

# *Land Management Planning*

## *Comment # Comment*

- 0005-003 Qualitative impacts must be evaluated and not ignored, i.e. logging on adjacent lands to the National Forest.
- 0010-001 A portion of Chugach National Forest is located within the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage. Of particular interest to the Municipality is the Turnagain Arm area. The Municipality of Anchorage and the State of Alaska recently developed land management plans for its land holdings and areas of jurisdiction within this area. They are the Girdwood Area Plan and the Turnagain Arm Management Plan, respectively. We urge that any activities proposed for National Forest lands within the Turnagain Arm area be consistent with these two plans.
- 0012-003 (If a Plan can say "The USFS will follow NGPA," it should!
- 0012-005 Management for biological diversity includes statistically designed monitoring--baseline before impacts, then follow-up. Require statistically-designed assessments before logging (even salvage logging)
- 0014-002 A second reason to withdraw the list is that much of the land covered by some of the listed areas is owned by the State of Alaska or by private parties. To include these lands in a federal restrictive designation is asking for conflicts and problems in the future.
- 0014-004 Fourth, covering private or state lands and valid existing rights (VERs), including mining claims, in W&SR designations will greatly increase the difficulty of the USFS to manage the affected areas of federal land. Every possible attempt should be made to not include VERs in any such designation, and existence of such VERs should be a strong basis for not including an area.
- 0014-005 Finally, the very act of studying areas in Alaska for addition to any form of conservation system unit (CSU), including Wild & Scenic Rivers, is illegal since the passage of ANILCA. ANILCA stated that there were to be "no more" set asides, unless specifically authorized by the Congress. Studying forests for new land management plans is allowed but studying the forests for inclusion in CSUs is not. Some would argue that only "studies... for the single purpose of considering the establishment..." are prohibited. Such a narrow interpretation would mean that any time a land management plan was being revised, the area could be considered for any of the six or more types of CSU designations. This was clearly not the intent of ANILCA. It is now our understanding that the notice of revision is also a notice of scoping for the EIS that will be written to support the Revision. This is not clear from the notice. Some of these areas have been mined almost continuously up to 100 years. We again urge you to withdraw this list.
- 0021-004 #4. Of course the current travel mgmt. plan needs revision The number of users wanting access via roads, trails, etc., is skyrocketing. Let the people (owners) get to their park lands.
- 0021-005 #3. Keep the 1.7 million acres from the '84 plan wilderness. Open up the other 4,000,000 acres. This is the people's land. Let them use it.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0039-001 Any forest management plan, especially one that involves a national forest with its competing interests, should manage for biological diversity as the utmost concern. Recreation, timber harvesting, etc. should play a secondary role to maintaining biological diversity. If diversity of life systems is considered most important, then the competing interests of recreation, tourism, timber harvesting or other uses will fall into place. If biological diversity is primary, then vegetation management will be done with a progressive point of view. The management will reflect what is good for maintaining the life systems, not what is good for timber interests. This sort of management requires reflection, honesty, and a concern for higher values beyond profit, greed bred by dishonesty and misplaced values. I worked for the Alaska Lands Act many years ago and have visited the state.
- 0049-001 Designations of "Wilderness Areas" and "Wild and Scenic Rivers" restricts management of the resources.
- 0069-008 The Chugach National Forest is truly unique among our National Forests. It is mostly composed of wilderness, yet is accessible to the largest urban area in the state and is visited by thousands of Alaskans and non-Alaskans every year. Keep it as it is, as much as possible. Let nature take its course and manage it only to protect it from further development.
- 0070-001 The new plan should stress the long term recreational and tourist goals fostered by leaving the forest in as natural a state as possible. Roadless, unlogged areas, scenic rivers, no motors, hopefully fewer snow machines, minimal hunting, catch and release fishing (except salmon) are the true valuable resources the Forest can provide. Better management is costly and senseless - forget it.
- 0094-001 I feel it is important to manage the Chugach National forest for it's wilderness characteristics, along with its importance for providing valuable fish and wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities within a wilderness setting. Wilderness and the opportunity to enjoy it will only become more uncommon in our increasingly over-populated world and our Federal Lands should be and will be the most important place to find this precious resource.
- 0099-004 4. It's time to place limits on human impact in the Forest. NO MORE SELLING OUT!!!
- 0118-004 3) Large-scale commercial logging should be discouraged by limiting the size of timber sales and by eliminating road building subsidies. 4) Clear cutting should be eliminated.
- 0120-001 (1) It is important that the Forest Service continues to keep an open mind and balance the use of the forest between all user groups. Any special interest group which is greedy and selfish to the point of wanting other groups banned from using parts of the forest should not be considered since the forest is there for all to use and as U.S. citizens we should all have equal use of the land.

*Comment # Comment*

0128-001 Chugach National Forest. Plan Don't give away the farm; that is, abandon the application of multiple use principals in favor of the imagined interests and needs of tourism and recreation (read preservation vs. non-extractive uses). The anti-use reactionaries are not representative of the intelligent public that is well informed as to the fundamental role of national forests and the economic as well as aesthetic resources they contain. As a forester whose entire career was interpretation related, I am well aware that, serious minded citizens, until they are tainted by the propaganda of the 'tree huggers', are supportive of the lands of many uses idea. That the public generally is becoming increasingly concerned that husbandry of all resources needs to be on a sound ecologic footing is a plus, which, however, doesn't amount to much of a change from long established silvicultural practice. The Forest Service, in part through its research arm, has continually looked for and initiated better ways of managing the renewable, resources: Management prescriptions are constantly subject to change based not only on forest science but on the changing needs of society. There continues to be outstanding opportunities for managing large areas of the Chugach for timber production. While acknowledging that most observers of clearcut areas consider this a destructive practice (some people will never learn, or, rather, may never be reached with correct information presented clearly and competently) it would be prudent to limit timber operations to areas out of sight of roads and traversed waterways. Also, in order to educate the public about the science and practice of forestry, it would be prudent to establish demonstration timber harvest areas that are effectively interpreted and publicized. The imagery of incompetence, distrust, and insensitivity that is attributed by the reactionary preservationist crowd to foresters and the Forest Service generally is a deliberate distortion of reality. Because they don't know better, many of the most influential political leaders at all levels pick up the same cudgel as they join the anti-timber and other resource use camps. For this reason, it is essential that the Forest Service and its friends change this attitude by conveying through use of all media straight forward, honest, impressive accounts of appropriate and effective resource management. I see no mention in the Forest Plan material for a most fundamental need related to planning, management, and public use. This need is knowledge, education; interpretation. A constructive relationship between the agency and the public cannot be achieved without understanding. The Forest Service must be impelled to keep the public informed on a continuing basis and not as defensive reaction. From my point, of view, as a long retired federal employee, it is rare that I see an interesting, informative, and pleasing story about foresters, forestry, and national forests. Some Regions, the Alaska Region being one, don't even keep in touch with their retirees, who most certainly should qualify as advocates or, perhaps champions, of the outfit. As for the Interpretive Services function on the Chugach, the story told at the Begich-Boggs Visitor Center, while very interesting in itself does little to tell the larger story of the Chugach; Wherever appropriate, as aspects of multiple use the resources of timber, wildlife, water, minerals, and the rest warrant interpretation.

0128-002 Does the Forest Interpretive Plan adequately incorporate all aspects of the Forest mission?

0129-001 To ensure by diligent participation and acceptance on the part of CNF that "Quiet" users deserve an outdoor experience devoid of unnatural and intrusive sounds such as from motors. Non-motorized recreationalists deserve equal and equally valuable (accessible, scenic, etc.) areas in which to enjoy CNF. Mapping and discussing these areas will be necessary, along with, I'm sure, some agreeing and disagreeing with motorized user groups over land designation. We'll look forward to working on this!

***Comment # Comment***

- 0131-001 The name Forest Plan indicates that the main thrust is forest. In that context is the future of life for the forest; for life of this planet; for the life of earth's inhabitants; Therefore the chief issue is forests. Now to preserve forests, the source of life. This preservation is accomplished by not clear cutting. by elimination if pollutants by study and research in maintaining healthy forests. by permitting introduction of compatible species of all life within the boundaries and keeping of all current species, with prudence. Keep the main attention on maintaining all forests as the foremost program in Land Management.
- 0135-001 For the record... most important is that all lands within Alaska be turned over to Alaska (management & ownership). The USDA Forest Service & BLM should be removed from all 50 sovereign states. Federal land jurisdiction within the states are defined in the United States Constitution of America under Art. 1, Sec. 9, #17... any federal laws, statutes, or regulations do not pertain to the Sovereign Citizens of the Sovereign States. Remember that the constitution was written to "control" government not the people. The people are sovereign, government is the "people's" servant
- 0137-001 I am bothered by the use of "the ability of forest ecosystems to supply goods and services in response to society's demands." The greatest value Chugach National Forest has to society is in its undisturbed natural beauty. I believe it is important that this is understood, because it can help you determine how you will "manage" the forest. Came to Barrow to see the impact of unlimited humanity on the tundra. Go down to the lower 48 and imagine the beauty of the ILLEGIBLE states before civilization began its demands of goods and services.
- 0139-001 I am very concerned that for Exxon Valdez trust monies are being used to develop tracts of land in the sound-in landlocked bay in particular, for park purposes. This under the guise of "habitat protection". None of the impact statements I have reviewed make mention of this proposed development only "maintain habitat", "protect area and habitat", "prevent damage to cultural resources" "Protect subsistence uses" PLEASE HELP STOP THIS FRAUD AND UNDERHANDED DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY! I am a landowner in landlocked Bay and request your assistance in this problem ILLEGIBLE!
- 0143-001 I am writing to make comments during the scoping period for your Chugach Forest Land Management Plan. Here are my comments: the Chugach is one of the few national forests without a single acre of designated wilderness. I recommend that you make protection of existing roadless areas and designation of them as wilderness a top priority in your planning process.
- 0144-001 As you proceed through your planning process, I feel it is extremely important that you recognize and integrate the Chugach plan with other land plans on adjacent and intermingled lands. In the Cooper Landing area these include: 1. Kenai River Special Management Area Plan, State Parks 2. Kenai Area Plan, State DNR 3. Upper Kenai River Plan, USFS, State Parks, Fish & Wildlife 4. Kenai Borough Land Plan, Cooperlanding Advisory Planning Commission Activities such as Timber Harvest, Recreation, Track & Roads, Fish and Game Management, and resource protection are not confined to one ownership, but must be coordinated with adjacent land managers.
- 0146-004 The new forest plan should not be based on opinion polls. Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived Impacts to the forest.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0146-007 - The Forest service should incorporate a tourism strategy into the new plan in order to accommodate growing numbers of visitors. The plan should provide for new visitor opportunities.
- 0148-001 I would like to see Congress from the Copper River Delta into a National Wildlife Refuge. Can the Forest Service help make that happen?
- 0149-001 Prince William Sound is changing; changing rapidly and not for the better. Every year the concerns voiced by our staff grow more desperate. Stories of trampled vegetation, trash, missing wildlife and overcrowding reflect the increasing pressure on the ecosystem. hopefully, the long awaited revision of the Forest Plan will play a significant role in reversing this trend. The preliminary revision topics successfully identify the critical issues threatening the health of the forest but there are specific topics necessitating close scrutiny in the development of the alternatives.
- 0149-003 Secondly, as a result of already significant use increases, there are limited options for remote wilderness opportunities. The Forest Service needs to take a proactive approach to uphold the qualities of the Wilderness Study Area. As a result of complex land ownership ILLEGIBLE, preservation of the Wilderness Study Area will require coordination
- 0158-001 If it ain't broke don't fix it. This country is being strangled to death with regulations. I am tired of losing my freedom bit by bit. My freedom is being lost due to things such as this crap. The Forest Service should take care of our forests and be left alone to do so. If the government could be trusted to keep promises it might be ok, but they cannot be trusted on anything.
- 0163-002 I want an allowable sale quantity of less than 5 million board feet per year
- 0165-007 The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council has acquired many Native corporation lands within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest. Most of these lands will be managed by the Forest. It would seem that as a component of its overall management plan the Forest should address specifically how these particular lands will be managed.
- 0165-009 The Forest Service should recognize that the primary estate is the subsurface estate. On the considerable land holdings where the Forest Service has acquired management over just the surface estate, it needs to have a working arrangement with the subsurface estate landowner. A plan for managing these split-estate lands should be a part of the overall land management plan.
- 0165-010 All too often in the history of Alaska actions have been taken by the federal government which have had inadequate preparation and analysis, and which turn out to negatively impact the local communities. Don't let that happen here. Please intimately involve your local communities and landowners as you make decisions on how the lands in their back yards will be used.

***Comment # Comment***

0171-001 I am a 17 year Alaska resident, a writer, videographer, naturalist and carpenter. For twelve of my years in Alaska, I have resided near enough to Chugach National Forest for many explorations into this beautiful and powerful wild region. Over the last year I have been active in public education and input regarding State Park developments at Bird Point along Turnagain Arm. I co-produced a short video: Bird Point -- A Rare Jewel in Our Hands which advocates for careful and sustainable developments at Bird Point. It is exciting that a new forest plan for the Chugach is being developed at this time. I have not had much time to research the current plan, or the course of development for the new forest plan. As a result I do not know what has already been established relative to my requests for new management opportunities and directions. Over the last few years I have been writing about the ideas outlined in these comments. This is the first time I am sharing them in writing beyond my computer screen. The work I have been doing falls within a public land management direction I call "soft land management." I believe the concepts and relationships I am describing here are fairly unfamiliar within the context of traditional public land management plans. Because of this a substantial portion of my comments is an explanation related to the specific request I have for the new forest plan. At this stage I will simply share these ideas with you in a general sense. Details can come later, as desired. As the process continues. I will be delighted to further correspond and meet with Forest Service management.

## *Comment # Comment*

0171-002

What I want to see included in the new forest plan is a window, or an opportunity for future developments, of what I am terming: "Bioregion Research and Education Areas". A BRE area as conceived, is, a scaled down wilderness area designated specifically for public research and education. The focus is human and societal development through interaction with the aesthetic resources of intact wild regions. The long range vision is for individuals and groups to have opportunities to make personal journeys or pilgrimages if you will, into places of natural beauty and power. Here they will have a range of choices for professional guidance and infrastructure within fields of wilderness education, adventure, ecology, personal development, holistic healing, group dynamics, communications, mediation, wilderness survival and subsistence etc. BRE areas are conceived as public land use for training and education in many applicable disciplines or interests. As conceived, these BRE areas will be joint ventures involving federal and state natural resources agencies, public education and social service agencies, private sector businesses and nonprofits. The BRE areas will support local economies based on these joint ventures. I will use my own business as a hypothetical example of a joint venture project: A local small business called Evolution Communications works through information age technology and natural places of beauty and power to offer a variety of services in individual, family and community development. I and a consortium of other related small businesses work with the forest Service, and various State agencies to establish a retreat center and school of esthetics and whole human development in the natural setting of an intact old-growth forest ecosystem. Our clients range from business executives to high school drop-outs. The execs come to take off their suits and let go into a journey they forgot they've always dreamed of A magical journey under their own power into an enchanted wilderness where they reconnect with a sense of greater purpose in their lives, rekindle their spirit of adventure and discovery, and learn how to be kids again. The drop-out outs come to try on some new suits of personal power, integrity and interaction. The backdrop for all this is nature -- living, breathing evolving presence of being inseparable from ourselves, yet sometimes elusive in the lifestyles many people live. As conceived, the bioregions will be defined by natural borders of topography, waterways. ecosystems and habitats, and will be large enough to support a minimum level of peripheral human developments relative to nature research, education and interaction. The BRE areas will be complete watersheds of streams or rivers, from headwater ridges to ocean estuaries, inter-tidal zones and the coastal waters within National Forest boundaries. Each BRE will eventually have research and education facilities and low impact basic human need support services. The heart of the BRE is roadless, with minimal motorized access on the periphery. A primary research component of the BRE area is exploring, learning about and documenting the natural processes and functions of the bioregion in a whole systems methodology. The goal is for public immersion into the interaction of natural forces in an intact wild bioregion -- to understand and experience the interaction of earth, water, wind, energy and living things in a natural living laboratory. The focus is experiential learning and education about the natural forces around one and within. The BRE area is specifically managed for these purposes. It's tourism and recreation with a decided focus. The education component of the BRE area is the constantly evolving product of the research and development programs. As conceived, it will be an interconnected, modular and diversified education curriculum for various components of society. In a natural intact wild region there exists a powerful, beautiful, dynamic spiritual energy and presence. It is the living creation in which we all live. Within natural intact human beings there exists this same energy and presence. A primary goal of the BRE area and "soft management" policies is to assist people in establishing or re-establishing their connection to nature -- within themselves and in common with the people and world around them. This is a general description of a fairly extensive management direction and discipline. It is what I am inspired to involve myself in. I believe the time is right for such use of public land, and that an Opportunity is before us to pioneer these new directions with the revision of the forest plan for the Chugach. I am at your service for further developments along the lines of the scenarios I have described here. The important thing to establish now, and what I am asking for in the new forest plan is a written policy window enabling future designation of one or BRE areas (watersheds) in the Chugach, As the comments review team, WHAT DO YOU THINK? Please let me know your recommendations for how to proceed from here. Perhaps you can pass on these comments to various people in the Forest Service who would be interested in working with me on these management directions.



