

SAR - DEIS Only

Comment # Comment

0011365-001

0022003-001

3. Please indicate if you feel the information in this document is easy to understand?

For the most part, it is not easy to understand

4. Please indicate whether you feel the information in this document is thorough and complete.

For the most part, it is neither thorough nor complete

It is not easy to understand your comparison of activities tables 2334

0022095-003

0026810-025

Brown Bears: In the DEIS discussion of brown bears (P. 3-192), there is no direct discussion of the effects of roads and increasing human access on bear conservation, There is also a very limited review of the literature including references to similar issues in southeast Alaska. We recommend a more thorough discussion of these issues because they are directly related to conservation concerns on the Kenai Peninsula.

The DEIS describes forest wide guidelines for brown bear conservation including a 750 ft. buffer of forest cover on both sides of Class 1 anadromous salmon streams. Based on recent studies conducted by the Interagency Brown Bear Study Team (IBBST), these buffers appear inadequate. Based on over 20,000 telemetry locations of female bears, the IBBST recently determined the average distance of female bears to the nearest anadromous stream was over 5,000 ft. (about 7x the distance of the current buffer). We strongly recommend the forest work closely with the IBBST to reconsider their guidelines in light of this new information.

The DEIS (P. 3-212) states 'The likelihood of forest management activities affecting the viability of brown bear on the Forest is low because the Forestwide standards and guidelines will be applied to help maintain the brown bear and its habitat.' We do not believe there has been an adequate analysis to support this conclusion. We believe there is need for a much more comprehensive viability analysis for brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula and recommend that the Forest Service undertake such an analysis.

We encourage the Forest Service to continue supporting IBBST brown bear research on the Kenai and develop a process of adaptive management so that new research findings can be incorporated into management as soon as possible. There should also be a detailed description of how brown bear populations will be monitored throughout this plan.

Comment # Comment

- 0026810-026 General Wildlife: The literature review and citations for most wildlife species in the environmental effects chapter of the DEIS is inconsistent and inadequate. For example, there is substantial literature on deer, mountain goats, and goshawks from similar habitats in southeastern Alaska that is not referenced or included in this review. A more comprehensive and thorough review would significantly strengthen this DEIS.
- The cumulative effects discussion addressing wildlife in the DEIS is quite minimal and superficial. Certainly it would be valuable to summarize the Suring et al. (1998) paper 'Analysis of cumulative effects on brown bears on the Kenai Peninsula, southcentral Alaska.' We suggest that this section should be substantially strengthened in the FEIS.
- Large carnivores are particularly vulnerable to habitat fragmentation and increasing human access. We recommend additional discussion and analysis of these issues related to bears, wolves, lynx, and wolverines on the Kenai Peninsula.
- 0028102-001
- What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- The written VS the CD version are in conflict & more constrict data is [Illegible].
- 0028105-002
- The two statements from the CD and paper work don't work together. The information's isn't the same on both.
- 0028106-002
- The statement on the CD does not match the hard copy print out. These two should coincide with one another.
- 0028110-002
- What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- It is not complete, please put out the correct info. and delay the [Illegible] for comment.
- 0028111-002
- What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- The current plan is not accurate & feel that further research is needed.
- 0028112-002
- What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- Need more time to study info.
- 0028113-002
- What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- Which one? I've seen two and they conflict with each other.

Comment # Comment

0028114-002

Continue the comment period until you have the conflicts resolved.

0028115-002

It is incomplete and the plans conflict. Post [Illegible] Dec 15 deadline and present a complete plan.

0028116-002

It is incomplete to the plans conflict past [Illegible] the Dec 14 deadline & present a complete plan.

0028117-002

Its not complete in the fact that the information on the disk off times doesn't agree with the written text and for that I think that until the information is complete the public comment should be extended.

0028118-002

Put out correct information the reports now are conflicting. Also extend the deadline.

0028119-002

Put out more information on the statements on exactly what are the real and current impact of snow machining in the forest.

0028120-002

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

Plan is not complete and presently contains conflicting statements. Postpone present hearings until only 1 plan exists.

0028122-002

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

Snowmachines have like to none impact on the environment. Your studies are not based on sound scientific studies. Instead they are brased to all motorized recreation.

