

SAR - Forest Plan - Chapter 3 - Rx Categories

Comment # Comment

0026812-003 Throughout the preferred alternative preservation is the prevailing emphasis, which is a singular rather than multiple use of the public resource. Of the eight alternatives, including the No Action and Preferred, six are heavily weighted towards preservation and only two provide for any multiple use management. Of the 22 prescriptions used in the alternatives, 1 allows for future resource development, 1 allows for current mineral development, 1 pertains to transportation/utility systems and 19 are preservation oriented. Rather than a reasonable range of alternatives and a realistic combination of uses, the public is asked to comment on what amounts to varying degrees of preservation. The plan is so biased that it appears better suited for a national park management plan.

0027580-001 There is no analysis of the impacts wilderness designations would have on access to private inholdings, adjacent private lands, or potentially developable land within the forest. Throughout the preferred alternative preservation is the prevailing emphasis, which is a singular rather than multiple use of the public resource. Of the eight alternatives, including the No Action and Preferred, six are heavily weighted towards preservation and only two provide for any multiple use management. Of the 22 prescriptions used in the alternatives, 1 allows for future resource development, 1 allows for current mineral development, 1 pertains to transportation/utility systems and 19 are preservation oriented. Rather than a reasonable range of alternatives and a realistic combination of uses, the public is asked to comment on what amounts to varying degrees of preservation.

0027589-003 D. It is apparent when establishing the 'Prescriptions' for review, the plans revisors viewed this revision primarily from the recreational aspect. Mineral resources and other traditional uses were not given equal value in determining the suggested revisions to the plan.

0034873-003 I would like to see the designation changed from 'N' (not permitted in the management area) to 'C' (allowed if consistent with management intent, standards, and guidelines) in the following management prescriptions:

- 501(b)-2
- Backcountry Motorized
- Backcountry Groups
- Developed Recreation - reduced noise
- Transportation/Utility

Comment # Comment

0034942-006

After reviewing all the proposed alternatives, it is clearly evident that the extreme environmentalists had great influence. Preservation seems to be a prevailing tone. Proposed prescriptions and categories are clearly biased toward extreme environmentalism and the desire to eventually eliminate any use of the Chugach. Of the dominant 22 prescriptions used in the alternatives, 19 are preservation oriented. The plan ignores a reasonable range of alternatives, which represent multiple use, or a realistic combination of uses. There is no indication that the plan will benefit all United States Citizens as set forth by Forest Service mandate.

In this mind-set, there will be no need for the Forest Service at all, because there will be nothing left to manage. It will already be managed to its maximum and totally preserved...forever. Our National Forests will become National Parks. It is unlawful for the Forest Service and extreme environmentalists to restrict the Chugach National Forest beyond the intent of Congress and the Forest Service's own governing laws.

There is no doubt that local user group conflicts may exist. This is a result of access and facility limitations coupled with current user restrictions and past land preservations. These conflicts are nothing that can't be settled locally in the basement of our town halls. There is no need for Federal mediation. Mediation does not mean restrictions and conditions. Mediation means management by the Forest Service involving local groups. Further restricting the Chugach will only exacerbate these conflicts. It will only be catering to the agenda of one group.

Although it is nearly impossible for the average person using our National Forests to understand the proposed alternatives, by studying your plan I have become aware of some very important and stunning issues:

