

SAR - Forest Plan - Appendix C

Comment # Comment

0020935-001

I am a resident of Seward and have been for 24 years. I am opposed to the closure of trails in Seward. This is a clear violation of rights. This state is large enough we don't need to close these beautiful areas. Skiers & Snowmachiners have learned to get along in the past and this seems to be the main factor of closure.

0021021-002

The number of backcountry users potentially impacted by snowmachine use in the areas subject to closure is low. The reasons are that the accessibility of these twelve to fourteen mile valleys is limited to nordic skiers because of deep snow, open rivers, overflow in the wetland areas, and the overall size of the valleys themselves. These conditions may occur at any point during the winter season and inhibit nordic skiing access. During the heavy snow months, I have occasionally witnessed a nordic skier using snowmachine tracks for access. The exception is during the freeze thaw weeks of spring where an occasional window of opportunity opens to allow skate skiers to glide on top of the hard pack corn snow. Robby Frankovich has been recreating as a dog musher in Twenty Mile and Placer Valleys since 1982. In a conversation with him on May 5, 2000, he explained to me that he relies on the snowmachine tracks to run his dogs. At the present level of snowmachine use during the week and on weekends, he feels that there is not a need to close these areas. He relies on snowmachiners to recreate. This is also true during the heavy snow months for the few and far between nordic skiers who also rely on snowmachine tracks for access.

In conclusion, the nordic skier in my experienced opinion, is such a small minority compared to the snow machiner as users of these possible closure areas. Ninety percent of the time, nordic skiers and mushers access terrain by snowmachine track, and they use only a small fraction of the terrain that snowmachiners use. Without snowmachiners breaking trail, I am afraid that nobody will be able to enjoy our winter wonderland if it were to be shut down to motorized vehicles. This land should be managed and used by all, not all the land used by a few.

0022054-001

I am writing to voice my opposition to the closure of any National or State Forest to any user group of any kind or form. Especially off highway vehicles and mountain bikes, and feel that restrictions are not in keeping with the mandate of the Forest Service to preserve these areas for the public's enjoyment. I would like you, to make sure that when setting policy for these road less acres, off-highway vehicle and mountain hiking access is preserved. I would like the concept of multiple use and multiple access to be a part of any such policy.

I support officials who support Equal access to the Forest for all users at all times with no closures, and no preference for special interest.

Comment # Comment

0022055-003

I am glad to see that there are areas closed to snowmachines in the Draft Plan. Additionally I would like to see other areas closed to snowmachines or at least managed by timeshare. Lost Lake and the Russian River Trail are two of my personal favorites, and I would like to see them better protected, but also I support better protection for Johnson Pass. Snow River, Fresno Ridge, the slope behind Summit Lake Lodge, Carter/Crescent Lakes. Marshall Pass, Jack Bay. and Sawmill Bay.

0022095-002

On many occasions (for over 30 years) I have traveled for a day trip up the Twentymile River on a snowmachine. We moved in that direction after the Girdwood area was closed for snowmachining, even though we had blazed many trails in the early years.

I would like to strongly urge you and request your careful consideration of keeping the Twentymile River, the Lost Lake trail near Seward and the Seattle Creek valley open for regular snowmachine use.

0022288-010

- Such designations could block access to lands with a management prescription which permits some resource development activity.

0022292-003

There must be ways into the Hope and Lost Lake area that could be developed as new access. Also, why can't we develop corridors through or around designated ski areas? Snowmachiners travel much further than skiers. Put that to use. Make corridors that bypass ski areas so that both users can make use of our resources at the same time. That would be a win win situation. But these suggestions never seem to be given any serious consideration.

0022422-001

Lost Lake, Snowy River and Carter/Crescent Lake are popular places that are used by all user groups from all over Kenai Peninsula as well as Anchorage. Mile 12, Manitoba and Turn Again Pass all have areas for skiing, closed to snowmachines.

Comment # Comment

0022712-001

- Primrose firemans (Seward Winter WT) & Snug Harbor
- New trail at [Illegible] mile 12 for motorized use
- Work with state for easement on Snug Harbor Rd. in Cooper Landing for parking & this would help upper Russia Trail access too.
- Parking area at the Fireman's Trail in Seward.

- Closing the Trails on Seward side on 3/31 could close the hole area if Chugach Power Station close off Sung Harbor too.
- The map showed not just the trails closed, but the area on top surrounding Lost Lake. It is unrealistic many non - motorized user could even reach these areas.

- Don't close both Primrose & Firemans Trails on 3/31, the non - motorized user, do not have the numeras of user to use. All that much trail there only 20 minute apart.
- If you have to close a trail, please close just a trail, not the areas on top.
- Tell me what I can do to aid easement on Snug Harbor road & work to a new trail for motorized use.

0023119-001

My name is Andrea and I am in the 6th groade and I really like to go four-wheeling with my Dad and sister in the Seward area. I think that four-wheelers are fun to ride. If I was without a four-wheeler on a trail when a bear came I couldn't do much but stand there or run, But if I had a four-wheeler I would be able to get out of the bears path quicly and be on my way. My Dad, My Sister and I have special spots we like to go to around the area that take a while to get to, so we like to use our four=wheelers to get to the spots and then we hike the rest of the way there.

0023120-001

Johnson Pass trail, Anchorage end should bare snow machine restrictions - How about half and half time share. Twenty mile alternate year plan, Lost lake, time share plan, but should close to snowmachines Feb. 15, for balanced use.

0023122-001

I would like to see more areas closed to snowmachines specifically, Johnson Pass and the Twenty Mile River Valley. Please support designating more areas for non motorized use.

0023124-001

To leave open for all to use all through the year and for many years to come. I enjoy all kinds of outdoor activities and would like to keep doing them without a book full of restrictions.

There are many things we all can do to make it work for everyone that uses this part of land. Widen the areas for parking, or make new parking areas, widen the trails for all to pass through.

Please don't take this wonderful, peaceful place away and put restrictions as to no one to use. I do know many that come and enjoy this wonderful place. There may be people that would love to help out on improvements just to avoid the Bad closures - Land of the free!

Comment # Comment

0026859-001 It's a [Illegible] shame any area by Turnagain Arm gets closed to snow mobiling. It's just ridiculous.

0026863-001 Opposed to proposed snow mobile closures, in particular on the west side of Turnagain pass. The [Illegible] there is ideal for snow mobilers.

0028139-001 The 'Preferred Alternative' to the Chugach National Forest plan offers a pretty good balance between motorized and non-motorized men in the winter. At least 10 pc cent of the Seward Ranger District should be set aside for skiers, snowshoers and other non-motorized users. These areas need to be reasonably close to the road so that they can be used without requiring an overnight trip.

I support all of the non-motorized areas in the Preferred Alternative. I would also like to see a couple of additions: Carter Lake, South Fork of the Snow River, and the entire Resurrection Pass after Feb. 15 - not just the trail itself.

I know snowmachiners are very upset about being excluded from Lost Lake after March 31. Maybe a trade can be made. Snowmachiners get Lost Lake (which is a little too far for most day-users) in exchange for the areas listed above.

Comment # Comment

0028144-001

- I do not feel that park areas should be opened and closed by a fixed date. The opening and closing should be based on snow cover. I am under the opinion that snowmobiles do not cause damage to the land unless there is not enough snow cover. I would propose that opening and closing of an area be determined by the amount of snow cover because the timeliness of this can change year to year.
- My second general comment is I do not like the idea of a 'every other year' time-share or permanent closure for any activity. I feel an 'every other day' time-share would be more appropriate. Personally, I do not know why anything has to be time-shared. I have always interacted with all types of recreation with no problems. If there has to be one however, I feel 'every other day' would keep all users in contact with the areas they enjoy.

I have specific concerns about motorized access restrictions in four areas.

- Lost Lake - USFS prescriptions K271/K269/K212/K268/K255: Again, the time any area in the park is to be closed should be based on snowfall not specific dates. I would like to see access to the lake remain available to motorized vehicles from both ends of the lake. Maybe the East side access could be restricted by a time-share method. From the plan, I understand that only the access is being limited. Lost Lake is one of the premier destination spots for snowmobiles. I feel access should be available for all recreationalists at any given time.
- Turnagain Pass - Seattle Creek Drainage - USFS prescription K076: This area should remain open to motorized use. Turnagain Pass is already successfully divided among motorized and non-motorized users. Please do not further confine our area of use by allowing a closure of this area.
- Twenty Mile River: I do not like the time share proposed for this area. As I mentioned before, 'Every other day' would be much more appropriate. This is a very large area and I feel both motorized and non-motorized users should be able to use this area at the same time.
- Skookum Glacier - Placer River drainage: I do not feel a permanent closure is an appropriate way of restricting use by any user. A more appropriate resolve would be to have a 'Every other day' time-share. I am opposed to complete closures.

My experience when skiing in the backcountry has never been ruined by the presence of motorized vehicles. Quite often a group of snowmobilers will come by but they are always moving, and in no time they are out of sight and sound of our activity. Please do not allow these restrictions that affect motorized use in the CNF. I want the park to be available for myself and my kids if they choose to go snowmobiling.

Comment # Comment

- 0029109-001 I am writing this letter in response to the upcoming Chugach National Forest plan revision. As an avid snowmobiler I strongly oppose the proposed closing of Lost Lake to snowmachines. Any closure of the Lost Lake area to snowmachines would greatly affect the outdoors recreation me and my family enjoy during the long cold dark Alaskan winters. The Lost Lake area in Seward has traditionally been a snowmachine haven starting back in the early 1970's when the Seward Chamber of Commerce offered \$100 to the first snowmachiner to put a trail into the area! Closing this area would not only affect the outdoor recreation of many snowmachiners , also it will have a negative impact on the economy of Seward. There are many businesses which stand to be affected by any closure. Examples would be hotels, gas stations, restaurants, snowmobile dealerships, etc. Economically this forest service plan can only hurt Seward.
- 0026706-003 To not close any areas to snowmachine and in fast open the closed side of Turnigan Pass [Illegible] of that means closing the side we ride on now to make it safer from avalanche danger.
- 0026707-001 To keep all areas being closed to snowmachines. Open

20 mile and Turnigan are the closest places to Anchorage to ride [Illegible] and to close them would mean we have to drive even further and then the places we would have to drive to would be closed too. (Lost Lakes)

There are no studies I've seen that prove snowmachines do damage to the environment.
- 0026708-001 To keep 20 mile Turnigan, and Lost Lakes open to snowmachines. I believe in equal access for all users. In '84 one side of Turnigan was closed to snowmachines. If one side has to be closed. Lets trade sides and give the open side to the skiers, people have already died on our side in [Illegible], lets trade so we can [Illegible] on the safer side. The skiers won't be in danger on the other side as they won't get close enough.

I ride Lost Lakes, 20 mile & Turnigan to close these would mean I would have to find now places to ride and I like riding these areas.
- 0026709-002 Please don't close my favorite places to ride i.e. Turnigan, 20 mile, Lost Lakes, Equal access!!

Equal access for all is my believe. Please keep the areas proposed to be closed, open! 20 mile, Turnigan, Lost Lakes, and none are all areas I ride and hope to keep riding these areas. If something must be closed, lets trade sides at Turnigan so snowmachines can ride safely without [Illegible] danger.
- 0026713-001 Look at the real deal and see now many real users there are in the woods. Don't close any areas to the thousands of riders on snowmachines.

Please don't close 20 mile, Turnigan, Lost Lakes, or any other snowmachines areas available to US.

Comment # Comment

- 0026719-001 . Most ATV riders are middle age and older. Many take children out and others have Physical limitations. These people have been excluded from the forest under the proposed non motorized summer use plan. I think leaving existing trails open and up grading 1 or 2 trails would be very much appreciated by locals & visitors willing to enjoy the forest. Good signage at trail heads reminding riders to stay on the trails works very well as we have seen in Chugach State Park. If crown point is the only significant trail left open to ATV use it could get crowded at Ames. I support leaving roads & trails traditionally built & used for off road and ATV's left open these include but are not limited to falls Creek, Mills Creek, Palmer Creek, Stetson, Snow River, under the preferred plan these trails will be closed and many people that customarily enjoy these areas would loose out.
- The preferred alternative opens the door for many new hiking trails. I believe the money and effort could be better spent on keeping existing hiking trails, mining roads and ATV trails in top condition to minimize environmental damage. If new trails are to be built they could be cut over Abandon and over grown trails. These can be seen from the Air by the trail of alders that have over taken them.
- 0026728-005 Close to snowmachines, by timeshare and land allocation (in addition to closures in the draft Plan): Johnson pass (north end), Lost Lake (balanced timeshare), Snow River (South Fork), Fresno Ridge, slope behind Summit lake lodge, Carter / Crescent lakes, Russian River trail. Marshall pass, Sawmill Bay, and Jack Bay.
- 0026988-002 (2) Prohibit snow-machines/ATV's [Illegible]: Skookum Valley, Smith Creek, Divide Creek Granite Creek, 20-Mile, Placer River, Lost Lake, Monitor a Land. The opposite side of the Seward Highway [Illegible] Summit Creek to the hope cut off.). Winner Creek, Palmer Creek, Center Creek, Johnson Pass Trail, Snow River.
- 0026988-003 (3) Prohibit Helicopter (commercial operations) in Winner Creek & Glacier Creek [Illegible].
- (4) Prohibit routine helicopter landings increases for commercial operation no more expansion of helicopter use.
- (5) Ban jet skis & air boats
- (6) Support & encourage non-motorized recreation which has the least impact to wildlife, air quality, & noise levels.
- (1) Limitations of off-road motorized recreation - however, the plan doesn't go far enough to restrict snowmachines.
- 0026990-001 - Allow no further development in the Resurrection River Valley including pipeline casements and even minimizing trail improvements to maintain a wilderness feeling and to naturally keep, snowmobile activity minimal.
- Eliminate the use of jet skis on any lake in Forest Service Lands area.
- 0026993-001 More snow mobile access to the C. N. F. There is more area available to non motorized use that never sees a foot print than all of the motorized use area combined. Please reconsider and at least let us keep the areas that we currently have.

Comment # Comment

0026994-001 I do not agree to the year to year schedule if noise is the distraction for non-motorized users than distance or time is the cure. My suggestion would be to allow 1st user M-W 2nd the sun alternating schedule so that each user will throughout the year have optional use [Illegible] ('Weekdays' & 'Weekends'). I believe that areas like Portage Valley along the New Road into Bear Valley which are already closed to motorized use should be included in the over all plan.

I do support status quo in the Twenty-mile Valley Carter Lake/Crescent Lake & Lost Lake areas.

0027009-001 The draft is very confusing in parts and really needs to be reexamined for contradictory statements. In addition it did not take into account various 'traditional uses' (i.e. hunting, fishing and trapping) in many areas or it has made areas virtually non accessible for traditional uses. Point in case in North Fork Snow river designation. Several individuals subsistence hunt that area but due to natural conditions must use motorized means to access the area the new plan would eliminate this access.

0027010-001 Instead of closing off various areas to snowmachining, why not look at [Illegible] those areas from different points or access for non motorized recreation from different areas. There are already several areas that are off limits to motorized recreation. It is unfair to target the areas listed in the plan for further restrictions due to the fact that these areas (Lost Lake, Primrose, Summit Lake, Turnigan Pass, and Resurrection Pass) are the only areas that are truly accessible to this group due to trail width (cont on reverse).

Do not close anymore areas to snowmachining or motorized access. There are already several areas that are non motorized only (Mantoba Mtn, Turnigan Pass (East side) etc. There are only few areas that are open to motorized sports without serious risk. These areas proposed for closure should be left alone and a plan devised to ensure equal shared access to these areas. It must be understood that in most cases everyone can share an area as most of them are large enough for all winter sports to occur.

0027011-001 Extend the no motorized area at Primrose to meet the area around Mount Adair and ensure that a motorized access is still allowed from the parking lot to the winter trail that access Lost lake, and do not close Crescent / Carter to any user group.

Do not close off Carter / Crescent lake to anyone but ensure equal access. Also ensure access to Lost Lake is not lost at Primrose due to safety of the riders. The closure period on all of the areas should be based on available snow cover and not on a Calendar date.

Comment # Comment

0027015-001

Please do not close the Carter lake / Cresnet lake or lower Russian Lakes area to non-motorized winter use.

1. Carter lake / Cresnet lake area is a high use area for snowmachines. Crossing it will only put stress on those areas open to snowmachines and make snowmachining unsafe in those areas by multiplying the number of riders there.

2. The trail going up to Carter Lake is not a ski trail. Children or [Illegible] will not be skiing the lower section unless they are expert, expert skiers. The trail from Crescent Creek trailhead is [Illegible] to [Illegible]

3. By closing Carter / Crescent areas and lower Russian lakes trail, you generate less cabin revenue. Also, cabin maintenance will suffer. I don't think it is appropriate for forest service personnel to utilize snow machines on trails closed to the public for snow machining. [Illegible] times, supplies for summer projects are taken into the cabins or to specific points on the trail during the winter months.

4. Carter / Crescent and Russian Lakes are areas where families recreating with small children can reach a destination, such as a cabin, in a reasonable amount of time by using a snow machine. Closing these areas would also [Illegible] access for those ice fishing or hunting. With short daylight hours, snow machines allow folks to get in and out of an area [Illegible]

5. Carter / Crescent and Russian Lakes are areas where families can snow machine together. Snow machining in these areas is not as technical as other well areas.

0027051-001

Just a word about the proposed Forest Service Winter Recreation Use Plan. I did not comment at the public hearings because of my job here in Seward, but I would like to make a few comments via this letter.

First, it must be understood that the motorized use of the same area at the same time is categorically incompatible with non-motorized use the latter including mushers, jorers, skiers, hikers or snowshoers.

The categories of incompatibility that come to my mind are ones of esthetics, mechanics, and safety.

The forest's job, as I see it, is first, assess the impact, both present and projected, of each user group. Then, in accordance with the principles of public forest recreation management, divide the area up, either temporally or spatially, into areas for each group. To this end, it may be necessary to open up more of the forest for access to meet projected needs.

Comment # Comment

0027054-001

What is most disturbing about the preferred alternative to CNF snowmobile users, is the new restrictions have been proposed for the most popular snowmobile areas. It would make more sense for the USFS to concentrate on limiting snowmobiles in areas less popular for snowmobiles, but still very acceptable for use by non-motorized users on skis or snowshoes. Johnson Pass Trail is a good example.

The USFS recently produced a handout that showed a net 7.9% loss (90.8% vs. current 98.7%) in winter motorized use areas on the Peninsula. This area calculation is very misleading to both motorized and non-motorized users. Most of the CNF is not available to snowmobile use because the terrain is not useable or is inaccessible. The end result is that the 7.9% reduction in snowmobile area is taken from the most popular snowmobile riding areas and really equates to a much larger loss of useable area for this single user group. If the USFS computed areas open to snowmobile use only where terrain was accessible and useable there may not be as much push from non-motorized users to close additional areas. This suggestion could help bring the majority of users in each these groups closer together and at the very least increase tolerance of one another.

The most unreasonable area closure in the preferred alternative is the Seattle Creek area. Closing this area to increase quiet recreating does not make sense considering that it must be accessed through a motorized area. Closing Seattle Creek also significantly reduces the snowmobile use area at Turnagain Pass where non-motorized users already have a huge, readily accessible area on the East side of the Seward Highway. An informal count when I last rode in this area had snowmobile vehicles outnumbering ski vehicles 10 to 1. The number of non-motorized users benefiting from closing Seattle Creek cannot come close to equaling the number of motorized users that will be restricted from this currently popular area.