***Comment # Comment***

- 0178-005 4. The communities of Prince William Sound are dependent on the National Forest for many aspects of their existence; meetings to provide opportunities for effective input on localized elements of the plans should be held in each community.
- 0178-009 Many of our shareholders live within the Chugach National Forest some of this Corporation's future business development will occur on lands adjacent to Chugach National Forest lands; it is therefore important that the revision of the Forest Plan incorporate management decisions that fully recognize the needs of those living and working within the area as the priority.
- 0179-003 3. It is increasingly important for there to be cooperative management agreements and cooperation between the Forest Service and the various. Native corporations whose lands are adjacent to Forest Service lands. Provisions should be made for coordinated planning for access and development where appropriate, as well as expedited property exchanges and use permits.
- 0179-004 4. The communities of Prince William Sound are dependent on the National Forest for many aspects of their existence; meetings to provide opportunities for effective input on localized elements of the plan should be held in each community.
- 0179-006 Many of our shareholders live within the Chugach National Forest, some of this Corporation's future business development will occur on lands adjacent to Chugach National Forest lands; it is therefore important that the revision of the Forest Plan incorporate management decisions that fully recognize the needs of those living and working within the area as the priority.
- 0182-001 Concerned about the move away from multiple use on the National Forest - National Forest are for multiple use which includes, timber harvesting, and mineral development. Concerned that there is not a geologist on the planning team, would like to see a geologist on the team. Would like the Forest Plan to address minerals as a specific resource including planning for further access and development of mineral resources on the Chugach National Forest. Would like to see some areas of the forest designated for commercial logging, increased tourism facilities, and mineral development.
- 0187-001 I work as an outdoor educator in Anchorage. I teach whitewater rafting, canoeing and sea kayaking mostly to people who live in Anchorage. I consider the following rivers and glaciers particularly important to recreational boaters: Sixmile Kenai River Columbia Glacier -- accessible by sea kayak Copper River (Upper & Lower) Since there are so many people that use these areas I would like to see managed growth. This includes: primitive camping areas, primitive launch areas, better river maps, more access to rangers, more human waste facilities (especially on the Kenai, Sixmile, at Chitna on the Copper. As a non-motorized boater (canoe & kayak) I am in favor of designated some rivers for non-power boat traffic only. It is also very difficult for rafters to raft through the fishing chaos on the Kenai during the summer fishing months. Sorry I don't have any solutions for this; I just recognize it as a problem. I'd like to see canoes and kayaks allowed on Portage Lake. Kayaks are allowed near all of the glaciers in PWS. I don't find mining and boating very compatible. I support all efforts to curtail mining on recreational rivers. Thanks for the opportunity to comment. I am very glad to see the Forest Service becoming more involved in recreation and less involved in tree harvesting.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0190-001 The current revision map does not appear to identify areas suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mining exploration. Is this an oversight? Or has the Forest Service already predetermined what is the best use of the land? Each year the Forest Service comes up with a new phrase for "Lock-up." Some years it is biosphere; at other times it "Wild and Scenic Designation." The residents of Cordova have hunted, fished and used the Chugach Forest for recreation as well as serenity. Any attempt by the Forest Service to further restrict access will be objected to by most of the Cordova residents. It is crucial that the U. S. Forest Service not impose a "Top Down" management plan. Each of the communities in the Prince William Sound is different and has different socioeconomic needs. I remain entirely unclear on how the Forest Service and the Exxon Valdez Trustees fit together. Because so little is known, the concern grows. How does this new partnership fit together? How do citizens fit in? The residents of the Prince William Sound must not be left out of the government's view of what is "best for them."
- 0191-001 Although the current revision of the Land Management Plan is intended to reflect the changes in environmental, social, and legal conditions that have come about since the original plan was initiated, there are several issues that need to be addressed. The current revision map does not address those areas identified as suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mining exploration. This information must be identified on information given to the public, so that the public can provide informed input into the revision process.
- 0193-004 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. Needs/desires of all aspects of our society IMPROVING THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST MANAGEMENT SITUATION Think about the areas and issues of concern that you have just written about. With your concerns and interests in mind, identify an improvement to the Chugach National Forest management situation. An improvement may be an action, project, or management approach that you think would be both desirable and feasible. 1. Q. How could the Chugach National Forest management situation be improved? Is this a short term or a long term improvement? Describe the improvement - be as specific as possible. 1. A. Develop well planned access points for a broad range of individuals that would limit impact on the overall forest. 2. Q. Why is this improvement desirable? 2. A. Would provide controlled access and use by all citizens without serious impact on the existing forest 3. Q. How is this improvement feasible? For example, who might be responsible for implementation? How might your improvement be funded? Be as specific as possible. 3. A. "National" forest would suggest federal funding, at least federal leadership 4. Q. What obstacles currently stand in the way of making this improvement? How might those obstacles be overcome? 4. A. Public misunderstanding of problem/lack of sympathy Federal Supervisors 5. Q. How does this improvement relate to other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation? 5. A. We see similar improvements in other locations as Seward highway
- 0195-002 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. Human beings are part of the ecological environment. Pass regulations protecting the environment but not restricting human access or use of needed resources. I want to be able to go camping or fishing or hunting. Build a campfire, walk on the land, not, just float by and look at it.
- 0195-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Animal habitat, watershed protection
- 0207-001 Vegetation Ice field I would appreciate a new layer of data indicating Ice field and forested and the percentage of overall forest. Long Term Information accessibility is essential in easy reference for discussion

***Comment # Comment***

- 0207-004 A. US forest service political pressures to develop and produce needed resources. John Muir vs Pinchot - Direct study of preserved lands, conserved lands and Wilderness Areas. Chugach is massive being the 2nd largest. Why not be the best managed and the largest wilderness preserve within multiple eco zones.
- 0210-002 All of the issues need to be addressed collectively/wholistically in order for the Forest to be successful. For example, logging beetle killed spruce cannot be managed without considering brown bear habitat ducation of Joe Public during the whole planning process so that support is built over time. People who are currently out of the loop
- 0217-001 Change is occurring - so rapidly in our watershed that a meeting every 13 years is not often enough. Meeting more often on a specific issue might keep your job from being overwhelming. If we met in 1996 on logging and in 1998 on tourism, people might think/learn more completely about a subject. The 6th year, could be overview, then the 8th & 10th on issues again, like fisheries, transportation, etc. It would require working together with local governments, other agencies, nonprofits on a regular basis. Funding could be shared. Outreach to citizens would be a major goal, education on the issue would happen in small doses in a variety of media. Everybody has own turf & own areas of interest. It is the integration of expertise, interests & abilities that would make it work. People have to be allowed to think "long term" and "bit picture," and learn more, and make adjustments as prudent.
- 0219-001 A. Agencies could agree to have different levels meet to draft a coordinated plan (while maintaining individual areas of expertise) A coordinated plan could address maintaining each (ILLEGIBLE) stability across boundaries as animals & people cross. Re: Education After listening thought - Go to senior citizen center as they can't safely get here for meetings . . . & think of the (ILLEGIBLE).
- 0221-001 1. A. Discussion sessions need to be ongoing to keep up with constantly and rapidly changing forest use & need situations. 10 to 15 yr. intervals between management plan revisions will not keep up with changes.
- 0221-002 2. A. Undesirable forest activities will develop beyond the ability of management plans to control.
- 0224-006 What each group needs - involve the forest service to develop management of access opportunities.
- 0225-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Obviously whatever ends up in the CNF Mgt Plan will influence how these issues are addressed how they are resolved and to what degree they are impacted both on the CNF lands as well as adjoining public lands.
- 0228-002
- 0228-001 The process of developing the plan - That developing the plants not included as an issue - River use, Kenai Lake use, tour boats out of Seward - More cabins, camp grounds: on road system, boat access -> Be able to maintain existing facilities.
- 0229-003 It's hard for people to see the underlying patterns, structure in such complex issues. People don't know how to start. The vehicle is this USFS Plan Update Process - an expansion of the collaborative process to engage people in clarifying/identifying indicators.
- 0229-004 Look at watershed & watershed groups to create the plan. P.S. I'd like to have copies of existing plan available to get a sense of what works & what doesn't - what is left out & already included.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0229-005 A. EDUCATION across issues as an element of the FS mission, plan, management, budget, operations.
- 0229-009 Plan Revision can be catalyst & critical ingredient in educating re unique resource of CNF while simultaneously creating partnerships to support sustainability long term.
- 0229-011 Obstacle: apathy A way out: 1) make personal contacts & invitations 2) ask for a 1-time only participation - short term commitment makes it easier to come) (unlikely that those who come won't continue) to be involved
- 0229-013 Outdoor contact from perspective of significance and awareness of ecosystems has been demonstrated to be single most influential factor in changing attitudes and creating environmental (ILLEGIBLE). Ultimately, the greatest force in changing the future of the planet. Critical that USFS plan invite people to meet & learn sense of place. It does not happen by itself anymore in the (ILLEGIBLE) society. Move for mind map Talk w 4 others 40 min
- 0230-004 The collaborative approach applies well to many issues in the plan. The difficult part is segmenting these issues in a meaningful way & and into meaningful regions. For example: ORV use on the Copper River Delta is likely to have a very different set of constituents & user groups than say snowmobiling on the Kenai Peninsula, or helicopters out of Girdwood.
- 0231-001 Designate the headwaters of the Kenai River (under F.S. management) a special management area. Work with local citizens to determine what that might be.
- 0231-002 Local group offer to hold & advertise meetings inviting local interested organizations & citizen to agree in what a special management are for Kenai River headwaters may look like and how it will function. F.S. is always responsible for implementation but report for management approaches will come from local users. F.S. can help process by providing information & personnel. Local group should have own funding and should consider this process part of their mission.
- 0231-003 Need to involve public in F.S. plan revision. -> Management of F.S. lands for protection of health of natural resources/ecosystem (among other things). -> Easier enforcement issues because of local buy-in.
- 0231-004 Management that protects ecosystem function to maintain biodiversity of forest & resources important to human communities (ie, salmon, tourism)
- 0231-005 Can the F.S. develop an education program that relates economic health to ecosystem protection.
- 0231-006 People -> community groups; diversity of users groups, ecologists, economists Views -> local uses of forest; how to maintain health of ecosystem, compatible economies uses & management
- 0232-001 Consider the possibility of charging user fees which would be kept by of the forest, i.e., fishing, hiking, hunting, wildlife viewing. This would mitigate the perverse incentives that now exist to choose logging/roading over other multiple-use activities & help promote ecosystem integrity. Under no circumstances would this approach be allowed to damage an ecosystem.
- 0232-004 This approach would have wide-ramifications which would allow the Forest Service to focus mgt. resources on service provision based on demand for services - i.e. amt. of fees paid in aggregate for a given service.
- 0232-005 Science Ecosystem integrity True citizen input to the planning process Ending federal subsidy to loggers for road building Collaboration among federal, state, native & local organizations in planning process

***Comment # Comment***

- 0233-001 ZONING - Could happen in short-term. Designate areas that are quiet, and areas that are motorized. It allows both type of private and commercial recreational user to enjoy the forest, not just the motorized. No extra funding required, unless there is presently no funding for monitoring & enforcement. Lack of agreement that quiet areas should be designated. Talking together? Not only recreational user would be affected. Accessible wilderness, scenic beauty, and opportunities for quiet are rapidly being lost in southcentral Alaska. A large number of forest users are therefore being denied the opportunities to enjoy the forest.
- 0235-006 It helps simplify a complex set of issues that are on the Kenai and PWS by dividing them up for managers. It provides clearer information to base other decisions. It provides better information on use patterns and brings in funding. Helps in management - reduces need to clean up after users.
- 0236-003 Kenai - management of State/private land, they have the bulk of the problem.
- 0236-005 PWS - provide for commercial access/tourism but limit the numbers. F.S. does not manage the saltwater - states does.
- 0237-002 Scenery is not a sufficient goal. Scenery plus the whole outdoor experience of natural quiet, weather, wildlife needs to be in the equation. Scenery is what one gets from a tour bus and does not begin to describe the wilderness experience. Natural quiet needs to be in the management plan as a natural resource. Communities surrounding the CNF.
- 0240-004 One improvement: The need to address consumerism as a way-of-life - as was done with cigarette smoking to reduce pressures on legislatures to allow non-sustainable timber cut quotas at expense of less destructive use values. Desirable Feasible Use an educational approach that shows the public exactly what is involved when stewardship of the forest is sacrificed to non-sustainable values. At stake is a national treasure which people from their particular view points don't see. If they saw the larger picture and how their use impacts it impossibly detriment always, they might be more willing to reexamine their practices to take account of the common as compared to their individual good. I think here we can learn much from the anti-smoking campaign which, in a relatively few years, focused attention on the larger picture - the detrimental effect of second-hand smoke on the non-smoker. Once aware of the harm caused to air quality by smokers, public concern developed into a non-smoking campaign whose success, I believe, even surprised those who first proposed public smoking bans. Narrow vision & self-interest. Narrow vision - educational campaign as indicated above self-interest. Maybe leave a system of compensation in place for those whose living is impacted by a greater stewardship approach to the Chugach Forest. Make restrictions in use necessitated by stewardship more acceptable and palatable.
- 0241-001 Citizens - Present and Future Generations Wildlife all species - fish conservation for use by Citizens Recreation - both motorized and non-motorized - access in general Scenic Beauty through access and preservation. Polarization - pro-development vs preservation not finding middle ground. I believe development forces have legitimate goals and can both economically and responsibly extract resources. Preservation will help to ensure future generations through wilderness etc. Limit such as no net loss. Science All concerned must accept compromise. One situation that must be addressed is litigation. John Shoen - Science that biologically looks at ecology of systems & species and disseminates information to Public. Set up some specific areas for commercial development - Salvage Logging, mining, road access development, motorized uses.
- 0241-003 Give citizens opportunity to exercise their rights without conflict, designation. It only involves small areas it would require compromise and create science for following phase. Stepping stone process. Trying to tackle too much at once. Mediation becomes necessary. Litigation must be removed involving principle and must address fundamental scientific concerns. They can be instituted to other areas of the forest and adapted to concerns specific to those areas.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0243-001 Citizen involvement - people only have so much time, it is only possible to coordinate schedules to some extent & people may burn out and get frustrated with how slow things move. Achieve informed consent in making resource allocation decisions.
- 0243-005 I hope that those members of the general public who cannot be involved feel like their interests and values are being represented by someone. I would like to have some form of rating system along the way to gauge how the public thinks each phase of the process is going. More quality and comprehensive citizen involvement in the planning process. Define study groups to identify alternative mgmt. scenarios that deal with some of the issues. Because it will improve alternatives developed in the plan, increase mutual trust and result in better decisions. Self appointed or group appointed leaders should organize these groups and F.S. will support as needed. The groups should not be made up completely of single interest members. These groups could remain in place to help implement the plan in the future as projects are implemented. Getting meaningful collaborative involvement from citizens. I don't know how citizens can commit to the time necessary to see that ideas, concerns & values are carried through the planning process to a final decision (ILLEGIBLE). If we fail in developing a method to allow for citizen collaborative throughout the planning process - then miscommunications will occur, mistrust will develop and the knowledge & experience of the general public will not be utilized. How can the Forest Service support citizens who are willing to work on Forest Management issues in a collaborative way? We must define the decision space then make sure that recommendation A. Community Leaders Conservation leaders Local Regional National Interest Groups Other Agencies & Land Owners & Native Corporations.
- 0244-007 If more access is available many of the issues that the people are concerned about, overcrowding, noise, Tourism, etc. would be addressed. Please keep me informed, & I hope to attend other meetings.
- 0246-008 It seems important that our elected representatives somehow participate in these discussions by sending their staffers and occasionally participating themselves.
- 0246-009 I think it would be great if the Forest Service could somehow work together with local TV and with newspapers to somehow reach greater segments of the public. Public TV only reaches a specific audience. More input from the public at the beginning of the process is better than protests at the end of the process. Maybe have a call-in part of the program. Educating the public helps them make better decisions. Because public education & involvement in planning is so important to implementation of any plan. Talking only to organizations reaches only those people who join organizations and there are many other people out there who don't have a way they feel is useful enough to communicate their wishes so they feel they are disenfranchised. I think that in instances where government leaders educate & inform the public, the public becomes more involved. And when the public is educated about the other side of the coin, it becomes more reasonable. I know the networks or at least local radio stations will occasionally use their time for public issues. I guess it would be a public information officer who would implement the program with forest service specialists and others from the community addressing issues. Use sound bites on programs that viewers watch. Regular programming and profit-making would stand in the way. Perhaps the various interests could pool resources to defray part of the expenses. Educating and involving citizens relates to all areas of government. Understanding the needs and interests of other parties leads to more constructive problem-solving. Use internet Seek input early & often Recognize limits on citizens' ability to participate in time-intensive processes. Industries & special interest groups pay folks to participate - most others work, etc. A very big process does not guarantee citizen participation, may actually give bigger advantage to wealthy special interests.
- 0249-001 start managing the timber resource of the forest & restore SBB impacted lands (long-term) -

