# SAR - FP - Interests - Recreation

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0021417-001 | Revision Chugach National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan<br>Forest Plan Revision<br>Alternative Development Comment Period<br>Chugach National Forest<br><br>The Chugach National Forest is currently revising the Forest Plan. This spring, the Forest Service will develop a range of land management alternatives based on public input. A public comment period is open until April 15th to provide input into alternative development.<br><br>The Forest Plan Revision has the potential to effect a wide variety of forest users, recreationists as well as people who make a living from natural resources. If you would like to provide input to the Forest Plan Revision, please contact me at (907) 271-2560 or Alan Vandiver at (907) 271-2474. If you have access to the Internet you may be interested in looking at the information posted on our web site at (www.fs.fed.us/r10/chugach/revision). |
| 0021557-001 | All of our uses of the Forest are non-motorized--backcountry skiing, backpacking, hiking, climbing, and sea kayaking--we advocate establishing non-motorized, quiet areas of the Forest to the greatest extent possible. If it is not feasible to establish such areas permanently or year-round, then we would support a fair and balanced allocation of Forest resources by timeshare, but only if such sharing is easily enforceable and will be enforced. The 'odd-year/even-year' or time-of-year restrictions seem more easily enforceable than area limits in remote parts of the Forest. |
| 0021791-002 | I recognize the need to accommodate increasing recreational uses in the Cordova district and PWS and I support it. I agree that there are areas that are managed with lower develop (see back) |
| 0021915-001 | 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, Dave Gibbons, 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.<br><br>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. |
| 0022472-001 | I am writing in support of some priority for skiing in some parts of the Chugach. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0023114-001 | |
| | I like - the balanced recreation opportunity, recommendation. |
| 0023149-002 | SECTION 2. That the existing trails and parking lots be upgraded for use by both snowmobiles and cross-country skiers in partnership with the federal, state, and local governments. Intergovernmental agreements should be made regarding leasing or exchanging land reasonably necessary to accomplish this goal.<br><br>SECTION 3. The Kenai Peninsula Borough also supports the federal government's giving grants or allowing private recreational groups to form partnerships with the federal government to improve or build trails or parking lots.<br><br>SECTION 4. That the Forest Service Plan consider building new access trails for cross-country skiers in appropriate locations in order to alleviate safety issues and conflicts with snowmobile use. |
| 0026585-007 | |
| | If new access routes open up due to logging activity etc., it should be planned AHEAD for recreation uses before the uses dictate the planning. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0028289-013 | The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum could provide an effective management tool for the respective Districts but as it is defined in the DEIS, the ROS standards are unclear and too loose. For example:<br><br>-- Encounter is not defined in the DEIS. The definition is fundamental to understanding the intent and management direction. Does it mean there must be contact amongst the parties? Are both parties on the shoreline in an encounter? Is one party on the shoreline and one party in the bay? Is it an encounter if both parties are in the bay? All of these definitions would necessitate a different set of numbers in your class characteristic chart.<br><br>-- The number of encounters outlined in the Primitive and Semi Primitive Non Motorized (SPNM) classes are too high if the definition of encounter applies only to the uplands. I recognize that this list reflects the national ROS guidelines but PWS is unique. The small percent of usable land i.e. the beaches and forest under-story necessitates a lower number of encounters.<br><br>-- If the number of allowed encounters is not changed or the definition of encounter is not expanded to include the water then the cap should be lowered for Recommended Wilderness.<br><br>-- How will the numbers be managed within an ROS setting? Are the numbers allotted by acreage within an ROS?<br><br>-- The ROS map should be included in the DEIS for the public to analyze. If all of the prescriptions are capped with a SPNM ROS then the mapping is critical. There is a significant difference in experience between encountering fifteen parties versus six parties a day.<br><br>-- The map would also be critical for analysis for the Semi Primitive Groups ROS where the group size is 100 for Category Two prescriptions.<br><br>The Recreation Activity Intensity Levels by Prescription<br><br>-- The table lists the number of lodges, visitors, landings etc. per site but not how many sites within a prescription allocation? I understand the numbers are generalities but it is difficult to fully evaluate the effect of a prescription without understanding the cumulative impacts. The intensity of use is a critical component to defining the reality of the prescription.<br><br>This activity table highlights the need for a comprehensive cumulative analysis. Small, incremental development could prevent the Forest Service from achieving the overall management objective. |
| 0028386-002 | I urge consideration and support for the hut system proposed by the Alaska Mountain and Wilderness Huts Association. |
| 0028397-005 | I do not support the addition<br>of any more recreation cabins. I would support the removal of existing cabins. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0029464-005 | RECREATION OPPORTUNITY SPECTRUM (ROS) CAPACITY<br><br>A. The Outfitter Guide Capacity in the Backcountry Prescription would best be set at a 50-50 ratio with the general public (rather than 70% general recreation and 30% commercial), Studies indicate that guided trips usually have a lower impact that private recreation and with a 50-50 mix we would able to still support the same amount of recreation in these lands, but with a minimized amount of harmful impact. |
| 0029464-010 | B. Strongly suggest that management plan be altered to allow USFS Special Use Permittees to utilize campgrounds as other members of the public are allowed to do through use of the established campsite reservation and fee systems. |
| 0034794-003 | , I support the proposal to delineate exclusion areas for motorized access to provide opportunities for other recreational endeavors such as hiking, fishing, canoeing, hunting, and wildlife viewing, which<br>are not compatible with and degraded by motorized recreational vehicle use and other development activities. |
| 0034991-002 | I demand more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0034993-003 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C. N. F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035164-002 | On CNF recreational management, please hold more local meeting. |
| 0035166-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035172-003 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035177-004 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0035183-005 | I strongly recommend more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035185-003 | We strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035194-002 | I also strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035203-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035205-002 | Strongly endorse more local uses involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035210-003 | t pits user groups against each other - I believe more local user involvement in all CNF recreational decisions would help. |
| 0035215-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035218-002 | We strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035219-002 | 1. I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decision. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0035220-003 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035221-001 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035230-002 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035231-002 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035234-002 | I strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035235-003 | There needs to be more local user group involvement in recreational management decision. |
| 0035247-002 | We strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035252-003 | We strongly endorse more local user involvement in all CNA recreational management decisions. |
| 0035267-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |

| Comment # | Comment |
|---|---|
| 0035275-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035310-002 | 1. I demand more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035321-003 | I would strongly support & endorse more (Local) user [Illegible] in all CNF recreation/management decisions. |
| 0035328-002 | I strongly endorse more local users/resident involvement in all recreational/ [Illegible]/usage and management decision. |
| 0035367-003 | We should be informed when and where a recreational land use management [Illegible] is proposed. |
| 0035368-002 | Strongly endorse more local user involvement in all C.N.F. recreational management decisions. |
| 0035565-003 | What specific comments do you have on the Proposed Revised Forest Plan?<br><br>We strongly endorese more local user involvement in all CNF recreational management decisions. |
| 0035649-009 | Camping in western Prince William Sound<br><br>Western Prince William Sound. I support development of a network of camping destinations, spaced to accommodate kayakers, extending outward from Whittier in western Prince William Sound. Some site development for campers is essential to protect shores and uplands from increasing recreation use. |