Additionally, closing most of the novice level snowmobile riding areas south of Anchorage will undoubtedly result in more inexperienced or first time snowmobile riders riding in the more challenging and steeper terrain that remains open. This terrain is probably above and beyond these riders skill level, a potential recipe for tragedy. Closing the Twenty Mile and Skookum valleys will severely the areas in CNF where beginner level snowmobilers can learn the sport on flat terrain.

Much of CNF is not accessible to non-motorized used due to distance from the trail head. This is not true for snowmobilers. Access corridors could be established to allow snowmobilers reach remote areas with minimal disturbance to non-motorized users. Careful planning and use of geographical features could limit noise outside of the corridors.

The Glacier and Seward Ranger districts are proposing calendar dates for the opening and closing of areas for snowmobile use. This only limits the use of snowmobiles and provides no means of extending a motorized season for a high snow year. This season could prove to be a good example, where it is obvious that areas don't have adequate snow to open December 1st, but may receive late snowfall that provides adequate cover for snowmobile riding beyond the March 31th closure proposed for some areas. Areas should be opened or closed strictly based on snow cover. The riding season is short enough without further restricting use based on a calendar date.

Comment # Comment

0027061-001 Turnagain Pass
At no time should the current non-motorized side of the pass be open for any motorized vehicles.
-- If the access to Seattle Creek remains motorized (Sunnyside), keep it open to motorized access.

Girdwood
Winner Creek drainage should be forever be non-Motorized access only.

Kenai Peninsula
I fully support mountain bike access to all currently open trails on the Kenai Pen.

0027353-002 I feel the Forest Service needs to take a firm stance on designating more areas for non-motorized recreation, especially in winter. For too long the balance has weighed heavily in favor of motorized recreation, which does not provide for multiple use. Specifically, all areas currently managed for non-motorized use need to remain that way. Also, the following areas should be set aside for non-motorized recreation:

South fork of Snow River -- The slope behind the Summit Lake Lodge -- Fresno Ridge and south for one mile to the State land boundary -- Carter and Crescent Lakes basins -- Jack Bay -- Sawmill Bay -- Marshall Pass
Commercial helicopter use and landings needs to be limited to very few, designated areas after a thorough assessment is made of potential impacts to recreationists and wildlife. The current situation in Juneau is a good example of what can happen if this issue is not addressed now. The helicopter traffic out of Seward has increased dramatically in recent years.

The preferred alternative shows the Lost Lake Trail closed to mountain bikes. Why? The map shows Primrose trail as being open to bikes, along with the area around Lost Lake. If any of this trail system should be closed it should be the alpine area around Lost Lake, which gets really muddy and thus heavily impacted by bikes.

The lower part of the Lost Lake trail is very durable compared to the alpine area around the lake. So, if the Lost Lake trail is to be closed, to bikes, it makes sense to close the area around the lake as well, since that is where the heavy impact is occurring.

I also noticed in the preferred alternative that horse use on some trails will be allowed as early as June

1. This is terrible! Horses do enough damage to the trail as it is, and giving them another month will only make things worse. The Devil's Pass trail especially becomes a muddy mess with the fall horse traffic.

I think horse use on the trails should be looked at very carefully on a case by case basis, but in general I would have to say that less horses on the trails would be a good thing in my book!

Comment # Comment

0027649-001 No problem will helicopter flying overhead, in the winter time. Snowmobile in [Illegible] [Illegible] area Twenty Mile. Opposed to closing it. Do understand need for alternating years unfair to have season last from December-March 31.

0027649-002 To be fair - switch sides of road every after year (at Turnagain pass) without Seattle Creek - T. pass is not enough crow [Illegible] road to crow pass, winner [Illegible] - will only affect local people. you're hurting the local along the crow pass road.

0027712-003 From the Comment Book at the Front Desk, Seward, AK

Keith Ham, POB 2601, Seward, AK 99664 - Concern about closing of trails in AK - should stay open for all users

0027712-005 From the Comment Book at the Front Desk, Seward, AK

Dan Logon, Box 392, Seward, AK 99664 - I want more trails, not more limitations on access to the ones we have.

0027712-006 From the Comment Book at the Front Desk, Seward, AK

John Bell, PO Box 2902, Seward, AK 99604 - I want more trails open to RTV

0027717-001 I would leave the forest as is so all people can enjoy it all year. Not just a few people who want to lock it up & keep most people out. Please keep forest open to ALL people, motorized or not.

0027724-001 Open up more public lands for all user groups, more trails, more roads. There are just not enough areas accessible so all user groups are being crowded into the few accessible areas open thus causing completes. Some areas then could be set aside for specific user groups.

0027726-005 Also please prohibit or greatly reduce helicopter flights and snowmachine areas and jet skis or airboats in or near forest.

Comment # Comment

0028092-001 I recommend no closures or further limits for access via snowmachine, bicycles or horses. I want to continue to see equal access for all users at all times. The way it is now, there are plenty of areas already closed or restricted to snow machines.

From the meetings I have attended its clear to me the skiing group want the entire forest closed to snowmachines. There are for more areas that skiers can access and go to due to restrictions on snowmachines.

If skiers want exclusive use trails, develop new trails to new areas. Develop these trails in areas that snowmachines do not presently access such as in the Seward area, MT. Alice.

0028103-001

Snowmobile [Illegible] separately [Illegible] all other ATV, all areas recommended to be [Illegible] left open. Turnigan Pass, [Illegible] trade sides alternate [Illegible] with [Illegible]. This [Illegible] of [Illegible] is presently being engaged.

20 Mile, [Illegible] etc.
need to [Illegible] open.

AS a [Illegible] and snowmachines. I would like to use all areas of the forest. I can appreciate area If enjoy [Illegible] I go 20-30 miles away from [Illegible] to [Illegible] and [Illegible]. I also [Illegible] and [Illegible] as a [Illegible] of [Illegible].

0028108-001

I would not close any areas to snowmobiler and I would not close or area or March 3 2000.

No time share, snowmobiles have west side of Turnagain for about 5 months now. The skiers have it for 12 months a year. You should only close an area when the adequate snow is not there. (When there is less than a foot). I know you could ride in Turnagain in most year is till the middle of May.

0028110-001

Do not close 20 Miles, Seattle Creek, Lost Lake to snowmobiling, or any others areas.

The time share plan is a sham. Skiers set it all the time and snowmobilers only set it some of the time.

0028111-001

Most of the land is already closed to snowmachines. I believe the current places open should remain open.

We are currently time sharing with skiers; hikers; snow shores; they get to enjoy there hobby much earlier & later throughout the year. And I believe are switching year to year on 20 mile already.

0028117-001

Not close any areas to snowmobiles like [Illegible] glacier, Bear Valley Seattle Creek Turnagain pass west.

The time share is all wrong we already time share they get it the first part of the winter till its open to motorized [Illegible] and than at the end of the season they get it after [Illegible] are not [Illegible] till all the snows gone. Motors get it about 6 months they get it 9 months.

Comment # Comment

0028120-001 Allow for continued access to all areas presently used by snow machining. Quiet areas are a non issue because most skiers / snow boarders use powered access to areas.

Time share is not equal for snow machiners. Some areas are closed to riding [Illegible] prime conditions & lighting. If March-May with adequate snow. Possible swapping areas like turnagain from side to side. To allow access to other prime areas for snow machines.

0028253-002

I believe that if all user groups are required to use this forest together, that they can to will find ways to enjoy this area without restricting an user group. This has worked well in the Kenai borough in the Caribou Hills recreation area.

0028463-001

I opposed to the closing of Lost lake & Cresent lake there already enough closed areas leave it as it is.

0028537-001

I support all of the non-motorized areas in the Preferred Alternative I would also like to see a couple of additions Carter Lake, South Fork of the Snow River, and the entire Resurrection Pass after Feb 15 - not just the trail itself

I know snowmachiners are very upset about being excluded from Lost Lake after March 31 Maybe a trade can be made Snowmachiners get Lost Lake (which is a little too far for most day-users) in exchange for the areas listed above

0028547-001

I would like to see turnagain pass in the Chugach National Park remain the same as it has been in past year for back country access, skiing and snowmobiling.

I do not think snow mobiling should be allowed on the (South-East?) tin can side of Hwy.

0029016-001

I would like to emphasize my support of designating additional areas as non-motorized recreational areas. The new additions to this category are less than 1% of the total land of the CNF and offer a reasonable accommodation to back-country skiers, snowshoers, snowboarders, and telemark skiers.

It is my belief that enforcing the partial closure of the Lost Lake area is not practical and urge the USFS to instead include the Carter/Crescent Lake area and the Snow River areas as an alternating motorized and non-motorized area.

Approximately 10% of the CNF on the Kenai Peninsula would be set aside for non-motorized use with the Preferred Plan. I believe that this 10% is minimal, and would encourage the USFS to add more land to this designation.

Comment # Comment

0029022-001

Closed to machines: North end of Johnson Pass Trail to Bench Lake, Mills Creek Rd (approach to Manitoba), Fresno Ridge (telemark area across the highway from Manitoba) and the old ski slopes behind Summit Lake and above the USFS Tenderfoot Campground.

Open to machines: Lost Lake near Seward.

In a barter for the Lost Lake loss to skiers: Alternate years with Snow River and Carter/Crescent, maybe snowmachines in even years and skiers in odd years to make up for the defacto loss of Lost Lake.

Non-motorized use on the west side of the highway: Primrose Trail and all the lower lands below 2,000 ft. between Mile 12 Hill and Primrose Creek (near Mile 18) to be developed as a ski trail system with public use cabins and interlinking trails between Primrose, Mile 12 Trails and Grayling/Meridian/Long Lakes.

0029023-001

To deny Alaskans access during the winter time, especially to snowmachining, a sport which is in my opinion, the least harmful of the motorized sports, is to deny access to a large, mostly unheard segment of the population. Areas such as Eklutna have worked out reasonable shared-use plans. Wednesday through Saturday, is non-motorized. Sunday through Tuesday is motorized. The proposed year on/year off is crazy. Snow conditions vary to widely from year to year.

0029023-002

Please consider all the user groups, and not just the ones with the loudest voice.

Comment # Comment

0029024-001

A little background. I am a 47 year old male, an avid winter outdoor enthusiast that has lived in Alaska for 11 years. I enjoy cross country and back country skiing. I also enjoy snowmobiling.

The Preferred Alternative closes some of the most popular snowmobiling areas in Alaska and so severely restricts use in others, it virtually closes them as well. During the public meeting in Anchorage, I heard several opposing views that had a common theme, that snowmobilers have access to 90% of the forest now and that supporters of non-motorized use only want a small amount closed' to motorized use. That argument does not hold water. The foremost reason this view is flawed is this; just because snowmobiles have access to areas, it does not mean you can access it. There are areas I would love to ride but can't because I can't get there and there are areas that can't be ridden because of severe terrain, obstacles or other impediments. The point is, just because there is forest available it does not automatically equate to an area that can be accessed.

There are arguably some areas well suited to a time share between users, but certainly not on an every other year basis. To place such a restriction on the Twenty Mile River area (or any other area) has the potential to shut out the snowmobiling public for a three-year period if snow conditions don't permit access on the assigned year. This years snow condition is a case in point. This Prescription will also cause confusion and contempt because some of the public will see riders in closed area accessing their cabins and think either that the area is open or open to just a select few, and they will be correct! The Twenty Mile and the Placer River drainage would be much better served with either an alternate day or alternate week plan. I know that Eklutna Lake uses this type of time share and both user groups seem to like it. (I have skied and ridden there).

Turnagain Pass - Seattle Creek drainage. The USFS Prescription permanently closes this area to motorized use. This is the most nonsensical Prescription of all. The backside (West) of Turnagain Pass is quite possibly the most popular and heavily used snowmobiling area in the entire state. Having this area open to snowmobiles greatly expands the available riding area in the pass. It makes no sense to close this area for quiet recreational opportunities because:

A. This area is known throughout the state for snowmobiling and it has been customarily used for motorized sports for years.

B. Because of its popularity and heavy use, the displaced riders would overwhelm other areas not currently accustomed to or designed for additional use.

C. Skiers already have exclusive use of the entire east side of the Turnagain area.

D. The back side currently used by snowmobilers, is so steep, only a very small number of extreme skiers would be able to use an area now used by hundreds of others.

E. Skiers would have to access the area through a motorized area.

Crescent and Carter Lakes - This area is accessed in the winter from a trailhead off the Seward Highway near the Trail Lakes Fish Hatchery.

Comment # Comment

The plan calls for an every other year time share. The same argument holds. A more equitable approach would be on an every other day or week time share. The better riding is around Carter Lake and is fairly limited so another alternative would be to leave the Seward Highway access open to machines and the Sterling Access open to skiers.

Lost Lake - The plan closes this area or parts of this area outside of a three-month window 12/1 to 3/31. This area usually has sufficient snow to ride until May. The plan seems to dictate that all areas are open only between 12/1 and 4/30. Openings and closings should be based on snow coverage and not an arbitrary date. It appears that the lake and areas above treeline would be open to access from Snug Harbor even when the Seward Firehouse and Primrose Creek Trails were closed to snowmobiles. Possible alternatives include leaving one of the East access trails for motorized use and one for non-motorized use. It is ridiculous to leave Lost Lake open for skiing activities when many skiers are not going to trek the 6-mile Primrose Trail and hundreds of snowmobilers will. This is a very popular and heavily used area. The Snug Harbor access will just not support the use by a combination of all the other users shut out from the other two access points. It won't

I am sure I have left out some popular areas, but I think you get my point. Total closure or closures based on an annual basis does not suit the snowmobiling public.

0029036-001

I was born and raised here in Alaska and I call it my home. Growing up in Anchorage and in the interior, the outdoors have played a large part in my life. I remember that while living in the interior I learned how to ski with the aid of a snowmobile. It was our lift system for many years and contributed to my success as a Junior racer for the State of Alaska on a National level. It also allowed my skiing skills to propel me into the University of Alaska Anchorage NCAA ski team for a few years. I contribute my skiing achievements to the use of snowmobiles. I also enjoy Nordic skiing, mountain biking, kayaking, and pretty much any activity that will get me out doors and into the CNF. I enjoy my motorized and non-motorized activities alike and would like to see an alternative that will work for everyone.

My land access concerns with the preferred alternative relate to the reduction and limitations to the current CNF winter motorized use areas. With regard to winter access, the preferred alternative reduces the area available for snowmobiles by increasing the areas available for non-motorized use. There are no current or proposed CNF areas where motorized use is allowed and non-motorized use is restricted. The opposite can be found in many areas.

What is most disturbing about the preferred alternative to CNF snowmobile users, is that the new restrictions have been proposed for the most popular snowmobile areas. It would make more sense for the USFS to concentrate on limiting snowmobiles in those areas that are less popular for snowmobiles, but may be very acceptable for use by non-motorized users on skis or snowshoes.

With the burden of limited areas immediately to the south, motorized users find themselves traveling farther and farther to find accessible areas to enjoy the outdoors in. Non-motorized users have at least the option to use all of the Municipality of Anchorage land along with Chugach State Park, while motorized users are not allowed in these areas. I feel that the preferred alternative does not consider the surrounding parks or lands in coming up with their conclusions.

I have the following comments and suggestions to be taken into consideration before approving the final version of the preferred alternative. As far as the proposal for 'time share' areas to be divided into motorized users and non-motorized users, this method has been presented as equitable to both user groups. I agree that time shares are equitable and can work well to see that one group isn't short changed an opportunity to access an area.

Comment # Comment

0029045-001

[Illegible] twenty mile drainage will be open to helicopters for skiing or whatever then it should be open to snowmachines, every winter also, helicopters are four louder than any sled. I think summer helicopter tours need to be very [Illegible] in places river Eagle Glacier areas-we do not need another [Illegible]. If any areas are closed to snowmachines, then [Illegible] like to see some areas closed to skiing.

0029059-010

Comment #11: The needs of older citizens and Americans With Disabilities and the mandates of ADA have been ignored by restricting access to 95% of the forest.

0029069-001

I sent this to the transportation contact listed on the Chugach Forest revision team. Is there anyone else I should send it to. I have alot of data about snowmachine and ATV related death and injury from the trauma registry and medical examiners databases. I hope some one is paying heed to the potential loss of limb and life inherent in the 'sharing' of trail systems between motorized and non motorized users.

I understand the resource allocation is being reviewed for the Chugach National Forest. I am an Orthopedic Surgeon and am frequently involved, in the treatment of severely injured individuals. I am concerned that land and trail use planning in Alaska does not adequately separate motorized from non motorized individuals. Snowmachine and ATV use in Alaska is know to be a high risk activity with a death and injury rate per mile traveled 10 times that of highway traffic. Five per cent of the deaths and hospitalizations involve a pedestrian (hiker, skier, musher, snowshoer). One third of the dead and injured are children, teens, passengers, mushers, pedestrians or jourers.

There is little back country law enforcement presence, no back country traffic code and no qualifications for snowmachine and ATV operators in Alaska. As back country motorized and non motorized space is poorly defined non motorized recreationists are at risk for death or serious injury when 'sharing' trail systems with snowmachines and ATVs.

Skiers, snowshoes, hikers are shut out of popular established trail systems in winter months on the Kenai due to erratic and often high speed motorized traffic.

As a safety matter access to popular trail systems (Lost Lake, Resurrection) should be alternated between motorized and non motorized use. The presence of motorized traffic on these trails denies safe access to non motorized users.

in 17 years of experience in treating severely injured people the worst injuries I have treated have been caused by pedestrian motor vehicle collisions. The best outcome is disability, fatal outcome is frequent. Prevention is the only good treatment. It is folly to admix motorized and non motorized traffic in high use areas.

Comment # Comment

0029071-001

I support the Preferred Plan, however, the amount of area dedicated to non-motorized winter use is appallingly low.

I have been skiing on the Kenai Peninsula since 1971. I testified years ago that snowmachines and cross-country skiing do not mix, and many of us predicted then the conflicts that would arise between cross-country skiing and motorized winter use of forest lands. It is simply not safe to be on the same trail as a motorized vehicle capable of going 70 m.p.h. That is why many of us no longer ski forest service trails.

While the compromise solution established years ago for Resurrection Trail, to separate the two user groups in time seemed attractive, it has proven to be unenforceable. I advocate three principles.

A. Separate skiers/skijourers/mushers and snowmachines in space. Designate certain areas as non-motorized and groom them for skiing.

B. Multiple use trails should have posted speed limits and right-of-way rules for snowmachines. The speed limit on forest trails should be 25 mph below treeline on trails, and 35 mph above treeline. These should be enforced by patrolling rangers.

C. Multiple use trails should be groomed on a timely basis to remove moguls created by snowmachines and for the enjoyment of both skiers and touring snowmachiners.

D. That policies and practices be established in the Chugach National Forest that promote family-style touring snowmachiners and 'hot-rodding' and 'high marking' be discouraged. Through the above mentioned speed limits.

Specifically, I support the following Keeping the Snow River a designated wilderness area Manitoba Mountain be closed to all snowmachine use between Summit Lake and a 4 miles north of the Canyon Creek footbridge. Groom trails below treeline from Summit Lake lodge to the northern extent of the closed area. The Area of the Seward Y be closed to snowmachines. Groom trails in the area.