***Comment # Comment***

- 0249-004 I think the public wants a green healthy forest Managing the vegetation in contrast to a most of the other issues, both good & bad aspects. can't manage the forest vegetation and other commodities over the long term without the public's acceptance that these are legitimate uses.
- 0250-001 Abandon all plans for more wilderness/park designation or any further study (this would include wild & scenic river classification as well). There's more than enough wilderness/park land already set aside.
- 0251-002 The issue is probably the weight to be placed on various user demands, i.e., should the tourism industry's desire for a snowmachine trail weigh equally with an Alaska cross-country skier's demand for a quiet area/experience. I do think recreational desires by individuals should be given higher recognition than the desire to make a buck, on public lands, when making a buck adversely impacts the individual's experience.
- 0253-005 Agency heads must sign partnership agreements and commit to develop specific management plans. Lower level staff must be given funds (ILLEGIBLE) time to work w/ public on these mgmt plans.
- 0253-007 A. The land ownership pattern in several parts of the forest would benefit from management partnerships. Summary - Define meaningful sub-areas within the forest. Not always watersheds, because human & wildlife uses may span several watersheds
- 0254-001 1. A. Have Native leaders and delegates from the conservation community on the panel that determines the final plan. Don't invite, inform, then ignore.
- 0254-002 1. A. (1) Working closely with native interests (I notice no Native Alaskan reps. here today.) This forest plan involves them also.
- 0254-004 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. (1) Too often, the Native perspective is not taken into account in land use planning in Alaska. There is little voluntary participation by them because there has been (ILLEGIBLE) breaches of faith.
- 0255-001 Historic fire-suppression & "management" has created enviro. ripe for beetles & fire danger.
- 0256-009 Designations & Motorized/Non-motorized areas - Work to separate mot/non-mot areas. If places are trashed by motorized vehicle users, close them. Education of mot. vehicle users re minimal impact & the need to obey laws/limitations in place. -- Mandatory education re min. impact.
- 0257-001 1. A. Clearly define the desired future condition for specific areas of the Forest. This would include veg composition, compatible activities & uses that would occur. The Forest plan would be unambiguous on how specific areas would be managed.
- 0257-002 2. A. The managers and the public would have clear expectations of what would be happening on the forest & what it is expected to look like in the future.
- 0257-003 3. A. The Forest IDT would have to work with the public to develop scenarios that clearly show how the Forest could be managed. Funding for agency involvement would come from normal appropriations. Citizen participation would be privately funded.
- 0257-004 4. A. There are conflicting views on how the Forest should be managed. A natural process view is incompatible with a managed view. Many uses are incompatible. More public interaction between conflicting views is imperative.
- 0257-006 2. A. There are different expectations about how the NF should be managed - natural processes versus managed processes. The conflicts between these two views create a lot of the tension and disagreement over mgt of the NF.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0258-004 1. A. Start managing the forest based on sound land management principles & multiple use and not on the politics of public opinion. For example an aggressive salvage program could enhance wildlife habitat, yet this is not being done. 2. A. Resource professionals are best qualified to manage forests & lands for desired outputs. The "politization" of the forest services has compromised sound long-term forest and land management. The current "fish bowl" management is not effective.
- 0258-005 3. A. This would require national and regional leadership and possibly some legislative changes to NEPA. Funding could be reduced because the great staff resources that are currently expended in the hand wringing over public opinion. The money spent on EIS documents would be better spent on the ground improving the management situation. 4. A. NEPA is the biggest obstacle as it has been used and abused to empower a minority of citizens who want to exclude management from out forests that are mandated for multiple use. A major reform of NEPA is needed before real management can resume. Make so-called public interest plaintiffs pay legal costs of both parties if they don't prevail. 5. A.. Until a more rational process is developed the forest will be in gridlock and little real management will occur.
- 0259-009 3. A. ESTABLISH LEVELS OF DEVELOPMENT. ALONG THE ROAD SYSTEM ALLOW MAXIMUM DEVELOPMENT (REST STOPS, PICNIC AREAS, CAMP SITES, WIDE ACCESSIBLE TRAILS). THE NEXT LEVEL ESTABLISH USABLE CAMPSITES WITH EASY TRAILS FOR THE MORE ADVENTUROUS INDIVIDUAL. LASTLY, THE INTERIOR OF C.N.F. THAT IS MOST REMOTE, LEAVE IN A WILDERNESS CONDITION.
- 0259-010 4. A. APPROXIMATELY 20% OF THE PEOPLE IN THE U.S. ARE DISABLED. ABOUT 1/2 OF THE DISABLED PEOPLE HAVE SOME FUNCTIONAL DISABILITY THAT PREVENTS THE INDIVIDUAL FROM STRENUOUS ACTIVITIES. THE NUMBER INCREASES EACH YEAR AS THE POPULATION AGES. THIS GROUP DESIRES OUTDOOR EXPERIENCES JUST THE SAME AS THE HIKER THAT SPENDS EACH WEEKEND IN THE MOUNTAINS.
- 0261-002 3. A. Multiple uses. Forest Service System lands are FEDERAL - all people have some % of the stakeholder stake as the locals. - Forest Service has other political & legal forces that shape policy, dealing w/ other agencies & other mandates.
- 0261-004 2. A. Helps FS determine 'acceptable' location of projects near communities. - Helps communities w/ (ILLEGIBLE) - if that is what they want. 3. A. Forest Service holds CL-visioning meeting in CNF communities. Implementation & monitoring jointly between community & FS. Funding through S&P \$ for community development. State money - such visitor documents are 'required' for grants.
- 0262-005 4. A. The forest is essentially closed to further timber harvesting, most timber management (ILLEGIBLE) has been re-assigned. The solution is to establish a broad based consensus among users, weighing input in order of priority as follows: 1) local residents (owners), 2) Economic impact population, 3) state residents, 4) visitors, 5) National community - Thereby establish the forest management priority of harvest and regeneration with multiple use.
- 0262-008 2. A. A) Forest should be effectively managed, so we don't end up with a dead forest, either because of the spruce beetle, or because the growth is all mature or over-mature without renewal and new timber growth.
- 0263-004 allow management plans to proceed if the science is sound & public involvement has created some sense of ownership in the plan (even if not in complete concurrence w/ all aspects of the plan). have mgt by the agency & the people rather than by the courts. FS gets 'hogtied' by special interests using legal proceedings to prevent implementation of any ideas they don't agree with. This wastes taxpayer's (ILLEGIBLE).

***Comment # Comment***

- 0263-006 1. A. honest, open dialog - commitment to the process & product of plan revision. Instead of groups with specific agendas fighting solely for their 'turf' & against (with lawsuits & other legal procedures) any proposal that doesn't meet their agendas, we need conflicting groups to dialog with one another & work together to resolve their conflicts & differences w/o the FS in the mediator role.
- 0264-008 2. A. I AM A RESOURCE DEVELOPER/MINER. I ALSO ENJOY FISHING, HUNTING & BOATING. I DO NOT WANT TO SEE THE FOREST BE MANAGED LIKE A NATIONAL PARK! ACCESS IS IMPORTANT - LOGGING ROADS SHOULD BE RETAINED, AT LEAST AS TRAILS.
- 0264-009 3. A. ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN COMMUNITIES IN AND NEAR THE FOREST. MAKE DECISIONS BASED ON HEALTH OF RESOURCE, NOT POLITICS. EXAMPLE: ALLOW TIMBER HARVEST FOR HEALTH OF FOREST, BOTH HEALTHY TREES AND BEETLE KILL.
- 0265-004 3. A. Form watershed committees, similar to the (ILLEGIBLE) River Special Management Area.
- 0265-009 seeing the Forest Service take an ecosystem/watershed management approach (i.e., "ecosystem health" vs. "forest health");
- 0265-012 consider and evaluate sustainable economic choices that can be made vs. unsustainable, short-term gains;
- 0266-001 1. A. a. The big picture, specifically how will the forest (ILLEGIBLE) taking into account nonforest lands and uses occurring there.
- 0266-004 2. A. a. That private and state lands/(ILLEGIBLE) uses will duplicate uses on the forest (ILLEGIBLE)
- 0266-007 3. A. The current Natural Resource States and general trend as to where they are headed. Also the assumption that Natural Resource planning and management leads to a better forest; compared to human management.
- 0266-008 I.D. common values of different groups.
- 0266-010 d. Improve planning to incorporate other landowner plans. e. Improve planning to expedite process.
- 0266-011 2. A. By getting consensus on values planning may be a whole lot easier.
- 0266-013 3. A. (1) Get consensus on common values through more meetings like this; f. service; As part of planning.
- 0266-015 (3) Involve locals & all users in active management. If locals can earn a living off of wilderness (ILLEGIBLE) then they will buy into these basic values.
- 0266-017 b. Information/Education and have them involved in management.
- 0267-001 1. A. Recommend more areas for Wilderness Designation - protect different ecosystem types. See them through to designation. Work w/ other land agencies & private land-owners to assess cumulative impacts of developments on the Forest. Determine through this where & how much wilderness should be designated.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0267-005 1. A. Specific Designations - Wilderness, Wild & Scenic Rivers issues involved (DONE IN GRAPH STYLE) Ecosystem protection Habitat Capabilities Wildlife, Fish Common/sensitive Brown Bears Water Quality subsistence Access Roadless Areas Industrial Tourism Commercial Activities Cumulative Effects scenic beauty citizens - local, non-local, groups, communities motorized vs. non motorized recreation education science, data needs spruce bark beetle laws, ANILCA, NEPA, ESA eta.
- 0267-006 2. A. The Chugach National Forest is the second largest national forest in the nation and currently has no wilderness designated on the forest. Over 90% of the forest is inventoried as roadless, which indicates an enormous potential for wilderness designated areas. This forest is easily accessible from Anchorage and receives many visitors and local users annually. With tourism (large-scale) developing at a quick rate in AK, the potential for impact to important/critical habitat and ecological areas of the forest is great. Degradation to Brown Bear habitat on the 3-4 Kenai, already in place, is a signal that we need large tracts of protected roadless areas in critical habitat areas of the forest (ie - (ILLEGIBLE LINE))
- 0267-007 3. A. Cumulative Impacts Analysis of Timbering, Mining, industrial tourism, and recreational (motorized) developments and viability of wildlife populations on the Forest. The bottom line is: use habitat viability and wildlife population viability (ILLEGIBLE) as the reference points. Allow developments to occur once the long term viability of wildlife pop's are addressed - ie, areas protected to ensure habitat capability.
- 0268-001 1. A. More definite designations of uses in areas. 2. A. Less misuse, arguments and ?'s on how to handle uses and problems.
- 0268-002 3. A. Define and implement rules, designations, funding? Needs a plan.
- 0268-003 4. A. Public involvement, more advertising, open meetings. Seems like its happening.
- 0268-005 1. A. A) Future generations (1) passing things on (2) how to protect today's ideas from tomorrow's ideas. b) (ILLEGIBLE) scales of benefits. Land allocation/specific designations and management direction. Issues involved are: 1. An ideal of conservation of resources (ie - land in it's natural state) when deciding on what and how much area to designate to which uses. 2. Some sort of "safety net" built in so designations to conserve won't be overturned by any future radical change in management direction.
- 0269-004 less "management", more research;
- 0269-005 identification of public attitudes toward the environment nationally (USFWS has several recent survey results),
- 0269-008 3. A. The largest task, and most costly, facing F.S. staffer's is monitoring and enforcing regulations that will require people to leave the land alone. Time & expense related to preparing timber sales could be directed to monitoring & enforcement. USFS should consider carefully its own findings on public perceptions regarding the Forest. It should also examine findings of other agencies & independent research groups. The Forest Service should work with the state & Coast Guard to develop a "coastal watch" program. The Forest Service can identify other areas where places have been managed poorly - mining sites, logging areas, etc. to show how benefits have been provided to a few stockholders at the expense of the public and the "resource".
- 0269-011 1. A. Avoidance of adversarial relationships. The relationship between issues and the Forest Plan, including such things as the relationship between wildlife concerns and habitat quality, the role of citizens in contributing to policy & management actions, and the role of future concerns (how does the proposed Whittier Road affect mgmt direction? Future oil spills? etc.)

