing sights, coastal paddling, camping routes and areas, large scale resorts and day-resort "anchor sites", etc., should be addressed. AVA was actively involved in the development of tourism prototypes for the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP). The "Typical Tourism Developments and Activities by Land Use Designation" cover a wide range of visitor activities anticipated on the National Forest over a 10 year period. We request: - these tourism designations, representing several years worth of effort, be used as the starting point for the tourism element in the Chugach 3 Plan to take advantage of previous work efforts. - Chugach staff directly work with and involve TLMP staff, such as Ron Freeman in the Alaska Region Forest Service offices in Juneau, to understand and initially apply the tourism components in TLMP. TLMP made significant strides forward to clarify and address differences between recreation and tourism. We hope the Chugach Plan revisions will continue to work in this direction.
- 0813-011 9. Land ownership patterns and the proposed management of non-forest land should be shown on base maps and considered during alternatives analysis when planning for forest lands. Base maps and planning analysis should also reflect lands that have been acquired for specific management purposes such as the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill property purchases. Identification of land ownership and management patterns will provide a comprehensive overview of the regional resources, identify the capability of the aggregate land base to meet various resource demands, and ensure Forest Service land use is compatible with adjoining properties.
- 0813-012 10. Twenty-one rivers and three glaciers have been identified as eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The proposed designations need to be weighed carefully in light of potential multiple uses, types of tourism, and future access needs. The designations should be based on a careful review of proposed land uses and resource potential. The plan should define the three types of designations under the Wild & Scenic Rivers System (wild, scenic and recreational), and clearly spell out the allowable uses and access for each designation. For example, mining is not allowed within one-quarter mile of a wild river. Other examples would be specific types of tourism operations that would/would not be allowed in each designation such as development of a base camp of operations for rafting or guiding. The plan should also identify the management responsibilities and the relationship of a federally designated wild and scenic river compared to a river defined as navigable by the State of Alaska. Rivers
- 0813-016 The economic benefits to local communities resulting from preservation of scenic -qualities should also be recognized and addressed.
- 0813-017 12. Site specific and more general waste management must be addressed from human waste on increasingly crowded and popular beaches to garbage. The Chugach plan should establish no or low-impact guidelines for scientific party field activities and work crew camps. Increasing garbage along shorelines, around scientific research camps, from fishing boats and floating homes, cabins, recreational campsites, etc. needs to be addressed. Garbage and human waste is an on-going problem that detracts from the area's scenic quality and can have an
- 0813-018 13. The revised plan must address conflicts between forest user groups, such as motorized and non motorized use.
- 0813-019 The plan should also identify a methodology and procedures to resolve future conflicts between resource groups that may arise after the plan is adopted, without the need for lengthy, additional planning efforts. The zoning concept of "front country, mid-country, and back country", used in British Columbia should be explored as a method to address different uses in the Chugach. This concept is also discussed in the 1993 Destination: Alaska documents produced

Comment # Comment

- 0813-020 14. Work with tourism and other groups to develop a program of information and education covering a wide variety of forest uses - sensitivity of fishery and wildlife habitat, cultural and community lifestyles, ways to mitigate adverse human impacts, etc. Work with the recreation and tourism groups to develop guidelines for wildlife viewing and low-impact use of areas likely to be used by wildlife. Include education on the importance of leaving cultural, historic,
- 0817-001 Alaska Audubon is dedicated to the conservation of Alaska's natural ecosystems focusing on birds, other wildlife, and their habitats for the benefit and enjoyment of current and future generations. We are submitting this letter on behalf of over 550,000 members of the National Audubon Society, our 2,200 Alaska members, and approximately 1,500 Anchorage Audubon members. SCOPING ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED IN THE CHUGACH PLAN REVISION
Adjacent Land Management and Inter-agency Cooperation The Chugach Plan Revision must look beyond agency boundaries. Many of the resources and issues at risk in southcentral Alaska transcend agency jurisdictions (e.g., large carnivore conservation, bark beetle infestation, transportation infrastructure, etc.). Therefore, it is necessary that the Forest Service work cooperatively with other state, federal, and borough management agencies to identify issues and resources on adjacent lands which may substantially influence management on the Chugach.
- 0817-002 Clearly, conservation of the Kenai Peninsula population of brown bears will require this kind of cooperation. A great opportunity currently exists to coordinate with the State Division of Forestry in their Kenai Area Planning and the Kenai Refuge with their refuge planning.
- 0817-003 GAP Analysis The Chugach Forest should seriously consider cooperating with adjacent land management agencies to conduct a regional Gap Analysis for the Chugach Forest and adjacent lands in southcentral Alaska. Gap Analysis is a landscape-scale inventory of regional biodiversity. Using GIS technology and biological inventories, Gap Analysis identifies ecologically significant lands, determines where they are and what proportion are protected, and helps natural resource managers identify high-priority conservation needs and strategies.
- 0817-007 Transportation Planning The plan revision must address an overall transportation plan which includes marine and overland highway corridors, trails, motorized and non-motorized zones and cumulative effects over a 10, 25, 50, and 100 year time frame. This effort should include cooperation with the Alaska Department of Transportation and other state and federal agencies.
- 0817-009 Recreation and Tourism Planning Outdoor recreation and tourism is increasing rapidly on the Chugach Forest and is one of the highest values of the forest. The plan revision must address recreation and tourism in a comprehensive master plan. There are many expectations for this area and many competing uses. Now is the time to sort these uses and users out and develop some kind of zoning approach to recreation/tourism management so that many uses can be accommodated in a sustainable fashion with minimal environmental impacts, It is not practical to consider multiple use management on the same acres of land. Instead, through creative planning and zoning in time and space, we should be able to accommodate a diversity of users and uses while minimizing conflicts. The Forest Service should work cooperatively with AWRTA and AVA in this process. The time to do this is now, before conflicts
- 0817-012 Forest Economics It is inevitable that many of the decisions regarding future use of the Chugach National Forest will be driven by economics. Consequently, in order to avoid situations where a decision to utilize one forest resource results in significant opportunity costs with other forest resources, it is essential that the Forest Service undertake a comprehensive analysis of the economic value of all Chugach National Forest resources. This analysis should include not only significant commodities, such as timber, but important amenities, including fish, wildlife, outdoor recreation, and scenery. Also, the recreational value of nonroaded versus roaded areas needs careful consideration since this will likely be a contentious issue. Because the value of most amenities tends to consist mostly of nonmarket values, it is important that the Forest Service use the right methodology for this analysis. We recommend an effort similar to a recent study of nonmarket economic values for national forests in the Pacific Northwest; Role of Nonmarket Economic Values in Benefit-Cost Analysis of Public Forest Management by Cindy Sorg Swanson and John B. Loomis (PNw-GTR-361) by the Pacific Northwest Research Station. While an analysis like that mentioned above will result in better information for decision-making, it must be remembered that economics generally expresses value in monetary terms. This may be suitable for commodities, but is often incomplete and lacking when applied to amenities. The value of an amenity is usually determined using indirect means (i.e., shadow prices) that often excludes some intangible or nonmonetary values that are difficult to quantify (spiritual significance being a good example). To avoid situations where the Forest Service compares the value of a commodity, using fairly complete estimates of the benefits, with the opportunity costs imposed on amenities, using only partial information about its respective value, the Forest Service needs to also consider other methodologies that are not strictly quantitative. These methodologies include the Precautionary Principle and Safe Minimum Standard, both being more applicable to protecting values, such as biodiversity, than benefit-costs analysis.
- 0817-013 ATV Access There appear to be problems with unlimited ATV use on the Forest.
- 0817-015 It will also be important to provide some kind of zoning to separate motorized and nonmotorized recreation
- 0817-028 We recommend that the Chugach Plan Revision address the special conservation needs of sea lions, particularly in relation to transportation, recreation, and tourism activity within Prince William Sound. The Plan should ensure that information and education efforts are adequate and that compliance and enforcement with federal regulations is adequate to minimize conservation problems.