When Resurrection Trail is closed after Feb. 15, not only the trail but the entire valley be closed.

Build a separate skiing, mushing, snowshoeing trail from Primrose Campground to the high country. Preferably make it a loop designed to be skied one way. Maintain the Turnagain Pass system of restricting snowmachines to one side of the road.

The Tiehack Mt. area north of Seward be closed to motorized vehicles

Further:

I support the studies be implemented to determine the affect of heavy motorized snowmachine use on moose, denned bears, ptarmigan, coyotes and other wildlife. I realize that previous studies indicate minimal impact. However, those were conducted before the volume of snowmachine traffic increased and the machines were capable of 60-70 mph speeds. I have heard anecdotal stories of snowmachiners running down coyotes, harassing moose etc. This should not be ignored. I cannot believe that the volume of Sunday afternoon snowmachiners in February in Turnagain Pass has no impact on wildlife.

Comment # Comment

0029072-001

I am writing to express my support for setting aside at the very least a minimum of 10% of the Chugach National Forest Land on the Kenai Peninsula for non-motorized backcountry use.

Conflicts do exist between the motorized and non-motorized use. The conflicts are of both safety and enjoyment related nature.

I support all of the following areas to be set aside for non-motorized use, in addition to others that were identified in the preferred alternative:

Resurrection trail corridor and surrounding area Lost Lake - with a 50/50 time share split, not just one month.
Snow River and South Fork Snow River drainages Expanding Manitoba area to include all slopes facing the road on both sides of the highway from Manitoba Mountain South to the Seward 'Y' - motorized corridors should be allowed for access beyond these roadside slopes.

A time share on Carter/Crescent Lakes
The North End of Johnson Pass

I recognize that this is a controversial topic for the Forest Service, and I encourage you to work with local users to further refine the selected areas. However, it is important to establish the % of land that should be set aside for non-motorized users. At the very least a minimum of 10% should be established as non-motorized winter use.

Comment # Comment

0029077-001 Alternating closure of any area to snowmachine use and skier use is bad for all user groups. To place such a restriction on the Twenty Mile River area (or any other area) has the potential to shut out the snowmobiling public for a three-year period if snow conditions don't permit access on the assigned year. I find this a frustrating thought as a bad snow year could keep me off the trails for 3 years. Likewise skiers could be in the same boat, although they require less snow to function, so they potentially stand to suffer less than snowmachiners.

Lost Lake area - This is a very popular and heavily used area. I believe that snow should be the determining factor for opening and closing the area. Not an arbitrarily chosen date, as the plan prefers. Also I believe that instead of closing both access points, designate one for snowmachining and leave one for skiing access. It is ludicrous to leave Lost Lake open for skiing activities when many skiers are not going to trek the 6-mile Primrose Trail while hundreds of snowmobilers will. The Snug Harbor access will just not support the increase in use that would result in the closure of other areas.

I also object to the closure of the Seattle Creek Drainage. I have never seen a skier back there. Hundreds of snowmachiners use the area on a nice weekend. The current situation is already limiting enough with snowmachines restricted to the west side of the highway.

In general I feel that the effects of the proposed random closures have not been studied. The current facilities for snowmachiners are barely adequate, specifically parking. Say for instance if twenty mile area was closed and all those regular users tried to go to Johnsons Pass trailhead to play, CNF will have a serious safety issues to deal with, as there will not be enough parking, and users will be parking all over the wide highway shoulders in the area. With the growing popularity of snowmachining the currently busy facilities will only become more unsafe if the proposed plan goes into effect unchanged.

0029124-001

Skiers, snowshoes, hikers are shut out of popular established trail systems in winter months on the Kenai due to erratic and often high speed motorized traffic.

As a safety matter access to popular trail systems (Lost Lake, Resurrection) should be alternated between motorized and non motorized use. The presence of motorized traffic on these trails denies safe access to non motorized users.

Comment # Comment

0029129-001

Please be aware that myself and a good many of my friends support an increase in the amount of land within Chugach National Forest set aside for NON-MOTORIZED use; specifically, areas in the Summit Lake vicinity, Carter Lake, the south fork of Snow River, and others.

I have experienced numerous instances of conflict and outright hostility from motorized users, bordering on actual assault, simply because some take offense in the fact that I choose to enjoy the CNF in a manner that doesn't injure it (or other's enjoyment of it). I have seen snow machine users deliberately high mark above skiers, purposely destroy trails, and criss-cross popular skiing slopes, making them unsuitable for that use until the next snowfall. Although it is not a problem specific to CNF, high-marking in an avalanche chute is a hazard to everyone, a dangerous practice which continues despite the numerous deaths and injuries. I assure you that this, as well as seeing tracks up the side of every mountain takes away a good deal of my enjoyment while using the Park. I'm confident that I'm not alone in thinking so.

The unregulated two-cycle engines usually employed on these machines give off far more particulates and unburned hydrocarbon products than any other type of engine by at least an order of magnitude, regularly leaving behind a smelly, ugly blue haze wherever their use is concentrated.

In an open valley, the noise of these machines can be heard for miles, sounding like some frenzied chain-saw battle; not the sort of thing that I seek out, when I go in search of some solitude in our beautiful mountains.

It is my opinion that a National Park should have more than one percent of its area, as it does now, set aside for non-motorized activities. The current situation is preposterous.

0029130-001

I would like to emphasize my support of designating additional areas as non-motorized recreational areas. The new additions to this category are less than 1% of the total land of the CNF and offer a reasonable accommodation to back-country skiers, snowshoers, snowboarders, and telemark skiers.

It is my belief that enforcing the partial closure of the Lost Lake area is not practical and urge the USFS to instead include the Carter/Crescent Lake area and the Snow River areas as an alternating motorized and non-motorized area.

Approximately 10% of the CNF on the Kenai Peninsula would be set aside for non-motorized use with the Preferred Plan. I believe that this 10% is minimal, and would encourage the USFS to add more land to this designation.

0029134-001

Please make sure that motorized activities, heliskiing and proposed resorts do not jeopardize the wild character of these lands, nor roadcutting nor lumbering by road or by helicopter.

Comment # Comment

0029143-001

The Kenai Peninsula has far too many closed or restricted areas now, and its clearly time to make improvements to allow users the opportunity to enjoy local resources and lands, not restrict them. I also believe that there is ample space to allow for a variety of uses with out making additional closures.

All lands above timber line on the 2+ million acre of Kenai National Wildlife Refuge are closed to aircraft landings and snowmachine travel. Kenai Fjords National park is closed. In 1987, in spite of opposition by the public, the 68 square mile Skilak Loop Wildlife Management Area was closed to motorized travel, except boats on Hidden lake. The area was designated to be used by cross country skiers and to view wildlife. Juneau/Resurrection Creek Trail is opened to snowmachine travel after Dec. 1, if snow is sufficient, and closed on Feb. 15. The preferred time to snowmachine is in the late winter, early spring. If any of these closed areas were even remotely crowded in winter, I would understand the need to create additional areas for skiers. Unfortunately, I believe, like most locals, that this planning effort is simply the result of a few whiners complaining that they saw or heard a snowmachine while skiing. On the other hand, I've never heard a snowmachiner complain that an area should be closed to skiers.....

My wife and I have lived in Alaska since the early 1970s and enjoy both skiing and snowmachine with our family. However, we never travel to Skilak Loop or would ever use the Lost Lake area to ski. These areas are simply too far and the trails are too steep into Lost Lake. In my career, with the state for over 26 years, I have had the opportunity to log thousands of hours conducting aerial wildlife surveys on the Kenai. On numerous occasions I have seen people on snowmachines in the higher elevations enjoying themselves but I have never seen a skier, except those transported by helicopter or in Turnagain Pass. If Lost Lake is closed to motorized travel it will not be enjoyed by anyone.

This planning effort should address the positive aspects of recreational use. The Forest Service has provided sub-standard trail maintenance and improvements to parking areas at trail heads. Improvements to parking alone would solve most of the complaints. Additionally, if you used the experience of the Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers and made trails wider, they could be safely enjoyed by both snowmachine riders and skiers. The trail into Lost Lake is narrow and extremely dangerous under icy conditions.

0029145-003

As well; in the Kenai peninsula (I've been there twice) I would like to see restrictions on motorized access to the Resurrection Creek and River areas and the Snow River.

0029162-001

I'm opposed to wilderness designations in areas of Important fisheries habitat access and I do support CDFU and the City of Cordova's position.

0029165-001

I am opposed to wilderness designations in areas of important fisheries habitat and access and I DO support CDFU and the City of Cordova's positions.

0029168-001

I am opposed to wilderness designations in areas of important fisheries habitat and access, especially the Copper River Delta.

Comment # Comment

0029195-001

Please maintain the non motorized areas delineated in the Chugach Forest Plan. Snow machines have gotten, more and more powerful. They can go more places faster. And, while most snowmachiners seem to be quite courteous, many are not, so controls are necessary. There are some non motorized activities that are incompatible with snow machines, such as telemark skiing. It seems reasonable to maintain just a few easily accessible places out of the entire Forest on the road system where skiers can have the snow.

As you know there are very few places where skiers, mushers, and other non motorized back country users can go that are free of snow machines, so please maintain these places.

If you need to make changes to the proposed plan I propose this alternative. Keep the telemark places non motorized. For Lost Lake Trail and Resurrection Pass Trail, allow the snow machiners in on a trial basis with the following guidelines. If you get complaints go back to the exclusions.

1. Within one mile of any Forest Service cabin all snow machiners must stay on the trail or move directly through the area.
2. When passing other back country users snow machines must reduce speed to 10 miles per hour (or some other speed that is reasonable).
3. If snow machiners are using a cabin they must travel one mile from the cabin before leaving the trail.

These restraints address problems I have had with snow machiners gathering around the Lost Lake Cabin to play. They were there all day without regard to cabin users. The comments in the log book suggested that they seemed to think they own the cabin (I have heard that they are responsible for building it, but it is public property). These suggestions also address problems I have had with snow machiners passing at high speed.

Again most of my experiences with snow machiners have been good, but the bad times are particularly notable.

0029197-001

I'm writing about the proposed revisions in the Chugach Nat'l forest. I have skied & mushed dogs in many of the areas in question. I have also done some snowmachining.

I'm not going to comment on every area, but I think there are two common sense themes that should prevail.

- 1) Snowmachines can go 50+ mph, so they don't really need areas right next to the roads or trails. They can be much farther into the back country in minutes than a skier could in a day.
- 2) Some of the trails, like Carter Lake trail, are pretty steep & icy for skiers, But fairly routine for a snowmachiner.

Please keep these in mind when you make your decisions.

Observation: I often spent the day on Resurrection Pass Trail with a dog team when open to both boards & machines & never saw a soul.

Comment # Comment

0029198-001

I would like to comment on the new changes to the FS use plan. I am very much in favor of having non motorized use of some of the Chugach. It is very important for skiers, snow shoers, snowboarders to have places they can go that are free of snow machines. I hope Manitoba Mountain will remain non motorized and that new areas up for a nonmotorized designation will be added. Resurrection trail, for instance, should have that designation for a good portion of the winter. I realize Lost Lake is a place that snow machiners use often and perhaps this area can remain motorized as a concession to other areas being put off limits.

0029200-001

I'm writing to voice my concerns that the Chugach National Forest should add additional non motorized winter areas tor skiers, snowshoers and hikers.

I would hope the USFS would at least consider:

1. adding to the Manitoba Mt area to include slopes on the east side of the highway to Summit lake
2. some sort of closure to machines on the Resurrection trail system
3. some sort of percentage goal, say 10% for non motorized winter use areas on the Chugach
4. closures in other areas identified by non motorized backcountry users

0029251-001

I am writing to express my support for setting aside a minimum of 10% of the Chugach National Forest Land on the Kenai Peninsula for non-motorized backcountry use.

Conflicts do exist between the motorized and non-motorized use. The conflicts are of both safety and enjoyment related nature.

I support all of the following areas to be set aside for non-motorized use, in addition to others that were identified in the preferred alternative:

Resurrection trail corridor and surrounding area Lost Lake - with a 50/50 time share split, not just one month.
Snow River and South Fork Snow River drainages Expanding Manitoba area to include all slopes facing the road on both sides of the highway from Manitoba Mountain South to the Seward 'Y' - motorized corridors should be allowed for access beyond these roadside slopes. A time share on Carter/Crescent Lakes The North End of Johnson Pass

I recognize that this is a controversial topic for the Forest Service, and I encourage you to work with local users to further refine the selected areas. However, it is important to establish the % of land that should be set aside for non-motorized users. A minimum of 10% should be established as non-motorized winter use.

Comment # Comment

0026730-003 Motorized/non-motorized recreation

We are pleased that the Forest Service has recognized that serious motorized/non-motorized recreation conflicts exist and need to be resolved. However, we believe that the Forest Plan is not the best tool for resolving these conflicts. We believe that each ranger district should prepare winter and summer recreation management plans based on more sophisticated knowledge of time/space conflicts and use patterns. Such a plan could consider a range of regulatory measures, such as designating corridors, setting use level limits, prohibiting certain activities. It could be implemented on a trial basis, with room for adjustment if attempted solutions don't work. We are distressed that the Forest Service is avoiding using prescriptions that could protect valuable ecological resources, because their implications for motorized access are unclear.

Having said that, we suggest the following changes to the Preferred Alternative:

-- Twentymile: Either one of the following two suggestions is preferable to the proposal in the Preferred Alternative: Substitute a split season motorized closure in Twentymile valley for an alternative year closure, or designate a motorized corridor on the west side of the valley.

The split season proposal originated with snowmachiners who attended a meeting we sponsored in Girdwood: their proposal is to open the valley to snowmachines in the first part of the season, close it in the second part, using the same dates as the current Resurrection Trail closure.

Another options would be to create a motorized corridor on the west side of the river. This would significantly reduce the impact of motorized use on wildlife-- mainly moose and wolves in the winter-- and would encourage a style of riding more in keeping with the traditional use the valley has supported without conflict for decades. It is important to locate such a corridor on the west side of the river, because wolves travel up and down the east side of the valley.

-- Johnson Pass: the existing motorized use closure reflected in the Preferred Alternative is consistently violated and unenforceable. Moreover, the area closed to motorized use upstream from Center Creek bridge on Johnson Pass Trail is completely inaccessible to non-motorized users. Therefore, we suggest moving the motorized use closure boundary from Center/Divide Creek to Bench creek, until you reach the bridge where Bench Creek makes a 90 degree turn to the west. This would make unit K332, and the northern sliver of K333 that is northeast of Bench Creek and north of the bridge, non-motorized. This closure boundary would be much easier to recognize on the ground than the existing one. At the same time, we suggest creating a snow-machine parking area at Granite Creek campground so that it is easier for snow machiners to access the existing winter trail on the south side of Bench Creek, and less tempting to violate the closure order by venturing off Johnson Pass trail up the north side of Center Creek.

We are not opposed to opening the portion of unit K111 that is south of Center creek to heli-skiing, as we understand it contains prime runs, provided that noise does not carry over to non-motorized units K332, 104, 105, and 107. However, K111 should stay closed to

Comment # Comment

snowmachines.

-- Girdwood environs: We are pleased with the no snowmachine designations in Winner Creek and Crow Creek. These designations respect a treasured local ski touring/telemarking area that has not traditionally been used by snowmachines, and the quality of life and safety of Crow Creek Road residents.

-- Seattle Creek: the non-motorized designation in Seattle Creek bowl is useless unless snowmachines are prohibited from accessing the ridge, because there's only one safe route to the ridge and it's too dangerous for snowmachines and skiers to share it. An additional concern is the large amount of trash--including dead snowmachine parts-- that has begun to accumulate on the ridge and in the bowl since snow-machines began accessing the area several years ago. This is a year-round environmental impact caused by winter motorized use.

0029301-001

We'd like to express our dissatisfaction on the proposed closures and restrictions to motorized use in the Chugach National Forest. We are snowmobilers, but we also enjoy backcountry skiing, snowshoeing, and hiking.

To our knowledge, there are currently no areas closed to skiing, snowshoeing, etc., but the proposed closures/restrictions to snowmobilers will severely impact access and usability. This is especially true in the Seattle Creek drainage, and at Lost Lake.

While we enjoy motorized as well as non-motorized recreation, we feel that the money spent on goods and services related to snowmobiling and injected into the local economies is disproportionate to that generated by our non-motorized activities and should be repaid with access to our forests and public lands.

0029320-001

The Twentymile River drainage is managed for non-motorized/motorized activities using the Backcountry Prescription, with the following conditions: Snowmachine use is allowed in alternate years, starting January 1st of each odd year (2003, 2005 etc.). On even years, the area is closed to snowmachine use.

Comment:

The Twenty Mile Area is very large, close to Anchorage and accommodates many snowmachiners each winter. Why would we close this area off every other year for just a few skiers? Have you ever counted the snowmachine users on the weekends in this area? Guaranteed that you could never get that many skiers there on the weekend.

I would suggest leaving this area open to all in the winter.

0029333-001

I strongly urge you not to close the areas in question- (20 Mile River Valley, Turnagain Pass, Lost Lake, etc.)

As a snowmachine causes drastically less damage to the local environment than a lone hiker, due to the snow cover, this should not be an issue.

Comment # Comment

0029343-002

A fair and equitable solution can be made. I have snowmachined in Turnagain Pass often, and have never seen snowmachine tracks on the skier side. I'm not saying that it has never happened, but by far and large I believe it does not. (I have however encountered skiers on the snowmachine side and was greeted with hand gestures that were not friendly. This, even while I was in an area I was already restricted too!)

I have snowmachined Lost Lake often as well and have never had an encounter with a hiker or skier. Some of these trips were well into spring. I do not see the issue here at all?

0029353-001

. For 6 months out of the year we enjoy snowmobiling with our friends and family, Without this recreation opportunity available to us, our entire existence during the winter months would be relatively uneventful. As anyone who has lived in this state for any length of time knows, you must have the ability to get out and enjoy the outdoor recreation that our State offers or you might as well leave. Its a long, cold, dark winter to be sitting around waiting for summer.

As a long time resident I am truly concerned about our environment, wildlife and other peoples right to recreate as they choose. I have been riding my snowmachines in the proposed closure areas for many years and I don't believe that closing these areas is going to benefit anyone and will certainly harm many. These areas make up almost 50% of the snowmachine recreation areas in the area. Without them we will be forced to pack in the limited areas up North. Just look at the current situation in Petersville right now. Because there is no snow down south everyone is forced to the North and we have massive overcrowding in the parking lots, on the trails, and on others private property in the area. This is a perfect example of what it would be like if this proposal should pass.

0029366-001

I am responding to the proposed change to the Forest Plan that would allow horses onto the trails one month earlier (from July 1 back to June 1). Working as the Trail Crew supervisor for 8 years I know firsthand the damaging impact horses can have on the trails and surrounding vegetation when conditions are wet and muddy. It is common for this to occur well into the month of June due to a heavy snow year or a slow spring melt. The opening date of July 1 was made with wise reasoning, and has allowed for special earlier opening under the discretion of the Trails Tech. and Rec. Staff Officer when conditions are dry enough. I would like to see this remain the same, In addition I believe it is extremely important to impose a ban on horses on the Lost Lake/Primrose trails especially above tree line due to the extensive areas of wet meadows. Also the Carter Lake Trail has seen an enormous increase of damage to wet meadows and the trail since Outfitter Guides with horses have been using it regularly in the past few years. Currently the Seward District is investing heavily in repairing the damage and upgrading the trail for these few specific users. I don't think this is right either, Carter Trail should be allowed time to recover and be worked on until horses are permitted. Please take these suggestions into consideration when revising the Forest Plan. Otherwise I'm afraid there will be many complaints from other trail users as well as many extra dollars invested in repairing damages and upgrading trails.