Comment # Comment

0028504-001 Specifically, our concerns regarding the DEIS are as follows:

FORESTWIDE CONCERNS:

Wilderness:

The Chugach National Forest incorporates 5.5 million acres and encompasses the northern-most temperate rainforest in the nation. At 98% roadless, it includes one of the world's last remaining intact rainforests. It is the second largest national forest in the country, and although 98% of the Chugach is classified as roadless and qualifies for Wilderness designation, there is no designated Wilderness on the forest. Comprised of Alaska's Kenai Peninsula, Prince William Sound, and the Copper River Delta, the issues and threats facing these three regions vary and demand wilderness protection for all regions.

The Forest Service's preferred alternative in the DEIS is disappointing with regard to wilderness recommendations in all three regions of the forest. It is especially disappointing when one considers results of a scientific survey conducted by Alaska Pacific University in consultation with the Forest Service. The survey concluded that a strong majority -- 72.7% -- of individuals from communities throughout the forest favor or strongly favor managing the Chugach National Forest for wilderness. In addition, the survey indicates that 61.4 percent of individuals from communities across the forest favor a substantial amount of the forest being recommended to Congress to be designated as wilderness.

Further, these survey results support the management direction that the chief of the Forest Service, Michael Dombeck, has called for in our national forests. Dombeck's vision underlines the responsibility of the Forest Service to identify and recommend additional wilderness areas where these opportunities exist. We have no greater opportunity for wilderness recommendations in national forests in the country than on the Chugach National Forest. And while the Forest Service has recommended wilderness in its preferred alternative, it has reduced its wilderness recommendations from the 1984

Forest Plan on the Kenai Peninsula and within the congressionally designated Wilderness Study Area in Prince William Sound. Additionally, about 65% of the Recommended Wilderness in the Preferred Alternative is rock and ice, a land cover that represents only approximately 14% of the Chugach National Forest.

TWS supports the Forest Service recommending ecologically rich and productive areas of the forest for wilderness designation for fish and wildlife habitat protection, in addition to recommending desirable recreation areas, which may be very scenic and encompass a greater percentage of rock and ice. The Forest Service outlines in the Forest Goals and Objectives (DEIS, p. 2-2), that it seeks to maintain ecological sustainability by establishing, 'the recommended network of Research Natural Areas that represent the range of bioenvironmental types and special ecological and geological types present on the Forest.' TWS believes the agency should be striving to take this exact approach regarding wilderness recommendations, and create a network of wildlands across the forest that will protect the range of bioenvironmental types and special ecological and geological types present on the Forest.

Comment # Comment

0028504-016

ATV's:

We applaud the Forest Service for its position regarding ATV's. Specifically we applaud the Forest Service for restricting ATV's only to designated routes and trails. This is a 'closed until open' policy, which we feel is not only necessary to protect forest

resources, but is the only responsible way to manage ORV use on national forests. Regarding ATV's, the policy on the Chugach is a model policy for other forests nationwide. TWS would not support entire areas open to ATV use, and we urge the Forest Service to make it as clear as possible in their Forest Plan that ATV's will only be allowed on designated routes and trails. We also urge the Forest Service to do all it can to monitor and enforce ATV use on the forest.

Snowmachines:

We urge the Forest Service to adopt a similar approach to snowmachine use on the forest as it has to ATV use. Up until now, the Forest Service has turned a blind eye to snowmachine activities and management on the forest. Contrary to what is being done with ATV's, the Forest Service has had an 'open until closed' policy regarding snowmachines. Further, snowmachines have not been restricted to designated routes and trails, rather entire areas are open to backcountry travel by snowmachines. The DEIS does not even contemplate restricting snowmachines to only designated routes and trails, such as it does with ATV's, which we find inconsistent and inadequate. We believe that because the DEIS does not evaluate a full range of alternatives regarding snowmachine use, including restricting recreational snowmachine use entirely and/or only to designated routes and trails, the Forest Service has violated NEPA in designing the DEIS.

Further, we believe the DEIS is inadequate in addressing ecological and social impacts of motorized uses on the forest. The preferred alternative opens large percentages of the forest to both snowmachines and helicopters, yet there is no analysis done on what the impacts of these openings will have. This combined with insufficient recreation information (see above), leaves TWS feeling that the DEIS has not adequately addressed the mandates of NFMA and NEPA.