Comment # Comment

- 0817-033 As more important population sources are roaded or developed and become "sinks," the brown bear population on the Kenai, as a whole, may begin a long-term irreversible decline. These are incremental steps toward a declining bear population. Since bears are wide-ranging species of landscapes (not just small habitat patches), the cumulative impacts of future development actions on the Peninsula may well influence the distribution and conservation of bears beyond the Chugach Forest to include other regions of the Peninsula including the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. We strongly recommend that the Chugach Plan Revision incorporate a major effort to address the long-term conservation of brown bears on the Peninsula. This effort should include: - establishment of a Kenai Brown Bear Task Force charged with developing a comprehensive conservation strategy for Kenai Peninsula brown bears. The Task Force should be composed of the Interagency Brown Bear Study Team plus representation from conservation, recreation, tourism, fishing, and timber interests; - GIS analysis of current brown bear distribution and movement data relative to topographic, watershed, vegetative, human developments (transportation, industrial, urban, residential), and land management jurisdictions and objectives; - interagency cooperation and a Peninsula-wide assessment across all land management jurisdictions; - a cumulative effects analysis; and - a time frame of 100 years. The opportunity to address this issue with a proactive, cost-effective conservation approach is now. If we wait until later, we may be forced into costly reactive management, the potential of ESA listing petitions, and a diminished chance of successful conservation. The brown bear conservation strategy will also help managers deal with other species that are sensitive to increased human access such as wolves, black bears, wolverines, lynx, and marten.
- 0817-037 Revision of the Chugach Forest Plan provides the opportunity for developing a proactive strategy for maintaining the forest's ecological integrity. An effective plan must incorporate an ecosystem perspective including long-term planning (e.g., 100 years), access to a comprehensive biological inventory, a landscape-scale analysis using GIS technology, evaluation of cumulative effects, and interdisciplinary and interagency cooperation.
- 0819-004 I don't know a lot about the issue, but I feel confident that the environmental groups alternative plan will be good and appropriate and I urge you to adopt their alternative.
- 0820-002 We urge the Forest Service to continue to manage these lands to maintain these qualities by prioritizing low-impact uses on the forest.
- 0820-004 The new Forest Service chief has indicated his desire for a shift in overall management from logging, mining and grazing priorities to priorities which include biological diversity, wildlife habitats and ecosystem health. The Forest Service is in the unique position to forward Chief Dombeck's vision of national forest lands on the Chugach while maintaining recreation and wildlife habitat as the traditional management priorities.
- 0820-007 Issues ACE would like the Forest Service to address in the draft alternatives for the Forest Plan Revision include: Cumulative Impacts: Under NEPA, the Forest Service is required to address cumulative impacts in any significant actions proposed to the forest. We would like the Forest Service to conduct a landscape level cumulative impacts analysis to address changes since the last forest plan as well as projections of future land uses. We would like the Forest Service to work with state, borough, municipal and private land owners in order to significantly address many of the impacts that have either taken place since the last forest plan or are in the foreseeable future. Changes to the area since the 1984 Chugach land plan include the Exxon Valdez oil spill, a notable increase in cruise ships and other tour operators, increased number of visitors, dramatic increase in motorized recreation, and large tracts of development, road building, and significant logging (primarily on lands near the forest) have undermined brown bear habitat capability. Possible future impacts include the road to Whittier, a new interior on the Kenai, a 25 mile road from the Copper River Delta to the Bering River, increases in cruise ship traffic, a possible deep water port north of Cordova, and the Forest Service's own solicitation for a facility in Turnagain Pass.
- 0820-008 ACE encourages the Forest Service to use the planning process as an opportunity for coordinating with other agency plans currently in the works, such as the Kenai Area Plan, Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge use plan, and the Prince William Sound transportation plan.
- 0820-010 The Forest Service has indicated its desire to work with vegetative mapping to better understand on a cumulative level what the lands in and around the forest now represent. We encourage this level of analysis and would like to see regeneration addressed as part of this process. In northern climates, such as Alaska, regeneration standards set for the Service as a whole are inappropriate. Regeneration is much slower in Alaska and ACE would like the Forest Service to acknowledge this fact when addressing cumulative impacts for logging proposals. ACE would like to see the Forest Service address regeneration in Alaska specifically in its draft alternatives.

Comment # Comment

- 0820-011 Forest Health/Insects, Disease/Salvage Logging: The USFS definition of forest health is: a "condition of forest ecosystems that sustains their complexity while providing for human needs." We appreciate the first half of this definition as it is biology-based. However, the last clause, providing for human needs, does not address actual forest health - it effectively transforms a natural forest into a tree farm. In this scenario, if forests are not producing for human needs (often interpreted to be wood fiber) they need to be coaxed to do so; they are in ill health and need treatment. Hence, large-scale logging is "prescribed" to eliminate the so-called unproductive beetle-killed spruce and promote regeneration. The latter is questionable, as regeneration in Alaska is a slow process to begin with. When coupled with a policy of a five-year window for replanting when a logging operation is complete, one must question whether or not regeneration is actually promoted. Additionally, sites vary immensely due to local ecological considerations and making general predications and forecasts is inappropriate. One clear example of this is at mile twelve along the Hope highway. This clear-cut was defaulted on by the first timber operator and eventually finished by a second some eight years later. Five year's time from the completion of the job has not yet expired and reforestation has not yet taken place. Another example is that of Kern Creek. This area was logged some 15 - 20 years ago and left to natural regeneration. The area has been "colonized" by alders. To date, conifers have failed to grow back within the site. These cuts, then, are both within legal limits for regeneration although it is certainly arguable that either have promoted regeneration or improved forest health.
- 0820-012 ACE concurs with several organizations who suggest a new definition of this controversial and rhetorical model. ACE would like the Forest Service to focus on "forest ecology" or "natural forest cycles," thereby promoting a holistic, rather than political, approach to the forest. This move toward a biologically sustainable definition will help in also addressing issues such as insect infestation and disease. Insects and disease are part of "natural forest cycles" and ACE would like to see the Forest Service treat them as such in the revision process.
- 0820-013 ACE would like the Forest Service to look at issues related to global climate changes and past human-related activities that may have a role in current spruce bark beetle cycles in order to holistically address the issue. For example, both Bradley dam and the intertie currently in use are projects which left slash piles behind and may have contributed to the current levels of spruce bark beetle activity. Additional human interference may not have the end result desired. In fact, some studies indicate that salvage logging may slow forest recovery cycles (as reported in Beschta, R.L. et
- 0820-014 ACE would like the Forest Service to replace the piecemeal view of the forest which divides it along lines of so-called forest health and practices such as salvage logging with long-term sustainable forest practices that view the forest ecosystem as a whole. Additionally, ACE would like to see the Forest Service utilize prescribed burns in this holistic view, rather than as another separate category of so-called treatment.
- 0820-019 In determining an appropriate level of logging on the forest, ACE would like the Forest Service to utilize the "forest ecology" concept laid out in the Forest Health section of this document. All forms of logging should be merged into one number for purposes of the forest plan. We would like to see the following types of logging merged for this purpose: green sales, salvage sales, personal use firewood, permitting for commercial use firewood, campground and roadway thinning, and other forms of logging we may have inadvertently left out. Fire:
- 0820-020 Although over 90% of the fires started within the Chugach are caused by humans, ACE recognizes the beneficial role fire can play in forest ecology. ACE also recognizes the destructive potential of fires in inhabited areas affected by spruce bark beetles. Although ACE believes the forest will regenerate fine on its own, we recognize there may be some areas where fire would be of benefit. ACE would like to see the Forest Service analyze fire potential as its primary agent of forest regeneration on the Kenai Peninsula, where the vast majority of human inhabitants live within the forest. The Copper River area has seen a significant increase in beetle activity over the last few years.
- 0820-021 if ACE would like the Forest Service to evaluate fire over the rest of the forest if ACE would like the Forest Service to map out areas of concern where fuel load is particularly high and/or where there are inhabited structures. Where a fire danger is high closest to communities, ACE would support selective logging to create shaded fuel breaks. However, using salvage logging as a way to address fuel loads could actually contribute to uncontrolled fire, as has been witnessed the past few summers with both Granite Creek and Crooked Creek fires ACE would like the Forest Service to map out areas of concern where fuel load is particularly high and/or where there are inhabited structures. Where a fire danger is high closest to communities, ACE would support selective logging to create shaded fuel breaks. In addition, ACE would like to see classification of lands mapped out. We believe economics must be weighed when addressing fire. To give the backcountry the same level of fire protection as are afforded to
- 0820-033 Wildlife: We are fortunate that the Chugach National Forest is has large tracts of pristine wilderness which supports an abundant wildlife population. Several sensitive species or species of concern reside within the forest and ACE would like the Forest Service to analyze potential impacts to each of these species in the different alternatives. ACE would like the Forest Service to fully consider current scientific review and programs which are already in place for conservation of these species, i.e. the Partners in Flight WatchList, to maintain the current viability of habitat.
- 0820-035 Transportation Planning: ACE urges the Forest Service to create a transportation plan on the Chugach that includes motorized and non-motorized uses on trails, roads, marine highways systems and other water corridors used for travel. There are several travel corridor-type proposals which would significantly impact the forest if