Comment # Comment

0029376-001

I am strongly against the closing of the forest service recreation areas, especially the Johnsons Pass area, to recreational snowmachiners.

These areas have been a frequent source of recreation for my family. They are high snowfall area's that are rarely utilized by non-motorized users due to the travel distances required, amount of snowfall in winter, and the severity of the terrain. The ability to traverse Johnsons pass in the winter even with a trail packed in by snow machines is a physical impossibility for all but a very small percentage of the population. The USFS's responsibility to manage resources for the users (voters and taxpayers, and their children) should be paramount to the narrow focus groups locking up more of my state, my home and my land, and an area of great beauty that my family could not enjoy without motorized access in the winter.

0029385-001

Please do not close Lost Lake Trail to motorized vehicles/snowmachines. Create a alternate trail system first, for people who also wish to access the area, but under different conditions. Access is the real issue, and the Forest Service has not yet established enough access for different user groups, to establish any boundaries like this. Create the access first, then analyze the user groups, and finish the process if its still needed!! I say 'still needed' because typically different user groups will frequent different areas, for a variety of reasons. Currently, access is a VERY limiting factor, and certainly has something to do with your stated position of 'there is a conflict between skiers, and snowmachiners

0029395-001

I would like to voice my opposition to any plan that would reduce, or close any of the following areas that I frequently recreate in with my Family; 20 mile River, Placer River, Johnson Pass, Turnagain Pass, or any of the associated areas that are currently open to snowmobiling.

0029400-001

I believe that the forest is large enough to provide 'quiet' places for everyone if managed properly. There are currently thousands of acres of forest which have been set aside for 'quiet' recreation and this seems to be adequate in my opinion. By restricting winter motorized use of forest lands further I feel that adverse impacts are inevitable. Motorized winter use affords the people of Alaska a unique perspective of the natural beauty of the forest and the stewardship required to maintain this beauty for future generations.

I believe there should be more development of the winter trails located within the forest rather than less. With a small amount of education and some regulation, conflicts between users could be minimized. As with any portion of society there are always conflicts. Trail heads should be further developed with larger parking areas, Toilet facilities and grooming in popular areas. If the forest asked the local population for volunteer labor I am sure that the would be surprised by the response from both motorized user groups as well as non-motorized groups. Areas where there could be more development are: access points to Lost Lake, Crescent Lake, Twenty Mile River drainage. Crow Creek Pass, Ptarmigan Creek, Turnagain Pass, and Bird Creek Valley. I know that local user groups are volunteering to improve some of these access points and trails at this time and I can only believe that as access becomes better that more people would be willing to become involved in improving relationships and our resources.

0029404-001

As both a snowmachiner and cross-country skier I would oppose the closure of 20 Mile, Placer River, Johnson pass, etc. to snow machine use.

I see no reason to concentrate the snow machines into smaller and smaller areas as it is unfair to this group and the danger of accidents between machines goes up with the concentrated numbers.

Comment # Comment

0029414-003

I also support the prohibition of off-road vehicles in the Winner Creek, Rosehip Creek, Portage Creek (outside the highway and railroad corridors), California Creek, Kern Creek (outside the highway/railroad corridor), Glacier Gulch, Magpie Creek, Glacier Creek (above Crow Creek), Skookum Creek (outside the railroad corridor), Milk Creek (outside the road corridor), Crystal Lake, Eagle River (outside the Nordic Ski Club training area on the Eagle Glacier), and Crow Creek (west side of the creek) drainages.

0029415-002

Your proposal to timeshare or land allocate the following areas is very fair and supported by many including myself. This proposal would once again open these areas to people like myself who have stayed away from them because of the overwhelming snowmachine traffic.

- Johnson Pass Trail (north end)
- Snow River (South Fork)
- Fresno Ridge
- Carter/Crescent Lakes
- Russian River Trail

0029439-001

I understand that Seattle creek will be just one of those places off limits to snowmobilers? If so, one of the states best riding areas will be closed off to the majority user group and be subject to steep avalanche prone areas in the valley floor. I think it also unfair for the Forest Service to close Resurrection to snowmobilers in the Spring and open to skiers all winter long. The Chugach National Forest is huge, unfortunately it has limited access which lies the problem. I do not mind sharing space with any winter recreationist as long as courtesy and trail manners are in place. Unfortunately, I feel somewhat betrayed by the Forest Service for taking away my rights as a user of the forest, I conducted a survey of skiers vs snowmobilers in the Placer River drainage and Trail river area last winter and the numbers were definitely weighed in favor of snowmobilers. Then I ask of you not to limit the access of the majority of the user group of the forest or take away areas of now legal riding areas, but rather 'share' the land as it was meant to be.

0029443-001

I am a resident of Girdwood, Alaska and a frequent skier in Turnagain Pass and Skookum Glacier. The management of these public lands will necessarily be more restrictive on all groups simply because the numbers of skiers, snowboarders, and snowmachiners have grown dramatically over the past five to ten years. For one group to claim zero-loss is irresponsible. Indeed, with the increase of snowmachines, the skiers have had to give up some areas. I used to ski in Seattle Creek, but the last time I went I had to dodge snowmachines on the ramp. That was more than five years ago.

0029452-002

We support the restrictions on snowmachines in places like the Twentymile, Lost Lake, Winner Creek, Seattle Creek, Bear Valley, and Skookum Glacier.

But more can be done to achieve fairness and balance on the Forest. We suggest additional restrictions, either full closures or time-shares, for Johnson Pass Trail (north end), South Fork Snow River, Fresno Ridge, Carter/Crescent lakes, Russian River Trail, and Jack and Sawmill bays.

0029452-004

Many types of watercraft, both motorized and non-motorized, are available for travel in the Forest, Two of them, however, are so obtrusive, and potentially so damaging, that there is no place for them on well-managed public lands. We recommend that you ban both jet skis and airboats in the Forest.

Comment # Comment

- 0029461-003 On another note, we understand you are receiving some pressure to designate certain areas in addition to wilderness areas as helicopter free in the planning unit outlines. We can make some suggestions for suitable locations in addition to the considerable wilderness areas proposed. Keeping in mind that Chugach State Park to the northwest and Kenai National Park to the southwest are both helicopter free, we would suggest you designate the Resurrection Pass area and the Lost Lake to Russian River areas as off-limits to recreational helicopter usage activities. Additionally, we have no interest in helicopter activities in the western side of the forest that drains towards Prince William Sound, roughly to the east of the previous wilderness study boundary. An additional area might be around Cooper Lake.
- 0029461-004 Given that you are under pressure from the snowmachine community regarding Twenty Mile and Seattle Creek, we have a suggestion that may help solve this issue. While for us the best solution is the existing one, we are amenable to a plan that time shares one year on/off between Seattle Creek and Twenty Mile so that one of these two areas is always open to snowmachiners. In this case, we would expect to be permitted to use the area open to snowmachining during the year it is open. We would prefer to see Units K298 exempted from this arrangement since it is so far back in the valley, but would be amenable to not using any other locations in the Twenty Mile valley during the off year.
- 0029473-001 As an avid snowmobiler I strongly oppose the proposed closing of Lost Lake to snowmachines. Any closure of the Lost Lake area to snowmachines would greatly affect the outdoors recreation me and my family enjoy during the long cold dark Alaskan winters. The Lost Lake area in Seward has traditionally been a snowmachine haven starting back in the early 1970's when the Seward Chamber of Commerce offered \$100 to the first snowmachiner to put a trail into the area! Closing this area would not only affect the outdoor recreation of many snowmachiners , also it will have a negative impact on the economy of Seward. There are many businesses which stand to be affected by any closure. Examples would be hotels, gas stations, restaurants, snowmobile dealerships, etc. Economically this forest service plan can only hurt Seward.
- I feel it is unfair that part of the reason for the proposed closure is the actions of special interest groups from the lower 48 specifically the Quiet Rights Coalition and The Sierra Club. What makes these groups so selfish? What makes them so special that they feel they can deny access to public wilderness instead of sharing these lands? I will follow this issue very closely and would greatly appreciate any support you could give in keeping Alaska for Alaskans.
- 0035082-004 Remove all motorized restrictions and time shore schemes on lost lake area and Ingram Creek
- 0035083-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares on Ingram Creek, & lost lake area.
- 0035088-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares or Ingram Creek & lost lake area.
- 0035090-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost lake, area.

Comment # Comment

0035093-006	Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost lake, area.
0035095-006	Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost lake, area.
0035097-006	remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost lake, area.
0035100-005	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the loss lake area.
0035101-006	remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek, & Lost lake, area.
0035103-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the loss lake area.
0035105-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the loss lake area.
0035106-006	Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek, & Lost lake, area.
0035109-006	Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake, area.

Comment # Comment

0035118-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek, & Lost Lake area.

0034170-001

The land you are propose to close to snowmachines such as lost lake should stay open to all users not just one group small or large. This is public land for all to see and use not be shut down by a group of people that has never seen it or will never see it. This goes for all alaska land that out side influence is helping in the decisions making on the closing of alaska land to the people of alaska. As for the trails such as lost lake; resurrection trail (closed by feb 15 best riding time) should stay open to all user groups hiker; skiers; bikers; snowmachiners; you need to make better parking and wider trails in places that need it so all the people of this state can freely use it not just one group. I have live in this state all my life 41 years and watched the government do one thing or another with the state with out really listening to the user groups that use it they listening to people that have never seen it never been to it and will never go there. I would like to see you leave this land open so my children and there children my go and enjoy the land as my father did with me on snowmachine over 34 years ago.

0034190-001

I have a couple questions as I try to understand Appendix C to the CNF Plan.

1) page C-2. Where do I find a definition for the Management Direction or Restriction Codes?

2) page C-2 and C-5, roads and trails listed within the Copper Rive Delta, How do you account for ANCSA 179b0 easements? example: the entire length of the Sheridan Glacier Rd as it exits State lands through its terminus is a 17(b) easement but the plan does not allow ATV use contrary to the easement reservations, I also note 17(b) trail easements in Table C-2 which show 'no' ATV use contrary to the reservations for those easements

Brian Lettich
General Manager
The Eyak Corporation

0034191-001

I am from the middle school at Soldotna A.K. I am sending you this about the revised forest plan. I think that you should be able to bring snowmachines and stuff like that to the pars and lost lake and you should open more parks for snowmachines.

0034199-001

I reside on the Kenai Peninsula and am writing in support of the CNF Preferred Plan which allows the inclusion of non-motorized recreational areas in the Chugach National Forest. It seems to be a very reasonable attempt to provide a balance of all user groups.

0034200-002

It is my belief that enforcing the partial closure of the Lost Lake area is not practical and urge the USFS to instead include the Carter/Crescent Lake area and the Snow River areas as an alternating motorized and non-motorized area.

Comment # Comment

0034215-002

2. Regarding Johnson pass, the area northeast of Bench Creek should be non-motorized and F.S. should create snowmobile access at Granite Creek Campground, Snowmobilers should stay south of Bench Creek. Center Creek and Divide Creek drainages should be non-motorized only.

0034218-001

I would really like to see or hear from the people who ski at lost lake , as I have never seen a ski track, let alone a skier at lost lake. I personally believe there is a couple of people who are complaining and trying to spoil the recreation for hundreds of others. Personally I ride in from Snug Harbor Rd. So I am not familiar with the rec use of trails from Lost Lake trail to Seward on the Primrose trail. I cannot imagine that there would be a safety issue on the snug harbor trail for any skier as the average speed of a snow machine going up that trail could not be more than 15 mph it is extremely rough and very twisty in spots, I think 15 mph would be pushing it.

My wife and I have a cabin in caribou hills where we use the same trails as skiers, dog mushers and ski-juorer's almost every week and have never had a problem sharing the trails, I don't see why we cannot do the same at Lost Lake, anyone I ride with has no problem giving the right of way, We are simply using the trails to reach the high country where we ride, and I believe that it would be unjust to deny us the right of those trails when they have been built and maintained by snowmachiners.

I also believe that it would benefit any skiers to have snow machines there if the skier had a broken leg or twisted ankle, why in the world would they want to do away with a safety factor that could make the difference of making it out or not? Who found the lost musher in caribou hills after the tustemena 500? not anyone on skies and not another person on a dog sled!

Please do not close any trails to lost lake to any user group!

0034220-001

Turnagain pass area should alternate as to which user group uses which side of the forest park lands for recreation. The snowmachiners groups have been isolated to the side that is most prone to avalanche danger, and some have already died. To crest the mountain top, and access the valleys further in, the operators level of riding skill, must be of almost professional levels, not just weekend/occasional rider level. So the majority of the recreationalists must confine themselves to the small area from the base of the mountain, to the highway, unloading area. I have to tell you, on a typical days riding, our small group will log 100 miles. Myself, and many others have typically viewed the open Turnagain Pass area as far to limiting, given current restrictions, as well as a dangerous area in general. Skiers, however, are in comparison, extremely limited in the possible utilization of their current area. They generally cover small distances, create no noise to initiate avalanches, and given current' technology, often do not traverse to the extreme altitudes that snowmachiners achieve. The area at Turnagain Pass currently restricted to Skiers only, offers far more recreation possibilities to the 'average' snowmachiner, because the terrain is much more docile, and does not require an extreme riding skill level, while being safer to noise levels in regards to avalanche danger. At the very least, these areas should be exchanged from year to year, so that all user groups can experience AGAIN, what I have in the remote past. Having frequented the area on snowmachine that is now 'skiers only' in the past, I can assure you that I never chose to ride in the area now designated 'snowmachines'.

Comment # Comment

0034223-001

Please do not close Lost Lake Trail to motorized vehicles/snowmachines. Create a alternate trail system first, for people who also wish to access the area, but under different conditions. Access is the real issue, and the Forest Service has not yet established enough access for different user groups, to establish any boundaries like this. Create the access first, then analyze the user groups, and finish the process if its still needed!! I say 'still needed' because typically different user groups will frequent different areas, for a variety of reasons. Currently, access is a VERY limiting factor, and certainly has something to do with your stated position of 'there is a conflict between skiers, and snowmachiners

0034225-001

Therefore, I recommend that backcountry non-motorized users get their fair share: 50% of the management units within a three hour hike (via skis) should be closed to motorized uses. The north end of Johnson Pass should be closed; heli-skiing and sightseeing should be vastly cut back; Lost Lake (which we skiers have really lost) should be closed to machining after Feb. 15

I strongly recommend the consideration of a winter yurt system from Ingrain Creek at Turnagain Arm to Bench Creek/Divide Creek at the north end of Johnson Pass as a means to provide improved access and disperse users. Six or so of yurts could be installed a couple of miles in at the base of the peaks along this area, and provide great opportunities for either weekend destinations, or longer linked trips.

Some miscellaneous comments: please do not open or designate Devils Pass as a non-motorized area...it has very high avalanche hazard and is basically a 'throw-away' area for skiers. Also, as far as I'm concerned, as a nordic skier who hits the trails 60-80 times/year in Anchorage and the backcountry 16 times or so a year, the Twentymile drainage is another throwaway area. Except for the most basic beginner (and when 'crust' skate skiing is available in late spring freeze-thaw cycles) it holds little appeal. It's flat and boring and any interesting terrain features are too distant for day enjoyment. A better example of a day area that should be further promoted and hold lots of appeal is the far eastern end of Center Ridge (an area that deserves a yurt).

Finally, do not open the Forest any earlier for horseback use--they tear up the trails and put nothing back but 'road apples'!!! Keep up the great work on the trails improvements, and give the quiet and muscle users an equitable share of the forest summer and winter' Far too much of this State is wide open to motorized exploitation and the Chugach should serve as a quiet refuge. Thank you for considering my comments.

Comment # Comment

0034252-001

- 20 Mile River change to every other week.
- Skookum Glacier - open to both Snow machiners and Skiers, I ride here often with my family, because you can ride on the floor of the Valley back to the Glacier safely. Other than the Heli skiing I have never seen a backcountry skier and rarely a track.
- Seattle Creek - should remain open to Snow machining, it is a safer alternative to riding on the face with the hot sun beating down on the slopes. Tills area has been open for many years and I don't believe the Forest Service has any scientific evidence that Snow machining is causing any disruption to the wild life. It may be critical habitat in the wanner months of spring, summer and fall but in the winter, very experienced backcountry travelers that know to provide plenty of room to wildlife only visit it.
- Turnagain - I suggest that we switch sides every other year.
- Moose Pass - establish a trail head at the far end of the Lake away from the community to provide access to Bench Lake and develop an access trail to Trail Glacier and Grand View away from the rail road tracks, I will gladly provide the labor.
- Lost Lake - open to both ill all times there are Valleys in and around the area that allow for Skiing in solitude that Snow machiners do not use, I have visited many of these areas and haven't heard or seen anyone.

Example; If Snow machiners are not allowed in an area for a period of time a week, month, or year then when it is the Snow machiners turn to use the restricted area the other side Skiers must be restricted from using the area during all Snow machine operating times. After all these restrictions are to minimize conflict.

0034253-003

I strongly urge the Forest Service to select an 'alternative' or mixture of 'alternatives' that emphasizes non-motorized recreation opportunities, preservation of Wilderness character, and maximum protection of Wild & Scenic eligible rivers.

Comment # Comment

0034256-001

Resurrection Trail

I would like to the trail open until March 31 for motorized use. This still gives skiers the best times to ski with longer warmer days. This would not exclude skiers. Also I believe the logging road should be promoted more for skiers. This is an underused, beautiful area perfect for skiing.

Snug Harbor Trail to Lost Lake

It would behoove everyone to get an easement dedicated for access to Lost Lake area from this side. The current parking area is very small and controlled by Chugach Power. It could be closed at any time from the Girl Scout Camp on up. 'Access to this area and Upper Russian Lake would benefit all user groups.

Primrose Trail

This area has plenty of parking. I have never seen a skier in this area in the 7 or 8 years that I have used this trail. I feel if improved parking is created at the Firemans trail near Seward, the use of these two trails could be alternated between motorized and non-motorized. This would separate the two user groups physically on the mountain for the most part, and could satisfy both groups if a little common sense is employed. These routes could be alternated yearly or monthly. I'm not familiar with mile 12 but it has been suggested to add an additional trail near this mile post. The more the better.

Carter-Crescent Lakes Trail.

I have seen skiers in this area a few times, on their way to the cabins. I do feel their access would be nearly impossible if there where no snow machine tracks to ski in. (as with a lot of areas) Perhaps an improved ski trail from the Quartz Creek area would improve access and would physically separate the two user groups and satisfy the skiers.

I believe MOST skiers would be very happy to just have a safe trail to ski on, and that is very understandable. There are ways to accomplish this task.

1. Wider trails
2. More Trails
3. Warning and information signs on trails
4. Alternate usage of trails
5. Trial bypasses or cutoffs, (different routes to the same place).

As you are aware, there are some skiers (like any group) who will never be content. I believe employing some or all of the changes above would satisfy the majority of the users of both groups.