0029059-011

Comment #12: The DEIS and the analysis of the alternatives do not contain an Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis (IRFA) as is required by the Regulatory Flexibility Act (RFA) (5 USC 601-612). The RFA requires agencies to consider the impact that a proposed rulemaking will have on small entities. The CLMP qualifies as a proposed rulemaking within the meaning of the RFA.

Because the proposal will have a significant impact on a substantial number of small entities, including small communities, Native Alaskan ANCSA Corporations, and other small businesses, the agency is required to prepare an initial regulatory flexibility analysis (IRFA) describing the reason the actions are being considered; a succinct statement of the objectives of, and legal basis for the proposal; the estimated number and types of small entities to which the proposed rule will apply, etc. The analysis or a summary of the analysis must be published with the proposal for public comment.

I have not been able to find an IRFA or summary of an IRFA anywhere in the proposed CLMP or in the DEIS. This constitutes a significant flaw in the proposed plan that must be addressed before a final plan is adopted. The final plan will require a Final RFA.

Comment # Comment

0028328-010

Interagency Coordination

The DEIS fails to address the need or potential for improved interagency planning and project coordination. There was ample discussion throughout the planning process regarding interagency coordination. On numerous occasions the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) addressed interagency coordination and it was OUr understanding this would be used as a management principle throughout the revised land plan. We encourage greater cooperation and coordination with bordering federal agencies whose land management priorities may be impacted by CNF activities. (See CFR Sec. 219.21)

0029399-002

3. The minerals evaluation is only reconnaissance in nature. Very little on-the-ground geologic study was done. The mineral evaluation was done by the government who could not find their asses with either hand. I know, I work for the government.

0029421-001

0029468-004

To read the assessments of most inventoried rivers, one would think them all highly eligible. The DEIS fails to discuss how the Forest Service arrived at the conclusion that most do not meet eligibility criteria. The decision appears arbitrary at best, especially when one does an eligibility comparison. For example, (do Portage to 20mile or one of the Delta rivers). With regard to those found eligible, many are under-classified.

Additionally, the preferred alternative should implement a boundary of one-half mile, as allowed for in ANILCA and once supported in IDT planning meetings, on all Wild & Scenic recommendations. A boundary of this size would better protect travel and feeding corridors for wildlife populations.

0029468-006

* Wilderness Recommendations

The DEIS's recommendations for Wilderness areas falls far short of recommending protection for candidate areas for Wilderness designations. The Chugach National Forest encompasses 5.5 million acres and is the northern-most temperate rainforest in the nation. At 98% roadless, it includes one of the world's last remaining intact rainforests. It is the second largest national forest in the country, and although 98% of the Chugach is classified as roadless and qualifies for Wilderness designation, there is no designated Wilderness on the forest. Comprised of Alaska's Kenai Peninsula, Prince William Sound, and the Copper River Delta, the issues and threats facing these three regions vary and demand wilderness protection for all regions.

Comment # Comment

0029468-009 * Submerged Lands

The DEIS is incomplete because it does not adequately address the management of and impacts to the submerged lands within the Chugach National Forest Boundary. We believe, as the Forest Service has recognized, that the tidelands and submerged lands within the proclamation boundary of the forest are part of the Chugach National Forest.

This is perhaps the most fatally flawed area in the DEIS. The National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requires that the CNF Land and Resource Management Plan must form one integrated plan for all of the lands and resources of the conservation unit. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) further requires that the Forest Service prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on the CNF that encompasses all of the resources found there. As the 1907 CNF boundary was drawn to include the tidelands and submerged lands of Prince William Sound, the Forest Service must address these resources, regardless of agreements with other land management agencies. Implications of this omission resound throughout the DEIS, from lack of adequate cumulative impacts to administrative rules and guidelines.

The Forest Service itself seems confused about its management in the Sound. For example, 3- 201 of the DEIS lists two Federally listed endangered species 'within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest,' both of which are aquatic mammals whose habitat is Prince William Sound (PWS). Yet, the DEIS fails to even consider visitor use on PWS as an impact to air quality, instead citing neighboring communities as the most likely source of air contamination (3-6). Rather than attempt to protect its resources, the Forest Service is continuing a pattern of abdicating management responsibility. In fact, the Forest Service cannot sidestep its responsibility, being required, for example, to prepare biological assessments for ESA-listed species within its boundaries.