- The Forest Service did not offer a reasonable range of alternatives with a reasonable combination of uses. The Forest Service biased the alternatives with only several levels of preservation available for comment. The plan ignores a full range of alternatives, which represent multiple use, and a combination of uses. The plan refuses to acknowledge all users. It seems there is much to lose and nothing to gain here....and for no good reason.
- It is unfair that the Forest Service has taken over three years and eight million dollars to come up with proposed alternatives that leave only two months for user comment. Given the biased tone of the alternatives, the vast complexity of the numerous alternatives, prescriptions, and existing laws mandating the Forest Service, this is insufficient and unacceptable. Obviously, further public input is needed.
- Furthermore, there are misleading errors and inconsistencies within the alternatives that the public has not yet been made aware. This is wrong. It is imperative that Americans clearly understand, without question or unknowingness, what the plan means. The Forest Service has a duty to inform the public of the errors immediately.
- Most importantly, it is evident that the Preferred Alternative ignores section 501(b) of ANILCA by further restricting use and assigning specific prescriptions within the Chugach. ANILCA specifically states that multiple use activities are permitted in these areas consistent with conservation offish, wildlife, and recreation.
- The 1976 National Forest Management Act (NFMA) requires the Forest Service to revise the Plan every 10 to 15 years. The Forest Service has twisted the intent of 'revise' to mean 'further and conditionally restrict'. Revising the Plan could mean to farther and unconditionally broaden the use of our Chugach. It could mean more access and the potential for more use. Although no Alternatives would suggest this.
- Unbelievably, the alternatives totally disregard any social, traditional, cultural, historical, and economic impacts. The Chugach lies in a State where these issues are critical, not only to Alaska, but to America. Alaskan Natives have traditionally used these lands for subsistence and survival. Local generations have hunted, fished, and recreated in the Chugach for hundreds of years. Studies of these issues are clearly missing. Again, the impacts are critical.

Comment # Comment

- The Forest Service fails to recognize that National Forest Service lands in Alaska are unique. Those who use the Chugach can only appreciate the sheer absence of populations, user groups, roads, access, facilities, development and exploitation. Input from those who are not ultimately familiar with the Chugach could be considered erroneous. Form letters and doctored up e-mails can't be seriously considered. Most people from California have no idea what the Chugach really has to offer. How could they? Conditionally restricting the Chugach farther makes sense only to those who will never use or see it.

- Surprisingly, the Preferred Alternative is not backed by the substantiation of up-to-date, unbiased scientific studies and data. I found some data used to be over 20 years old and very inaccurate. A modern geophysical survey does not exist. Mining data used is 70 years old. Brown Bear Core areas are mysteriously established and include no proof of where or why they should even exist. A Brown Bear count in this area is unavailable. Unbelievably, local fish, game, and wildlife experts have not been contacted. Scientific data is absent. Considering telemetry studies as scientific information for establishment of Core areas is ignorant.

- There is no study revealing the impacts that wilderness designations would have on access to private and public lands, or development of potential lands within the Chugach. Should we wait until after the fact to address these issues? Of course not.

- The Preferred Alternative does not allow for potential resource development, and it leaves only a minute portion available for mineral development, transportation and utility systems. There are no provisions for mitigating, harvesting, and reforestation of hundreds of thousands of acres of Spruce Bark Beetle infestation. Not only is this a fire hazard for residents in the area, but it is an economical disaster. Once again, a total preservation tone.

- 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.

- The Preferred Alternative encompasses and manages waters that are already managed by the State of Alaska. Given the importance of Alaskan fisheries, this is a major conflict and a contradiction of law. Who will have authority to manage?

I strongly oppose the Preferred Alternative and all the proposed Alternatives. Six of the Alternatives are strongly preservation oriented and only two provide for slight multiple use management. They do not guarantee my rights to the Chugach National Forest as specified by law. They are too restrictive and conditional. They support a singular and prejudice use of our public resources (preservation) rather than a multiple use. They are a poor excuse for managing the Chugach. Finally, they over-step the intent of our National Forests and the intent of Congress. We can not live 15 years with the Preferred Alternative or any of the Forest Services Alternatives!

I support that the Chugach National Forest Lands be designated without further restriction in any way, without more conditions. 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.

Most of us have busy lives. We assume the Forest Service will manage the Chugach sensibly and without influence. We assume environmental special interest groups, politics, money, and red tape come second to the laws set forth mandating the Forest Service. We assume you people will do what is right, for the benefit of ALL American People. We assume when NFMA required the Forest Service Plan to be 'revised' every 10 to 15 years, that 'revised' did not

Comment # Comment

mean, 'further conditionally restrict'!

I was extremely disappointed after reviewing the Alternatives. It seems the goals of our Forefathers who established our National Parks mean nothing. I pray that someday my young children will feel and see the experiences I have in the Chugach. Telling stories of 'how it used to be' isn't going to satisfy them.

I'm all for environmental friendliness in our National Forests. But I will not support conditional and eternal preservation and the restriction from its use. Why would I?