Please lets work together and avoid banning use and make every effort to share this great area.

Comment # Comment

0034296-001

We have seen a great increase in the use of Primrose as an access to Lost Lake for snowmachine riders. We feel that there are not enough places for people to have access to the forest. So, far too many people are overusing the few access sites that are available. These access sites, and destinations are currently shared by those of us that enjoy the quiet sports, skiing and snowshoeing, as well as those who prefer to use machines.

We have reached a point in time where overlapping use by these two different types of recreation is not a viable option any more. We don't feel that arguing to limit motorized use of the Primrose Trail is in the best interests of the the Forest Service, or its users.

We encourage the Forest Service to establish many more separate areas for motorized and non-motorized recreation. Wisconsin has a huge trail system for snow machines, some 30,000 miles according to my brother who lives there and uses the trails. There are areas used by both skiers and machiners. These joint use areas have low speed limits for the snowmachines, including stop signs where trails cross. Skiers are not to use the snowmachine trails, and vice versa. There are fines for those that do not follow the regulations. This works in Wisconsin because there are law enforcement people available. Here in Alaska with a small enforcement staff covering thousands of square miles this kind of enforcement is not really feasible. Adherence to regulations has to come from the people who use the Forest. Regulations themselves have to be adapted to meet modern technology and engineering that has evolved with the snowmachine.

We appreciate that snowmachiners need places to use their equipment as it is now designed.

In the 70's the Seward Ranger District was negotiating for a trailhead for the Lost Lake Trail. Property was changing hands fairly regularly. Instead of continuing to negotiate with the Harbor View Subdivision developers, who were not unamenable to easements, it was felt their offer was not 'in the public's interest.' And now, we still don't have a trail head near Seward with adequate parking for hikers or snowmachiners. It is important that the Forest Service actively negotiate with land owners and the state to create trailheads and access points that don't impinge on private landowners. These access areas need to be either big enough now or be such that they can be expanded as our population grows and use demands. The Snow River valley is one of these points. Areas here should be designated wilderness, motorized and non-motorized before the need becomes more obvious than it is already.

That there is a need for more winter-use trails is obvious. At one meeting I attended a suggestion was made to widen some existing trails. This idea may work well in the winter, but any trail that is also used in the summer for hiking needs to be carefully looked at before any work is done. Shady, narrow trails are a part of the woodland hiking experience. Primrose Trail is a prime example here, A possible snowmachine trail to connect with Trail River Campground with Crescent Lake or even Quartz Creek Campground on the north side of Kenai Lake would probably appeal to snowmachiners.

The Forest Service also needs to plan winter maintenance. Primrose Campground Road, for example, is plowed by the state for a safe turnaround for school buses. The whole parking lot is not always plowed. So there is often little parking space for motorhomes, and other vehicles with snowmobile trailers or for skiers. If the Forest Service creates attractive areas within the Forest and does not take the pains to maintain adequate access we will have more and more of the same situation as has been reported in the Peter's Creek area of Wasilla with people parking in the roadways, blocking access to homes, or hindering emergency vehicles. Winter maintenance is an important part of access that needs to be addressed throughout the Forest.

Comment # Comment

0034297-001

Snowmobiling is one of the activities that a wide variety of the visitors are able to do. I have grown up cross-country skiing and is an excellent way to see the country, but, as I am sure you know, is a difficult sport for someone trying it the first time. Snowmobiling allows access to more areas by more people so they can experience what Alaska has to offer. Getting off the highway is what our state is all about.

Alaska Snow Safaris is based in Girdwood and we do a majority of our tours in the Twentymile and Skookum/Placer River Valleys. These valleys provide excellent terrain for the beginning snowmobiler and is safe with little or no avalanche danger. Places such as these are hard to find anywhere near Girdwood.

I personally can not think of any reason why these areas should be closed to snowmobiling. I understand that the machines are noisy and when I started riding in these valleys I was very interested in observing who used these areas for recreation because I wanted to avoid skier - machiner conflict. Not once in the last three years have I come across cross-country skiers in either of these valleys. In the Skookum Valley I have seen less than ten people skiing. I don't believe that eliminating machines from this area would have a dramatic increase on the number of people using this area for skiing.

Closure of the Seattle Creek area would do nothing but eliminate an excellent snowmobiling area. In the winter, snowmobilers are the only people who use this area. I have seen snowboarders and some alpine skiers, but access by them was by snowmobile.

We live in a place with a large amount of land and I can see no reason to close these areas or put limits on snowmobiling. Restricting these particular areas would ruin OUT business and take away land utilized almost exclusively by snowmachiners.

0034413-010

9. The needs of disabled and older Americans have been neglected with likely 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups.

0034417-002

Regarding non-motorized recreation areas, I recommend a time or space closure on snowmobiles at the following areas in priority order for me and my friends and family;

1. Johnson Pass Trail (north end) and including the valley up Center Creek to a pass overlooking Spencer Glacier, which I ski on most springs from March 15 and on. Please close to snowmobile use after March 15.
2. Fresno Ridge and south for 1 mile to state land: because I ski on these areas all winter from my cabin at Fresno Creek area, and we have skied there for over 10 years. Long before an snowmobiles entered the slopes.
3. Carter/Crescent Lakes: Likewise we have skied these areas for years before snowmobiles discovered them, and we have been displaced. I recommend the Lost Lake trail is traded for this area; leave Lost Lake to snowmobile access because a closure after March 31 is too late anyway.
4. Russian River Trail: Again, we have skied this area for years, including for my honeymoon trip, and I have not returned since snowmobile access. Perhaps a temporal split as with the Resurrection Trail would be appropriate no snowmobiles after February 15,
5. Snow River (South Fork): When I lived in Seward, I skied this area every spring, and I know current residents are dismayed with the snowmobile use that has displaced them. As with other areas, I recommend a temporal split, close the area to snowmobile use after March 1.

Comment # Comment

0034420-009

Fixed wing and Helicopters:

Jet skis and airboats as well as future inventions like these should not be allowed in the Chugach Forest.

0034436-009

Finally, jet skis and airboats are exceptionally annoying, and for most purposes there are alternative types of watercraft, both motorized and non-motorized, that could be used. In addition, they are highly polluting and disruptive to nesting shorebirds. Jet skis and airboats should not be allowed in the Forest; adequate access already exists on State lands.

0034444-003

The heavy emphasis on motorized use in the Preferred Alternative is unfair to non-motorized users. The presence of jet skis, snowmobiles and other ORVs in pristine areas denies paddlers, hikers, wildlife watchers, photographers, cross-country skiers and others the ability to enjoy these wild resources.

Jet Skis are already becoming a problem on the Kenai River and in Prince William Sound.

0034445-002

I support all of the non-motorized areas in the Preferred Alternative. I would also like to see a couple of additions: Carter Lake, South Fork of the Snow River, and the entire Resurrection Pass after Feb. 15 - not just the trail itself.

I know snowmachiners are very upset about being excluded from Lost Lake after March 31. Maybe a trade can be made. Snowmachiners get Lost Lake (which is a little too far for most day-users) in exchange for the areas listed above.

0034452-001

1) Keep Seattle creek (back side of Turnagain pass) open to snowmachines and extend the season in the pass into May snowpack permitting.

2) Keep Twentymile open every year to riding.

3) Keep Placer river open every year to riding.

4) Keep all riding along the Seward HWY from Turnagain pass to the Sterling HWY open to May first.

5) Keep Johnson pass, Crescent lake, Carter lake open every year to riding.

6) Keep Lost lake open and all existing trail heads open every year. Improve parking and trails up to Lost lake.

0034758-003

I would also support NOT CHOOSING winter recreation management alternatives at this time, but asking the main user groups (skiers, heli-skiers, boarders, mountaineers, snow machiners, etc) to form a joint committee to create a consensus proposal.

Comment # Comment

0034767-001

I attended the meeting at the Kenai Borough Building last month and I came away somewhat perplexed. It was explained by Forest Service staff that these proposed revisions were an attempt to satisfy complaints from cross-country skiers who wished to be able to have an outdoor experience in the Lost Lake area, that were unencumbered by snowmachines and their associated annoyances.

I submit to you that I, as a near fifty year resident of Alaska, I would like to be able to enjoy in today's age, some of the pristine environment that I enjoyed as a youngster over thirty years ago. Such as flying to Deep Creek and landing on the beach and fishing for King Salmon at the confluence with Cook Inlet, and not be able to so much as hear another individual! NOT EVER GOING TO HAPPEN AGAIN!!!! Things have changed and the quality of outdoor life has diminished not for me alone, but for everyone. So I say to you good folks, who are doing your level best to appease a small but very vocal minority; Keep what you do in perspective and don't loose sight of the facts. Keep in mind (hat Americans have lost sight of the fact that this country is supposed to be governed by the majority and not by special interests. Keep in mind that you are charged with the responsibility of administrating what belongs to all of us. By limiting access to one user group is a travesty of the principles that have made this country great. On a little lighter note I would like to add the following perspective in the form of a question. How well do you think it would be received, if a group of snowmobilers got together, and asked the Forest Service to lock the gates to all cross-country skiing in the Lost Lake area because they wanted to have an area that they could enjoy without the prospect of even seeing a skier? I DON'T THINK SO!!!! Sounds pretty ridiculous to me. In closing, I pray God gives you the wisdom you need to make the right decisions with this delicate and controversial matter.

0034775-003

9. The needs of disabled and older Americans have been neglected with likely 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups.

0034778-001

Open Lost Lake and the west side of the Seward Highway to motorized winter travel. This should include the Primrose area.
Close the Carter Lake-Crescent Lake area to motorized winter travel.

0034778-003

I believe that segregated areas are the best solution to any present or future conflicts between non-motorized and motorized users. Education, awareness, and respect can go a long way toward avoiding conflicts, but unfortunately they will still occur. Separated areas work quite well in the Turnagain area, and I think that this concept needs to be instituted and expanded in the Manitoba area as well. I also believe that changes to the Plan in the Lost Lake-Carter Lake areas may go a long way toward forging a compromise between the user groups who both want access to prime backcountry recreation areas.

Comment # Comment

0034780-002

I would also like to see Johnson Pass north end trail, Fresno Snow River, Fresno Ridge, Carter, Crescent Lakes, Russian River, Jack Bay, Sawmill Bay, Marshall Bay and Kseugi Ridge closed to snowmachiners either by timeshare or land allocation.

0034781-002

(4) limit ATV use to a few designated roads and trails

0034781-003

(3) ban jet skis and airboats;

0034789-004

reduce or ban helicopter landings, ATV and snow machine use, and ban personal water craft.

0034791-002

Furthermore, the nonmotorized area around Manitoba Mountain needs to be expanded to prevent user conflicts. I have encountered snowmachines in ski-only areas at the base of Manitoba. The terrain is too inviting and the area is poorly marked, leading to both intentional and unintentional snowmachine infractions. A wider nonmotorized buffer around Manitoba would reduce conflict.

0034809-001

Closing the parks and forest from the very people (handicapped & older) is cutting out the very people that made the system what it is today. Also snowmachiners are very limited in comparison to skiers in the country they can go in. We have been snowmachining in the Twenty Mile area since 1957. Skiers are happy to use our trails and we have made many a path to the brush, when there is heavy deep snows, so the moose can get to the brush to eat. Please reconsider closing the Twenty Mile area every other year. Am sure there are more snowmachiners than skiers and go up that valley.

0034822-003

Also the only restriction to use of Resurrection Creek Trail by snow mobiles should be sufficient snow cover.

Comment # Comment

0034826-001

I am a member of the Kenai Peninsula Outdoor Club and Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers Club. The outdoor club is a loose knit group of people who get together and plan monthly outings. We frequently travel into the Chugach forest areas for mountain-hiking, hiking, camping, X-C skiing, etc. and use the public use cabins. I have also invited the group to Caribou Hills on occasion to stay at our cabin and play in that recreation area. The members all enjoyed the area and did not have any negative comments on the shared trails.

I feel the best land use alternative proposed is a combination of A and B. I think the recreation in both summer and winter are important. As well as good access for motorized and nonmotorized are equally important. I feel it is possible for all user groups to use the trails and have a workable solution. If you allow the public to volunteer to upgrade and maintain trails that could be used by all users, as well as make new trails in areas that are proven to be new access to shared areas, it would be a great private and public effort with less traffic on any given trail, and no friction between differing groups.

0034829-001

I am adamantly opposed to more closures of areas to snow machine use. Included in areas that I do not want closed are: Lost Lake, Johnson Pass, Seattle Creek and areas on the West Side of Turnagain Pass, Twenty Mile River, Placer River and all areas accessible from the highway corridor.

0034832-001

I don't belong to any group other then the Caribou Hills Cabin Hoppers. But would like to say that what is right for the lower 48 is not necessarily 'right for Alaska. Where people are trapped inside for months at a time due to cold weather unless they have some type of outdoor sport. That sport for thousands of Alaskans is snowmachining. To take away some of the prime areas to anyone would be wrong.

I also don't believe any one group should be excluded, skiers (which I am also one) cannot go as high up or as far as snowmachiners, so I don't see where that is a problem. Build corridors.

Pollution's? In this vast state? I don't see the same problems as other states might have. Elk following snowmachine paths and leaving the park area is not a problem either.

Improvements that I would like to see are to build more parking areas to access areas for winter recreation.

0034837-009

9. The needs of disabled and older Americans have been neglected with likely 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups.

0034841-001

I endorse the proposed plan with an increase in scope if needed to include alternating non-motorized use for winter recreation in the Twentymile Creek area, Crescent/Carter lakes area, the S. Fork of Snow River, the slope behind Summit Lake Lodge, Fresno Creek and Upper/Lower Paradise Lakes.

0034843-005

Lastly, jetskis should be banned from all waters in the forest. They are an unnecessary and irritating form of watercraft that have no function other than pure recreation.

Comment # Comment

0034844-001

Can't you find any area on the Kenai Penn. that can be opened for 4 wheelers. The forest is suppose to be multi use. Should be able to open a few old non state mining roads or trails.

0034852-001

We'd like to express our dissatisfaction on the proposed closures and restrictions to motorized use in the Chugach National Forest. We are snowmobilers, but we also enjoy backcountry skiing, snowshoeing, and hiking.

To our knowledge, there are currently no areas closed to skiing, snowshoeing, etc., but the proposed closures/restrictions to snowmobilers will severely impact access and usability. This is especially true in the Seattle Creek drainage, and at Lost Lake.

While we enjoy motorized as well as non-motorized recreation, we feel that the money spent on goods and services related to snowmobiling and injected into the local economies is disproportionate to that generated by our non-motorized activities and should be repaid with access to our forests and public lands.

Please reconsider and don't restrict any user groups from these lands.

0034856-003

I would urge you to close all of the Chugach National Forest to personal watercraft and airboats. These loud and disturbing (to humans and to wildlife) machines are incompatible with the habitat. I would like to see areas of Prince William Sound closed to personal watercraft, having been harassed by them while kayaking.

0034856-005

Many of us who recreate in the Chugach, whether Alaskans or visitors from elsewhere, go there specifically for the experience of wilderness. As soon as a skier is interrupted by a snowmachine or helicopter, or a paddler is buzzed by a personal watercraft or airboat, the experience of wilderness is forever damaged. Motorized activities have a far greater impact on non-motorized than the reverse. Please weigh these different uses accordingly.

0034872-003

Ban all jet skis and air boats.

0034872-004

Limit ATVs to a few designated, existing roads and trails.

Comment # Comment

0034873-004 5.) I support the winter recreational motorized/non-motorized time share plans at Twentymile River and East Lost Lake. Temporal separation of the uses is an excellent way to share areas we all appreciate.

I would like the Forest Service to consider time share plans on other trails in the popular recreation areas of the Kenai Peninsula. Crescent/Carter Lake, Russian River Trail, Cooper Lake, and Snow River are areas to consider for future shared use plans.

0034875-005

I agree with the limitations on helicopter landings to the Placer River and Eagle Glacier areas.

Specifically, I support the motorized/non-motorized time-share and closure recommendations in the plan, in particular the Twentymile even-odd year timeshare, the Fresno Ridge backcountry ski area, and Winner Creek, Seattle Creek and Bear Valley closures.

I recommend that the following areas be closed year-round to motorized uses: Carter and Crescent Lakes, South Fork Snow River, the north end of the Johnson Pass Trail, and, if they're not recommended as wilderness, the Russian River trail system and the Resurrection Pass Trail.

0034880-002

I did notice that the Kenai Peninsula portion of the forest has ninety-percent motorize access as oppose to ten percent allocated to non-motorized access. Would it be fair to say that only ten percent of public participates in non-motorized activity and is therefore entitled to a smaller area free of competition from snow machines? There is great value to quiet and serenity from noise and motorized recreation. The trend we see in the National Parks is the restriction or prohibition of motorized access (Denali, Yellowstone, and Yosemite National Parks). I would encourage an effort to document impacts to the environment and recreation. This documentation should be used in managing and responding to the need for motorized and non-motorized recreation and the protection of the environment.

Comment # Comment

0034881-001 Non-motorized areas
This has created a gross imbalance between winterized and non-motorized winter recreation opportunities. You have already heard ample testimony that the noise, exhaust, and high speeds of snowmachines create an unpleasant and hazardous situation for non-motorized winter recreationists. Therefore,
Non-motorized winter recreation. I support the proposed expansion of non-motorized winter recreation areas on the eastern Kenai Peninsula, as outlined in the Preferred Alternative of the Draft Plan: Twenty-mile River, Skookum Glacier, Winner Creek, Seattle Creek, Bear Valley, and Lost Lake. However, I propose that the Lost Lake seasonal time-share should close the trail to motorized use on February 15 or 28 rather than the proposed March 31 date.

Possible trade-off of Twenty-mile and Placer Rivers. Twenty-mile River and Placer River to Skookum and Spencer Glaciers are among my favorite places for back-country ski touring. These valleys offer excellent low-elevation winter recreation near Anchorage because of their deep snowpacks and scenic values. A motorized/non-motorized time-share in alternating years for the Twenty-mile River seems like the most enforceable arrangement. If you decide to keep the Twenty-mile River always open to snowmachines, then I suggest you make the Skookum Glacier and Placer River an entirely non-motorized area, as a trade-off.

Additional non-motorized winter recreation areas. There are several additional areas that merit closure to motorized recreation. These are the north end of the Johnson Pass Trail, additional acreage at Manitoba Mountain, and the south fork of the Snow River, Carter and Crescent Lake trail, and the Russian River Trail. In particular, the Johnson Pass Trail and Manitoba Mountain area are well-established cross-country ski areas.

Manitoba Mountain expansion of non-motorized area. I hope the USFS will expand the non-motorized recreation area at Manitoba Mountain for several specific reasons: A) Skiers at Manitoba Mountain may in the near future lose some of their traditional non-motorized recreation area because of the State of Alaska's land selections (the State Legislature has been hostile to creation of non-motorized areas on state land, even within State Parks). Expansion of the non-motorized area on federal land would offset the possible losses on State land. B) A larger non-motorized area will be more enforceable. With the current area, snowmachines stray onto the non-motorized slopes. C) Manitoba has some of the best and most consistent snow conditions for backcountry skiing in southcentral Alaska.