***Comment # Comment***

- 0269-014 I want to see the Plan plan for future events by providing natural areas set aside for 2 planning efforts in 100-200 years, areas where the only "management" is no "management," just occasional research.
- 0269-016 4. A. Lower 48 & International (UN?) residents, animals other than humans, trees, etc. [WHO SPEAKS FOR THEM??]
- 0270-002 b. Access management - key to being able to manage the impact of people on fish and wildlife resources. Also provide for a more diverse range of experience.
- 0270-004 3. A. a. Management direction needs to be compatible with objectives of meeting viable population levels. b. Need to zone the way people can interact.
- 0270-005 4. A. a. Need to work cooperatively with State/Federal agencies, interest/user groups to meet overall. b. Need to assess peoples attitudes/values about access. Attempt to meet wide variety of needs within specific areas or watersheds.
- 0270-006 1. A. Zone watersheds for specific uses to meet the needs of society. Some watersheds could be designed to meet intensive uses, others could be managed less intensively or not at all. 2. A. Help resolve some of the concerns/conflicts of intensive versus extensive use. Don't think that can manage for all resources w/ each watersheds. 3. A. User fees to fund intensive watershed management in those watersheds that are heavily used.
- 0270-007 4. A. User fee new. Can't get people to agree to uses of specific areas.
- 0271-001 1. A. The Forest Service needs to get any planning direction that is available from land owners within the Forest Boundaries. That includes communities, Native corporations, State of Alaska (DNR, and state tourism agencies), Princess Tours. 2. A. We have to be able to assess the impact that the development that occurs through those entities is at least not incompatible with what the Forest Service may propose through their plan.
- 0272-001 1. A. (1) The part of the map that is of concern to me is the allocation issues, that when conflicts occur, that resolution of the conflict consider desires of users at the individual user level at an equal level to those of the more powerful corporation or state interests representing the large volume tourism interests. (2) That citizen connection to the Forest Plan. 2. A. (1) I'm concerned that large volume tourism could develop, basically without the Forest Service having any authorities over it, and thereby failing to take into account that growth that is going to happen anyway. (2) That citizen connection is essential for the plan to have any support once it's developed.
- 0272-002 3. A. I think the Forest Service should have as base information, any currently known intentions of landowners within Forest boundaries, directions of State Legislature in encouraging growth of tourism that affects the Forest, even growth plans from such corporations as Princess Tours.
- 0272-003 4. A. There's always the points of view of interests for those whose desired recreation type of experience is in conflict with the type I enjoy. There's the other side, is there a way for both sides to get something of what they want.
- 0273-001 1. A. Motorized versus nonmotorized uses of the forest. Helicopter access, snow machines, airboats, ATVs. 2. A. Conflicts between cross-country skiers and snowmobilers & helicopter skiers. Also conflicts over noise created by motorized users. Many people see use as either/or. They want total exclusion. There are many people that see exclusion as preventing them from being able to enjoy the Forest.
- 0274-001 1. A. Map showing where snowmobiles are currently using the forest. 2. A. Help define the situations where conflicts are real & where perceived.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0276-002 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. Tourists. loggers. miners. local residents (adjacent communities)
- 0277-001 1. A. Tourism. Issues: Access; specific designation. Commercial activities as applied to beauty and forest health. Education on the sciences and accumulative effects for interpreting to guests.
- 0277-005 3. A. How "the plan" stands up to the areas or issues not covered by "the plan", ie, water access to uplands - who controls or coordinates neighboring issues. What prevailing laws or Acts exist which may be effected by the plan - other boundaries to cross, etc. (fees)
- 0278-001 1. A. The general public needs to be more aware that their forest management plan is under review and basically that there is a plan. Long term. More input from the non-user view may allow planners to include ideas from the general public, rather than specific users. 2. A. It would allow more national pride in public ownership of the Nat'l Forests & wilderness areas. It would help to capture the special value of the Nat'l forest ("and not being used (ie developed) must not have value") a perception? 3. A. Nat'l P.R. campaign by the (ILLEGIBLE). General funding or fee demo money. 4. A. The general public don't seem to know that a Nat'l Forest is theirs. In these modern days there's too many distractions and access for many is just not available. Internet virtual reality (ie. (ILLEGIBLE) Park) public service announcements. Like the old Smoky the Bear commercials. 5. A. It adds the question of social value of a Nat'l Forest and hopefully brings to light areas to better protect or ways to better educate the public about their forests. Create partnerships to enhance the educational processes - public schools,
- 0281-001 1. A. \* Multiple use management direction \* This involves a variety of issues whether its motorized-vs-non etc. It's extremely important to me that all uses are managed for wisely.
- 0281-002 My concern is that certain user groups may try to exclude other user groups on the forest. Some of this may be due to lack of understanding of the other users or bad experiences with different user groups. I enjoy doing a variety of activities on the forest and feel that I am a responsible user no matter what the activity and I don't want the forest to become a huge gridwork of you can only do this here and that there.
- 0281-003 Of course the legal aspect has to be taken into consideration as well as the capability of certain areas to support certain activities.
- 0282-001 How can we manage for something (forest health) if we cannot clearly define it? So we can manage our ecosystems wisely. . Easy, get parties around the table & make (ILLEGIBLE) F.S. responsible. Doesn't need any funding. None, except the desire by some to have forest health defined as the "(ILLEGIBLE) the mature trees". . Key to management of Forests on the Kenai, which are the only forest lands the Chugach is considering for (ILLEGIBLE) mgmt.
- 0284-001 The social values of the Forest. Alternatives will only involve recognition of measurable values - eg, economic value in particular. But the values are still real - as in, "What economic value do you place on your 86-year-old grandmother who is not "producing" - only "costing." Also, impact of forest management or community "quality of life" issues. The full range of social values of the Forest environment are not well understood. Further, there is little historical process for integrating these values into the development of mgt. alternatives. Thus, they won't be included as full "members" in development/allocations of use. This is important because legitimate uses of the Forest may not be considered if they cannot be measured in "commensurate" units. The realm of trade-offs involving "hard" land use allocation - especially uses which foreclose options to preserve important "soft" values. The full population (Alaska and other states) including those "users" who may not actually set foot on a forest but whom nevertheless care about what the Forest is like. Need to also include Alaska Native populations.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0285-001 Further work at identifying extent (ILLEGIBLE) geographic location of full range of public values. Methods could involve workshops (ILLEGIBLE) social surveys. Because would help establish commensurate ranking of full range of values. This would help lend status to values traditionally ignored because no information on their relative status existed. The Forest Service, in cooperation with others, could sponsor the investigation. Funding should come from the Forest Service as part of forest planning funds. Mostly old paradigm mindsets on the part of natural resource trained -ologists who are primarily interested in their functional area. There (is) are no functional area to deal with social values of issues other than as the other-ologists incorporate them individually.
- 0285-002 It is integral in the full ecosystem management perspective.
- 0287-001 By recognizing and integrating national interests/values in planning. This would be a long-term improvement. I DON'T KNOW YET Because it better incorporated national interests for a national resource. Doesn't leave decisions solely up to local populations with vested interest. I DON'T KNOW YET! However, that should not foreclose debate (or effort toward R/D) on the issue. This type of thinking has traditionally stifled innovative and practical development of analysis/decision-making processes for things not easily (though not necessarily properly) measured (or noncommensurate). J. Michael McCloskey says it is the vote Putting the Chugach in perspective with all the other federal land interests. How to adjudicate local vs distant "votes." Even if we could (ILLEGIBLE) register our individual views, is it a straight vote? weighted vote? Etc. - By changing the way the society views its responsibilities to natural resources. Very "science-fiction-ish." It would affect most other parts and issues because it would change the pool of citizens with a vested ability to register their opinions.
- 0288-001 Balancing local vs. national level concerns about the Chugach, who controls the destiny of the Forest: Small number of local, vocal individuals or larger number of remote citizens. Compromising (?) the local knowledge of culture vs. national scale viewpoint, which group will dominate decisions - especially if the groups are at odds in terms of objectives. All or most all other parts & issues. However, may be especially relevant in terms of national preservation objectives versus local needs for subsistence or recreation. Do we - or how much do we - incorporate the larger national interest in the (ILLEGIBLE) decisions?
- 0289-001 Do we "sacrifice" any local economic/social values (ie, jobs, quality of life - which may include subsistence opportunities) for the good of national representation or "warm fuzzy" feelings of commercial interests or NGOs.
- 0290-001 I am primarily concerned that plan reflect the diverse views and needs of the public. I am concerned that public input is managed in a way that allows the best collective thinking on a particular issue such as ecotourism or resource development to be weighed by the public through a viable process; rather than have those ideas eliminated by an individual or small group. Care needs to be taken when grouping issues or ideas so that individual values of those managing the information don't have an overpowering influence. Always be mindful of the different viewpoint. Sometimes the best ideas come from the most unlikely places. When the plan is completed there must be a viable annual review and report to the public on efforts and results to implement the plan - a report card Accountability and public support It could be done by an independent Board representing diverse interests. Forest Service Personnel or contract it out

## *Comment # Comment*

0291-001 The Alaska Forest Association and its member companies have been carefully going over the scoping information provided by the Chugach Land Management Plan (CLMP) revision team. I am writing to ask you to consider altering your revision schedule to provide a better scoping period prior to beginning the planning process in earnest. The scoping stage of the CLMP revision is exceptionally important since it is the period that defines the issues to be considered during the planning process and the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While we recognize the magnitude of the task before you and appreciate the effort your team has put into providing materials for public use in the scoping process, we have some concerns which have prompted this request: - Lack of maps. I asked for all available information, including all available maps when I visited your offices a month ago. Only one map was available, entitled, "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." I was also given a couple back issues of the CLMP newsletter, and a brief description of the CLMP team. When I asked again about other maps, I was told there were none. I am told that at the public workshops held in Anchorage and Cordova, there were several maps displayed. AFA would like to have an opportunity to study all available maps prior to the close of the scoping period. Please have someone contact me regarding the availability of additional maps. - "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." There are several features which keep this from being an appropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. For example, established rights of way granting public access across private lands are shown. Valid access rights across National Forest System lands to ensure access to private property, however, are not shown. This information could be very important in forming public opinion as to appropriate land use designations. Leaving this kind of information off the map will skew the process from the start. The map also fails to identify known mineral deposits, nor does it identify known anomalies and other areas of significant potential for mineral development. It likewise fails to identify the commercial forest lands on the CNF, settling for an ambiguous "biologically capable timber land" indicator. This makes it very difficult for the public to appreciate the economic potential which would be forgone if these areas are put into non-development land use designations. The map is also misleading in the way it treats land ownership. Non-federal ownership, other than state marine parks, is shown in grey. I know this is fairly standard with Forest Service land use maps. However, since a unique set of circumstances exists on the Chugach, derived from events in 1988, it is not appropriate in this case and helps make this map misleading as a basis for public comment on the CLMP revision. There is a world of difference between land owned by a corporation and intended for resource extraction, and land purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. As you know, the latter is to be perpetually protected (i.e., non-development use only). These usage differences are important if the public is going to have a realistic picture of what is likely to happen across the forest over the next decade or so. The coding on the map and the list of "eligible" Wild and Scenic River areas included in the November newsletter is not easy to connect. If the public is to know enough to comment on whether these rivers are appropriately being considered for nomination, there should be, at a minimum, a number key that connects printed information on each river (the name, for example) with its location on the map.

0291-002 Finally, I am puzzled by one item of information which the Forest Service is stating with respect to the Chugach National Forest. At the workshops, the team is saying that 98.9% of the CNF is unroaded or without "improved road access." Given that the Seward Highway bisects a significant chunk of the Chugach, I would like to know how this is calculated. Do you consider a half-mile corridor along the road to be accessed by the road? A mile? More? Less? How does the Forest Service plan to treat RS 2477 access? It would appear that at least one recognized RS 2477 right of way will be severely, perhaps permanently, impaired by a Wild and Scenic River designation. AFA believes that the information missing from the publicly released scoping documents is significant enough to warrant a new scoping period. Please consider, at least, issuing additional maps and information and extending the period for public scoping comments by four months.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0292-002 What is a primitive 2 area and where in the CNF are any primitive 2 areas? Are primitive 2 areas already designated or are they part of the revision process?
- 0292-003 After reading what I can on the CNF I get the impression all users from total wilderness to logging and ORVs will be provided for. If I am wrong, please refer me to the right papers and pages dealing with ORVs.
- 0292-004 Also it seems and I have been told by people who have been keeping better watch over the forest plan than I have that big trade offs were made in the beginning concerning Indian logging and development with the big islands. Any info you have on this will help. I am neither an environmentalist nor a pro developer just someone caught in the middle. I am asking you for info on a small scale because it's hard for someone like me to wade through all the paper work. Please keep this in mind and maybe try and second guess me and send what you think might help.
- 0294-003 In 1907 President Teddy Roosevelt created the Chugach National Forest primarily to protect the forest and wildlife of the Copper River Delta. The Delta, up to and including Miles Lake and Baird Canyon, with millions of birds and abundant wildlife, must be permanently protected through the new forest plan by recommendation for legislative designation.
- 0295-004 4. MINERALS -- Many areas within the Forest have high mineral potential and good access to roads, the railroad, or tidewater. Areas with known mineralization and moderate to high mineral potential should definitely be given a minerals prescription, and no areas should be withdrawn from mineral entry unless they are included in an actual conservation system unit (CSU) that is totally incompatible with mining. Areas which are merely under study for potential inclusion in a CSU should not be closed to mineral entry. It is important that access to these areas not be restricted. The entire rail corridor, and areas bordering it in the Forest, should be available for mineral development. Refer to U. S. Bureau of Mines studies including OFR 83-81: 1979 USBM Sampling Sites and Analytical Results for the CNF and MLA 5-84: Mineral Occurrences In The Chugach National Forest, South-central Alaska for mineral potential maps of the CNF. It is important to point out that much of the CNF is very poorly explored for minerals and the level of geological mapping is very primitive in most areas. Just because an area is not rated as moderate to high for mineral potential does not mean that the area is not mineralized, it just has not been unexplored yet. The inter-disciplinary team for the CLMP plan development should include a geologist and a mining engineer. The present IDT contains no mineral professionals.
- 0295-006 6. DECISION PROCESS -- The Chugach National Forest was intended to be managed for multiple use resource development -- including forestry, mining, oil & gas, recreation, commercial tourism, etc. There is great concern that the decision process has been biased by "pre-decision" thinking, toward "recreation only" uses of the Forest. The Forest Service was placed under the Department of Agriculture because Congress recognized timber is a renewable resource like any other crop which requires harvest and management to realize maximum economic benefits and yields of forest products to the citizens of the United States. The National Forest System was created to provide a continuous supply of timber, minerals, water, etc. for the use of the citizens of the United States, emphasizing multiple use management. Some of the CLMP informational materials are asking leading questions such as, "is it still appropriate for logging to continue in the Chugach National Forest?" This literature demonstrates an institutional bias on the part of the CLMP IDT not to have logging take place. The Organic Act and the other Forest Management acts mandate multiple use management of National Forest land, and the CLMP IDT is legally bound to adhere to the Forest Service management directives. The CLMP planning literature should educate the public about the multiple use mandates which the Forest Service must adhere to. C.L.M.P. comments Page 2