Comment # Comment

- 0820-036 ACE would like the Forest Service to work cooperatively with agencies compiling other transportation plans in order to be pro-active with the expected traffic increases in and through the forest. ACE urges the Forest Service to gain a level of control over Prince William Sound projected use by participating in the Prince William Sound Regional
- 0820-038 Further, ACE would like the Forest Service to come up with a transportation plan which abides by the agreements and guidelines set forth in the Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan (the expected completion date is January
- 0820-039 Non-motorized & Motorized Uses: Natural quiet allows us to enjoy natural noise-like wind in the trees, snow falling, water flowing, and birds singing. Natural quiet is rapidly disappearing and is a resource that's easily taken for granted. We would like to see it listed as a primary resource, like fish and wildlife, recreation, scenic beauty, when analyzing proposals to the forest. When an activity of significant impact is proposed, for example the construction of a logging road, the effect on natural quiet and on primitive recreation should be analyzed and given serious
- 0820-040 In order to do a better job of planning, ACE believes the Forest Service needs an understanding of the existing situation/inventory/baseline. A Resource Report, including a detailed map, that describes designated use areas, rules of operation, and policies for private and commercial motorized vehicles (as described below) should be developed for the planning process. The report should include rules in Forest wilderness areas, such as study area, plan recommendation, or congressionally designated
- 0820-042 ACE recommends the concept of utilizing a carrying capacity model for motorized use on the forest. At this time most motorized vehicle use is allowed to grow uncontrollably as a result of minimal oversight and regulation. Carrying capacity analyses need to be done for all motorized uses, and limits therefore set on the extent of those uses.
- 0820-043 ACE recommends an adequate program of monitoring and enforcement of appropriate rules regarding motorized uses. Recreation is a primary, not merely incidental, use of the forest. ACE would like to see the Forest Service adequately monitor and enforce rules established to allow for the enjoyment of quiet recreation.
- 0820-048 subsistence: Many of ACE's members utilize resources from the forest to maintain a subsistence lifestyle. ACE would like the Forest Service to ensure its compliance with Title VIII of ANILCA, which provides direction to protect existing and future subsistence opportunities, by addressing the issue within the cumulative analyses requested. Projects proposed on the forest, which may endanger subsistence opportunities are unacceptable. Alaskans, those who have lived here for thousands of years and those who came later, have a tradition of utilizing the resources the land and waters provide. These uses are, in general, much more compatible with maintaining wildlife viability, watershed Quality and ecosystem health than most other uses on the forest. In the past, the Forest Service has addressed the issue of subsistence in various proposals, however, assurances for mitigation have been weak. ACE would like the Forest Service to seriously consider potential impacts to subsistence in each of its
- 0820-050 In conclusion, ACE would like to see the Forest Service continue to give wildlife habitat and recreation the priority in its management. We are most interested in seeing the Forest Service address cumulative effects as its baseline management technique.
- 0821-006 Sierra Club strongly endorses the idea of an inter-agency task force to examine the viability of brown bear and wolf populations on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 0821-025 Because of its unique national profile, its internationally recognized fish and wildlife values, and the lack of permanent protection for any Chugach NF lands at present, we are requesting the Forest Service hold public hearings in the lower-48 to gather citizen comments on management of the Chugach.
- 0821-001 Overall, Sierra Club advocates managing the Chugach National Forest to protect its fish, wildlife, and wilderness
- 0821-002 It is imperative the revised Forest Plan address the cumulative impacts of all forest activities -- including activities occurring on adjacent non-national forest land -- on the Forest's natural resource values.
- 0821-003 In addition, we urge the Forest Service to become informed and involved in the land planning and management decisions and actions of adjacent landowners, particularly the State of Alaska's and borough/municipal planning processes. As you know, cumulative impacts of development activities do not recognize boundaries of land ownership. This recognition of the impact of activities on adjacent lands is particularly important on the Kenai Peninsula and Copper River Delta. On the Kenai, logging on state and private lands must be addressed when making decisions on fish and wildlife management, specifically brown bear and wolf.
- 0822-001 My primary concern, based on information I have seen in the "Revisions" newsletters, is that the management objectives of the forest are being weighted too heavily toward primitive dispersed recreation uses. While this objective certainly has a place in the overall management regime of the forest it should be a very small part of the land management plan and should not be designated in any areas where it may preclude other multiple uses of the forest. With 5.4 million acres of land, the Chugach National Forest has plenty of room for all users.

Comment # Comment

- 0822-005 Finally, the information distributed to the public for purposes of obtaining scoping comments is very biased toward a park-like management objective for the forest. Not only are the issues framed with a pro-preservation bias, but there is a total lack of information on resources that could, and should, be developed when the need and demand arise. For instance, there is no information on the comment maps or in the newsletters on the amount or location of commercial forest types, mineralization, potential destination tourism areas or oil and gas deposits. Amazingly, there was no display of the thousands of acres being acquired by the EVOS Trustee Council for transfer to the Chugach National Forest. As a land manager by profession, I cannot imagine how your agency can possibly think it can responsibly manage its public land assets without knowing what those assets are. On the other hand, if the Chugach National Forest does have this information it should consider very carefully the serious ramifications of withholding it from the public during the scoping process. The Chugach National Forest must delay closure of the scoping period until all the information about the Forest is compiled and distributed for public review. Thank you for the opportunity to submit scoping comments on the Chugach National Forest Land Plan revision. The Chugach National Forest can truly be the "Land of many uses"; I am confident that your planning team will find innovative ways to meet the needs of all users of our local forest lands.
- 0826-003 3. The plan also needs to determine how to best look at cumulative impacts of management actions on national forest lands in relation to watershed or landscape level planning. The national forest should consider land management actions of other landowners and should cooperate and provide incentives for private landowners to work with the forest service on broader scale regional plans. At the same time private landowner rights, particularly under ANCSA, should be protected and reaffirmed.
- 0826-005 5. The forest should be managed for a full range of multiple uses and one use should not preclude any of the other uses. The management plan should be clear about how the variety of uses will be managed for across the landscape. Managers should be given the flexibility to deal with conflicts in a creative and innovative manner. Timber management should be a high priority in this mix of uses, since most of the other national lands in parks, wildlife refuges etc. don't allow timber management to occur. The national forest system should provide a stable, consistent
- 0827-008 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them in an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.
- 0827-011 Additional Comments: I have visited Alaska many times. I am continually appalled by the horrible management guidelines of the Forest Service. "They have destroyed a great National Forest and a superb rain forest at a huge tax loss to our citizens, to remove any future joy which could have been achieved by a Wilderness experience in this fabulous non-renewable forest. Stop the clear-cutting and pandering to timber interests. Let them go South. Save this wild habitat for the fisheries, tourism and the wonderful animals and subsistence livers... who respect and utilize this great resource in a non-destructive way. Start the New Year off on the correct footing for a change.
- 0828-004 4) The Kenai Peninsula brown bears are being threatened due to declining habitat. Because bears are an "indicator species," the Forest Service needs to make habitat protection a priority in its plan. We encourage the Service to participate in any Brown Bear Task Force that is created on the Kenai Peninsula and to work with land owners to address cumulative impacts for brown bears, and other species, as well as watershed issues.
- 0830-007 HABITAT PROTECTION. Continue land purchases and comprehensive planning.
- 0830-009 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS. Look at the whole picture and cumulative impacts of future activities such as mining, mariculture/aquaculture, lodges. Take a watershed impact look at activities. What will these activities have on the scenic qualities, the water quality for people as well as fish. The chemical nature of modern mining has a proven negative impact on the migrating capabilities of salmon. Permanent lodges are having a negative impact on fish and wildlife and should not be allowed on Forest lands. There are plenty of private and state lands for this. There is a growing impact on charter and private boaters from encroachment on vessel anchorages by commercial floating lodges and mariculture/aquaculture projects? A limited entry should be initiated immediately on these activities.
- 0832-001 Also, please understand that I want all these categories to be addressed within the framework of cumulative impacts. Maintain or Increase Roadless Areas: Maintain or increase the current roadless inventoried areas on the Chugach. We are fortunate that, unlike most other national forests, we have relatively few roads.
- 0832-005 Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining
- 0832-010 Please participate in any task force that is created and initiate a Brown Bear Protection Plan on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 0832-011 in addition, work with other land owners to address cumulative impacts for Brown Bears and other species, as well as watershed issues.
- 0832-012 Permanently Protect the Copper River Delta: In 1907 President Teddy Roosevelt created the Chugach National Forest primarily to protect the forest and wildlife of the Copper River Delta. The Delta, up to and including Miles Lake and Baird Canyon, with millions of birds and abundant wildlife, must be permanently protected through the new forest plan by recommendation for legislative designation.