Helicopter restrictions. I would also like limits placed on helicopter landings in areas closed to snowmachines. Otherwise, the non-motorized recreation setting will be degraded. Specifically, I oppose winter helicopter landings at the most popular and accessible backcountry ski areas: Skookum Glacier, Spencer Glacier, Center Ridge (Turnagain Pass), and Manitoba Mountain.

Limit the spring/summer/fall use of ATVs and four-wheel drive vehicles to designated trails in a limited number of valleys. ATVs are causing widespread damage to vegetation, soils and creeks in the eastern Kenai. For example, note the increased vehicle use and proliferating vehicle trails up Mills Creek, 15 years ago, that valley had only a foot track in the upper reaches. I especially urge restriction of ATV use in Prince William Sound, where shallow, wet soils are particularly susceptible to erosion and compaction.

Comment # Comment

0034887-001

Snow Machine Closures that are proposed

When the Draft EIS and the Forest Plan were released and public meetings were held, a new 'alternative' emerged for the Seward Ranger District addressing the issue of year-round snowmachine closures in the Carter Lake/Crescent Lake area and the Russian Lakes Trail area and another area near Summit Lake. This is Mike Kania's Rangers Proposal.

I am opposed to these year round closures for snowmachines for the following reasons:

1) These year round closures do not show up in any of the alternatives that were published in the Draft EIS including the preferred alternative. There was a lot of thought and effort to put together a range of alternatives by many people including the Plan Revision Team. By creating a new alternative now, the Forest Service is bypassing the entire NEPA process of review and comment by the public.

2) These areas have been used by local residents for many years for winter recreation and subsistence reasons. In Page 1-1 of the DEIS, the statement in paragraph two #1 of the Purpose and Need states the following:

'...Establish seasonal timeshares for motorized and nonmotorized activities, allowing for motorized users in the most popular areas'. With year-round closures of snowmachines in some of the most popular areas for local residents, the Forest Service would not be following the stated Purpose and Need for access.

3) The Forest Service would be cutting off winter recreation opportunities for people who are not able to otherwise access the National Forest. This includes people with young children and the older folks or folks with disabilities. Unlike many areas in the lower 48 states which have many good areas for family recreation in the winter months, Alaska's steep terrain and low light conditions combined with the short day light and cold temperatures does not lend itself to many opportunities for these groups of people. The one way that is available to these groups to enjoy the National Forest in the winter is by snow machine. Many people enjoy showing the wonder of Alaska winters to their children (particularly local residents in Moose Pass, Seward, Hope and Cooper Landing) is by taking them by snowmachine into a public use cabin for overnight stays. We did this with our two kids (ages 2 and 5) last winter and even though my husband and I are avid skiers, there is no way we would contemplate this on skis. The kids really enjoyed the experience because they could experience winter but not be subjected to the cold temperatures for long periods of time. Adults can withstand these temperatures for much longer than young children can.

0034887-002

4) I support creating a new area for a winter non-motorized skiing opportunity for families. One such area is polygon K161. This area doesn't receive a huge amount of snowmachine use and the Forest Service could have a series of trails that are for different level skiers. Carter Lake, Russian Lakes Trail and Lost Lake trails are for only navigable on skis for those folks who are expert skiers. These trails are steep and very curvy. These trails are not for families with beginning skiers or even the average skier.

0034897-005

7. You have ignored the needs of disabled and older Americans with 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups of people.

0034897-007

9. We also oppose restrictions on snow machining except on the Tin Can Mountain side of the Seward Highway that has been traditionally closed to snow machining anyway. Tin Can is a popular and awesome site for telemarking and it is appropriate to exclude snow machining there, as it has been either by practice or policy for years.

Comment # Comment

0034897-008 8. We strongly oppose the prohibition on helicopter landings in wilderness areas. I enjoy remote, back country skiing and even though most of the time I get to where I start carving my turns under the power of my own two strong legs, I enjoy and want to maintain the option of accessing remote slopes via helicopter. The supposed negative 'impact' of heli-skiing is a false and overblown claim.

0034898-007 7. You have ignored the needs of disabled and older Americans with 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups of people.

0034898-009

9. We also oppose restrictions on snow machining except on the Tin Can Mountain side of the Seward Highway that has been traditionally closed to snow machining anyway. Tin Can is a popular and awesome site for telemarking and it is appropriate to exclude snow machining there, as it has been either by practice or policy for years.

0034902-001

About closing Lost Lake to snow machines: There are 2 trails to lost lake. Why not close 1 of them to snowmachines, all season. One trail for skiers, one for snowmachines. Why not develop ski trails around the Graying Lake area, or the North Fork of the Snow River area, or in the Summit Lake area, so average skiers and family groups can use them. Experienced Back-country skiers can find places off the beaten trail to ski alone.

20 mile creek area: closing this area to snowmachines is a good compromise. It is an accessible area for Anchorage skiers.

Seattle Creek: Why close this area to snowmachines? Few skiers will ever see it.

About closing Carter Lake to snow machines: The trail up and down the hill, for most skiers, is impossible to ski. They will need to walk. Snow machines break in the trail. Leave it open for snowmachines, or if you must, just open it to snowmachines every other month, or every other 2 week period. Access is very limited, so good signage at the trailhead could easily explain these regulations.

If all the proposed snowmobile closures go into effect, it will greatly increase snowmobile density in the remaining areas, such as the South end of Johnson Pass.

Resurrection Pass is currently closed to snowmachines in February. If Carter Lake is also closed, there will not be any accessible recreational cabins for snowmobilers.

0034904-009

8. The needs of disabled and older Americans have been neglected with likely 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups.

Comment # Comment

0034907-001

Motorized Closures

I also support the full closure of Lost Lake. Currently it is open to snow machines until April 1, leaving almost no time for skiers to enjoy the area.

Please also close snow machine use, at a minimum, on the Johnson Pass trail, the South Fork of Snow River, Fresno Ridge, the Carter-Crescent Lakes Trail, and the Russian River Trail.

The recent availability of snow machine technology to recreational users should not dictate the quality of back-country experiences in the Forest. Snow machine use precludes backcountry skiing and skijoring for me and other non-motorized visitors to the forest. It is simply not worth it to me to share the trail with the number of snow machines that are currently using Twentymile and other readily accessible areas of the Forest. The experience of cross-country skiing in areas open to snow machining is like hiking on the shoulder of Minnesota Avenue.

0034908-001

I support the banning of all motorized vehicles from the Seattle Creek drainage and the Skookum Glacier Valley (including helicopters). There are a limited number of safe, road accessible areas for non-motorized recreation and the above are two places ideally suited to that use of the public Forest lands. Motorized vehicles unacceptably compromise the very values (such as quiet and lack of air pollution) that non-motorized recreationists seek. Furthermore, motorized vehicles can access much larger and more distant areas easily because of their speed. For this reason I support the use of access corridors adjacent to or sometimes through non-motorized areas to allow those with greater mobility to access public lands for their chosen means of recreating.

I comment on these areas and issues more extensively because I know them and the issues around avalanches very well. In this regard I also support the time sharing concept for the Twenty Mile valley and the Lost Lake area. I would advocate for an earlier closure of snowmobiling in the Lost Lake area perhaps Feb. 15 if not a total closure.

Comment # Comment

0034909-001

Please do not close these areas to snowmobile access or use:
20 Mile River
Copper River
Harding Ice Field
Lost Lake
Placer River
Resurrection Trail
Russian River Trail
Skookum Glacier

Closing Resurrection Trail every year to snowmobiles after February 15 is completely unfair. Spring riding is the best riding of the year. I am happy to share any area with non-motorized users. But I am not willing to keep giving non-motorized users exclusive access to some of the best recreation areas. It seems to me the current proposals heavily favor the non-motorized users.

Snowmobiles should not but subject to the same restrictions as other ATVS (dirt-bikes, four-wheelers...) Comparatively snowmobiles cause almost no environmental damage and I would like to see wilderness areas open to snowmobiles.

Comment # Comment

0034912-001

Please do not close these areas to snowmobile access or use:

20 Mile River
Copper River
Harding Ice Field
Lost Lake
Resurrection Trail
Russian River Trail
Skookum Glacier

I really did not care for any of the plans that I saw proposed.
I would rather see a plan that actually shares the public land use.

Closing Resurrection Trail every year to snowmobiles after February 15 is completely unfair. Spring riding is the best riding of the year. I am happy to share any area with non-motorized users. But I am not willing to keep giving non-motorized users exclusive access to some of the best recreation areas. It seems to me the current proposals heavily favor the non-motorized users.

I would much rather see a plan that actually shares all the land with all groups of users. If we can't coexist using it at the same time, then there should be a rotating schedule implemented rather than permanently excluding a group of users from certain areas. It seems the motorized users are always the ones whose access rights are being restricted.

A more appropriate and fair plan would be to have an area open to non-motorized use only for a year and then next year open the area to motorized use. Like in Turnagain Pass, why can't we swap access rights every year? One side open to motorized use, and the other side is restricted to non-motorized use for one year, then each year we would alternate sides. (This has been referred to as 'Time Zoning'.)

I am completely and totally opposed to giving the non-motorized users any more exclusive rights to land use. I am, however, willing to share land usage with them, providing both groups (motorized and non-motorized users) have equal rights and privileges for using the land. 'Time Zoning' areas seems very fair to me. It is certainly a much better plan than to exclude a group of users from accessing public land for the next twenty years.

Snowmobilers need much more room to operate safely than non-motorized users do. So why do we keep seeing more and more restrictions placed on where snowmobilers can ride?

Enforcement on motorized users in the wrong areas is always much more severe than it is for non-motorized users. Lets have some equality here. No restrictions should be enforced, unless there are equal penalties for both non-motorized and motorized users alike.

Snowmobiles should not but subject to the same restrictions as other ATVs (dirt-bikes, four-wheelers...) Comparatively snowmobiles cause almost no environmental damage and I would like to see wilderness areas open to snowmobiles.

That is what this all comes down to, we all have the right to access and use the land. But no one should have more or better rights than anyone else.

0034922-001

1. Because of increasing conflicts among motorized and non-motorized recreationists, your plan must provide a balance that addresses the conflicts. Place restrictions on motorized access into more areas, for example the north end of Johnson Pass Trail, South Fork of Snow River, and Carter/Crescent Lakes and Fresno Ridge. Manage a greater portion of the Kenai Peninsula for non-motorized winter recreation.

Comment # Comment

0034926-008

9. The needs of disabled and older Americans have been neglected with likely 95% of the Forest inaccessible to these groups.

0034929-017

All motorized use should be limited to designated routes. To adequately address ORVs, the Chugach Land and Resource Management Plan should include the following four provisions:

- a) prohibit cross-country travel by ORVs;
- b) only permit existing or proposed ORV use where the Forest Service can demonstrate that ORV use does not result in adverse environmental impacts;
- c) permit ORV use only to the extent that monitoring and enforcement are funded and implemented; and
- d) prohibit motorized vehicle use in legislatively or administratively proposed wilderness areas and other wilderness quality lands including roadless areas.

0034938-002

-- Lost Lake Area. The plan calls for restricting winter motorized use in this area to the period from 12/1 to 3/31 each winter. I cannot support this restriction. Lost Lake is located at a high elevation and, as such, has snow well into April and May. This area is one the last areas on the Kenai Peninsula to have snow each spring.

The area is accessible from the end of Snug Harbor Road - and area which is also high and, thus, snow-covered well into the end of winter. The proposed revisions to the plan seem to discriminate against winter motorized users with this restriction.

0034938-004

-- Recreational Facilities. The plan provides for minimal additional recreation facilities in the Chugach National Forest. I believe it is in the best interests of the public to provide planning guidelines for the establishment of many more facilities in the forest. These facilities include, but are not limited to:

- Enhance access at Johnson Pass (North) Trailhead; including road extension, campgrounds, parking areas, developed ski trails, snowmobile area, etc.
- Enhance access at Johnson Pass (South) Trailhead; including additional parking facilities.
- Enhance access at Carter Lake Trailhead; including additional parking facilities.
- Enhance access at Devils Pass Trailhead; including road extension, parking areas, campgrounds, developed ski trails, snowmobile area, etc.
- Upper Russian Lake/Cooper Lake/Lost Lake Trail System; developed trail system with end-of-road and remote campsites/parking areas and additional cabins, developed ski trails, snowmobile access points, etc.
- Summit Lake; developed parking area, campsites, ski trails, snowmobile access points, etc.

Comment # Comment

0034938-008

-- Land Use Studies. I do not believe that the Proposed Revised Plan adequately considers actual land uses. Specifically, I am concerned that winter motorized users are being crammed into smaller, congested areas while winter non-motorized areas seem to be being set up for what seems to be individual use.

I've seen the changes

in Turnagain Pass - where separate areas have been set up for winter motorized and non-motorized users. On any given weekend, the winter motorized area will be packed with users. On the other side of the road, the facilities are typically less than half utilized. This observation seems to be typical of facilities throughout the forest.

I've made similar observations with the Resurrection Pass Trail. When the trail is open to winter motorized users, the parking lot seems to be quite full on any given weekend. Yet, when the trail is only open to winter non-motorized users, the parking lot is only fractionally utilized.

It is my belief that winter non-motorized users tend to stay closer to home when skiing, snowboarding, snowshoeing, etc. They use the facilities in the more urban areas because it affords them the opportunity to recreate in a shorter period of time. On the other hand, winter motorized users, for the most part, do not have these opportunities. People who use snow machines tend to migrate to the forests for their recreation - it simply goes with the territory.

0034940-002

What ever happened to Alaska National Interests Land Conservation Act, as it relates to access to rights. The Preferred plan as written is filled with restriction and closures by the words of the forest service planning team like (may or may be) these words are found in the executive summary report. Not only do these Preferred Plan designations violate the 'no more' clause of ANILCA they close the door on future exploration and development opportunities. For instant in there Preferred Plan there will be no more new roads or trails.

0034942-011

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative. I attest first hand that there is no critical rationale or circumstance that requires such a drastic preservation oriented approach. In fact, I support more access to the Chugach. Currently the Chugach can only be accessed in a few localized areas. This is ridiculous in such a big Forest. Most other National Forests are much smaller, yet have an abundance of accesses. I support more roads and better roads to our Chugach. I support better facilities, new trailheads and trails, remote campsites and expanded user areas. I support management of motorized and non-motorized user groups - not elimination. I support responsible use opportunities for all users of our future generations. I support decisions made by Forest Service personnel that are not influenced by special interest groups, but rather by law and common sense.

0034946-001

I am writing to express my opinion regarding the management of Chugach National Forest. I have been an active member of the Kenai Peninsula Public Land Users Group (KP-PLUG). I spent days studying manuals, reports, impact statements and maps to familiarize myself with the proposed management plan. I found discrepancies between the impact statements and maps. I feel that the time necessary to digest the proposed plan and inconsistencies in the documents make a thorough understanding nearly impossible. I have taken it upon myself along with other KP-PLUG members to make the most sense possible of the plan and relay that information in laymen terms to those people I feel would be affected by the proposed plan.

I have spoken with hundreds of people regarding the preferred alternative for managing the CNF. Of all these conversations not one or any combination of the concerns warranted such drastic management changes. I believe that the forest service has been influenced by individuals and groups from outside the state of AK that have no such connections to tins state; CNF should be managed for the interests of the local communities. AK has plenty of lands that are closed to access. Because of Alaskan's unique lifestyles there must be SOME lands set aside for current and future generations to enjoy.

Comment # Comment

- 0034953-001 The existing forest plan has worked very well. I am a hunter in the area & have seen more animals than when I started 20 yrs. ago. Alaska is such a vast wilderness anyway, why would you want to shut down what little access we have to begin with.
- 0034953-003 The information & data is biased, it does not take into consideration local input & knowledge. I too, want land & wildlife for my children to enjoy, so I know we need to manage the forest, however if it continues to go on like this, there will be no land left for them to enjoy, because of restricted accesses & uses.
- 0034956-001 This is public lands and should be enjoyed by those who use common sense. The rules set up by our fore father were good for the lands and the people. We are too quick to change. We don't want to lose the use of our lands.
- We want our backcountry open to all.
- 0034967-002 Get with local [Illegible] people and steady the areas affected.
- Get more user groups involved, local people who use this land.
- 0034968-003 Let local user groups have more input.
- 0034970-004 Let the local user groups have more input.
- 0034971-003 Let local user groups have more input.
- 0034972-003 Let the local user groups have more input.
- 0034977-003 I strongly [Illegible] more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions.

Comment # Comment

- 0034982-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake area.
- 0034984-006 Remove all motorized and time share restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake area.
- 0034985-006 Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake areas.
- 0034988-006 Remove all motorized [Illegible] time share restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake [Illegible].
- 0034993-004 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.
- 0034995-007 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake, area.
- 0034996-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake.
- 0034997-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake.
- 0034999-002 Seek and act upon local input regarding the management of Chugach National Forest (CNF).

Comment # Comment

- 0035025-006 I advocate the law under ANILCA-it provides for access rights.
- 0035027-006 I support local resources and individuals have official involvement on all planning and management issues on lands.
- 0035028-006 I support local resources and individuals have official involvement on all planning and management issues on lands.
- 0035039-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake area.
- 0035041-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake area.
- 0035042-005 Remove all motorized restriction & timeshare on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake areas.I support motorized use on Crescent Lake areas, Resurrection Pass areas,
- 0035066-007 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.
- 0035070-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & time shares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake, area.
- 0035128-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.

Comment # Comment

0035138-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and lost lake.

0035139-006 remove all motorized restrictions timeshares on Ingram Creek
& Lost Lake area.

0035140-004 Remove all motorized restrictions and
timeshare schemes on Lost Lake area, resurrection trail system and
Ingram Creek

0035141-005 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.

0035142-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.

0035144-004 Remove all motorized restrictions and
timeshare schemes on Lost Lake area and Ingram Creek

0035145-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.

0035157-007

1) Cannot support the restrictions on access as it [Illegible] to ANILCA 'No
more' clause and other issues.

0035159-002 Trail and
parking lot improvements are the best [Illegible] action to make forest public
lands more accessible.

Comment # Comment

0035160-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Crk. & Lostlake.

0035161-001

I want to see scientific data that supports the needs of more restrictions or closure of US Forest lands. Public lands should be able to be accessed free of charge by all US citizens.

0035162-004 future use or this forest all [Illegible].
Do not make any of the forest land more restrictive than they [Illegible]

0035163-003 2. Considering the size of the area and the current resources available to you - why can't you regulate these areas from year to year instead of defining areas restricting uses which would not harm and areas.

0035165-003

I strongly support the local formation, of user groups (not specifically one type) (skiing snowmobiling, boating hunters) we then could as a group maintain and continue to use and enjoy these lands here in Alaska we love.

0035170-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost lake area.

0035171-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek, Lostlake area.

0035179-004

No motorized restrictions on any land already used we already have to little as is. No restrictions on lost lake or time shares. Lost lake should be accessed any way we feel safest, snug harbor or primrose or Seward. We also need more parking space.

Don't put any restrictions on motorized users. We don't need anymore areas set apart for skiers only, because they don't use the area they have now.