The Forest Service has yet to address the jurisdiction issue through the NEPA process, although relinquishing management of the waters of Prince William Sound is certainly 'a major federal action significantly affecting the environment.' The final plan should make it very clear that the tidelands and submerged lands within the proclamation boundary of the forest are part of the Chugach National Forest and will be included in its management.

0035083-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035088-002

The scientific studies seem biased and nothing is really proved.

Comment # Comment

0035090-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035093-002

The Scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035095-002

The Scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035097-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035101-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035103-002

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

0035105-002

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

0035106-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035109-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

Comment # Comment

0035118-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035120-002

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035121-002

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035122-002

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0034179-001

I recently read information about the Draft EIS for the Chugach National Forest. I was surprised to learn that no wilderness designation is recommended for the valuable wetland, habitat of the Copper River Delta. Likewise, wilderness designation is also absent for areas in Prince William Sound and for critical bear habitat. It only seems prudent that such valuable areas should be set aside for all time and protected from any kind of development or use that could cause irreparable damage. As our population grows and pressure on our most important natural areas increases, I believe our society demands protection of these prime areas. Our natural heritage is at stake and, therefore, I urge the Forest Service to recommend wilderness designation for all these critical areas of the Chugach National Forest.

0034209-001

I understand you are currently working on a DEIS for the Chugach National Forest. In the DEIS, I understand that wetlands within the Copper River Delta are being considered for wilderness designation. As a hunter, conservationist, and resource biologist I strongly favor designation of the Copper River Delta as a wilderness area. Specifically, areas east and west of the river should be designated in order to protect valuable habitat for salmon, shorebirds, waterfowl, brown bears, and other wetland-dependent wildlife. In addition, wilderness designation should be extended to areas in Prince William Sound like Knight and Montague Islands and Jack and Sawmill Bays. Finally, critical brown bear habitat and all eligible wild and scenic rivers including the Copper, Martin, Bering, and Katalla rivers should be included in the wilderness designation.

0034259-002

Use logging only to protect the safety of communities. Do not use 'forest health' as an excuse for more logging in wild unroaded areas.

0034259-004

I also recommend all eligible rivers on the Forest, including the Copper, Bering, Martin, and Katalla Rivers, Alaganik Slough, and Martin and Bering Lakes, be given wild and scenic river status.

Comment # Comment

0034280-001

0034401-001 I am writing in regards to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement by the Forest Service concerning the Chugach Land Management Plan.

 I would recommend and plead with the Forest Service this area as well as all of the rivers in the area be designated WILDERNESS.

 This land has begun to recover, however without the help of you recommending this Land WILDERNESS, it stands vulnerable to large scale development and commercialization.

 Please recommend these lands as WILDERNESS and protect them from development, drilling, mining, and greed.

0034402-001 Further:

 COPPER RIVER DELTA: SABP demands the Forest Service recommend wilderness for all of the valuable Copper River Delta wetlands both east and west of the river. The Forest Service had recommended Wilderness for the southeastern portion of the Delta in an early draft of their preferred alternative, but changed that recommendation in the Draft EIS.

 PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND: We demand the Forest Service recommend the entire Wilderness Study Area, Knight and Montague Islands, and Jack and Sawmill Bays as Wilderness to help protect species recovering from the Exxon Valdez oil spill and the Sound from large-scale industrial tourism.

 KENAI PENINSULA: We also demand that the Forest Service recommend Wilderness on the Kenai to protect brown bears and their habitat and to reduce motorized use. Specifically, Resurrection Creek and River areas, Snow River and Twentymile should be recommended as Wilderness on the Kenai.

0034402-002

 Additionally, all eligible wild and scenic rivers forest-wide should be recommended, including the Copper, Martin, Bering, Katalla Rivers, Alaganik Slough, and Martin and Bering Lakes.

0034402-003

 Please see that these areas are saved for the future!