Comment # Comment

- 0836-007 Vegetation Management Proposed timber sales, salvage sales, etc., should be identified and cumulative impacts discussed. The Forest Plan should direct timber sale analysis from a holistic (landscape scale) approach, identifying sensitive habitats, travel corridors,
- 0836-008 Habitat Conservation Areas (HCAs), etc., before timber units are actually laid out. The old-growth forest associated species should be identified, and impacts associated with removing old-growth forest and fragmenting large old-growth blocks should be discussed in detail.
- 0836-009 The Forest Plan should include ample old-growth retention blocks. The Plan should address retention areas to be managed to maintain the uneven-age structure of old-growth habitat components required to maintain population levels of old growth dependent wildlife. These retention areas are critical in conserving old-growth habitat.
- 0836-013 Timber harvesting on private lands should be included in analysis forest-wide to determine the full affects of each sale area in relation to cumulative impacts and direct loss of habitat.
- 0836-014 Management of log transfer facilities should be addressed, including monitoring and underwater site investigations (documenting the zone of deposition) and restoration of benthic areas and landing sites. The Plan should discuss direct, indirect, secondary and cumulative impacts of bark, shading, storage of logs, and other solid waste materials on aquatic resources and commercial and subsistence valued resources and identify actions to prevent and mitigate
- 0836-015 Mitigation plans should be encouraged forest-wide that address clean-up measures and timeframes for restoration actions to be accomplished for such effects as bark accumulation, mooring of logs, non-point surface drainage (i.e., bark leachate), erosion and sedimentation, improper disposal of solid waste materials (i.e., pipes, cables, oil drums, plastics), and chronic petroleum product spills.
- 0836-016 2 Travel Management and Access Roads, current and proposed, should be disclosed. Road closures, permanent and intermittent, should be identified. Permanent road closures should include removal of road beds and restoring to prior conditions.
- 0836-017 Road impacts, cumulative and direct, on fish and wildlife should be included in the Forest Plan EIS, especially for sensitive species such as wolves, lynx, etc., and their prey species. The Forest Plan should address road corridor widths in relation to best management practices. Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management The long-term habitat and management requirements of sensitive species such as lynx, goshawk, olive-sided flycatcher, harlequin ducks, etc., should be discussed and provided for in the Plan.
- 0836-019 Additionally, the Black Oystercatcher population, a species on the Partners in Flight WatchList 1996, numbers 800-1,000 individuals in Prince William Sound. Increased boat landings on some beaches in Prince William Sound could disrupt breeding oystercatchers and foraging behavior of migratory shorebirds. The Forest Plan should discuss and provide management direction for neotropical migrants nesting and habitat needs. The plan should discuss long-term as well as short-term monitoring programs.
- 0836-020 Specific monitoring plans should be developed and discussed for aquatic, marine, and terrestrial fish and wildlife habitats. Plans should include frequency, priority, corrective measures, and time frames in which actions will be accomplished. Monitoring plan results/actions should be provided to other agencies for review and coordination, and joint-agency inspections should be encouraged.
- 0836-021 The Forest Plan should minimize impacts to fish habitat and result in long-term maintenance of healthy fish populations. The Plan should address what measures will be taken to evaluate fish habitat, ensure adequate protection, and provide immediate corrective action if problems arise. The method of monitoring used to ensure compliance with NFMA, frequency of inspections, percentage of unit inspections, and cumulative analysis of past and current fish habitat losses should be included. The Service believes an index of health should be developed for
- 0836-022 3 Aquatic vegetation (sea grasses) occurring within the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries are important to a variety of aquatic species. The Plan should identify areas supporting significant sea grass resources and describe what measures will be taken to protect these areas. Degradation of wetlands caused by heavy equipment impacting vegetation and impairing natural drainage patterns resulting in a loss of nesting and foraging habitat for migratory birds and other species are of great concern to Service. These alterations can result in permanent or semi-permanent hydrologic changes and loss of functional wetlands characteristics. Degradation or loss of limited types of wetlands (i.e., fens) can have a drastic change to other adjacent habitats (i.e., fish habitat). The Forest Plan should outline how Executive Order 11990, as amended, will be met to avoid to extent possible the long- and short-term impacts associated with destruction or modification of wetlands. Removal, storage, reutilization, and/or disposal of overburden removed during road construction should be outlined in the Forest Plan. Reporting of cubic yards of material removed, acreage impacted, and acreage rehabilitated, should be part of ongoing planning and monitoring. The Service encourages the Forest Service to consider compensatory mitigation to offset unavoidable adverse impacts to wetlands which remain after all minimization efforts have been met (NEPA Section 1508.20). This approach also embraces positive stewardship of public lands.

Comment # Comment

- 0836-023 Process Comments The Forest Plan should attempt a broad landscape approach to ensure biodiversity. Maintaining viable, well-distributed populations of wildlife across the Chugach National Forest is required by the 1976 National Forest Management Act. An important first step in maintaining viable populations is to determine habitat requirements for species and then provide sufficient area of habitat for the desired population. This stepping stone approach should assist in making decisions for maintaining viable, well distributed populations. Habitat and other resources values should be documented to ensure there is adequate biological information available on which to make informed decisions in the planning process. The goal should be to provide a reasoned basis for predicting impacts associated with the proposed action and alternatives, and to define baseline values to which post-project conditions can be compared. Several types of habitat capability, landscape, and population viability models are available as planning tools. We suggest that the FS begin to collect appropriate information for use with these statistical models and to employ their use as soon as possible. The latest scientific information should be utilized to update existing statistical models. The Forest Plan should direct and include cumulative impact assessments at the landscape level to address losses of habitats and steps for assessing site-specific impacts throughout the Chugach National Forest.
- 0836-024 4 Forest-wide examination of cumulative impacts of past and planned logging activities should be analyzed. Survey information should be in sufficient detail to allow thorough evaluation of impacts of proposed plan. The Plan should include the number of or percentage of timber units covered. Maps should reflect this as well. Visual aids such as maps should be able to stand alone and be easily read. Key landmarks, names of topographic features, road numbers/names, etc., are most helpful. Additionally, cataloged fish strewn numbers and names should be included.
- 0837-001 Recreation The principal issue that will need to be confronted during the revision of the CNFP is the accommodation of the growing number of recreation users and resolution of the increasing conflicts between users, especially motorized and non-motorized users, both commercial and private.
- 0837-002 Components of this problem include: - The effects generated by road access to Whittier. This issue needs to be carefully evaluated given the potential for increased use. This access will generate increased use that will have effects throughout the western parts of Prince William Sound (PWS). We believe it is important to examine the potential effects of this change in the variety of its aspects: increased demands for parking and facilities in Whittier proper, increased usage of PWS. facilities, both federal and state; increased conflict between traditional users and newcomers; increased commercial use to accommodate the increased demand for access and its associated impact on non-commercial use; potential impacts on state and federal land likely to be impacted by increased numbers of recreational users; and the impacts to railroad operations. Increasing conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses. These conflicts will grow as the number of motorized users increases and encroach on areas
- 0837-003 This issue is particularly severe in the area of Manitoba Mountain but is a potential problem for all areas having road or trail access with adjacent state land backed by upslope CNF property.
- 0837-004 - Increasing non-motorized uses. Areas that are easily road accessible should experience significantly increasing non-motorized use. Examples of potential conflicts occur on the Kenai River, Six Mile Creek, and Forty Mile River. Use of land tracts focuses on areas with popular trail systems, like the Resurrection Pass and Russian River/Lakes trails, with growing conflicts between mountain bike users and hikers. Coordinated planning of those areas involving state resources is important, especially each of the three rivers.
- 0837-005 - Increasing motorized use. Similar increases in motorized uses can be expected at the Manitoba Mountain and Resurrection Pass areas during the winter months, creating potential conflict with the non-motorized uses at Manitoba. During the summer, increasing off-road vehicle use can be expected on former mining roads or forest service roads and pressure for such use can be expected to increase in other areas of the CNF that are road accessible. Whether areas should be created for additional motorized uses may be a significant issue. DNR is especially concerned about those areas where state tracts adjoin federal lands.
- 0837-006 Land Management/Planning There are several issues that are important to DNR in the revision of the CNFP: Most importantly, there is the need for coordinated management of adjacent state and federal lands and state waters. This will require a generally similar management approach for an area. There may be opportunities for shared, joint, or assigned management for an area(s) that may be advantageous to both agencies. In the Kenai Peninsula, significant areas of state land occur at Moose Pass, along the Seward Highway between Canyon Creek and the Seward-Kenai Peninsula 'Y', and Seward.
- 0837-007 Within PWS, state land (as well as state tidelands and submerged lands) occupy numerous sites throughout the CNF planning area Issues effecting the management of an area will reflect, in large part, its location:
- 0837-008 In the Seward and Moose Pass areas, the focus for state land is upland recreation issues. It may also be necessary to coordinate forest management activities in these areas given the problems of insect infestation and use of previous timber harvest roads. State lands along the Seward Highway are intended for development, to support highway related needs and the recreation oriented demands. A coordinated approach to the provision of land for commercial and related services is appropriate.