Comment # Comment

- 0035189-002 I would like to see more trails & access into the Chugach - full access not conditional.
- 0035198-002 As a lifelong Alaskan I resent unreasonable limitations being put on public lands - especially when those who want these limits are predominately not these who live work and play in the area, but are outsider interests.
- 0035203-003 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.
- 0035208-003 This restricts the use by current user groups unnecessary to restrict use.
- 0035211-003 I believe that there needs to be more local user involvement in all decisions made by CNF. The way the proposal is written now user groups are [Illegible] against user groups -
- 0035212-003 (1) Expand user group's access & use.
- 0035212-004 (2) Management & local involvement without further restrictions.
- 0035212-007 5) Avoid discrimination of user groups - There's plenty of beautiful land - No further restrictions are needed!!!
- 0035215-003 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.

Comment # Comment

0035224-003	#3 Endorse more local user involvement
0035238-006	Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake area.
0035242-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the Lost Lake area.
0035248-004	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek, & Lost Lake
0035256-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek, & Lost lake areas.
0035257-007	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek, Lost lake area.
0035258-006	Remove all motorized and time share restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost lake areas.
0035260-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost lake areas.
0035263-006	Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on: Ingram Creek, Lost Lake area.

Comment # Comment

- 0035266-007 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake area.
- 0035267-003 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.
- 0035269-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake
- 0035270-007 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshare on Ingram creek & Lost Lake area
- 0035272-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake area.
- 0035274-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Crk. & Lost Lake.
- 0035278-006 Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on Ingram Creek, Lost Lake area.
- 0035282-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the Ingram Creek and Lost Lake area.
- 0035284-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & 'time-shares' from Ingram Creek & Lost Lake areas.

Comment # Comment

- 0035285-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek & Lost Lake
area.
- 0035287-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the
Ingram Creek and Lost Lake area.
- 0035293-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake.
- 0035295-006 Remove all motorized and timeshare restrictions on the
Ingram Creek and Lost Lake areas.
- 0035298-004 Remove all motorized restrictions, and timeshares on Lost Lake area and
Ingram Creek
- 0035302-006 Remove all
motorized restrictions and timeshares on the Lost Lake area.
- 0035306-006 Remove
all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Creek and Last lake.

I support to leave land open for my family.
- 0035308-003 I support motorized use on an Crescent Lake and Lost Lake, resurrection
pass areas, the studies you have are not based on local usage done by
an unbiased firm.
- 0035308-006 remove all motorized restrictions, timeshares on Ingram Creek and Lost
Lake areas.

Comment # Comment

- 0035309-005 Remove all motorized restrictions and timeshares on the Lost Lake area.
- 0035318-002 Do not limit or remove any access motorized or otherwise. We need more access & more trails. Do not restrict.
- Don't limit or reduce any existing motorized access to Lost Lake, Carter Lake or Sung Harbor road or to any other existing snowmachine area. Look for areas that are un-usable to snowmachining to use for skiers.
- 0035325-002 Do not make any lands any more restrictive than prescription 312. Allow equal access and opportunities for all users.
- 0035330-002 No restrictions and closures, I want to see more access, trails, trail heads for multiple users.
- 0035339-003 Make bigger parking areas. Help make more user trail.
- 0035341-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Crk. & Lost Lake.
- 0035344-006 Remove all motorized restrictions & timeshares on Ingram Crk. & Lost Lake.
- 0035348-001 I do not agree with the Preferred Alternative for the Kenai Peninsula. It seems user groups are being set up against each other. I don't see conflict and the access needs to be increased for all at restricted.
- 0035356-001 I have receive more information leave plane alone.

Comment # Comment

0035365-005 remove all motorized restrictions timeshare on Ingram Creek and Lost Lake areas. I support motorized use on Cresnet Lake areas, Resurrection Pass areas,

0035373-003

This land needs to be kept open to the wide [Illegible] of user groups that currently use it.

0035390-001

I personally have been snowmobiling in the areas you are trying to close for over twenty years and you can imagine how I feel about what you are trying to do. In twenty mile valley for one you are so limited on the days riding is possible adding more restrictions are unbelievable, that and in twenty years I have seen no more than 15 skiers in that valley and only two that were more than two miles back in and we had to give them a ride out because it was getting dark on them. Second area I would like to discuss is Seattle Creek where I have never seen a skier. Skookum Glacier is where I always take friends that are not avid snowmachiners such as myself it's easy and just a short ride.

0035406-001

Please accept this e-mail as my stance against the closure of snowmobiling in the glacier district.

0035408-004

Establish a recreation plan that is truly fair & balanced by also closing to snowmachines (either with full closures or time-shares): Johnson Pass Trail (north end), Snow River (South Fork), Fresno Ridge, Carter/Crescent lakes, Russian River Trail, Jack and Sawmill Bays. Helicopter overflights & landings must be greatly reduced. Jet skis and airboats should not be allowed in the National Forest.

Comment # Comment

0035412-001 The Preferred Alternative closes some of the most popular snowmobiling areas in Alaska and so severely restricts use in others, it virtually closes them as well. During the public meeting in Anchorage, I heard several opposing views that had a common theme, that snowmobilers have access to 90% of the forest now and that supporters of non-motorized use only want a small amount closed to motorized use. That argument does not hold water. The foremost reason this view is flawed is this; just because snowmobiles have access to certain areas, it does not mean you can access it. There are areas I would love to ride (or ski) but can't because of severe terrain, obstacles or other impediments. The point is, just because there is forest available it does not automatically equate to an area that can be accessed.

There are arguably some areas well suited to a time share between users, but certainly not on an every other year basis. To place such a restriction on the Twenty Mile River area (or any other area) has the potential to shut out the snowmobiling public for a three-year period if snow conditions don't permit access on the assigned year. This year's snow condition is a case in point. This Prescription will also cause confusion and contempt because some of the public will see riders in closed area accessing their cabins and think either that the area is open or open to just a select few, and they will be correct! The Twenty Mile and the Placer River drainage would be much better served with either an alternate day or alternate week plan. I know that Eklutna Lake uses this type of time share and both user groups seem to like it. (I have skied and ridden there).

Turnagain Pass - Seattle Creek drainage. The USFS Prescription permanently closes this area to motorized use. This is the most nonsensical Prescription of all. The backside (West) of Turnagain Pass is quite possibly the most popular and heavily used snowmobiling area in the entire state. Having this area open to snowmobiles greatly expands the available riding area in the pass. It makes no sense to close this area for quiet recreational opportunities because:

A. This area is known throughout the state for snowmobiling and it has been customarily used for motorized sports for years.

B. Because of its popularity and heavy use, the displaced riders would overwhelm other areas not currently accustomed to or designed for the additional use.

C. Skiers already have exclusive use of the entire east side of the Turnagain area.

D. The back side, currently used by snowmobilers, is so steep, only a very small number of extreme skiers would be able to use an area now used by hundreds of snowmobilers.

E. Skiers would have to access 'their' area through a motorized area.

Crescent and Carter Lakes - This area is accessed in the winter from a trailhead off the Seward Highway near the Trail Lakes Fish Hatchery. The plan calls for an every other year time share. The same argument holds. A more equitable approach would be on an every other day or week time share. The better riding is around Carter Lake and is fairly limited so another alternative would be to leave the Seward Highway access open to machines and the Sterling Access open to skiers.

Lost Lake - The plan closes this area or parts of this area outside of a three-month window 12/1 to 3/31. This area usually has sufficient snow to ride until May. The plan seems to dictate that all areas are open only between 12/1 and 4/30. Openings and closings should be based on snow coverage and not an arbitrary date. It appears that the lake and areas above treeline would be open to access from Snug Harbor even when the Seward Firehouse and Primrose Creek Trails were closed to snowmobiles. Possible alternatives include leaving one of the East access trails for motorized use and one for non-motorized use. It is ridiculous to leave Lost Lake open for skiing activities when many skiers are not going to trek the 6-mile Primrose Trail and hundreds of snowmobilers will. This is a very popular and heavily used area. The Snug Harbor access will just not support the use by a combination of all the other users shut out from the other two access points. It won't.

I am sure I have left out some popular areas, but I think you get my point. Total closure or closures based on an annual basis does not suit the snowmobiling public.

Comment # Comment

0035414-005 The preferred alternative shows the Lost Lake Trail closed to mountain bikes. Why? The map shows Primrose trail as being open to bikes, along with the area around Lost Lake. If any of this trail system should be closed it should be the alpine area around Lost Lake, which gets really muddy and thus heavily impacted by bikes. The lower part of the Lost Lake trail is very durable compared to the alpine area around the lake. So, if the Lost Lake trail is to be closed to bikes, it makes sense to close the area around the lake as well, since that is where the heavy impact is occurring.

0035414-006 1. This is terrible! Horses do enough damage to the trail as it is, and giving them another month will only make things worse. The Devil's Pass trail especially becomes a muddy mess with the fall horse traffic. I think horse use on the trails should be looked at very carefully on a case by case basis, but in general I would have to say that less horses on the trails would be a good thing in my book!

0035544-010 .

With the Whittier Road opening this summer, visitors are expected to increase tenfold to Prince William Sound. Yet the Forest Service does not adequately address the issue in the preferred alternative, instead deferring management to the State of Alaska. The Forest Service should assert its right to ensure federal standards and guidelines are used for meaningful management. Otherwise, this area will be further hampered in its recovery from the Exxon spill. Conservative visitor limits should be set. It is always easier to increase access than decrease it later once damage is done.

0035545-001

The backcountry in Alaska has changed dramatically within the last six years. Only a few years ago snow machines were a rare annoyance to me since I generally picked terrain that was inaccessible to snow machines. I avoided those areas which saw heavy snow machine use. But with engineering advances and increased popularity and acceptance, snow machines now spoil just about any place that is not protected by law or regulation.

In a very short period of time I have found my options dramatically reduced. The areas that are restricted to snow machines that are reasonably accessible are now limited to some parts of the Chugach State Park, a small area of the Talkeetna's that is closed. Tin Can and Sunshine Mountains on the south of the Seward Highway at Turnagain Pass, and Manitoba Mountain.

We did have an era in which Alaska's back country was one of the most fantastic parts of the planet. A place you could go and experience life in the way it was for millions of years: primitive, wild, quiet, and beautiful. But that era is passing as people are now overrunning much of the back country with machines

Comment # Comment

0035545-002 As regards helicopter skiing operations, I think that there needs to be some sort of balance. . . But on the other hand, the helicopter access should be limited. The area around Thompson Pass is over run with helicopters, and could use some restrictions: for instance, the mountains just east of the highway could be left for muscle powered skiers. (Incidentally, I

I think the cat operation at Winner Creek is a good example of sharing and development of backcountry skiing areas near highways. The cat track makes access for skiers such as me, and there is plenty of untracked snow up on the mountains for both muscle powered skiers and tourists paying for the ride in a snow cat. And the snow cat is not an ugly, noisy, annoyance. And the skiers do not put crazy tracks all over that spoil the skiing, as do the highmarkers.

0035546-001

To limit access to a group is not the management tool we need to incorporate on the Kenai Peninsula. There are only a few access points for all of us to use, lets expand our trail system to get more access into the remote areas. Snowmachiners, mountain bikers and ATV riders are already extremely limited to their access points into the back country, to further limit these groups to the advantage of (the most mobile group) is not only not fair it's an outrage. The most use of the back country in the winter comes from the snowmachiners not the skiers. The backcountry in Alaska is so remote and hard to get to that most skiers never get more that 3 or 5 miles off the road system.

I've identified some alternatives to the management plan as follows;

-- Grayling lake and Meridian lakes could be connected and be skiing only

-- The power line from mile 12 to Primrose could be skiing only

-- A new trail from Trail Lake campground to Crescent Lake (Saddle Cabin) using the Logging Road access (already 4-miles long) could be accomplished rather easily. This will give access to alpine skiing as well as the usage of the Saddle Cabin.

There are I believe, alternatives out there that will not require closure or exclusion of access to any one group, I would really appreciate an open mind to the alternative to the proposed management plan.

I would also ask and request that Resurrection Pass trail system be opened to snowmachine use until March 31 st of every year. This is the time of best snow-cover and also the most daylight for use.

0035562-001

My specific comments are to oppose any winter motorized vehicle requisitions in the Chugach National Forest the present plan is already biased toward the use of any motorized vehicles and to regulate this anymore [Illegible]. The forest is a 'vast' wild place and without snowmobiles a very big percentage of it will go inexperienced by anyone most people do not understand the amount of area there is and there is plenty of room for everyone also I would like to make a specific comment about Lost Lake and Crescent Lake Trails. Lost Lake is not open yet this year if it was closing on 2/15 as the plan states we would have less than 8 weeks to ride the best place in the state. There is a trail that begins at mile [Illegible] of the Seward Highway that would be perfect for skiers to prevent conflicts sharing our forest does not have to take place independently there is plenty of room for everyone.

Comment # Comment

0035626-001

I am writing to express my opposition to any increase in motorized use in the Turnagain Pass.

I am backcountry skier and I frequent the Turnagain Pass one to four times a week throughout the winter.

There are very few areas that are appropriate for backcountry skiers near Anchorage due to road accessibility, terrain and consistent snow conditions. Turnagain Pass is ideal for all of the above reasons as has been shown by its popularity this year. One day I counted 65 cars in one of the parking areas on the current skier side.

There are several concerns over skier/motorized vehicle shared areas. Some these concerns that I share include safety issues related to avalanche danger and low visibility/high speed interaction. Motorized vehicle use creates less than ideal snow conditions for skiing in mountainous terrain. The noise and air pollution conditions associated with motorized vehicle use are particularly inconsistent with muscle-powered sports. Finally, any change in use would require a commensurate change in parking facilities.

I hope that in the Revision of the Forest Plan there is no proposed increase in motorized vehicle use in the Turnagain Pass area. Please contact me if you have any questions at the above contact information.

0035627-001

I am writing to express my opposition to any increase in motorized use in the Turnagain Pass.

I am backcountry skier and I frequent the Turnagain Pass about once a week throughout the winter.

There are very few areas that are appropriate for backcountry skiers near Anchorage due to road accessibility, terrain and consistent snow conditions. Turnagain Pass is ideal for all of the above reasons as has been shown by its popularity. The conditions are unique the world-over and will be ruined for skiing if opened for snowmobiling. Snowmobiles will ruin the powder conditions and create a severe safety hazard to any skiers in the area. Snowmobiles already have access to most of the state of Alaska, why should they be given access to a traditionally skiing-only area?

There are several concerns over skier/motorized vehicle shared areas. Some these concerns that I share include safety issues related to avalanche danger and low visibility/high speed interaction. Motorized vehicle use creates less than ideal snow conditions for skiing in mountainous terrain. The noise and air pollution conditions associated with motorized vehicle use are particularly inconsistent with muscle-powered sports. Finally, any change in use would require a commensurate change in parking facilities.

I hope that in the Revision of the Forest Plan there is no proposed increase in motorized vehicle use in the Turnagain Pass area. Please contact me if you have any questions at the above contact information.

0035648-004

The Twenty Mile River area (numerous USFS prescriptions) is a vast area that will not likely see significant non-motorized access. My suggestion would be to leave this area open to motorized use or divided with an every other day time share.

Comment # Comment

0035648-005 Another possible option would be to limit motorized use to a corridor within a certain distance of the highway, Skookum Glacier (portions of USES prescriptions K331/K336) is almost 6 miles from the highway with the entrance to this drainage almost 3 miles from the highway. This distance will limit access by most non-motorized users. My suggestion for this area would be to leave access as currently implemented or utilize an every other day time share. I would also suggest that some of the less popular motorized areas such as Johnson Trail and Resurrection Trail be promoted as destinations for non-motorized or quiet use with every other day time shares. Both of these trails are ideal for non-motorized use.

Within the Seward Ranger District, the Lost Lake area (USFS prescriptions K271/K269/K212/K268/K255) is probably the most popular snowmobile use area on the Peninsula. The preferred alternative reduces motorized access in the 'eastern portion' of Lost Lake through seasonal restrictions. It is not clear what is considered the 'eastern portion'. Does this only include the trails and trailheads? Does this mean that with adequate snow cover accessing the area from the West will be allowed outside of the restricted time period? There are large areas West of the lake that are very desirable for snowmobile use through late spring, but are inaccessible by non-motorized users because of the distance from trailheads. Motorized users access this area from two trailheads off the Seward Highway in the East and from Snug Harbor Road off the Sterling Highway from the West. The West access does not provide adequate access for the number of users this area generates. My suggestion for equitable access would be to leave one of the East trailheads open to motorized users as long as there is adequate snow cover. The district ranger is proposing a time share for the Crescent and Carter Lakes area (USFS prescriptions K202/K203/K88/K179). This area would probably benefit more from an every other day time share which would ensure that the trail from the Seward Highway trailhead is useable by non-motorized users.

The USFS has done a commendable job of compiling alternatives and formatting these alternatives so that the public can determine how the revised plan affects them. I am a registered professional engineer and I have been involved in projects that required an EIS. I have experienced first hand the high level of effort that is required to produce this type of document.

I understand that preparing a planning document is a difficult task and that inevitably someone will not be happy with the results. In this letter, I have attempted to provide suggestions and alternatives rather than just criticize the Forest Plan Revision Team efforts. Please take my suggestions into consideration when finalizing the Forest Plan.

Summary of suggested changes to the preferred alternative:

- Eliminate the every other year time share option and replace with alternating days of the week type of time share option.
- Eliminate calendar day restrictions and set opening and closing dates for winter motorized use based on adequate snow cover.
- Recalculate or reestablish the CNF area open to winter motorized use based on actual riding areas not map area. Present this information in the Forest Plan.
- Leave Twenty Mile River area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists or use an alternating days of the week time share.
- Leave Skookum Glacier open to winter motorized use or an alternating days of the week time share.
- Leave Seattle Creek area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists.
- Promote the Johnson Pass Trail and Resurrection Trail as Quiet or non motorized use trails. If deemed necessary for setting trails, allow motorized use on an alternating day of the week time share.

Comment # Comment

- Eliminate the every other year time share option at Carter and Crescent Lakes and replace with alternating days of the week type of time share option.

- Eliminate the seasonal restrictions for East Lost Lake and leave one trailhead open to winter motorized users.

Comment # Comment

0035648-006

Within the Seward Ranger District, the Lost Lake area (USFS prescriptions K271/K269/K212/K268/K255) is probably the most popular snowmobile use area on the Peninsula. The preferred alternative reduces motorized access in the 'eastern portion' of Lost Lake through seasonal restrictions. It is not clear what is considered the 'eastern portion'. Does this only include the trails and trailheads? Does this mean that with adequate snow cover accessing the area from the West will be allowed outside of the restricted time period? There are large areas West of the lake that are very desirable for snowmobile use through late spring, but are inaccessible by non-motorized users because of the distance from trailheads. Motorized users access this area from two trailheads off the Seward Highway in the East and from Snug Harbor Road off the Sterling Highway from the West. The West access does not provide adequate access for the number of users this area generates. My suggestion for equitable access would be to leave one of the East trailheads open to motorized users as long as there is adequate snow cover. The district ranger is proposing a time share for the Crescent and Carter Lakes area (USFS prescriptions K202/K203/K88/K179). This area would probably benefit more from an every other day time share which would ensure that the trail from the Seward Highway trailhead is useable by non-motorized users.

The USFS has done a commendable job of compiling alternatives and formatting these alternatives so that the public can determine how the revised plan affects them. I am a registered professional engineer and I have been involved in projects that required an EIS. I have experienced first hand the high level of effort that is required to produce this type of document.