***Comment # Comment***

- 0295-011 10. WILDERNESS -- I oppose any new Federal Wilderness designations in the Chugach. Most of the Forest is wilderness, and nearly 2 million acres are presently managed to retain wilderness values. Alaska already contains 57 million acres of designated Wilderness, 62% of all Federal Wilderness areas. The areas which are presently managed as Wilderness should be re-evaluated to determine whether the Wilderness management is still appropriate and/or necessary.
- 0297-001 I'd like to inquire about the most recent planning exercise that was undertaken by the Chugach National Forest staff. I'm referring to the recently completed salvage timber sale planning process. I understand that some 5.6 million dollars was spent and the entire plan was then abandoned, making this exercise for all intents and purposes, a total waste of time and, of course, money. Would you please let me know if this is correct and what the Forest intends to do about this? Regarding the CLMP Revision process, it seems to me that the focus of this effort should be to specifically define the mission of the Forest and then fit a cost-effective management team to this mission. In this era of scarce financial resources the Idea of planning for planning's sake and serial planning (i.e., immediately following one large scale planning exercise with another as has been the case on the Tongass) Is unacceptable. I am aware of the federal laws that require the National Forest system to undertake plan revisions every five years. I am also aware that the requirement does not stipulate that each revision process last 58 months.
- 0298-001 The USFS is required to follow Federal Environmental Law regarding the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 USCA Section 1600 et seq.). I am concerned that decision processes will be biased toward preservationist opinion as opposed to the USFS obligation to provided for multiple uses of forest resources under 16 USC 1600 and as required by the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, (16 USC 528-531). Additionally, The National Forest System was created to provide products from timber, minerals, and water for the use of U.S. citizens by multiple use development. Required assurances are identified in Section 1604(e) and appear to include coordination of resource extraction with recreation, wildlife, and wilderness uses (see also 36 CFR 219). Therefore multiple use by definition, includes more than the exclusive designation of wildlife habitat, wild & scenic rivers, and additional wilderness on public lands. I trust that the USFS will follow Federal Environmental Law regarding this scoping process and not concede to typical preservationist bias that opposes multiple use development during pre-decision planning.
- 0304-001 Dear Sirs P.W.S. is an area where I hunt & fish & commercial fish. I understand that you people have alot of control out that way. Please consider commercial fishermen & resident subsistence users when making plans new laws in P.W.S.
- 0307-001 What rivers, streams, lakes and Glaciers are being spoke of under the section covering "wild and scenic rivers designations". Can you provide us with one of the maps showing us which are involved. We also would like any documents showing or explaining what regulations and restrictions would be involved with this designation for these resources.
- 0310-001 A management plan which recognizes the potential of CNF for a variety of year-round recreational activities, and a deemphasis on costly, nonrevenue producing timber operations which create long-term damage for all other uses.
- 0310-002 A recognition that areas of natural quiet are important in forest management and that recreational uses which promote natural quiet as a distinct forest resource should be encouraged in designated areas.
- 0311-002 Continued collaborative learning workshops in which citizens of one region are transplanted into other regions to offer personal insights and common ground between regions.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0325-001 I am transmitting this communication to advise you that I am appalled to learn about captioned. To capitulate to the public nuisance organizations like the rabid environmentalists and their ilk IS POSITIVELY NO MANAGEMENT AT ALL! The fact that your announcement came so soon after you had circulated your August 1997 Revision Process Document to the public and requested public inputs is most certainly distressing to say the least. I, personally, feel I wasted my time replying to your request for comments. I took the liberty to discuss your cancellation decision with your local forest ranger here at Seward. That telephone dialogue clearly impressed me of the Forest Service's token endeavor "to work something out with the rabid environmental look-up establishment" whereby at least some of the Kenai Peninsula's spruce bark beetle dead trees could be harvested. The preponderance of the evidence IS ABSOLUTELY profound to all Americans about the rabid environmentalists and their sinister one item lock-up agenda! All that any prudent, fair-minded American Citizen has to do is be cognizant of their incessant attempts to stop resource development wherever it occurs and it matters damned little to them if they have to file a law suit to obtain their objective! In my humble opinion, it would have been highly appropriate in this case for the Forest Service to file suit to stop the rabid environmental establishment from arbitrarily and callously interfering with the Forest Service's management policies. Moreover, a successful lawsuit's follow-up for punitive damages for the highest amount in monetary terms possible is the only awakening they will ever come to understand! CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST LAND & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN November 16, 1997 Page Two This writer is not so naive to understand that the multiple-use land and resource management policies of the Forest Service, which had served the American people so very well through the years, have been replaced by almost a single-use management concept. Nowhere is this more evident than in the Tongass National Forest, however, this writer is not so naive to believe the new anti-resource development penchant is dictated by the executive branch of our federal government. And, of course, that is not surprising because it comes from the most corrupt presidential administration in the nation's history! Yellow draft-dodgers and the Clintonite butcher-crowd of the Branch Dividian Compound IS ALL THE PROOF anyone needs of corruption! I rest my case!
- 0333-006 Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived impacts to the forest. -
- 0336-010 It appears that pressure from a highly vocal minority routinely turns the Forest Service away from science and active resource management and towards the role of an "absentee" landlord. Timber harvest is not incompatible with other uses of the land over the long term. Even the State Ferry System brochures that are designed to show Alaska's rare beauty routinely have regrown clearcuts in the background of nearly every one of them when examined by the educated eye. Some temporary displacement of selected uses might occur during and immediately after timber harvest, but that can in no way be represented as incompatibility over the longer term. What are the individuals and groups that insist on non-development of the nation's resources paying for the privilege of leaving these vast tracts of forest land untouched for their personal benefit? The Forest Service has become more like the National Park Service as an idle observer of nature, seemingly satisfied with watching the ongoing decline of the forests it is charged with stewardship of. This passive role plays into the present political arena well, but does an extreme disservice to the American people as a whole and Alaskans in particular both now and for future generations. We urge you to adopt a pro-active and responsible resource management role as a result of the upcoming planning process.
- 0338-001 1. A. Mngmnt Direction, which also includes specific designations. The issues relate to the burgeoning tourism/recreation industry, wild & scenic designations and how local traditional use can all fit together.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0338-002 2. A. With tremendous growth in tourism, i.e. tourist, hunters, fishers, from within & outside of Alaska, your job takes the takes on the look of people managers, not land mngrs. As an individual who has enjoyed a certain lifestyle in regards to his environment, impact from Growth/Mngmnt have a certain effect.
- 0338-003 4. A. One size does not fit all, what good for Vermont isn't necessarily good for CNF, local input needs to play a certain role.
- 0338-005 B) Keep public dialogue open throughout entire process
- 0340-001 That local issues and concerns are such a small part of the input to the forest plans. Trying to restrict or weight concerns of special interest groups that may rarely or never use the forest. I think that many people in groups follow the group leadership even when they have no knowledge of the particulars involved with a situation. These issues are important to me because I feel that some of the uses that determine why I live here would not be deemed appropriate by armchair experts. Maybe a citizen advisory board or committee that could comment as a recommending body to the Forest Service. I think the people who would most be against this are the contingent that wants to lock up lands and restrict access even if they are not going to benefit directly ie They never plan to come here, but when they do they want nobody else here and everything to remain untouched Taking steps away from Chugach National Forest becoming Chugach National Park. Put an advisory committee in place. To prohibit further drift in this direction To reflect community concerns. Be more supportive of developments of special use permits and the needs of current uses. Funded through user fees.
- 0341-001 Designations Determination of designations Closing of a area useable land Public awareness Justification for determination
- 0342-001 The Forest Plan & Management directions based on it. Issues involved include providing for all uses at this stage in the process, basing management decisions on science, and following direct of plan once issued. The Forest Service should manage for multiple use which includes timber harvest mining, access by motorized public, etc. The Forest Service needs to be held accountable for its actions or lack thereof - such as the bark beetle situation. Account for private land owners within the forest, the requisition of ENOS land swap acreage for mgmt. purposes, mandates requiring proper mgmt of renewable resources for fiber & economic support. The public beyond environmental groups - who dedicate entire full time staffs to effecting their agenda in the system. No one else can dedicate that amount of resources to this area. Education of the public on impact of various mgmt decisions & opportunities that exist on Forest education on possible output Education provides local groups & individuals with the tools to evaluate various management decisions & reduces power of special interest groups. Much of the "public" input to the planning process is by professional environmentalists with specific well organized preservation agendas Through use of existing system. Research. The current scoping documents do not fully represent all opportunities on the forest
- 0344-001 motorized recreation concerned that motorized recreation will be further restricted or eliminated, thereby diminishing the quality of life of the local residences seasonal restrictions e.e. less area accessible during the summer months when tundra can be damaged & waterfowl are mating. More area available during winter months when there is a snow cover & birds have migrated South Input from the local residence is extremely important because they will have to live with management decisions.
- 0346-001 Local versus non local citizens when it comes down to Forest Plan in the area you live in local views should outweigh non local My family and neighbors being governed out of the Forest! I have 4 children the youngest being 5 yrs old. If I don't stand up and have a say, will we Cordovans have a Forest for use in 30 years! . Local people who live and use the forest on a daily basis! .