 COPPER RIVER DELTA: Conservationists are urging the Forest Service to recommend wilderness for all of the valuable Copper River Delta wetlands both east and west of the river. The Forest Service had recommended wilderness for the southeastern portion of the Delta in an early draft of their preferred alternative, but changed that recommendation in the Draft EIS.

 PRINCE WILLIAM SOUND: Conservationists are urging the Forest Service to recommend the entire Wilderness Study Area, Knight and Montague Islands, and Jack and Sawmill Bays as Wilderness to help protect species recovering from the Exxon Valdez oil spill and the Sound from large-scale industrial tourism.

 KENAI PENINSULA: Conservationists are urging the Forest Service to recommend Wilderness on the Kenai to protect brown bears and their habitat and to reduce motorized use. Specifically, Resurrection Creek and River areas, Snow River and Twentymile should be recommended as Wilderness on the Kenai.

Comment # Comment

0034402-004 Additionally, all eligible wild and scenic rivers forest-wide should be recommended, including the Copper, Martin, Bering, Katalla Rivers, Alaganik Slough, and Martin and Bering Lakes.

0034775-006 4. The EIS includes no guidelines for sustainable management for timber harvest and the preferred alternative does not have an allowable sale quantity (ASQ) for forest management through timber harvest. The minerals evaluation is insufficient with most of the data dating from the 1930s.
7. The DEIS does not include a reasonable range of alternatives and a realistic combination of uses. The public is asked to comment on what amounts to varying degrees of preservation.

6. There is no analysis of the impacts 'Wilderness' designations would have on access to private inholdings, adjacent private lands, or potentially developable land within the forest.

0034822-001

0034947-001

(1) The fact that there is very, very little Un-biased Scientific Documentation to substantiate any of your many changes. In fact most of the studies I have researched have shown that the Scientific Proof points against your proposed changes.

0034951-002 The studies and data used are not accurate Let all the people know what you are doing & and than let them speak. You are wrong in [Illegible] you are proposing. We may [Illegible] to live with facts. But you show nothing.

0034952-003

I feel this plan was developed before the times was taken to do specific studies.

0034954-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'Local' knowledge into account. Take and use local input. These studies are not accurate.

0034955-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

Comment # Comment

0034957-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0034961-002

Studies and data in D.E.I.S. are biased, prejudiced and written by Forest Service employees who are not familiar with imparted areas and have not used verifiable scientific or biological studies or input from experienced local state biologists or forestry experts.

0034962-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0034964-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be conducted. Let the local user groups have more impact.

0034968-002

All studies and data are biased since they were done by your own personnel. Independent studies should always be done.

0034969-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personnel. Independent studies should always be conducted. Let the local user groups have more input.

0034970-003

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be conducted.

0034971-002

All studies and data is biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be done.

0034972-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personnel. Independent studies should always be conducted.

Comment # Comment

- 0034981-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0034982-002 The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.
- 0034984-002 What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.
- 0034985-002 The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.
- 0034988-002 What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account.
- Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.
- 0034989-002 The studies you are [Illegible] decision are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.
- the studies are not based on local usage done by an unbiased firm.
- I support local resources individuals having official involvement on all planning management issues on lands.
- 0034995-003 The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.
- 0034996-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

Comment # Comment

0034997-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0034998-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0034999-003 The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personal.

0035000-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035001-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, Therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035002-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035003-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035004-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035005-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

Comment # Comment

- 0035006-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035007-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035008-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035009-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, There fore they are biased. This should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035010-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, there fore they are Biased. The should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035011-002 All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, There fore they are Biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.
- 0035027-002 your studies are based decision are done in house without the use of an unbiased firm, local comments and knowledge are not being used to design this plan.
- , the studies you have are not based on local usage done by an unbiased firm.
- 0035028-002 your studies are based decision are done in house without the use of on unbiased firm, local comments and knowledge are not being used to design this plan.
- the studies you have are not based on local usage done by on unbiased firm.
- 0035029-002 The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

Comment # Comment

0035034-002

Your studies are based decision are done in house without the use of an unbiased firm, local comments and knowledge are not being used to design this plan.
the studies you have are not [Illegible] on local usage done by an unbiased firm.

0035037-002

Your studies are based decision are done in house without the use of an unbiased firm, local comments and knowledge are not being used to design this plan.
the studies you have are not [Illegible] on local usage done by on unbiased firm.