I understand that preparing a planning document is a difficult task and that inevitably someone will not be happy with the results. In this letter, I have attempted to provide suggestions and alternatives rather than just criticize the Forest Plan Revision Team efforts. Please take my suggestions into consideration when finalizing the Forest Plan.

Summary of suggested changes to the preferred alternative:

- Eliminate the every other year time share option and replace with alternating days of the week type of time share option.
- Eliminate calendar day restrictions and set opening and dosing dates for winter motorized use based on adequate snow cover.
- Recalculate or reestablish the CNF area open to winter motorized use based on actual riding areas not map area. Present this information in the Forest Plan.
- Leave Twenty Mile River area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists or use an alternating days of the week time share.
- Leave Skookum Glacier open to winter motorized use or an alternating days of the week time share.
- Leave Seattle Creek area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists.
- Promote the Johnson Pass Trail and Resurrection Trail as Quiet or non motorized use trails. If deemed necessary for setting trails, allow motorized use on an alternating day of the week time share.
- Eliminate the every other year time share option at Carter and Crescent Lakes and replace with alternating days of the week type of time share option.
- Eliminate the seasonal restrictions for East Lost Lake and leave one trailhead open to winter motorized users.

Comment # Comment

0035648-007

-- Leave Twenty Mile River area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists or use an alternating days of the week time share.

0035648-008

-- Leave Skookum Glacier open to winter motorized use or an alternating days of the week time share.

-- Leave Seattle Creek area open to winter motorized use as it currently exists.

0035648-010

-- Eliminate the seasonal restrictions for East Lost Lake and leave one trailhead open to winter motorized users.

0035649-001

I support the proposed expansion of non-motorized winter recreation areas on the eastern Kenai Peninsula, as outlined in the Preferred Alternative of the Draft Plan: Twenty-mile River. Skookum Glacier, Winner Creek, Seattle Creek, Bear Valley, and Lost Lake. However, I propose that the Lost Lake seasonal time-share should close the trail to motorized use on February 15 or 28 rather than the proposed March 31 date. Additional non-motorized winter recreation areas. There are several additional areas that merit closure to motorized recreation. These are the north end of the Johnson Pass Trail, additional acreage at Manitoba Mountain, and the south fork of the Snow River, Carter and Crescent Lake trail, and the Russian River Trail. In particular, the Johnson Pass Trail and Manitoba Mountain area are well-established cross-country ski areas. Helicopter restrictions. I would also like limits placed on helicopter landings in areas closed to snowmachines. Otherwise, the non-motorized recreation setting will be degraded. Specifically, I oppose winter helicopter landings at the most popular and accessible backcountry ski areas: Skookum Glacier, Spencer Glacier, Center Ridge (Turnagain Pass), and Manitoba Mountain.

0035728-004

The preferred alternative shows the Lost Lake Trail closed to mountain bikes. Why? The map shows Primrose trail as being open to bikes, along with the area around Lost Lake. If any of this trail system should be closed it should be the alpine area around Lost Lake, which gets really muddy and thus heavily impacted by bikes. The lower part of the Lost Lake trail is very durable compared to the alpine area around the lake. So, if the Lost Lake trail is to be closed to bikes, it makes sense to close the area around the lake as well, since that is where the heavy impact is occurring.

I also noticed in the preferred alternative that horse use on some trails will be allowed as early as June

1. This is terrible! Horses do enough damage to the trail as it is, and giving them another month will only make things worse. The Devil's Pass trail especially becomes a muddy mess with the fall horse traffic. I think horse use on the trails should be looked at very carefully on a case by case basis, but in general I would have to say that less horses on the trails would be a good thing in my book!

Comment # Comment

0035824-001 I have a concern regarding winter access for snowmachines. With the vast wilderness that Alaska has to offer to its residents and visitors, I disagree with the idea of limiting snowmachine access to areas close to Anchorage, in particular Twenty Mile Valley and Skookum Glacier Valley.
We have seen a growing number of visitors opting for skiing and snowmobiling as a pre- or post-convention activity. Limiting access to these two areas severely impacts the ability of our visitors to experience the beauty of the Twenty Mile and Skookum Glacier area.

Please reconsider the issue of eliminating snowmachine access to these two areas.

0035962-001 I hope the areas at the head of Turnagain Arm do not get closed to motorized access even though their use is often limited by weather. My wife & I have enjoyed snowmachining in that area with many friends in past years & would like to see it remain open.
It is particularly more enjoyable than Turnagain Pass due to the steep terrain & avalanche danger. We have introduced many of our friends to snowmachining in those valleys.

Comment # Comment

0036008-001

In a very short period of time I have found my options dramatically reduced. The areas that are restricted to snow machines that are reasonably accessible are now limited to some parts of the Chugach State Park, a small area of the Talkeetna's that is closed. Tin Can and Sunshine Mountains on the south of the Seward Highway at Turnagain Pass, and Manitoba Mountain.

The Lost Lake trail is a beautiful trail and I climbed Resurrection Peak two summers ago. I would never go there when snow machiners use it. But I would use the are for late winter skiing trips if it were to be closed to snow machines.

For this reason the plan should also close the Grandview area.

Last winter I telemark skied in the Winner Creek area. For reasons I do not understand, I saw only the snow cat and skiers. No snow machines. This is a great telemark/back country area and should not be ruined by snow machiners.

Years ago, I skied up the Johnson trail several times. I have not gone back for years because of snow machine use. It would be nice if the north end of this was closed to snow machines.

As regards helicopter skiing operations, I think that there needs to be some sort of balance. On one day when I was up the Skookum there was a helicopter taking skiers up the mountains on both sides. I did not mind and I believe that this type of use is compatible. But on the other hand, the helicopter access should be limited. The area around Thompson Pass is over run with helicopters, and could use some restrictions: for instance, the mountains just east of the highway could be left for muscle powered skiers. (Incidentally, I am 53 years old and plan to keep climbing for many years, without helicopters, cats, etc.).

I think the cat operation at Winner Creek is a good example of sharing and development of backcountry skiing areas near highways. The cat track makes access for skiers such as me, and there is plenty of untracked snow up on

the mountains for both muscle powered skiers and tourists paying for the ride in a snow cat. And the snow cat is not an ugly, noisy, annoyance. And the skiers do not put crazy tracks all over that spoil the skiing, as do the highmarkers.

In conclusion, I urge you to maximize areas that closed to snow machines. Keep them out of the Chugach National Forest areas I have mentioned, and out of many more. Remember, those areas where they are allowed are fundamentally changed for the worse.

With respect to helicopters and snow cat operations, I urge genuine sharing, with sensible regulation.

0036072-004

While the plan closes some areas from snowmachines I would like to see these areas added: Johnson Pass Trail (north end); Snow River (South Fork); Fresno Ridge; Carter/Crescent Lakes; Russian River Trail; Jack Bay and Sawmill Bay. Jet skis and airboats should not be allowed in the Chugach. Other quieter means for water travel are more appropriate.

Helicopter use should be curtailed, they are noisy, disruptive to people and wildlife, they are affordable to only a few. Please limit commercial use, flight seeing, and landing sites.

Comment # Comment

0036171-001

WE have trapped, fished, hunted, crosscountry skied and snowmachined all over the Russian lake trails resurrection trails and surrounding areas for over 25 years now and have made a living doing it.

All this just to keep a hiking trail from getting wet. We still crosscountry ski and snowmachine and hike etc.. all these areas individual and as a family and enjoy these areas. As a skier/hiker you can use it 100 % of the time put as a motorized user you are limited. It is suppose to be equal use.

0036172-001

I have specific concerns about motorized access restrictions in four areas.

- Lost Lake - USFS prescriptions K271/K269/K212/K268/K255: Again, the time any area in the park is to be closed should be based on snowfall not specific dates. I would like to see access to the lake remain available to motorized vehicles from both ends of the lake. Maybe the East side access could be restricted by a time-share method. From the plan, I understand that only the access is being limited. Lost Lake is one of the premier destination spots for snowmobiles. I feel access should be available for all recreationalists at any given time.
- Turnagain Pass - Seattle Creek Drainage - USFS prescription K076: This area should remain open to motorized use. Turnagain Pass is already successfully divided among motorized and non-motorized users. Please do not further confine our area of use by allowing a closure of this area.
- Twenty Mile River: I do not like the time share proposed for this area. As I mentioned before, 'Every other day' would be much more appropriate. This is a very large area and I feel both motorized and non-motorized users should be able to use this area at the same time.
- Skookum Glacier - Placer River drainage: I do not feel a permanent closure is an appropriate way of restricting use by any user. A more appropriate resolve would be to have a 'Every other day' time-share. I am opposed to complete closures.

My experience when skiing in the backcountry has never been ruined by the presence of motorized vehicles. Quite often a group of snowmobilers will come by but they are always moving, and in no time they are out of sight and sound of our activity. Please do not allow these restrictions that affect motorized use in the CNF. I want the park to be available for myself and my kids if they choose to go snowmobiling.

Comment # Comment

- 0036178-002 I would hope the USFS would at least consider:
1. adding to the Manitoba Mt area to include slopes on the east side of the highway to Summit lake
 2. some sort of closure to machines on the Resurrection trail system
 3. some sort of percentage goal, say 10% for non motorized winter use areas on the Chugach
 4. closures in other areas identified by non motorized backcountry users

It's my hope that your actions can insure that future back country users can find areas of the Chugach that are, to quote Robert Service, as 'plumb full of hush to the brim' as possible in this hectic age of ours.

0036179-001

Please include my name on the list of people opposing the proposed motorized recreation closures in the glacier district. Any further restrictions are not needed and not fair to the very large and growing number of snowmachiners in the state of Alaska. Unfortunately, motorsports are plagued by a few 'bad apples' that receive a great amount of media attention. The majority of motorsports enthusiasts are responsible people, as are the majority of enthusiasts to non-motorized sports. We shouldn't all suffer for actions of a few.

0036195-002

I believe the proposed changes are the agenda of a small special interest group and that the majority of people in the area are satisfied with the current plan. Please do not let a small group of people shut off access to country that my family and I have enjoyed for years.

0036200-001

I understand that there is legislation regarding more land closures here in Alaska. Specifically, along Turnagain arm and down the Kenai. I believe this is not in the best interest of Alaskans. Somehow I cannot feel that there is other motives behind it. Certainly, our great state can accommodate all: snowmachiners, skiers, dog mushers alike. The land is much to vast that it cannot be shared. While I agree there are certain areas that are fragile and should be left that way I cannot help but feel this is hardly the case. It appears the land closest to Anchorage suddenly has taken on different meanings. Additionally, the land will feel the stress in other areas that will be overused by the snowmachining community. What about those areas? What about the much needed revenue brought in by snowmobiles to areas that primarily rely on tourist money. I hope that all aspects of this issue is looked at closely and fairly before such judgment is made.

Comment # Comment

0036234-001 There are only a few spots with access to the backcountry on the Kenai Peninsula.
To limit access to a group is not the management tool we need to incorporate on the Kenai Peninsula. There are only few access points for all of us to use, lets expand our trail system to get more access into the remote areas. Snowmachiners, mountain bikers and ATV riders are already extremely limited to their access points into the back country, to further limit these groups to the advantage of (the most mobile group) is not only not fair it's an outrage. The most use of the back country in the winter comes from the snowmachiners not the skiers. The backcountry in Alaska is remote and hard to get to that most skiers never get more that 3 or 5 miles off the road system.

I've identified some alternatives to the management plan as follows:

Grayling lake and Meridian lakes could be connected and be skiing only
The power line from mile 12 to Primrose could be skiing only
A new trail from Trail Lake campground to Crescent Lake (Saddle Cabin) using the Logging Road access (already 4-miles long) could be accomplished rather easily. This will give access to alpine skiing as well as the usage the Saddle Cabin.

There are I believe, alternatives out there that will not require closure or exclusion of access to any one group, I would really appreciate an open mind to the alternative to the proposed management plan.

I would also ask and request that Resurrection Pass trail system be opened to snowmachine use until March 31st of every year. This is the time of best snow-cover and also the most daylight for use.

0036239-001 I recommend that backcountry non-motorized users get their fair share: 50% of the management units within a three hour hike (via skis) should be closed to motorized uses. The north end of Johnson Pass should be closed; heli-skiing and sightseeing should be vastly cut back; Lost Lake (which we skiers have really lost) should be closed to machining after Feb. 15

0036264-001 Equal access to ALL our public lands is a right to ALL user groups. The closure of the Chugach National Forest is a blatant disregard for the right of the public to access our public lands. The closures of such public access is one in which outside interest groups are regulating public lands in which the local residents are being left out of the process.

Compromise and equal shared access is of utmost importance. Our public lands are for public use and not for exclusive user groups. Public lands are for the public and not meant to be kept from the public. The current proposal put forth by the Forest Service is heavily biased against equal access to all user groups.

0036306-003 There are areas in the state, which have designated non-motorized recreation areas and done so successfully, for example Hatchers Pass and Turnagain Pass. There needs to be more recreation sights, which can be utilized, by skiers. One suggestion is closing Bean Creek Trail to snow mobile use and allowing snow machines on Juneau Falls trail head. This allows both snow machines and skiers to have access to Juneau lake cabins.

Comment # Comment

0036306-004 Other suggested closure to snow machine usage include Johnson Pass Trail Head on the north end, Snow River south fork, the slope behind Summit Lake Lodge, Fresno Ridge and south 1 mile to state land, Carter/Crescent Lakes, Russian River Trail, Jack Bay, Sawmill Bay, and Marshall Pass.

0036311-001 Please do not close these areas to snowmobile access or use:

- 20 Mile River
- Copper River
- Harding Ice Field
- Lost Lake
- Resurrection Trail
- Russian River Trail
- Skookum Glacier

Closing Resurrection Trail every year to snowmobiles after February 15 is completely unfair. Spring riding is the best riding of the year. I am happy to share any area with non-motorized users. But I am not willing to keep giving non-motorized users exclusive access to some of the best recreation areas. It seems to me the current proposals heavily favor the non-motorized users.

A more appropriate and fair plan would be to have an area open to non-motorized use only for a year and then next year open the area to motorized use. Like in Turnagain Pass, why can't we swap access rights every year? One side open to motorized use, and the other side is restricted to non-motorized use for one year, then each year we would alternate sides. (This has been referred to as 'Time Zoning'.)

I am completely and totally opposed to giving the non-motorized users any more exclusive rights to land use. I am, however, willing to share land usage with them, providing both groups (motorized and non-motorized users) have equal rights and privileges for using the land. 'Time Zoning' areas seems very fair to me. It is certainly a much better plan than to exclude a group of users from accessing public land for the next twenty years.

Snowmobilers need much more room to operate safely than non-motorized users do. So why do we keep seeing more and more restrictions placed on where snowmobilers can ride?

Enforcement on motorized users in the wrong areas is always much more severe than it is for non-motorized users. Let's have some equality here. No restrictions should be enforced, unless there are equal penalties for both non-motorized and motorized users alike.

Snowmobiles should not but subject to the same restrictions as other ATVs (dirt-bikes, four-wheelers...) Comparatively snowmobiles cause almost no environmental damage and I would like to see wilderness areas open to snowmobiles.

That is what this all comes down to, we all have the right to access and use the land. But no one should have more or better rights than anyone else.

Comment # Comment

- 0036319-001 I use my own private airplane, snowmachines, skies, snowshoes, ATV, river boats, canoes, ocean skiff, and other personal modes of transportation to access the back country of Alaska.
- 0036319-004 (3) The Local Public Opinion is not supporting your 'need to Change' or your many proposed changes. Out of the hundreds of actual 'back country users' I have talked to, less than 5% think additional restrictions and separations are the solutions to the situations that exist between user groups. The other 95% agree that:
More - not less, trails and access points for all users to the back country
Improve not remove the trails we already have for all users
Maintain and manage the existing recreation facilities we have for all users and add more as possible
More user involvement in a spirit of co-operation
are some of the real answers to congestion and other minor problems in the C.N.F.
- 0036321-003 -- Lost Lake Area. The plan calls for restricting winter motorized use in this area to the period from 12/1 to 3/31 each winter. I cannot support this restriction. Lost Lake is located at a high elevation and, as such, has snow well into April and May. This area is one the last areas on the Kenai Peninsula to have snow each spring. The area is accessible from the end of Snug Harbor Road - and area which is also high and, thus, snow-covered well into the end of winter. The proposed revisions to the plan seem to discriminate against winter motorized users with this restriction.
- 0036322-010 -- Prescriptions ignore utilization and access issues. The Chugach is immediately accessible in very few places. Roads and facilities are few. Conditionally restricting areas directly adjacent to access points, closing roads, and limiting activities to campgrounds, virtually eliminates the majority of use and users of the Chugach. Again, a total preservation tone.
- 0036322-011 In fact, I support more access to the Chugach.
Currently the Chugach can only be accessed in a few localized areas. This is ridiculous in such a big Forest. Most other National Forests are much smaller, yet have an abundance of accesses. I support more roads and better roads to our Chugach. I support better facilities, new trailheads and trails, remote campsites and expanded user areas. I support management of motorized and non-motorized user groups - not elimination. I support responsible use opportunities for all users of our future generations. I support decisions made by Forest Service personnel that are not influenced by special interest groups, but rather by law and common sense.
- 0036335-001 This letter is in response to the Closure of the Chugach National Forest in several locations on the Kenai Peninsula I want to go on record to let all know that I oppose the closure of Lost Lake, Resurrection Trait and all others areas to Snowmobiling or any other means for that matter.. It is unfair for you to close these areas knowing this.
- 0036337-001 As an outdoor enthusiast, I oppose the recent plan of the Forest Service to deny access to certain areas on the Kenai Peninsula and other parts of Alaska to Snowmachines, Bicycles, ATV's, Watercraft, and horses. This plan would eliminate some groups altogether and allow certain groups to have access only a few months of the year There should be equal and shared access for all user groups year round without regard to special user groups on public land.

Comment # Comment

0036574-015 The Access Management Plan also does not address the marine waters as the primary form of access to many parts of the Forest. Revised Forest Plan, Appendix C. The Plan addresses 'Road Management' and 'Trails and Route Management,' but does not consider managing recreational and commercial access on the tidelands and marine submerged lands throughout the Forest. Consequently, the Access Management Plan fails to address the modes of transportation used to access the marine environment. The Access Management Plan must address the marine waters, including the locations where such access occurs and the appropriate modes of access such as cruise ships, fishing vessels, power boats, personal watercraft, kayaks, rafts, and other vessels, etc.

0036576-001 Please revise your current Forest Plan to increase snowmobile access. Our access is already too limited with ending date the end of March. Also the Resurrection Pass Trail must be opened to snowmobiles from December 1 through April 30 of each year.

It would be a huge error to close Carter Lake and Crescent Lake areas to snowmobilers. This is a popular area for families to recreate. It is also a problem to close Lost Lake or any other area to snowmobiling. Skiers have access to these areas literally 10 months out of the year in good snow years. Any more restrictions are simply inappropriate and unfair.

I implore you and your group to put aside any personal feelings regarding motorized vehicles. You must make a decision based on what is right. Multi-use trails are the correct option. Lifting snowmobile restrictions is right. When you answer the questions of the skiers, remind them of the dates in which they can ski around the December 1 through April 30 dates.

0036612-004

The South Fork of the Snow River and the North end of the Johnson Pass Trail should be a snowmachine timeshare. Lost Lake should be closed to snowmachines on Feb. 15,