***Comment # Comment***

- 0347-001 Management Direction. Positive: Need to add multiple uses or replace "special designations  
Implementation of the plan is more important than the planning process itself
- 0347-002 The economic health of (illegible) communities Negative: Politics & environmental input is given too  
much weight/ Economics & science not considered adequately 1984 Plan was not fully  
implemented Risk of plan being modified w/o process Impacts of FS decisions on inholders &  
adjacent landowners
- 0350-002 Tourism, economy, protection of beauty, freedom of movement
- 0350-006 Montague Is. needs a break Install it in the plan, Forest Service already implemented most of it  
Wording used to put it in the proposed plan, put it in . Montague Is. closure will affect users from  
Whittier & Anchorage, What's wrong with the forest plan as it is now written, I'm in favor of  
addressing a few issues but let's not go overboard!
- 0355-001 Conduct frequent & focused discussion sessions on specific topics & specific topics or to learn  
about situation work on developing an improvement Improved communications, shared  
responsibility, ownership R.S. & those interested in improving a situation Time, Commitment
- 0357-002 5. A. It relates to people's attitudes. 2nd Improvement - Provide many different forums for public  
involvement as possible - from public meetings, to accepting input by letters, phone calls, e-mail  
3rd Improvement - Follow up after Plan is done to demonstrate to people the relationship between  
their input & the results in the Plan.
- 0358-001 1. A. Sustainable Resource management - logging - tourism - aesthetics Fisheries & wildlife  
"wilderness" -
- 0358-004 3. A. Most all - ORV's tourism operators, other agencies, current (ILLEGIBLE) direction, past  
uses and decisions. 4. A. Interest groups related to these issues - Again - most all.
- 0359-001 1. A. That section of the situation map that shows the relationship between attitudes and citizens  
as it affects citizen understanding and support of the new Forest Plan. 2. A. The concerns are  
two: 1) Do citizens have a sufficient understanding of the differences between National park  
Service, State of Alaska Designation and National Forest management under a multiple use  
concept. 2) Will citizens have enough confidence that input will make a difference in the final  
outcome of the Plan so they can support it. 3. A. Have to consider the impact of past decisions  
and public involvement that have created feelings that the Forest Service hasn't listened to the  
Public - What is the relationship of the involvement to the decision
- 0361-001 1. A. Provide better leadership and organization in the Planning process - getting the general  
public involved at the "big picture" stage is a little overwhelming. Can't sink your teeth into specific  
relevant issues. (arrow indicating continued on back, but no copy) 2. A. Better decisions will be  
made, and leadership perceived.
- 0369-001 1. A. Forest plan for the future that includes lasting ecosystems for future use.
- 0369-009 3. A. A balance that promotes an ecological balance for the future of the forest to last for  
generations. 4. A. Wildlife, habitat, good science, public use polling 1. A. It seems to me that a  
long term forest plan with the view of true ecological health of the forest rather than 10-15 year  
plans might benefit all involved. 2. A. The forest is something we hope will last forever Let's try to  
get a plan that addresses some issues for the future.
- 0369-010 5. A. Maybe by addressing such issues presented by increased use on all fronts such as tourism,  
motorized pressure, logging issues. Rather than offer quick fix to arising problems. Address the  
forest as forever.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0370-005 Borough, Community, State (ILLEGIBLE) expansion 4) Seward/Storlig Hwy (ILLEGIBLE) scenic protection 5) Working with USFNS, State ... with Peninsula and Anch. AK as a whole
- 0370-006 6) Balance ski/snow machine use.
- 0370-013 Take tonights process to the other agencies, 99% of the USFS employees are sharp as a whip, use that intellect and resource to follow thru on main direction.
- 0370-019 1. A. Managing the forest is a good thing, however [many of the unmanaged areas around Cooper Landing have great green new spruce regeneration] (ILLEGIBLE) in near back country OK, let mature, nature (ILLEGIBLE) in back country. Use Fire Look at USPWS management, and what works for them, even if their (ILLEGIBLE) are diff. there are lessons to be learned. Actually you're doing pretty good, actually very good. The eastern Kenai was defined with grace, and true multiple use for this whole century. The salvage Logging was a BAD issue and not handled well. Brought distrust.
- 0373-001 1. A. Open more trails & areas for year round motorized use 2. A. More people would be able to use forest lands more often 3. A. Very little funding would be necessary 4. A. Quiet Zone. Share areas equally. 5. A. Non-motorized/motorized users could easily share all areas possibly even week-on/week-off seasonally?
- 0374-002 motorized recreation; non-motorized recreation;
- 0376-001 Wildlife/Wilderness Forest condition logging/roads 2. A. That we will endanger existing wildlife & its habitat & create less desirable wilderness. 4. A. All people; motorized/non-motorized interests; tourists/locals; economic gain/no economic gain historic uses/increased usage; locals/non-locals
- 0376-002 Wildlife/Wilderness Forest condition logging/roads 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. That we will endanger existing wildlife & its habitat & create less desirable wilderness. 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. All people; motorized/non-motorized interests; tourists/locals; economic gain/no economic gain historic uses/increased usage; locals/non-locals
- 0377-003 how FS will use issues in determining objectives for certain segments of land Thresholds should be set which would then, depending on existing condition, drive projects. example: use habitat & bear capability index as LAC Threshold which would restrict development example: use demand for moose to determine % early (illegible) stage to meet subsistence levels in Hope
- 0378-002 2. A. The plan may be improperly managed or modified by specific local interests to suit their own agenda. Plan must be adhered to. ENFORCE
- 0378-003 The resource MUST prevail. It is THE most important factor involved. I am particularly concerned when I see local jurisdictions or citizens taking over and using public lands to their own benefit. Very dangerous precedent being set.
- 0378-004 I am not aware of a management plan. Perhaps a presence in Valdez would make the locals aware that there is mgmt. Even better, we would have a target to aim our concerns at
- 0378-005 We don't know we're involved until we read about it or see it on the news, after the fact.
- 0378-008 . All aspects of the mgmt plan can be addressed. At least concerned individuals would have somewhere to take their concerns.
- 0379-002 4. A. Do not believe that "locals" have superior rights in the forest to citizens elsewhere. As you note, it's a national forest.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0382-003 1. A. Take politics out of resource management let good science prevail 2. A. The wrong people are making the decisions 3. A. Increase funding for proper decisions 4. A. Kick out Tony Knowles and his Republican cronies 5. A. They made the Whittier Road decision with no E.I.S. for P.W.S.
- 0383-001 1. A. Recreation, Tourism, Wildlife/Subsistence 2. A. See more Forest Service presence in Valdez in order to have plans for accessible Forest lands...trails, maine parks, etc.
- 0384-003 3. Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. Whittier Road = Recreation & economic development Logging = natives, labor, other landowners
- 0384-004 4. A. I think tourism will increase, road or not. Logging will continue. So...important to implement planning tools to control NPS pollution, i.e. forestry BMPs, road construction BMPs. THE PROBLEM IS THERE ARE NOT SUFFICIENT FUNDS TO PLAN AND PROVIDE OVERSIGHT AND ENFORCEMENT OF BMPS BY ADEC, ADNR, OR ANYONE ELSE. How to provide funds? User fees. Logging fees. Road use fee
- 0386-001 1. A. Motorized recreation 2. A. Where they can be used and where they can't, and why not. Because myself and other people use them 3. A. Tourism, wildlife, vegetation 4. A. All public, both recreational & non
- 0387-001 1. A. The development and management of the EVOS land purchase of the Tatiter Corp. Lands not showing access across private-native-lands 2. A. Own land at Snug Corner, logging has caused up growth in black bear density, existing roads from logging should remain open for recreation access of hunting, fishing & camping 3. A. Soft use on West side Harder use on East side
- 0389-002 1. A. A year to year look at open areas for ORV use - ie moving trails so huge mud holes are not created - multiple trails on big Islands so every one is not riding same place 2. A. Right now all of the CNF is closed except for small areas left for local needs. The areas Y rules I would propose affect a smaller area than any other use. I can explain if asked 3. A. I would gladly & have offered in person & writing to take CNF personnel out on my boat & machines & identify areas to ride & areas to avoid & rules to be followed 4. A. Apparently the way the current Plan is written ORV use for me is off limits in the CNF 5. A. Again many people feel ORV use is a negative & will fight it. I don't feel I tear up the country. I do make tracks. But with the right rules & working closely with CNF personnel I can be severely limited but still enjoy hunting area I can never walk to.
- 0390-001 Look at the areas of that Situation Map that are important to you. 1. Q. What part of the Situation Map is particularly important to you? What issues are involved? 1. A. Wild rivers and their protection 2. Q. What are your specific concerns and interests about these issues? Why are these issues important to you? 2. A. Promotion of several wild rivers as candidates for protection Nellie Juan/River # 1/Bering/Martin
- 0390-002 Q. What other parts and issues of the Chugach National Forest management situation must be considered when designing improvements related to this part of the Situation Map? 3. A. prioritization of river protection as a "highest use" above development 4. Q. What people or views must be considered when designing improvements related to this issue or area? 4. A. I am not sure, but certainly the Martin & Bering are candidates for logging operations. Q. How would you like to be involved as the revision process continues? A. I am available to be a resource providing first-hand knowledge of several rivers which are or should be under consideration for "wild" designation. Nellie Juan, Canyonck, Kenai, River #1, Copper, Martin & Bering. Q. Would you be interested in forming study groups on certain issues? A. Sure, tho I am probably most useful providing complete or draft river quidebook chapters on these rivers.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0394-001 1. A. a) Wilderness b) Tourism & recreation c) public education d) Logging e) FS rgs.
- 0397-001 1. A. The College Fjord/Nellie Juan wilderness study area does not encompass enough low elevation, mature forest. Enlarge it by Including Andy Simon Mtn, Lark Mtn., Spencer & Bartlett glaciers. Also include upper Snow River, upper Ptarmigan Cr and Grant Lake and upper Falls Cr.
- 0397-003 3. A. You need to consider reducing the expectations of the logging industry for timber. They expect as much as they can process. You should also consider the amount of logging that already occurs on state & ANESA land that used to be Chugach National Forest.
- 0398-001 Our concerns can only be addressed through the continuation of the multiple use mandate which has been a cornerstone of Forest Service policy and set national forests apart from parks and refuges. The Chugach National Forest was intended to be managed for multiple use development, including timber, mining, oil and gas, recreation, commercial tourism and other resources. The national forest system was created to provide a continuous supply of timber, minerals, water and other resources. This policy should continue to be reflected in the new plan if the Chugach National Forest is truly to be a land of many uses. A number of RDC members are concerned the decision process will be biased by pre-decision planning for "recreation only" uses in the Forest. Multiple use means more than recreation, subsistence and wildlife habitat. These elements are all important, but must go hand-in-hand with responsible resource development. The Forest Plan Revision Map fails to address areas suitable for timber harvesting, mining exploration, destination tourism, or oil and gas development. The revision already appears predisposed to non-development, pro-wilderness designations. The new forest plan should not be based on opinion polls. Decisions should be grounded in good science, balancing economic and environmental considerations. Forest managers should resist decision-making based on aesthetics, misguided public opinion and perceived impacts to the forest.
- 0400-001 The Chugach is a national forest of truly national significance. It holds the northernmost reaches of temperate rainforest in the United States. The Copper River Delta is the single largest undisturbed wetland for migratory waterfowl on the Pacific flyway. In the heart of the Chugach, the Prince William Sound area has yet to fully recover from nation's worst oil spill eight years ago. Unlike most national forests, the Chugach faces little pressure to exploit it for timber resources. There are no communities that depend on supplies of Chugach timber to sustain their economies. Recreation, wildlife and providing subsistence food for rural Alaskans rank far higher among the uses a new Chugach forest plan must protect.
- 0400-002 Despite the Exxon oil spill, these six million acres are among the wildest and least spoiled terrain in the national forest system -- and the Chugach plan should aim to keep them that way.
- 0400-013 In crafting alternatives, the Forest Service should make clear that some uses cause inherent conflicts with other uses (such as motorized recreational access vs. quiet recreation; mineral entry vs. maximum fish and wildlife protection, etc.). In cases where one use interferes with other uses, the forest should be "zoned" into areas where that one use is predominant.
- 0400-019 We'd also like to reiterate our earlier request and ask the Forest Service to hold public hearings on concept alternatives at sites in the Lower 48. The Chugach is truly a national forest of national significance, and the Forest Service should reach beyond Alaska so that people in the rest of the country have a full and fair chance to help shape its future.
- 0401-001 In all honesty, other than the Salvage issue, I feel that the USFS has done a really wonderful job with the Chugach all these years. And even thru the heat of the North Shore Road and proposed salvage sales, I know the USFS employees involved were trying their best to do the right thing.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0401-002 The future management of the Kenai Peninsula, and the Chugach National Forest will become much more complex with the coming millennium. The answers won't be as easy as in the past. In some ways though, your issues will be easier than those of the managers on the western Kenai. It's important though, for the USFS to work with the USFWS, NPS, State of Alaska, Kenai Peninsula Borough. Native people, and local communities both on the western Kenai and to the north of Turnagain and Prince William Sound.
- 0404-001 We trust that the Chugach interdisciplinary team will use progressive science, and follow NFMA and NEPA while creating a plan for the future well-being of the forest and its inhabitants.
- 0405-001 I consider myself privileged to have had the opportunity to explore and appreciate the Chugach National Forest by hiking many of its trails and kayaking and camping in Prince William Sound. What a treasure the Chugach is! My vision for its future would be for it to remain at least as wild and biologically vibrant as it now is. Having worked at the Tetlin and Kenai National Wildlife Refuges and with the Forestry Division of the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, I am aware of increasing and varied demands being placed on our forests, and other natural areas. I urge you to ensure that the revision of the Chugach Land Use Management Plan provides first and foremost for the ecological needs of the forest. The Chugach should meet only those human demands that do not compromise its ecological integrity and should meet such demands in the most environmentally sensitive manner. I also urge you to ensure that the plan revision provides for low-impact, wilderness recreation to the greatest extent possible. Low-impact, non-motorized recreation is one of the most environmentally-benign uses of the forest. Further, given rising population and shrinking natural areas, recreation opportunities such as those offered by the Chugach are increasingly rare and should be guarded for both their economic and intrinsic values.
- 0408-001 I am a periodic Chugach National Forest user under my own power and occasionally hire commercial operators that have permits to conduct their business on the Chugach. I believe in the need to strive for a dynamic forest plan. A plan that recognizes advanced technologies for resource development and public lands access while providing recreational access for all user groups, motorized and non-motorized. Opportunity for commercial use by Alaska based businesses especially those recreational in nature are highly desirable for the Chugach National Forest. My desires for tourism related business opportunities are based strongly in multi use management of the Chugach National Forest. Additionally the USFS must defend the rights of citizens to access and develop the resources of the National Forest System. A few activists have been successful in undermining the basis of the National Forest Service within the Department of Agriculture. Some attack this institution's multi-use mandate on all development related fronts. Consistent intrusions by preservationist forces has; contributed to an unhealthy forest; restricted access by various user groups, both motorized and non-motorized; created chaos in several fisheries enhancement programs; and have prevented our government employees from achieving the goals of the 1984 Chugach National Forest Management Plan.
- 0408-002 Management Plan revisions should contain restrictions on the NEPA process. Permit applications by individuals for small Mom and Pop business cannot weather the lengthy NEPA process especially an application that attracts preservationist appeals. The Plan must allow activities to take place in areas of designation without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or biased opinion polls. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts, appeals should be limited to the same. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0413-001 Since the last Land Management Plan was completed for the Chugach National Forest there has been a steadily accelerating decline in the health of the forest your agency is charged with managing. As an integral part of the revision process for the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan I urge you to adopt a pro-active management posture with respect to timber resource salvage and controlling forest pests in the future. It is imperative that your agency cut through all the political rhetoric and predictions of dire environmental disasters (always stated as fact by the preservationists - but never has any single one of them come about) and get back to the basics of truly being a "land manager". I appreciate the opportunity to provide my input.
- 0418-004 As the national forest proximate to Prince William Sound, the site of this country's most egregious oil spill, the Chugach holds a high profile in the eyes of many Americans. In the forest plan revision process, the Forest Service has a special opportunity to proceed with the recovery - both ecological and psychological that has begun since the 1989 disaster. I hope the Chugach National Forest will recognize this opportunity and draft a plan that offers exceptional protection to the area as wilderness and wildlife habitat.
- 0421-002 Specificity of Plan The present 1984 Chugach Land Management Plan is very vague and should have more specifics. This is one reason why so many Forest Service projects end up in administrative appeal or litigation. Individual projects such as timber sales presently have very little planning guidance to tier to. A very specific plan is needed in order to avoid surprises and project delays, and to reduce the money and staff time spent on subsequent appeals and litigation. This would also clearly demonstrate how all projects and decisions meet the mission, goals, and objectives of the Forest Service. For example, the draft Plan should clearly identify areas on a map where timber harvest will be done over the next 10 years instead of simply listing a targeted volume by Management Area. This would not necessarily require planning at the same scale used for individual sales (a watershed scale may suffice). Similarly, the Plan should develop specific Visual Quality Objectives and Recreational Opportunity Spectra for all areas of the Forest. This should clearly identify the objectives, specific high value locations, and typical management prescriptions instead of relying upon more general guidance for the Forest as a whole. Consensus from all interest groups is probably not a realistic expectation for any forest plan. However, a very specific Plan may help achieve as much consent as possible because proposed decisions could be reviewed in a broader landscape context. By consent I mean that some groups may not like the decision but will not appeal it. The Forest Service may get consent for logging within a specific watershed at the Plan level if it is clearly evident that other specific watersheds will be managed primarily for recreation. The eventual individual timber sales would never be a surprise and should proceed more smoothly. Perhaps timber harvest areas should have been proposed during the scoping phase of the Plan revision (similar to how the Wild & Scenic River eligibilities were presented). This may have identified where timber harvesting would be acceptable to critics. Actually this would probably expose that no area is acceptable to many critics, and thus further weaken their litigation and frivolous concerns over individual sales.
- 0423-002 For the most part, I think you do a good job of setting forth proposed revision topics.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0423-012 The overall vision I would also like to see the Plan try to articulate an overall vision for the forest, one that transcends the specific topics discussed in the Plan and brings them all together into a coherent whole instead. Even with the multiple use mandate that the Forest Service operates under, the fact remains that different national forests around the nation have extremely different characters, and, consciously or not, have come to articulate some very different visions of what a public forest might be. It is important that the Chugach be guided by an overall vision of what it should be, and not simply have its character determined by accident. Some national forests have ended up being primarily high impact industrial in nature, as the gutted national forests of the Pacific Northwest sadly attest to other national forests have ended up being preserved primarily as non-industrial, low impact recreational forests, as is the case with the Los Padres National Forest in California, or the George Washington National Forest in Virginia. I for one would rather see the Chugach tend towards the latter model than the former; the Chugach is a prime Alaska tourism and recreational area, one that is well deserving of a comparable level of protection for these premier uses. Still, the overall vision of the Chugach needs to take into account what is absolutely unique about this forest -- the incredible amount of true roadless wilderness it has to provide. In this regard, the Chugach should not just be viewed as another recreational forest, but as something more. Something that is incompatible with any commercial logging, mining, or extensive development, and that represents a unique use value that both benefits large numbers of residents and the Chugach should be, and implements a Forest Plan in which the Chugach will be preserved as the rare world-class recreational and wilderness resource that it is.
- 0434-002 2. Lack of credible resource information in the scoping process. The information provided the public during the scoping phase of the plan revision has been lacking in data concerning various resource values across the landscape. Where are the maps showing beetle infestation extent, mineral potential, timber values, visitors days etc.? Does the forest lack this type of data or has the planning team determined that such facts are not relevant to meaningful forest planning? The comment map prepared by the Forest Service biases public input on Issues such as wild and scenic rivers and research natural areas.
- 0434-003 3. The planning team is violating ANILCA Studying the eligibility of Rivers within the forest for the sole purpose of nomination as a Wild and Scenic Conservation System Unit is in direct conflict with ANILCA and is an inappropriate undertaking for the planning team.
- 0434-004 4. The Forest Service mandate requires management for multiple uses. The organic act and multiple use mandate require the Forest Service to provide for true multiple uses including industrial forestry and mining. The forest plan is not the place to reinvent this mandate, as is apparently being proposed by the emphasis towards recreation and habitat as single use objectives of the forest. The question for the public is not whether timber harvest is appropriate on the forest. Congress, not the administration, is the body empowered with implementing such sweeping changes in the management direction of these public lands.
- 0434-009 9. The forest plan must include a strict implementation policy to avoid the abuses in non-implementation as has occurred since the 1984 plan was prepared (such as the significant failure to achieve the target allowable timber sale quantity and the arbitrary withdrawal of any timber salvage attempts by the forest supervisor).

***Comment # Comment***

- 0442-001 It was good to see you all again. Thank you for making the trip to Valdez and sending us information for the library. I liked the format you followed, because it gave participants and opportunity to meet and talk with people holding different views. However, since the timeframe was so rushed, I feel that only the first step in discussion, listening, occurred, not the development of constructive ideas. That happened after your meeting here, a Valdez fisherman who has been carrying on a with the Cordova office about the use of ORVs, and I met for the first time and shared a table. It seemed to me that he had a valid point about using ORVs on existing roads at the FAA station. I also referred him to the last Forest Plan and EIS in the Valdez Library and other documents you sent. Since then, he has stopped me on the dock and said, he's changed his mind: He'd rather have all wilderness and no ORVs. He hadn't thought of the impact on the Sound, even the FAA station area, if everyone who had an ORV decided to go there. It would have been more beneficial for your planning efforts if more time had been allowed for discussion and a chance to really think about the effects of individual proposals before you picked up the pieces of paper.
- 0442-006 During the last planning process, we were very concerned with the range of alternatives offered. For example, alternatives that we might have supported for several reasons were lumped together with options that we would not have supported in any alternative such as widespread prescribed burning for game species habitat improvement. We would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in considering the range of alternatives during the planning process. We also remain concerned about the status of the inventories on which the planning process according to the Fed. regs. is based. As you know, this was a point of concern during the previous planning process. The recreation inventory, for example, had a statistical reliability of 0 and included all the ice, rock and glaciers; the timber inventory was based on aerial photographs and not ground proofed. This led to statements such as "There is an unlimited supply of recreation lands and a limited demand," as well as "There is a limited supply of commercial timber and an unlimited demand." We are most concerned that the analysis of the management situation, alternatives and economic analyses be based on accurate, statistically reliable inventories. We look forward to reviewing both the inventories and the analyses of the management situation. When this step is completed, we hope that you will make them available to the Valdez Public Library.
- 0445-010 Tenth, and last (but not least!): I hope that you will remember, at all times, as you are revising the Chugach N.F. management plan, that this treasure is owned by all Americans, including many who will never see it but are nevertheless concerned about it's management and hence it's fate. There are many areas in our country that I have never visited, and never will; however, I want them to be properly managed and protected, and those that I'm a part owner of, as is the case with the National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and Public Domain lands managed by the B.L.M., I believe I have a right to expect that they will be! You have a responsibility as managers of the National Forests to be good stewards of the land, and not yield to those who would push the "lowest common denominator" approach. I urge you to carry out that responsibility in a conscientious manner.
- 0446-002 2. ANILCA. When Congress enacted the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act it stated that sufficient conservation units had been created, and mandated that no more studies be conducted for the; single purpose of establishing new conservation units except by Congressional direction. This is a clew prohibition against the creation of now wilderness and/or Wild and Scenic Rivers. Therefore, the USFS should not be considering the designation of or studying the creation of new conservation system units in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0449-006 In this age "lock-up" is no longer an option. Wise and carefully crafted use of our resources is the answer and the preferred course. We hope that this management plan moves in that direction.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0450-004 No Net Loss: The USFS should balance the effects of private lands being removed from the resource base due to purchase by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustees. As in Southeast Alaska where preservationist claim that harvest on private lands must be factored into the timber harvest planning process on the Tongass, so should timberlands remove from production by EVOS be factored into the Chugach Land Use Plan. Since 1891, when the forest reserves were established, the primary purpose of the National Forest system has been to provide an even flow of Umber resources. The specific mix of resources has changed over, the past decades, but the primary product has been a healthy forest providing Umber, wildlife, recreation and water resources. The staff of the Chugach should develop a plan that applies the science necessary to maintain the health of the forest. The plan should not be tailor to placate those few zealots that would sacrifice the long-term health of the Chugach for short-term political gain. Without the implementation of a scientifically sound silvicultural prescription, the Chugach will face decades, if not generations of stagnation before the existing climax stage of succession can be achieved. This is not a popularity contest, sound silviculture must take precedence over political correctness when land management decision are made.
- 0451-005 Hope residents demand that the VSFS manage the Forest to protect our subsistence activities of mining. fish & game utilization, use of forest products and access to all Kenai Peninsula! Hope is a Rural Subsistence comm.
- 0452-006 As an aside note, except for emotional effect, I have yet to figure how the EXXON Valdez oil spill directly ties in to logging or forest management.
- 0453-001 Although management of the wilderness seems like a strange idea to me - it is wilderness that has allowed the beauty and diversity found in nature to develop - I realize it can be done responsibly to benefit wildlife, human lifestyles, the land, and future generations. I urge you to take into account the intrinsic value of these forests and our responsibility to our children to preserve them. There are many uses and aspects of forests that make them valuable.
- 0453-005 Let the uses of the forest be highly sustainable ones that do not destroy the diversity, health, or beauty contained within. Please - if you must manage - do it the right way. Look to the future and the peace and beauty that future generations deserve.
- 0455-003 3) I support ANILCA Section 101, "Sufficient conservation units"; and Section 1326 (b) "No more studies" clauses.
- 0456-001 INTRODUCTION As a preliminary matter, I call to your attention the letter I filed with Acting Forest Supervisor Dave Gibbons on December 11, 1997 (attached hereto as Appendix A), requesting a revised scoping period and schedule (incorporated here by reference). In that letter, I cited deficiencies in the information available to the public during the present scoping period. As of this date, I have received no reply to the letter. AFA continues to maintain that information essential to meaningful public participation during the scoping period was inadequately represented in the documents readily available to the public during this period. I therefore urge the Forest Service to reopen the scoping period to correct those deficiencies. AFA reserves to right to add to the comments contained in this letter if the Forest Service complies with this request.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0456-002 THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE CHUGACH NATIONAL FOREST IS MAINTAINED IN MULTIPLE USE STATUS THROUGHOUT THE LIFE OF THE FOREST PLAN The Forest Service has an obligation to the Alaska public to ensure that the Chugach National Forest remains open for the full range of multiple uses over the life of the forest plan. These include recreation opportunities and resource development options. A full range of alternatives which includes a variety of combinations of the various uses must be reasonably considered during the EIS process. There must not be a presumption that certain areas will be designated wilderness prior to the development of the plan. Only those areas designated as a Wilderness Study Area by ANILCA should be considered eligible for wilderness designation, but it must not be predetermined to be set aside for wilderness status. It should be thoroughly evaluated for its potential for other uses. Given the amount of land already designated as wilderness in Alaska (62% of all federal wilderness in the United States), it would be inappropriate to designate the entire 1.97 million acre Wilderness Study Area as recommended wilderness under the revised plan. It would be equally inappropriate to retain the wilderness recommendation on the 1.7 million acres so recommended in the 1984 forest plan. Such actions would only preclude multiple use management on those acres and reduce the opportunities for the people of Alaska.
- 0456-005 IV. THE REVISED FOREST PLAN SHOULD IDENTIFY LANDS WITH HIGH POTENTIAL FOR OIL AND GAS DEVELOPMENT, AND PRESERVE ACCESS TO THOSE LANDS FOR FUTURE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT. Areas with known oil and gas reserves potential should be given an oil and gas development prescription and should be designated by the plan for future oil and gas development. Oil and gas development opportunities must be evaluated in the EIS, and a full range of alternatives which include opportunities to explore for and develop oil and gas reserves in the CNF should be considered.
- 0456-010 IX. CONCLUSION In summary, AFA requests that the Forest Service ensure that a genuine multiple use management approach governs the writing of the Chugach Land Management Plan revision and accompanying Environmental Impact Statement. The new plan should not preclude management options that will be important for the health of the forest and the health of the regional economy. It should enhance, not interfere with, the normal, natural and permissible uses of the forest by the people who live there, work there, and visit there, The Forest Service should strive to manage, not lock up, the Chugach National Forest so that it remains healthy and vibrant, and so that activities, including timber harvest, can be sustained on the CNF in perpetuity.