0035039-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035041-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

0035042-002

The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.

What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?

the studies are not based on local usage done by an unbiased firm.

0035062-003

Why weren't independent studies published on your DEIS?

0035066-003

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035070-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personel.

Comment # Comment

0035082-002

Studies and data in D.E.I.S. are biased, prejudiced and written by Forest Service employees who are not familiar with impacted areas and have not used verifiable scientific or biological studies or input from experienced local state biologists or forestry experts.
They are biased and unscientific.

0035128-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035137-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other Organizations and done in Alaska.

0035138-002

All your Studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other Organizations and done in Alaska.

0035139-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035140-002

Studies on data in D.E.I.S, are biased, prejudiced, and written by paid Forest Service employees who are not familiar with impacts areas and have not used scientific or biological studies or input from experienced local state biologist's or forestry exports.

0035141-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035142-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035144-002

Studies and data in D.E.I.S. are biased, prejudiced, and written by Forest Service employees who are not familiar with impacted areas and have not used scientific or biological studies or input from experienced local state biologist or forestry experts.

Comment # Comment

0035145-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035157-006

3) I cannot support the plan because restrictive changes to the existing plan because no viable studies support such restrictions!

0035159-003

They [Illegible] no scientific evidence to support closures on public lands. The idea that Brown Bears need protection during [Illegible] in unbranded. Core Brown Bear [Illegible] areas do not [Illegible]

0035160-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035162-001

This needs a [Illegible] check - I don't believe this is illegal. You are out or line with ANILCA [Illegible] waters on the state we [Illegible] limits.

0035170-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035171-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be conducted. Let the local user groups have more input.

0035179-002

All of the studies and all the information in the DEIS is one sided, and is obviously developed by environmentalist and not users.

0035180-001

What DEI statement. All I have found is your on personals studies or thoughts, I have seen no other, now studies done by other Organizations!

Comment # Comment

- 0035189-003 What are your specific comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement?
- I far as I could tell. There were no scientific studies done to substantiate the changes that were made. If they were done. Why weren't they listed. They should have been listed so people could research them.
- 0035191-002
- I do not support this because these has not been any studies to justify restrictions.
- I [Illegible] more of the local residents need not be involve.
- 0035195-002
- We need more specific studies to prove need for more restrictions.
- None are needed as for as I can see.
- More local user involvement in planning.
- 0035208-002 Cannot understand value, and poorly written seems very biased. Need more studies.
- 0035210-002 Very hard to interest -There needs to be more unbiased scientific studies done on the land involved - Reduced Noise: Brown Bear etc.
- I
- 0035211-002 I don't believe that adequate studies have been done to see what impact on local communities there would be if lands were restricted. I also found the documentation very hard to interpret as it was written.
- 0035222-003 The DEIS is very environmental and preservation oriented. I feel the drastic restriction proposed are not supported by adequate studies, data or lessoning. I do not see why the Chugach can not be further managed in its present state rather than further restricted. I see no reason or cause for such drastic DEIS.
- 0035229-001
- Need more data to make any decision. (Studies need to take place). Before any changes are made, I would like to see a unbiased group or more do a study on the proposed land.
- 0035235-002 I would like to see some in depth studies rare place before any changes are made.

Comment # Comment

0035238-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035242-002

I think that the information and data are [Illegible], it does not take into consideration local input and knowledge.

0035248-002

Studies and data are biased and prejudiced without reference to local area and user groups.

0035256-002

Biased & un-professional.

0035257-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be conducted.

0035258-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035260-002

Biased of un-professional.

0035263-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personal. Independent studies should always be conducted.

Let the local user groups have more input.

0035264-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

Comment # Comment

0035266-003 The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035269-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035270-003 The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035271-002

The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035272-002 No additional restricting. seek and act upon local input regarding the management of Chugach National Forest (CNF).
The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035273-002 No additional restricting. Seek and act upon local input regarding the management of Chugach National Forest (CNF).
The scientific studies included are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035274-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035275-003 2. I cannot support the preferred alt. due to direct conflicts between the plan and ANILCA as it relates to access rights, 'no more' clause & other issue.