Comment # Comment

- 0837-009 DNR is nearing the completion of the Kenai Area Plan (KAP). State area plans determine appropriate uses (allowed and prohibited) and lands to be retained by the state (and therefore not available for selection under the municipal entitlement program. The KAP provides recommendations on state land that adjoins the CNF and, again, there is the need for coordination between the two agencies.
- 0837-010 In the Kenai River corridor, there will be the need to coordinate both land and water recreation related activity. The recently adopted Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan provides for a common management scheme for this area. A memorandum of understanding between the resource agencies having responsibility for the protection of the Kenai River is due to be signed in the next several months. The Forest Service is to be a signatory to this agreement. It will be especially important to monitor the amount of scenic float trips in the Upper River and to coordinate recreation facility development. It will also be necessary to integrate the Upper Kenai River Cooperative Plan, jointly developed by the state, USFS, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for coordinating the management of the upper Kenai River, into components of the CNFP. And, more generally, it will be necessary for the CNF planning effort to integrate the recommendations of the Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan into the Forest planning effort.
- 0837-011 In the PWS area, use of state land is established by the Prince William Sound Area Plan (PWSAP). Although this plan designates significant portions of the state uplands for recreation or assigns a protected status, there are numerous tracts that provide for various types of development related uses.
- 0837-012 The increasing demands placed on the western area of PWS through the improvement of access at Whittier will affect both state and federal recreation sites and these facilities will require improvement and increased management.
- 0837-013 The issue of coordinated recreation planning and management is particularly critical, and needs careful consideration throughout the planning process. The USFS is strongly encouraged to review these plans in the preparation of the CNFP. DNR will be especially concerned about designations in the CNFP that indirectly or directly affect the uses that are identified in the PWSAP or KAP. -
- 0837-014 The state is also concerned over the designation given upland parcels. These designations, to the extent practicable, should be sufficiently broad to allow flexibility in management and use. It can be expected that conditions will change over time and that the CNFP will not be able to anticipate all of these changes. In instances involving large tracts where use patterns cannot be determined with a reasonable level of confidence at the time of plan preparation, DNR, in its area plans, uses designations of a general type. These permit a number of uses, consistent with good land management practices. The actual blend of uses is determined in the future when development pressures are more apparent. The point here is that we would prefer that the CNFP use more general designations where use patterns may change over time, to accommodate the changing uses without the need for a difficult plan amendment process.
- 0837-015 - The CNF Planning Team should give consideration to the establishment of an advisory council or group that consists of user and special interest groups, similar to that used by the Bureau of Land Management in the resolution of their land management and mining issues. When used by BLM, they have been found to be quite effective in brokering solutions to fairly intractable problems in an efficient and low-confrontation manner. These groups do not have to have "official" standing. They have been formed to deal with a particular issue and have a limited life.
- 0837-016 - DNR suggests that the CNF Planning Team give consideration to the establishment of an inter-agency planning team. This group would meet regularly, on an as needed basis, to be kept abreast of the CNFP planning effort and of the planning/study activities of the agencies participating on the inter-agency planning team. Significant issues would be brought before this group for discussion prior to a position being set out in the plan. DNR uses an analogous inter-agency planning group in the development of its resource and land management plans.
- 0837-017 Navigability The state owns the land under many of the streams in the CNF that are navigable, all watercolumns, and all tidal areas in or adjacent to CNF. The courts have defined navigable waters as those used or susceptible to use for travel, trade, and commerce at the time of statehood. The state is concerned with designations affecting the navigable waters within the CNF planning area that would limit their use by the citizens of the state.
- 0837-018 Wild/Scenic Rivers DNR is concerned with the designation of Recreational, Wild and Scenic rivers under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and most particularly, with the "Wild" designation because of the restrictions associated with this classification. With the exception of four streams (Bear Creek, Cascade Creek, Canyon Creek, and Palmer Creek) all of the other rivers/glaciers identified by the USFS seem to fit the "navigability" criteria and the waters thereof are state owned. It is likely that some or many of the 20 streams/glaciers identified by USFS will be dropped as a result of the planning process.
- 0837-019 The state has generally not supported the creation of new Conservation Systems Units in Alaska, as directed by Congress in Section 10 of ANILCA. Any designation must be carefully tailored to protect traditional uses, including mining and recreation. Because of our authority over the watercolumn and fiduciary responsibilities to the citizens of the state, we believe that any recommendations developed under this Act must be carefully coordinated with DNR. Underlying our concerns is the need for the people of the state to use waters within the National Forest in a traditional

Comment # Comment

- 0837-020 Tidelands and Submerged Lands The state owns both the tidelands and submerged adjacent to the CNF. Use of these areas is designated in the PWSAP or KAP. An important issue to the state is the effect of the expected increasing recreational pressure in the western part of PWS on the tidelands and submerged lands. Anchorages and use areas are now designated in the PWS area plan, but it may be necessary for DNR to modify these recommendations in order to accommodate the increased water use recreation pressure. The CNF planning team should work closely with DNR throughout the planning process, particularly during the period when the preferred alternative is under development. It may be appropriate for the CNFP to accommodate expected uses in appropriate USFS upland sites rather than forcing these uses onto state tidelands. Conversely, it may be necessary for DNR to modify the area plan to accommodate upland recreation recommendations of the CNFP. If inter-agency coordination is lacking, the CNFP upland planning recommendations are going to be of questionable utility because of the close connection between upland and tideland/submerged uses in this area. It will also be advisable for the CNF planning team to work with the South-central Region of the Division of Land on tidelands development planning. This unit of DNR manages the tidelands of PWS and has periodic applications for tideland uses adjacent to both state and federal uplands, and develop of a coordinated strategy is desirable. We suggest a worksession with the CNF planning team on tideland issues in January.
- 0837-021 Forest Management The revision of the CNFP should concentrate on forest health.
- 0837-022 Multiple use requires a healthy vegetative cover in order to meet the needs of the greatest number of users.
- 0837-023 Forest harvest for the purpose of supporting a timber industry is an important consideration but should not be the focal point of the forest management effort. Nonetheless, the issues of forest management exist, focusing on vegetative management to achieve the other objectives in the CNFP or to resolve forest health problems. The following have been identified as issues that need particular attention in the update:
- 0837-024 - Land use designations should allow for optimum flexibility in addressing insect and disease infestations.
- 0837-025 - The vegetation management strategy proposed should consider and discuss the impacts on adjacent forest properties. - The CNFP should detail the future desired condition of the vegetative cover within the CNF and how the USFS expects to achieve this condition.
- 0837-026 - Additionally, the results of the newly initiated insect infestation study for the Kenai Peninsula should be integrated within the CNF revision. It is to be finalized by June, 1998. This study will provide a unique opportunity for the major public land owners in the peninsula (Borough, State, US Forest Service) to develop a common understanding of the infestation problem, how it may affect the holdings of each entity, and how each agency can contribute to an integrated solution to this pervasive problem.
- 0837-027 Road access is another issue that needs significant in-depth review and discussion. The only way the forest can be fully and properly managed is by allowing road access for management purposes and user ingress/regress. Future desired conditions should reflect the necessity for access and the type of access should be decided on a case by cases basis depending on the land use designations impacted and the critical need for intensive management. Access (road) guidelines for crossing CNF lands should spell out the process and be streamlined to cause limited delay. This should be true for access requested for both private and state forest lands.
- 0838-001 I am sending you this discussion as an effort to provide a means to achieve a new level of cooperation with the public and provide for more effective management of the Chugach National Forest.
- 0838-002 I am intending to provide a vision of how a change can be achieved that would change present and future management practices in order to produce a change in the average forest health condition and prevent the continued cycling of catastrophic losses from major change events stemming from forest condition factors such as overstocking, excesses in distributions and the preponderance of older, less vigorous age classes, and lack of stand
- 0838-003 The focus of this conference was to develop a better understanding of the role the University of Alaska Fairbanks can play in support of the forest products industry in Alaska. Speakers for the conference came from several agencies and organizations both from within and outside Alaska.

Comment # Comment

- 0838-004 During the conference, four separate speakers, myself included, spoke about ecosystem management and the need to provide for a new focus on management of the forest resources in order to promote a condition that would reflect a vigorous, sustainable, and diverse forest with less propensity for major catastrophic events. One that is not bug-proof but rather is bug-resistant. It was emphasized that having a healthy and sustainable forest is dependent upon also having a healthy forest products industry. A healthy forest products industry assists with the application of various stand management prescriptions that can help assure long-term forest health and sustainability. It is also necessary to understand that burning the forest further contributes to the release of greenhouse gases through oxidation of bound carbon compounds and their release back into the atmosphere. Recent multi-national negotiations to reduce greenhouse emissions calls for better alternatives than burning large areas of forest land. Scientists such as the late Carl Sagan wrote that if we are to begin to make progress in reductions of greenhouse emissions from the standpoint of forest management, it is essential that we provide for healthy vigorously growing forests and limit the amounts of sequestered carbon being returned to the atmosphere. Harvesting and utilization of forest products such as lumber provides for the retention of sequestered carbon. The burning of forests in tropical and sub-tropical countries has been a key issue in the debate over greenhouse gaseous emissions. The future of the world, with an ever increasing human population demands and associated resource
- 0838-005 1 dependency, requires that land resource managers be increasingly concerned about management of both land and atmospheric resources. There are those who would say that insects, diseases, fire, and weather damage are natural factors of change and are agents of restoration ecology rather than forest decline. However, the effects of past management, both locally through practices such as fire control, and international effects such as global warming, have artificially influenced the future of these forests in spite of attempts to allow a natural course of events to occur. Problems with natural catastrophic events in our forests on the scale occurring throughout Alaska dictate that we will see long-term changes in forest structure and vegetation and likely long-term effects on wildlife habitat. And if proper management is not taken we will very likely see a recycling of catastrophic event patterns. We are now at a point where serious and long-lasting decisions need to be made about the future forests of our region. This will take foresight, planning, and management, . . . management for a forest condition rather than commodity outputs. As Leroy Kline of the Oregon Department of Forestry stated, "There is a great tendency to fix past mistakes. However, unless more effort is devoted to looking forward toward prevention rather than backward toward correction, we will continually be trying to catch up." This is where ecosystem management as a tool or process for landscape level planning on a regional basis can be effective.
- 0838-007 Implementing a Plan of Action to Provide for Regional Landscape Level Management. I am introducing an outline that provides a means of implementing regional plans for the management of forest resources based on objective forest conditions. This outline is intended to provide an overview of a means for cooperative development of management planning on a regional basis. The implications of adoption of such a 2 cooperative plan are extensive and reflect on the heightened concerns being expressed throughout the region for a better, more effective means of conducting forest resource management to reflect the needs of the forest and society for a diverse, sustainable, and resilient forest capable of meeting a variety of needs for both today and the future.
- 0838-008 The responsibility for forest resource management involves a number of organizations. While it is their task to effectively manage their lands for management objectives, forest health and risks are factors that influence these lands on a regional basis which can negate or reduce the effectiveness of land management on smaller tracts of ownership. It is necessary that landowners both realize the importance of planning on a regional (landscape level basis) and have a means or decision-making process for implementation of such plans. Components of this outline: Description of the Environment (The Ecosystem Diversity Matrix): The USFS has developed a mapping of forest areas in Alaska by Ecological Units. These Ecological units subdivide into finer habitat type classifications which can provide a basis for management planning and create an Ecosystem Diversity matrix. Establishing a forest inventory of habitat types which are based on identifiable site parameters is the first step. Forest canopy structure for each habitat type can vary depending on historical events including insect and disease incidence and fire. Research must provide forest growth and yield information for these habitat types. Wise management of the forest on a regional basis will require providing a balance of the forest structures within these habitat types. Failure to provide this balance can contribute to the long-term health decline and reduction of a diverse, and sustainable forest on a regional basis. A process has been developed for the balanced distribution of stand structures within habitat types as was recently outlined by Dr. Bob Pfister from the University of Montana. This process could be successfully developed as part of a region-wide natural resource management plan. Necessary Information for each habitat type classification. Tree species and canopy structure for a given habitat type. (small tree single story, medium tree multi-story, etc.) Associated Stand Hazards Associated Site Productivity Classes Access Class Condition Classes (heavy insect activity, heavy disease, heavy fire risk, diverse vigorous stand, stagnated stand, wind damage)

