

SAR - DEIS - Chapter 3 Only

<i>Comment #</i>	<i>Comment</i>
------------------	----------------

0026896-001

I would like to see the final plan prioritize sustainability of all biotic components, habitat maintenance, and unregulated ecological processes Please count this as my formal DEIS comment, and thank you for your concern.

0027727-002

Where's the proof of destruction of land by snowmachines - Hikers - Hunters etc.

0029063-033

Affected Environment Environmental Consequences The Draft EIS provides an in-depth analysis of management alternatives, the environment, and potential impacts each alternative will have on resources within CNF. However, combining the "Affected environment" and "Environmental consequences" sections into one chapter has resulted in this information being unorganized and difficult to understand. We suggest that separation of these two chapters would help organize the information into a more reader-friendly format. We also recommend that the rationale for decisions resulting in resource tradeoffs should be more fully documented in the Final EIS, so that potential impacts and relative risks may be more thoroughly understood.

0029063-052

Page 3- 17. Table 3-5 Under the preferred column, we suggest summer trails and non-motorized areas be separated.

Comment # Comment

0028328-011

Cumulative Impacts

In general, cumulative impacts are hard to assess in the DEIS, given that a substantial portion of the forest has been left out of the analysis. Because the DEIS fails to adequately address other lands or interagency coordination, it's difficult to reason the logic behind omission of Prince William Sound. Where the DEIS does address cumulative impacts, the analysis is sadly insufficient in most cases. Overall, the DEIS uses language such as, "the likelihood of forest management activities affecting the viability of brown bears on the Forest is low because the Forestwide standards and guidelines will be applied to help maintain the brown bear and its habitat." There is little to no real cumulative impacts analysis in the DEIS. At times it's difficult to tell if the DEIS is, indeed, an environmental impact statement or, rather, a presentation of differing sets of information. Cumulative impacts addressed in Forest Products talk of the cumulative "production" rather than environmental consequences. In some areas, cumulative impacts are completely unaddressed, such as the Minerals section. CEQ Regulations define Cumulative impact as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. (Sec. 1508.7) (Emphasis added)

Further, if the Forest Service is to adequately address cumulative impacts the preferred alternative and accompanying analysis must take into account activities on adjacent lands. The Forest Service should provide a balance to regional uses, rather than assume it must fulfill every need on Chugach lands. For example, the preferred alternative allows for significant increases in landings heli-skiing and heli-hiking operations, despite adjacent State land permits for the same uses. About three-quarters of the lands surrounding Valdez are State owned and are open to heli-skiing. The preferred alternative, then, should provide ample opportunity to those residents wanting quiet areas. Also, activities on neighboring lands have a direct impact to the resource on CNF lands. Any analysis done without activity information from adjacent lands is not a cumulative analysis. This level of analysis is required under CEQ Regulations Sec. 1508.

0034797-003

3. Limit the use of all-terrain or off-road vehicles to those roads and trails where conflicts with natural resource values, such as wildlife, sensitive plant populations, or soils can be avoided. Also, prohibit their use in areas where conflicts with social values such as indigenous (native) uses or other recreational uses of the forest exist.

0035165-002

We are actively pursuing specific methods by which we can minimize environmental [illegible].

0035302-002

The data and information that has been brought to our attention is very old, inaccurate and does not show the true picture of what is happening locally.

0036223-001

In reading the DEIS, I was disappointed frequently at its narrow scope. There is relatively little mention of Prince William Sound, for example. Even though the Forest Service has signed an MOU with the State regarding management in the Sound, the DEIS and PA imply the FS has no jurisdictional responsibility. It's somewhat ironic that the FS ends up being the manager for lands damaged by the Exxon spill. Key wildlife are completely left out of the DEIS - such as harbor seals, killer whales and sea otters. Yet, federal law compels the FS to consider management implications to those species, which are federally listed - stellar sea lion and humpback whale. Where does the FS draw the management line? Land activities clearly will affect fish and aquatic wildlife, in particular those mammals that have haul outs on land or those who feed on land-based animals. Regardless of the MOD status, the DEIS and Land Use Plan need to include Prince William Sound. Otherwise comprehensive analysis is not possible.

Comment # Comment

0036223-002 I am not a fan of most motorized recreation vehicles. For the most part they are noisy, polluting, and environmentally damaging. Operators gain access to areas that put increased stress on wildlife populations through harassment, poaching, over-harvest and intrusion. Although I support efforts in the PA to provide more opportunities to be free from these obnoxious machines, it does not go far enough. The FEIS should address motorized off-road uses as a cumulative impact. In the preferred alternative motorized uses are treated separately. They need to be considered together.

0036574-014 Visitor use on the water and the associated increase in demand for visitor facilities will be responsible possibly for the largest future impacts to the Forest's natural resources. Thus, the DEIS should include a section addressing the effects from marine transportation, including discussion about cruise ships, fishing vessels, power boats, personal watercraft, kayaks, rafts, and other vessels, etc.