0035278-002

All studies and data are biased since they were conducted by your own personnel. Independent studies should always be conducted. Let the local user groups have more input.

Comment # Comment

0035282-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' Knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035284-002

Also seek and act upon local input regarding the management of CNF.

I believe your studies & data are biased since they were conducted by 'in-house' personnel.

0035285-002

The scientific studies seen biased because they were done by 'in-house' people.

0035287-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' Knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035293-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, therefore they are biased. I support the Kenai Peninsula public hand user group. They should have been done by other organizations and done in Alaska.

0035295-002

The studies and data used are biased and do not take much 'local' knowledge into account. Weigh local user input more heavily than outside interest groups.

0035298-002

Studies and data are biased [Illegible], and non-scientific without specific input from local area user groups & biologists.

0035306-002

All your studies are done by people working for the Forest Service, Therefore they are biased. They should have been done by other Organizations and done in Alaska.

0035308-002

I support local resource and individuals have official involvement all planning and management issues on lands.

Your studies are based decision are done in house without the use of an unbiased firm, local comments and knowledge are not being used to design this plan.

Comment # Comment

0035323-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035329-002

I believe before you change or make a draft on environmental impact without scientific or specific evaluations done on the areas that you want to change.

0035333-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035334-002

There should be some kind of evaluation that would be conducted to see the impacts of the land in question.

0035336-002

Studies and data in D.E.I.S. are biased, prejudiced and written by Forest Service employees who are not familiar with imported areas and have not used verifiable scientific or biological studies or input from experienced local state biologists or forestry experts.

0035338-002

The studies you are basing decisions on are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.

0035338-007

I support local resources individuals having official involvement on all planning management issues on lands.

0035341-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

0035344-002

Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.

Comment # Comment

- 0035364-002 I would also recommend that it be based on scientific data and legally valid.
- 0035365-002 The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.the studies are not based on local usage done by an unbiased firm. I support local resources individuals having official involvement on all planning management issues on lands.
- 0035366-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.
- 0035369-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.
- 0035370-002 The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan. the studies are not based on local usage done by an unbiased firm. I support local resources individuals having official involvement on all planning management issues on lands.
- 0035371-002 I think we need local input. It needs to have better management.
- Please no more restrictions on lands without having a valid and a unbiased scientific study.
- 0035376-002 Your studies were conducted by your own personnel. As such they are biased. Studies cited to change the management plan should always be done independently.
- 0035548-002 The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.
- 0035549-002 The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.

Comment # Comment

- 0035550-002 The studies you are basing decisions are done 'in house' without use of an unbiased firm. Local comments and knowledge are not being used to design the plan.
- 0035816-005 The DEIS does not include a reasonable range of alternatives and a realistic combination of uses The public is asked to comment on what amounts to varying degrees of preservation
- 0036247-001
- 0036314-001 -- Many of the revisions mean closure, restriction, and condition. The plan does not use up-to-date, unbiased, scientific data or studies. As a result, there is no justification for such a drastic revision.
- 0036319-002 (1) The fact that there is very, very little Un-biased Scientific Documentation to substantiate any of your many changes. In fact most of the studies I have researched have shown that the Scientific Proof points against your proposed changes.
- 0036559-001
- Please accept the following comments on the Proposed Revised Forest Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Chugach National Forest.
- The Native Village of Eyak and other Chugach Tribes have utilized the Chugach National Forest lands and waters for the past 10,000 years. We have subsistence and commercially fished subsistence hunted and gathered subsistence foods. We consider Prince William Sound and the Copper River to be our Traditional Homeland. We don't want to see any changes in the Forest Revision Plan that would prevent any of our Traditional Activities, These activities are part of our Culture.
- 0036574-008 2/ The DEIS states the following, 'In the Sound, lands managed by the Forest Service have extensive saltwater shorelines. On the adjacent saltwater, uses and activities are not regulated by the Forest Service, nor does any other agency control the number, types, and concentrations of vessels. For the purposes of forest planning, only the characteristics and uses of the uplands are considered in the [Recreation Opportunity Spectrum] analysis. While we recognize that activities on the saltwater can affect peopled recreation experiences on the uplands, in the current regulatory framework those effects are considered outside the scope of this analysis.' DEIS 3-272.
- 0036574-013