Comment # Comment

- 0838-009 The Process of Integrating Landscape Ecology and Natural Resource Management. (The Decision-making process) Once the Ecosystem Diversity Matrix is completed, we can proceed with development of a process by which we can integrate landscape ecology with natural resource management. 3 In order to integrate ecosystem management into a natural resource management plan it will be necessary to develop working groups dedicated to various natural resources such as vegetation, wildlife, society needs, and Landscape level processes and provide a framework for their cooperative effort. This can be facilitated by organizations such as the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The integration of these groups will be further augmented with the utilization of a calibrated forest planning model such as Forest Vegetation Simulator Growth and Yield Model. The Alaska Cooperative Extension in cooperation with the USFS is seeking to develop 4 calibrated Stand Prognosis Model for the South-central and Interior forest region of Alaska. This model could become a valuable tool in the process of management planning integration. Tools For The Decision-Making Process: Ecosystem Diversity Matrix (identified above) Vegetation, Wildlife, and Landscape level processes working groups Human Dimensions Group (derived from a cross-section of the public and developed through the Cooperative Extension Program) Stand and Forest Growth and Yield Modeling Integration Planning Process to incorporate working group inputs Forest Natural Resource Management Plan: Piecing the complex Ecosystem Diversity Matrix together over time in order to provide a healthy forest through ecosystem management on a landscape level (such as is being conducted by the University of Montana for the Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Research Project).
- 0838-010 Public ecosystem management education The silvicultural practices to promote and sustain a forest condition include a variety of tools including prescribed burning, natural processes, and various timber harvesting options. It is essential to realize that the bottom line is the maintenance of a long-term sustainable, healthy, and diverse forest condition. During the application of this decision-making process in Montana, it was found that using this approach rather than one aimed at a target commodity output actually achieve a combination of goals including better public support for harvest activities since the public is the body to decide the forest condition for which they want managed. The decision-making process will be aided by a decision-making body derived from the public that are trained by third party specialists in order to empower them to participate in constructive dialog on future forest conditions and processes to achieve those conditions. In addition to the efforts to develop effective natural resource management plans for Alaskan forest areas it is also necessary that we do a better job of educating the public about ecosystem management. Examples of alternatives that could be supported to assist this process include efforts by the State of Alaska Dept. of Nat. Resources under support 4 of the USFS to provide for Project Learning Tree in the public schools. Another recent example is the 4-H Forest Ecosystem Natural Resources Education Project developed by Julie Riley of the Alaska Cooperative Extension (ACE).
- 0838-011 This outline was presented to provide an opportunity to see a new horizon for Natural Resource management and with a hope that decision-making for the future forests for Alaska will be made in a manner such that we are looking to a future condition and which reflects the needs and desires of society.
- 0860-003 Monitoring of protecting the forest in the face of increased access, protecting high impact sites
- 0860-004 Taking continued input as the impact of the road is realized
- 0860-006 Worst - Put the Ice Fields on a map.
- 0860-011 Increase FS presence in Valdez
- 0860-012 Advance planning to prepare for use impact
- 0860-018 Careful zoning protects quieter more passive uses
- 0860-019 USFS works with State DNR to protect tidelands from monopolistic uses like float camps
- 0860-020 East PWS has received zoning management and attention as thoroughly as WPWS Naked Island group has not been touched by logging
- 0860-021 Leave the Forest alone Pristine and natural beauty here before us and will be after us
- 0860-023 Support and encourage multiple season recreation
- 0860-027 Build more recreation cabins
- 0860-030 Additional FS Cabins Additional Hiking Trails ## to care for what we currently have
- 0860-031 Education for users on Forest
- 0860-032 A Forest Plan developed by organized groups of citizens of diverse interests working together to improve conflict
- 0860-034 Forest Service work to educate visitors to low impact ways of utilizing forest so more people can enjoy high quality experience FS work to educate people on watchable wildlife guidelines

Comment # Comment

0860-039 West PWS protected while East PWS opened to responsible exploitation

0860-040 Forest Service does not regulate adjacent tidelands and floatcamps

0860-041 Improved access to recreation, emphasize multi season recreation but no infrastructure support

0860-048 Continue under estimating number of people recreating on Forest

0860-050 Don't use existing research data

0860-051 Regulation on FS lands are not enforced Plan imposed through legislative or political process No citizen involvement in plan or except for interest groups Plan is not workable

0860-055 Lodges and marina's approved for forest lands

0860-061 A plan that is considerate of all that we don't know about natural resource management and provides for

0860-062 To develop a plan through the use of citizen involvement to the greatest extent practical

0860-063 Maintain the good trails and cabin system. Expand the system if it can be done with little impact on wildlife

0860-065 The Forest is managed in a way that replicates natural processes (i.e. ecosystem management.)

0860-068 Maintain current Forest conditions

0860-069 Develop a plan that reflects a concerned publics appreciation for and desire to care for public lands A plan that emphasizes sustainable recreational and wildlife habitat value to assure that future generations and wildlife will enjoy the forest quality that we have today

0860-070 Worst Abandonment of planning Politics govern revision process management direction imposed through legislation. Forest Service required to implement a plan the public doesn't support

0860-078 Long-term plan with teeth and credibility to protect from short-sighted development

0860-081 Cooperative product among Forest Service, Alaska State Parks, Native Corporations, and Native villages Budget sufficient to implement Include logging, mining, recreation, and protection

0860-082 Forest Service will provide a plan that allows for future access and development and provides for true multiple-use based on fair allocation Forest Service will base management decisions in large part on science

0860-083 Leave forest as is

0860-086 Managed for biodiversity with natural processes generally allowed to take its course

0860-090 Forest divided into areas that are managed differently

0860-091 A plan produced through cooperative efforts of diverse group of citizens, agency members, and scientists

0860-104 Honor public land, including no "no trespassing" signs, and lots of robust discussion about management

0860-111 Streamline permitting for tour operators

0860-114 A multi-use forest where users respect the rights of others

0860-116 Public involvement in all aspects of management

0860-117 Timber harvest, destination tourism, and mining recognized as legitimate