## *Comment # Comment*

0456-011

The Alaska Forest Association and its member companies have been carefully going over the scoping information provided by the Chugach Land Management Plan (CLMP) revision team. I am writing to ask you to consider altering your revision schedule to provide a better scoping period prior to beginning the planning process in earnest. The scoping stage of the CLMP revision is exceptionally important since it is the period that defines the issues to be considered during the planning process and the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). While we recognize the magnitude of the task before you and appreciate the effort your team has put into providing materials for public use in the scoping process, we have some concerns which have prompted this request: Lack of maps. I asked for all available information, including all available maps when I visited your offices a month ago. Only one map was available, entitled, "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." I was also given a couple back issues of the CLMP newsletter, and a brief description of the CLMP team. When I asked again about other maps, I was told there were none. I am told that at the public workshops held in Anchorage and Cordova, there were several maps displayed. AFA would like to have an opportunity to study all available maps prior to the close of the scoping period. Please have someone contact me regarding the availability of additional maps. "Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map." There are several features which keep this from being an appropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. For example, established rights of way granting public access across private lands are shown. Valid access rights across National Forest System lands to ensure access to private property, however, are not shown. This information could be very important in forming public opinion as to appropriate land use designations. Leaving this kind of information off the map will skew the process from the start. The map also fails to identify known mineral deposits, nor does it identify known anomalies and other areas of significant potential for mineral development. It likewise fails to identify the commercial forest lands on the CNF, settling for an ambiguous "biologically capable timber land" indicator. This makes it very difficult for the public to appreciate the economic potential which would be forgone if these areas are put into non-development land use designations. The map is also misleading in the way it treats land ownership. Non-federal ownership, other than state marine parks, is shown in grey. I know this is fairly standard with Forest Service land use maps. However, since a unique set of circumstances exists on the Chugach, derived from events in 1988, it is not appropriate in this case and helps make this map misleading as a basis for public comment on the CLMP revision. There is a world of difference between land owned by a corporation and intended for resource extraction, and land purchased by the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. As you know, the latter is to be perpetually protected (i.e., non-development use only). These usage differences are important if the public is going to have a realistic picture of what is likely to happen across the forest over the next decade or so. The coding on the map and the list of "eligible" Wild and Scenic River areas included in the November newsletter is not easy to connect. If the public is to know enough to comment on whether these rivers are appropriately being considered for nomination, there should be, at a minimum, a number key that connects printed information on each river (the name, for example) with its location on the map. Finally, I am puzzled by one item of information which the Forest Service is stating with respect to the Chugach National Forest. At the workshops, the team is saying that 98.9% of the CNF is unroaded or without "improved road access." Given that the Seward Highway bisects a significant chunk of the Chugach, I would like to know how this is calculated. Do you consider a half-mile corridor along the road to be accessed by the road? A mile? More? Less? How does the Forest Service plan to treat RS 2477 access? It would appear that at least one recognized RS 2477 right of way will be severely, perhaps permanently, impaired by a Wild and Scenic River designation. AFA believes that the information missing from the publicly released scoping documents is significant enough to warrant a new scoping period. Please consider, at least, issuing additional maps and information and extending the period for public scoping comments by four months.



***Comment # Comment***

- 0457-001 Conservation and preservation are the most important ideas to consider when I think of the future of Chugach N.F. and Alaska.
- 0460-001 As the Chugach National Forest proceeds with the Land Management Plan revision process, I urge you to adopt a pro-active forest management posture. The health of the forested areas within the Chugach National Forest is deteriorating rapidly. Only a scientifically applied, active land management program can maintain the health of the forest over time.
- 0463-008 The Forest Management Objectives should reflect the potential for jobs and income from tourism. Management Prescriptions should allow for a spectrum of tourism activities as consistent with the character of the Forest, particularly emphasizing the increasing value of nature and wilderness-based tourism in an increasingly crowded and environmentally disturbed world. D. Existing and projected economic impacts of tourism must be accurately estimated and addressed. The tourism industry in conjunction with the State Division of Tourism has compiled detailed statistics and annual rates of growth by region, certain destinations, demographic characteristics, etc. that should be used as the definitive source. Demand forecasts and employment assumptions and impacts for tourism resources should be reviewed and verified by the industry. E. Site Specific Data Collection. Site specific tourism data must be collected in order to discern impacts and perform alternatives analysis. Towards this end, AWRTA and AVA are working together to initially develop maps depicting water use by different types of member boat use. If additional maps are needed to supplement the tourism/recreation data base, we are willing to work with our members to develop needed information. The Geographic Information System (GIS) data base layer(s) used to define tourism and recreation should receive industry review prior to development of alternatives. This should be integrated within a watershed by watershed inventory of the forest which would identify issues regarding water quality, riparian areas, wildlife and fisheries, and any harmed areas. This will help the Forest Service and the public better understand the impacts of future actions on the forest on a watershed level.
- 0463-009 Due to the proximity of the Forest to a significant portion of Alaska's population base, the Forest Plan must include the role of the motorized and non motorized private user in the future vision of the Forest. In order to get a complete picture of use patterns and subsequent impacts, the Forest Service needs to consider this growing demand on Forest resources.
- 0463-020 Emphasize protection of fisheries resources through education and habitat protection. Forest wide guidelines should place greater emphasis on educating the public regarding proper conduct around salmon streams. B. Provide more services and incentives to private landowners to assist in protecting fisheries habitat on their lands, including research and information on the effects of logging and other developments on salmon habitat and water quality.
- 0463-025 Any analysis of possible timber harvest activities should fully address impacts on existing and likely future recreation and tourism uses. It should include a realistic and reliable timber inventory and make a fair and just cost/benefit analysis that fully considers recreation and tourism related values. AWRTA and the Alaska Visitor's Association (AVA) have begun working together in recent months to address tourism issues in Prince William Sound and the Chugach National Forest. We share a common interest, along with many other user groups and the Forest Service, in protecting the resources upon which recreation and tourism are based. We have shared information and perspectives, and collaborated closely with AVA in developing these scoping comments. We intend to continue to work together to ensure that tourism and recreation interests in the Sound and in the Chugach National Forest. We urge the Forest Service to include both organizations in discussions about tourism patterns and trends and needs, and in the development of alternatives. In

***Comment # Comment***

- 0464-003 Chugach Land Management Plan revisions should define limits for the NEPA appeal process. Appeals need to be limited to legitimate science based questions of concern. The Plan must allow multi-use to occur without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or opinion polls with built-in bias. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts of a particular use, appeals should be limited to addressing specific impacts that were overlooked. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.
- 0464-010 CLMP revision alternatives must point to the benefits of multi-use, not continue to highlight the negative effects one user group has upon the other. Consider these points in drafting forest management alternatives: - Identifying access points for resource extraction should include analyzing potential for future use by recreational groups.
- 0465-001 We specifically request notice of all opportunities for public participation, input, briefing, and review throughout the process, and copies of all publicly disseminated documents relating to the CLMP revision. In particular, we wish to remain as closely as possible informed and involved as alternatives are being formulated. It has been our uniform experience that additional communication at the alternatives formulation stage is repaid many times over in terms of later public acceptance of the process. If the revision does not develop multiple alternatives that are viewed as sound, science-based, and philosophically acceptable to broad segments of the conservation-oriented public, including out membership and that of the other groups constituting the Alaska Rainforest Campaign, it will become a future source of conflict and failure.
- 0465-002 Range of Alternatives The Chugach is in a position unique among national forests, vast and endowed with superlative natural values, yet largely unroaded and unencumbered by a timber sale program. The highest and best use of the forest is beyond dispute in the preservation of its natural values -- in particular its roadless character. The challenge of the plan revision process is to develop severed meaningfully different alternatives that all maintain the roadless and natural characteristics of the forest for the many local, regional, national and even international visitors who come to the Chugach for its unspoiled qualities. This must not be a planning process in which there is a single "amenity" alternative surrounded by proposals for degrading the forest through varying degrees of commodity extraction. the foundation of the planning process must be a solid understanding of what will be required genuinely to ensure compliance with all applicable legal standards.
- 0465-003 Prime among these are the Forest Service's obligation to maintain viable populations of all native (and some other) vertebrate species, well-distributed throughout their existing range on the Forest. A high level of confidence must be achieved that this requirement is met in all alternatives, and that no gaps will develop in populations. Using the alternatives review process to evaluate different approaches to wildlife viability, so that only one or two of the alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) really "insure" wildlife population viability (36 C.F.R. Section 219.19), would thwart the requirement that all reasonable alternatives be studied.
- 0465-004 Different DEIS alternatives should examine different ways of exceeding minimum management requirements, for example insuring that abundant wildlife and fish populations remain on the Chugach in. perpetuity, but should not differ in meeting bare legal minimum.
- 0465-005 In addition to impeccably science-based approaches to ensuring legal compliance, alternatives are needed that present significantly different sets of standards for dealing with the following inter-related cornerstone issues: roadless areas, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, and abundant wildlife and fish.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0465-017 Conclusion In summary, as it develops the Chugach Land Management Plan, the Chugach Planning Team has a tremendous opportunity to develop multiple meaningful management plans that are responsive to public needs and serve the long-term conservation goals of the nation. By fully protecting; wilderness, roadless areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, and wildlife populations and habitat, the Chugach can make itself the showcase forest for the new millennium.
- 0466-005 In summary, the management plan should honestly include management for multiple use, not just using the words for window dressing.
- 0467-025 Survey information should be in sufficient detail to allow thorough evaluation of impacts of proposed plan. The Plan should include the number of or percentage of timber units covered.
- 0467-026 Maps should reflect this as well. Visual aids such as maps should be able to stand alone and be easily read. Key landmarks, names of topographic features, road numbers/names, etc., are most helpful. Additionally, catalogued fish stream numbers and names should be included.
- 0473-001 It is important to put this planning process in perspective, as much of the forest surrounds Prince William Sound and the Gulf of Alaska coasts oiled by the Exxon Valdez spill-- and still has not recovered.
- 0473-002 Since wilderness values of the coastline were harmed by the spill, and have not recovered in many areas, the Chugach forest should aid this recovery process by removing certain future industrial threats by recommending to Congress that large areas be permanently protected as wilderness.
- 0473-003 I believe that the most important purposes of the Chugach National Forest are to maintain wilderness and wild, natural forests for future generations.
- 0473-006 There should to be areas designated as quiet (non-motorized use) so that these kinds of experiences continue in the forest.
- 0474-004 Most People Ski in a BROKEN TRAIL (If they are normal) I ski more than I snowmachine by 100 hrs to 1 hr at least but AM GLAD TO SEE A Snowmachine to break trail. KEEP Closures Manitoba & Turnagain Pass split Delete Res Pass Wildlife Impacts of Snowmachine.
- 0475-005 Given that bark can be, and is used for many purposes, allowing it to be discharged as a pollutant is a waste of a useful and valuable product. The Forest Service should adopt a policy that prohibits back deposits in water and directs any person allowed to take trees from the Forest to use the entire tree in a beneficial to take trees from the Forest to use the entire tree in a beneficial manner.
- 0475-007 The Forest Service should recommend for designation all potential rivers within the Chugach.
- 0475-008 This[copper river delta] is an area of immense natural beauty and abundant wildlife. The Delta is a fragile ecosystem that should be permanently protected.
- 0475-010 While the Forest Service may have no voice on patented mining claims, it can have one in approving, modifying, or disapproving what is done in the rest of the project area. Congress gave the Forest Service authority to regulate mining under the Organic Act which allows for rules to preserve the forests from destruction and the National Forest Management Act, which directs the Forest Service to prepare forest plans. Thus the Chugach Plan should include a standard that requires an Environmental Assessment or Impact statement to be completed for each claim.
- 0476-009 Seventh, I would like to recommend that applications for mining permits should be subject to the environmental assessment process, with an opportunity for public input.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0476-012 Tenth, and last (but not least!): I hope that you will remember, at all times, as you are revising the Chugach N.F. management plans that this treasure is owned by all Americans, including many who will never see it but are nevertheless concerned about it's management and hence it's fate. There are many areas in our country that I have never visited, and never will; however, I want them to be properly managed and protected, and those that I'm a part owner of, as is the case with the National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and Public Domain lands managed by the B.L.M., I believe I have a right to expect that they will be! You have a responsibility as managers of the National Forests to be good stewards of the land, and not yield to those who would push the "lowest common denominator" approach. I urge you to carry out that responsibility in a conscientious manner.
- 0478-001 The above comment plan does not reflect the best interest of the Chugach National Forest.
- 0478-004 I do not endorse the ten point form letter comment plan (attached) submitted to the unidentified special interest group.
- 0479-012 The Forest Service needs to address transportation issues, including a transportation plan for the forest.
- 0479-015 inevitable growth of a large-scale tourism industry in southcentral Alaska poses significant threats to the forest, including road-building, structural developments, and increased access, both motorized and non-motorized, among other issues. These major threats to defacto wilderness areas, coupled with the significant impacts the forest and its resources endured related to the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill in 1989, have the potential to indefinitely alter the character of the forest. The Forest Service needs to address these types of impacts and increased uses and demands on the forest, in its Forest Plan revision.
- 0479-017 Thus the Forest Service must address a wildlife viability/habitat protection plan forest-wide for the Chugach National Forest, giving special consideration to the habitat needs of the brown bear on the Kenai Peninsula. We encourage the Forest Service to work with other agencies in southcentral Alaska to create a Brown Bear Task Force and develop a Brown Bear Conservation Plan, which includes a habitat protection component for the Chugach National Forest and other lands on the Kenai Peninsula. The recommendations of this Task Force should be included in the Chugach Planning process. The issues surrounding the long term viability of brown bears on the forest should direct the Forest Planning Process toward favoring long term protection of critical habitat areas on the forest, such as Wilderness designations on the Kenai Peninsula and in the Nellie Juan / College Fjord Wilderness Study area, and recommending Wilderness designation for other roadless areas on the forest.
- 0479-019 This would be achieved with a number of designated Wilderness areas comprised of different ecosystem types: for example, Wilderness designation in the Nellie Juan/College Fjord Study Area and the Kenai Peninsula and Copper River Delta areas.
- 0479-023 We envision a balance of recreational and tourism uses of the forest.
- 0479-025 We envision large scale tourism developments only along highway corridors, and/or in already roaded areas, but not in backcountry, roadless areas.