0860-118 Multiple use

0860-121 Nordic ski trails and cabins expanded

0860-126 Worst Spending millions trying to control the beetle

0860-129 No appeal rights

Comment # Comment

- 0860-130 To work 3-5 years on revised plan with little citizen involvement, then receive an appeal and have to start over
- 0860-143 Management eliminates natural cycles
- 0860-153 Legislatively imposed plan
- 0860-156 No multiple use, one extreme "wins" No access, development, or recreation
- 0860-157 Lawsuit gridlock resulting in legislated "solutions" Adversarial relationships where no management is possible
- 0860-159 To be gridlocked because we can't work together One group dictates what will happen Public input not considered
- 0862-001 Clarify management of newly acquired lands in WSA – Does ANILCA apply?
Roadless – How does it fit with ANILCA
What areas are available for sale of common variety minerals?
- 0862-002 In development of plan – coordinate with RPT, Private land owners, ADF&G, Fisheries/Rec (look at make up of Kenai River Group)
- 0862-005 Limited access due to RR corridors by project development are we encouraging trespassing; create access points across RR so they do not walk along tracks.
- 0862-010 Clarify restrictions in Portage Bear Valleys
Firearms, Hunting, Closures
Fed & State Coordination
Portage Lake – Navigation managed by state???
- 0862-011 Carrying capacities for Outfitters and Guides
Include in alternatives; complex, different activities, easier on public, need for activity.
- 0862-012 Unique resources will degrade due to improper planning/management sheer overuse without resource protection education and enforcement (presence). Possibility more authority for people in the field to expand FPO program)
- 0862-014 Strengthening external contacts especially other agencies, umbrella for PWS to foster communication.
- 0862-015 Management of Bear Valley
Motorized/non
Hunting
Plan development/nondevelopment
- 0862-016 Motorized vs. quiet rights/non motorized tech advances access, closures, wilderness, WSAS, brown bears.
- 0862-018 What is future management direction and do we have tools/infrastructure funding and commitment, internal support SO/RO.
Internal Collaboration – common game plan – good communication
Need process for internal participation
Updates
Form to provide
Go to districts before public with draft alternatives & have a working meeting
Be sure districts get content analysis
Timeline to districts, input needed by
Who is on IDT go to all employees
FLT
District liaison, someone who cares
IDT members – focus meetings at districts

Comment # Comment

- 0862-019 Forest Plan Monitoring
- Determine what we can measure & value of it
 - Commitment to do it (funding)
 - If its not reasonable, it won't get done.
 - Get district involvement
 - Using Modern standards
- 0862-021 Oil Spill contingency Plan
- 0862-022 Development of Administrative sites ie. Whittier, Chenega, etc., conversion of existing facilities (non-FS)
- 0862-024 Coordinate with state to designate appropriate areas
- 0862-025 Buoy Management? Liability, commitment, ecosystem management, marine
- 0862-026 Lands – support acquisition/trade of land to consolidate land base.
- 0863-001 Even flow sustainable plan which emphasizes partnerships to generate initial increases in resource and services production which is then maintained by increases in workload indicator outputs -?budget.
- A plan that builds steadily from where we are and emphasizes our best and/or unique features and attributes.
- A balance of resource uses in which a majority of people are happy.
- No appeal.
- Community support
- The team remains sane
- A plan that meets the needs of all users and that all users will accept.
- Balance of uses
- Protection of sites, especially high – use areas to prevent resource damage – Do thru use restrictions (Type & season), facility designs, etc.
- Maintains the natural biological diversity of the National Forest
- To have full, final say in the final plan implementation as a forest
- Public/Legislature confidence in our leadership/stewardship
- To have full final say in the final implementation
- 0863-005 The mission/goals of the forest service as an agency are met; some interest groups are happy, some are unhappy, but the plan accomplishes the agency's intent for moving into the future.
- Interaction between Forest Service Management and public will be improved to new heights.
- Natural resources were controlled at a reasonable level so they can be enjoyed by all people
- 0863-006 Continue in acquiring land for public use
- 0863-007 Direction to spend \$ on highest priority issues
- 0863-010 A proactive management plan that integrates resources management to meet used demands.
- A plan that the forest actually commits to implement.
- Reasonably address full range of interests.

Comment # Comment

0863-011

Consider supply and demand needs at larger scales i.e. Kenai Pen, south central AK, statewide. A collaborative process can improve allocation opportunities.

A common planning period for cooperating agencies

0863-012

Our definition of EM does not focus on retaining our ecosystems simply as they are now but focusing on idea of integrated resource concerns, mimic natural processes.

0863-013

Recognize official existing infrastructure corridors and develop standards and guidelines for determining future corridors.

Have a mission statement and set of goals for the plan.

The plan should identify where there are conflicts for land allocation, exchanges.

The alternative should be analyzed for fiscal implementation feasibility.

That it's clear from the verbage and maps what the allocations mean.

0863-017

Management direction which sets public expectations which we cannot implement. Major concern is the change in the way \$ come to the forest. A grand development plan in most resource areas can't be implemented because plans do not drive budget – past performance drives budget.

Comment # Comment

0863-019	<p>WORST - No attempt to meet recreation demand by creating new trails, facilities etc.</p> <p>Not attempting to restore spruce bark beetle affected lands on the Kenai River</p> <p>Not attempting FPR to further polarize interest groups. Planning used as vehicle and springboard for special interest management.</p> <p>10 years of appeals and supplemental planning.</p> <p>Decline of all wildlife species.</p> <p>Power lines everywhere</p> <p>Over developing the acquired land</p> <p>Continued lack of scientific direction</p> <p>No timber/vegetation management program</p> <p>Continued enhancing pinks</p> <p>More damage will be done to lands where the public may utilize for recreation purposes.</p> <p>All of the natural resources are destroyed</p> <p>That the plan does not come out the way you wanted. Very limited knowledge on the plan so can't really comment on either.</p> <p>Lost public/legislative confidence in our leadership & stewardship.</p> <p>Change scenic quality of lands</p> <p>That we react to extreme preservation positions and lock up the forest based on emotional reactions of environmental effects</p> <p>There was no sustainable timber program that was responsive to forest health - a variety of wildlife habitats – the local economy</p> <p>No goals are met – no clear mission is accomplished, so many compromises are made that no one is happy.</p> <p>Ignores the natural values of the area.</p> <p>Get legal counsel involved early so that plan is more defensible in court.</p> <p>Planning is a social process rather than a scientific process.</p> <p>Deal with strategic issues up front.</p> <p>IDT may ignore special activity requests because don't know how to deal with them? Ex. Communication sites, transportation, utility corridors, etc. How do capture specialist input in such questions?</p>
0864-001	<p>Taking care of what we currently have before looking at new ideas, facilities, etc.</p> <p>Concerns and interests sheet</p> <p>1. Situation Map question CODE Research Natural Areas and Special Areas</p> <p>Copper River Delta mandate (ANILCA) I would like to see the FS maintain management.</p>
0864-002	<p>Code Effect Ecosystem Management Cause agency Coordination Designating Land Use within ecosystems management process (E.I.-watershed analysis and more public and interagency interaction.</p>

Comment # Comment

- 0864-003 2. Issues important and concerns question.
Code admin Land management planning
Because my background is Land use and Geography. I would like to see the watershed analysis process being used more as a means to inventory and organize information and data then using that information and data to address management issues across the forest- It would be nice to go through the process across the forest before an area becomes a "hot spot" or have the data before a "crisis" issue hits
- 0864-004 3. Code admin forest service organization
Technology and truly changing the hierarchical way budgets get dispersed. My district is larger then most forest- We need A LOT of computer power and space to process project scaled data- yet we get equipment and technology based on the # of people- its irrelevant to the workload we are given to complete.
- 0864-005 4. Code admin Collaborative stewardship
Landuse is broad- I think the collaborative learning process is a positive step to get all groups/people heard and communicating. It seems like a process we could use beyond forest plan. My soapbox- I grew up with the Judge Bold decision in Puget Sound. The "native" vs. "non-native" issues tore families and friends apart. I see the same thing happening now with "Indian Country" and subsistence. I don't believe "special rights" will fix past wrongs. We need to be one nation with a value given to diversity.
- 0864-006
Improve sheet
1. Code Admin Forest service organ.
We set up "Teams" and "Processes" that are suppose to address "change" in the way we communicate and do things- yet the issues that they are to address should be address within staff areas and on units- staff areas and units should be held responsible and accountable for things like civil rights and implementing new technologies or
- 0864-007 2. code admin forest service organ.
Because – business as usual will maintain the status quo but when they are all bought out or retire R10 will have a hard time attracting and keeping people with the skills (science, computer, social) needed if the don't address the changing work force/employees of future.
- 0864-008 3. Code admin forest service organ
Management – Line offices are responsible for implementation. Need to change budget process (How money is given out) not the budget-- \$ shouldn't be so "focused". Need to look at what it cost to manage areas/locations, NOT divide between different disciplines- We have lots of money, we just can't use it in a flexible manner, yet managing land use issues is extremely flexible in nature.
- 0864-009 4. Code admin envir., Educ
Congress is an obstacle and Public understanding of what it takes to manage. I think interpretation programs aimed at adults would be a very good step to gaining public support.
- 0864-010 5. Code Admin forest service organ
We are still in "family" work force mode – "come join us and be like us" – that won't work anymore. Need to say "come join us and share your skills, thoughts and ideas"
- 0865-001
1. Each time Forest Plan revision comes up special funding should supplied for a team of National Forest Specialist to develop document.

2 A specialized task force could be far more efficient due to experience level.
Frees up our own staff to continue with our normal public service to provide specialist in put.

3. A national forest plan task force would continually exist and be responsible for ALL NF revision plans. Congress would allocate funding annually for this team

. .
4. Budget limitations. A bill signed right into law for this process

5. It relates to all aspects, as the forest plan is one of our primary directions. This concept may be highly idealistic but realistically we all have full plates; to use our own staff for the bulk of process makes us ineffective at "caring for the land and serving the people"

Comment # Comment

0865-002

1. 1) Radio TV other communications plans needed. . 2) Minerals/fuels plans may be needed. 3) Specialized reinvention applied.4) wild as Scenic river designations. 5) land use designation necessary. 6) Access to trails mgt. Addressed 7) Forest uses camping capabilities assigned. 8) Free use and firewood addressed. 9) land ownership, conveyances and changing ownership. 10) Public access easements
2. My concern for all these issues is that they haven't been fully addressed or even recognized in the past. These are hazey issues which need consideration and a form of direction applied within CLMP.
3. See #1. 1) Radio TV other communications plans needed. . 2) Minerals/fuels plans may be needed. 3) Specialized reinvention applied.4) wild as Scenic river designations. 5) land use designation necessary. 6) Access to trails mgt. Addressed 7) Forest uses camping capabilities assigned. 8) Free use and firewood addressed. 9) land ownership, conveyances and changing ownership. 10) Public access easements
C
4. Other views. 1) State, USFS, law enforcement, USCG, & private communication organizations., 2) State, USFS, private and municipal, 3) USFS lands folks, state, private enterprises, 4) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 5) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 6)) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 7) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 8) USFS, local communities, native corporations.

0869-001

- 1) CNF mngt situation
 - a) Evaluate cumulative impacts on resources – examples could be sensitive wildlife species or areas where pristine wilderness experiences are possible. We'll stick in wildlife here – specifically the goshawk as an example.

0869-002

- c) Improve land cover info in GIS to aid process.

0869-005

- a) Virtually all – everything is connected.
- 4) Other views
 - a) User groups: Environmentalists, ATV users, Hunters, fishers, commercial fishers, subsistence hunters and fishers, tour operators, local community groups, birders
 - b) Other agencies: ADF&G, DNR, USFWS, tourism board, subsistence board

Comment # Comment

0870-001

1) CNF improve mngt situation
Provide more training (mandatory) in technological abilities. Long term

2) Why desirable?
Technology keeps changing and will continue to do so

3) Improvement feasibility?
A lot can be done OJT @ unit level.

4) Obstacles
None

CONCERNS AND INTERESTS

1) Situation Map
a) Management direction – Having clear workable standards and guidelines to work with.
b) Free use timber law – out of date for this day and age.
c) Subsistence – Not our baliwick – How much effort do we put into it which will be eventually wasted?

2) Concerns/Interests
a) Without standards and guidelines – There are no measures to base decisions off of.
b) Technology and population (human) have changed to where this archaic law may have impacts on other issues that need to be dealt with.
c) Not our baliwick – Takes a lot of time away from other issues that need to be dealt with.

3) Other views
a) Mainly internal managers
b) Anyone interested in free use wood.
c) ADF&G

0871-001

Need learn objectives and well defined methods with the results based on the best science & knowledge available with the clean intention of conservation of the resources.

In the past the process has been destroyed by unclear goals and objectives, methods that change with the weather resulting in a poor product that arrived way past the implementation.

It is easy to implement clear objectives if your overriding priority is conservation of existing resources.

Take a look at the real world where natural resources take a back seat to exploitation of trees, water, etc.

If you don't take conservation ethic, what is the alternative? Development for all? And where does that leave us in 20 years?

Resolving issues needs to be driven by sound science and incorporating ecosystem management, that conservation is the primary concern.

Conservation of existing resources must be paramount (but does not necessarily mean that existing recreational activities be curtailed but that in the present state.

0873-003 No funding needed – able to use people and money we spend now to do what they were really funded for.
Decision makers (FS/DR)

It's a CFR that's a law – outside scope of Forest Plan so should figure out how we are going to meet that need and

0873-005 Remember uniqueness of different areas of Chugach.

Be careful of broadbrush "assumptions" or standard and guidelines. Temper for situation (ie. PWS vs Ressurrection Bay or Kenai). Don't forget reason people want to visit or live there.

How to handle increased demands for visitor services while keeping some places less developed (ie. jewels in some peoples mind)

Some people want everything developed and some want it primitive.

Comment # Comment

- 0874-003 Good science/research and citizen input should drive the allocation of uses & resources. However science should not be prostituted to meet the publics whim. We need to be able to look into the future and predict trends in social mores, technology and needs. The Plan should be proactive and designed for the 21st Century.
- Peoples views are the heart of forest planning – allocating uses and resources
- All stakeholders should have input, although all will not get what they want. Need to balance local needs with national needs. Local populations should be listened to
- 0875-005 Consider the relationship with State Lands that are adjacent to Forest eg. MOV on management? Same with Native Corps. – can we find underlying common goals of land stewardship – so that negative cumulative impacts are
- 0875-006 Profit motive! At the expense of the resource and the selfish motive at the expense of resource eg. Four wheelers on the islands.
- 0876-001
- Forest Plan getting bogged down and not have a clear direction.
- Citizens – Groups putting input as national groups and only a small voice from locals who live in the area and spend 365 days there having to live with impacts of non-locals.
- 0876-003
- Local interest. Existing uses must be considered when designing improvements. Economic impacts to the local economy, environmental impacts, subsistence economy, recreational opportunities – lost or gained.
- Improvements
- Forest Plan: Try to state clear objectives designations etc. long term.
- Citizens: Involvement more local access, comments, request input, local talks; long term. Provide meetings to meet locals, Identify points of view. District Ranger, Forest Sup. District personal: Funded with Forest \$ Local development \$. Determining weight of one voice or group or how to weight these.
- 0881-001
- P Updating plan with new (since 84 LMP) developments, studies, plans, issues (Upper Kenai River Comp. Plan; Sixmile; Res. Pass carrying capacity allocation)
- 0881-009 P Specificity of plan to ensure descretion vs. protection, loose direction vs explicit direction
- 0881-011 P Identify areas for acquisition - inholdings, other ownership
- 0881-016 P ROS is adopted as standard rather than guideline
- 0881-017 P Use, existence fo roads in "roadless areas" (especially mining) ("trails" vs roads) (eg. Carter Lade). Is designation appropriate?
- 0882-001
- I do have a couple suggestions for future meetings of a similar format. I noticed that about half of the crowd were unwilling to wait until the public discussion period. I suspect that most people were there to express a view and left without the opportunity. Perhaps subsequent meetings could rearrange the agenda so that the comment period precedes the educational portion. Or written educational materials could be made available at a meeting devoted primarily to discussion.
- Having maps on the wall provided everyone with good visuals and perhaps sparked memories and issues. The option of writing on the maps should be encouraged.
- I'd like to see facilitated small group discussions between the users groups. I envision and expansion of the one-on-one approach with the group size being limited to six or seven. A strong, assertive facilitator is a must given the contentious nature of the issues.
- 0883-001
- What issues are important to me?? Motorized vs. Quiet Rights/Non-motorized. Access, Closures, wilderness areas (or study areas). Technology – Hunting??

Comment # Comment

0883-002

I still like the idea of areas “untrammeled by the aspects of man” yet these areas should be located where use could be limited or regulated. I am concerned about increased dispersed use and elimination of use in specific areas.

0884-001

I am concerned about Internal Collaboration, USFS needs to agree with self on management of WSA)

0884-002

I am concerned about Prince William Sound management given increased access.

0884-003

Often personal opinions become policy. We send a different message to public, lack of specific program direction. Increased work to satisfy individuals (\$),

0884-004

Impacts to PWS lack of infrastructure to deal with increased use. We will be fixing the Forest instead of managing it.

0884-005

Consider forest health and recreational opportunities for the general public (not high end users, rich).

0884-006

Consider the following views – PWSAC, RPT and EVOS

0885-001

These are important to me: Wilderness in the PWS, competing resource use and Forest Service presence.

The above are the primary management focus on the GRD. Fisheries conflicts/recreation development/community.

The following must be considered: State management plans, community management plans, interest group plans, commercial fish industry (PWSAC)

0886-001

What are the issues? Changing use patterns in the PWS. Resolving WSA issues as they relate to PWS. Nonmotorized/motorized. Internal collaboration. Strengthening external contacts.

0887-002

Needs to be more collaboration with other natural resource agencies (state & federal) research studies and

0889-001

This is my letter to reserve the right to appeal, intervene and/or, suit in matters of the Chugach Land Management Plan. As I make my living in the forest, I am very concerned. I hope to be very active in the Management Planning Process. Is the ID team going to go ahead with the issue to ask Congress to withdraw Land under the Wild and

0890-005

7) Coordinate with other ongoing planning processes such as the Kenai Area Plan. Consider development activities on adjacent non-national forest lands.

0890-007

6) Analyze present and future demand for recreation and tourism use and development. The impact of these activities on sensitive areas of the Kenai Peninsula, Copper River Delta, and Prince William Sound must be closely

0892-001

Please include the following comments in accordance with the scoping process of the Chugach National Forest Revision. Also, please understand that I want all these categories to be addressed within the framework of