## *Comment # Comment*

- 0479-034 Wildlife Viability: TWS would like the Forest Service to the review scientific information and habitat needs of sensitive species, or "species of concern" on the forest, including Brown bear, Black bear, Wolf, North American lynx, Northern Goshawk, Marbled murrelet, Kittlitz's murrelet, Harlequin duck, Olive sided flycatcher, Alder flycatcher, Grey-cheeked thrush, Blackpole warbler, and possibly others, and develop a wildlife viability / habitat conservation plan for these species which is incorporated into the alternatives developed during the revision process. In order to do this, the Forest Service must first develop habitat capability index models for wolves, Harlequin ducks, lynx, 4 Marbled murrelets and goshawks, and for any other sensitive species or species of concern for which these models have not been developed.
- 0479-041 TWS would like to suggest the Forest Service approach cumulative impacts analysis in a two-tiered process, where Tier VIII would be cumulative impacts analysis on a "Landscape" or "Ecosystem" level, built up from the sum of all the Tier 2 "Watershed" level analyses. With this approach, the Forest Service would better understand its actions on a larger-scale or "macro" level and also on a watershed or "micro" level. Both levels of analysis will be invaluable to the long term sustainability and viability of forest resources.
- 0479-042 Watershed Analysis: TWS would like the Forest Service to do a watershed by watershed inventory of the forest which would identify issues regarding water quality, riparian areas, wildlife and fisheries, and any harmed areas. This will help the Forest Service and the public better understand the impacts of future actions on the forest on a watershed level. In addition, increased cruise ship activity in Prince William Sound and other motorized modes of recreation throughout the forest, such as jet skis, may well degrade water quality.
- 0479-046 Forest Health and Spruce Bark Beetle: In the past few years, salvage logging has been proposed on the Chugach to address so-called "forest health." Forest health has been defined by the former Chief of the Forest Service, as, ". . . a desired state of forest health exists where extant biotic and abiotic influences do not threaten resource management objectives now or in the future -- including ecosystem functions" (Thomas 1995). TWS does not find "forest health," as defined by Thomas, to be an acceptable term upon which to base forest management decisions. TWS would like the Forest Service to move away from using this narrow and controversial term (and the concepts heretofore developed around "forest health") in the revision process, and instead approach forest resource management from a more holistic perspective, where "ecology" and "natural forest cycles" have some value within Forest Service terminology and policy-making. We would like to suggest the Forest Service use the term "forest ecology" in place of "forest health." Allowing "natural forest cycles" and "forest ecology" to have value in Forest Service terminology and policy-making is not only consistent with the National Forest Management Act (NFMA), but is especially important to TWS when addressing aspects of the Chugach National Forest such as the spruce bark beetle. We would like to see the Forest Service discuss the spruce bark beetle as a natural and inherent part of spruce forests, whose prevalence is affected by climactic conditions and stages in forest succession. When addressing the spruce bark beetle in the revision process, we would like the Forest Service to address long-term, ecosystem-based solutions for the spruce bark beetle, and not turn to logging as the only "cure" for the spruce bark beetle. Pacific Northwest scientists have released reports and recommendations which suggest that salvage logging may well slow the recovery of beetle infested forests (Beschta, R.L. et al., 1995, and the Eastside Forests Scientific Society Panel, Washington and Oregon). Given that salvage logging may well slow the recovery of beetle infested forests, TWS would like the Forest Service to turn its attention to alternatives other than salvage logging in recovery efforts regarding the spruce bark beetle, such as prescribed fire.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0479-047 Fire: Fire is the primary agent for forest regeneration, which for the Chugach could have important management implications at this time. Fuel load will increase as more trees die and fall from beetle kill. TWS would like the Forest Service to address this issue using prescribed fires as a solution to fuel load build up in the revision process, not salvage logging. We would like to see the Forest Service map out areas where concern over fuel load is high, and where prescribed fires are a viable solution. Clearly areas surrounding private lands and occupied dwellings may need alternative management methods, such as creating fire breaks.
- 0479-048 While some may believe salvage logging is a good management tool for fire reduction, TWS does not subscribe to this way of thinking. Events over the past two summers on the Kenai Peninsula suggest that logging activities, such as road building, and slash pile burning, which are inevitable aspects of current logging methods, actually increase the potential for uncontrolled fires. Slash piles which are left to burn unattended and increased human access to the forest due to roadbuilding, both of which are associated with logging activities, heighten the probability of human-caused, uncontrolled fires. Both of these situations have caused significant fires on the Kenai in recent years. Instead of salvage logging to reduce fuel loads, which to the contrary has caused uncontrolled, human-caused fires, TWS would like to see the Forest Service develop a prescribed fire management plan during the revision process to address fire concerns on the forest.
- 0479-050 Chugach National Forest. Transportation: TWS would like the Forest Service to develop its own Transportation Plan in the revision process which would address all aspects of travel in and around the forest, including roads, marine highway systems, and motorized and non-motorized access and designated areas on the forest (motorized use includes cars, trucks, RV's, atv's, motorbikes, snowmachines, fixed-wing planes, helicopters, jet skis, airboats, and other powerboats, and any other motorized means of transportation), and developments within highway corridors that affect the forest.
- 0479-053 Further, we would like to ensure that the Forest Service addresses and complies with all of the agreements made in the Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan (SCHPP) which is due to be finalized in January of 1998.
- 0479-056 3) Copper River Trail/Road: TWS would like the Forest Service to address the long-term plans for and associated impacts regarding the Copper River Trail / Road in the planning process. 4)
- 0479-058 Motorized/Non-Motorized Access: Natural Quiet needs to be added to the list of primary resources" listed in the Forest Plan, such as fish and wildlife, recreation, and scenic beauty, etc.. Natural Quiet is a threatened and rapidly disappearing resource which deserves protection and specific analysis.
- 0479-059 A Resource Report regarding motorized use on the forest, including a detailed map of zones or designated use areas, the policies for use of motorized access (i.e. where and where not, when and when not, and under what other rules motorized vehicles are allowed to operate), and impacts of motorized use, such as pollution and increased access, should be developed for the planning process. Motorized use, from our perspective, includes: cars, trucks, RVs, atv's, orv's, motorbikes, snowmachines, fixed-wing planes, helicopters, jet skis, airboats, and other powerboats, and any other motorized means of transportation.
- 0479-060 All motorized uses in wilderness areas should conform to ANILCA and The Wilderness Act, and the Forest Service should work on developing "Limits of Acceptable Change" regarding motorized use on the forest.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0479-061 There needs to be a balance of motorized and non-motorized designated areas in both remote and more accessible areas, in all seasons -- fall, winter, spring and summer. The current situation heavily favors motorized use in the winter, and TWS instead would like to see equal opportunity for the two types of winter users. This can only be accomplished through the separation of users through either time or space zoning, and the 8 separation needs to be adequate in time or space to provide "Natural Quiet" for non-motorized users.
- 0479-062 The current ORV plan should be updated and incorporated into the Chugach Land Management Planning (CLMP) Process. Points Regarding Specific Types of Motorized Use:
- 0479-068 The inevitable growth of a large-scale tourism industry in southcentral Alaska poses significant threats to the forest, including road-building, structural developments, and increased access, both motorized and non-motorized, among other issues. In order to get a complete picture of use patterns and subsequent adverse impacts, the Forest Service needs to consider the increasing number of private users on the forest. The Forest Service needs to address these types of impacts and increased uses and demands on the forest in its Forest Plan revision.
- 0479-071 Mining: At this time, mining is permitted in virtually every watershed in the Chugach National Forest. TWS would like the Forest Service to do a cumulative impacts analysis regarding mining on the forest during the revision process. This would dovetail nicely with the watershed cumulative impacts analysis suggested above. TWS recommends that the Forest Service review all mining activity on the Forest to determine which areas should be withdrawn from any further mining claims to protect wilderness and wildlife values on the forest, and which claims should be acquired to similarly protect those values.
- 0479-076 We believe large-scale tourism with its associated developments and impacts, including road-building, facility development and increased access and use of the forest pose some of the most significant threats to the forest. Therefore, TWS would like the Forest Service to address the following topics as outlined above in the revision process: Wilderness, Roadless Areas, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Other Special Designations on the Forest, Wildlife Viability; Subsistence; Cumulative Impacts Analysis; Watershed Analysis; Timber/Salvage Logging; Forest Health/Spruce Bark Beetle; Fire; Transportation; Motorized/Non-Motorized Access; Tourism & Recreation; Air Quality; and Mining. We appreciate the opportunity to submit these initial scoping comments, and hope our comments will be meaningfully incorporated into the revision process.
- 0483-011 To date, most lands "managed" by the USFS have ended up being degraded with impaired watersheds and fisheries, fragmented wildlife habitat, invasions of exotic plants and increasing risks to sensitive and endangered species. It is time the USFS change its focus or it is time to abolish the USFS.
- 0484-001 Knowledgeable and responsible use of our recreational resources is of prime importance, especially on Kenai Peninsula where we live.
- 0484-004 It would even be nice to see some side roads opened up that allow driving away from the main road to access some of the valleys. The key being balance between "over-accessing" and "under-accessing." Under accessing would mean an Alaska that one drives through and exists only as scenery viewed from a car window. Much of the appeal will be lost if all the pull-out roads are gated off (as most seem to be along the new Sterling Highway) and there are no "exploring" roads left open.
- 0485-005 Only through federally mandated preservation, can a land or waterway receive some protection. And I stress the word some since protection, such as with the designation of National Parks or Wild and Scenic Rivers does not guarantee absence of human caused damage from remote or neighboring sources.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0487-001 A recognition that Natural Quiet is a Natural Resource and a specific human value just as scenic beauty is a resource and its appreciation is a specific human value. This has been extensively documented in recreational and visitor surveys.
- 0487-002 A listing of Natural Quiet in every resource list and value list. 3) A listing of Natural Quiet in every survey or questionnaire. 4) A plan for long term protection of the Natural Quiet Resource.
- 0487-003 A recognition of, and plan for identifying, the carrying capacity and limits of acceptable use in all areas of the Forest. The current method of responding in a piecemeal fashion to each demand will ultimately destroy what now exists.
- 0487-004 The impact of large tourism and a growing local population will overwhelm the resource unless the Plan puts specific limits on human activities of all kinds in every management area.
- 0487-006 A recognition and plan for the right of communities neighboring Chugach National Forest to peace and quiet.
- 0487-014 In addition to a plan for fair and balanced non-motorized and motorized recreational use, a plan for topographical and/or temporal separation of snowmachine use from non-motorized winter recreation is needed. The current separation in places such as Turnagain Pass does not provide a sound barrier.
- 0488-002 Mineral Activities - The Chugach is home to extensive mineralization. Areas of known mineralization or potential should be given a minerals prescription. Mining is one of the oldest commercial and recreation uses of the Chugach, establishing many of the roads, trails and communities. This historic relationship needs to be continued.
- 0488-003 Timber - Manage the forest to provide sufficient quantities of timber, both salvage and quality trees for full-time commercial operations.
- 0488-004 Access - There is a growing need for increased access. Increased use by individuals, recreation, tourism and other commercial users has placed a great need on the importance of maintaining and expanding access to the Chugach. We need to protect, expand and promote roads, trails, landing strips, docking spots, and helicopter access within the Chugach. The plan should consider new access routes and locations along with increase motorized uses. This will allow the greatest number of users to enjoy the Forest and not limit the region to a small number of users.
- 0492-002 The number one use of our nations national forests is driving for pleasure. To this end the Chugach National Forest has failed. My comment is to keep roads open. If this cannot occur then they should be left and allowed to convert naturally into trails. This is how the limited amount of trails in the forest has come into existence. Remember to days development leads to to morrows recreation areas. With 98.8% of the forest without means of access the majority of the public are denied use, handicapped and elderly are discriminated against by policy.
- 0492-007 The scoping process needs to be revised so that it is not contaminated by the intimidation techniques. The radical environmental groups with a membership of less than three thousandths of Alaska's population are currently setting policy.
- 0493-005 It make's sense to protect the Chugach. It seems of utmost importance to protect the Chugach National Forest since it has been heavily damaged by the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989 and since the forest provides habitat to brown bears, salmon, and many other wildlife species.
- 0495-005 Quiet areas in which no motorized vehicular travel is allowed should be established, and the determination of these areas should be based strictly on maintaining the overall quality the whole forest.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0532-001 No more corporate profit from public lands Protect public lands from exploitation and destruction for the many generations to come.
- 0572-001 Instead of designating quiet areas, consider inventorying & designating appropriate primitive, non-motorized recreation areas.
- 0627-001 I want to see this National Forest managed so the environment comes first.
- 0654-004 CNF should continue working more closely with interested citizens in its planning efforts. Meeting held on this Forest Plan were very positive. The National Forest should continue seeking public input-possibly through an advisory committee-to avoid large conflicts such as the recent salvage logging debate.
- 0654-007 Do watershed analysis for major projects/planning efforts.
- 0655-004 You folks at The Forest Service are doing a great job responding to and meeting many differing viewpoints. Thank you for your efforts.
- 0656-001 Thank you for listening to the residents of the area in the past 2 yrs. I believe these recommendations will help keep the area useable to a greater number of People & Habitat
- 0659-001 Please, please protect it - our grandchildren will need it.
- 0699-001 Alaska has the chance now to preserve our forest, fishing streams and its pristine beauty spots. Save it for the future generations. I have five grandchildren all born in Alaska & in March will have five great-grandchildren, all youngsters. Please consider it for them 7 thousands of others to enjoy when they grow up. We also need stricter rules for tankers and fishing ships.
- 0704-001 I wish I had the time and knowledge to address these issues in more detail. Suffice to say that forests are more easily destroyed than created, thus whatever we do with them must be done with care.
- 0705-003 The watershed analysis is essential to the health of our salmon streams.
- 0716-001 Somethings should be left along on Mother Earth, and Chugach N.F. is one of them.
- 0725-001 The wild world exists in a state of siege. As stewards of lands that belong to all of us, you should manage them in such a way as to assure that in 50 or 100 years when our world will be a greatly different place from what it is now, people can say, "How farsighted they were to protect this place from themselves."
- 0735-001 I agree with all the above! God gave us this gorgeous area to keep & use with Conservation!--not to destroy. I think Mother Nature is telling Modern Man to back up and slow down a little, recycles!
- 0738-001 Remember - once we spoil our forests we lose all the beauty of this mountain, mud slides and loss of salmon streams follow with erosion.
- 0739-001 Please protect the forest.
- 0763-001 Each of these points is extremely important to me. This is what Alaska is all about and what most tourists come to see. Please do all you can to save it! come to see. Please do all you can to save it!
- 0765-001 Pull in any legal requirements that prohibit destruction of forests and endangered or threatened species. The more law we have on our side to protect Chugach the better.
- 0775-001 The Protection of Prince William Sound & should be a very high priority.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0777-002 we address our concern that the Chugach National Forest, while revising its forest management plan, does not alter the fundamental balance struck by Congress with its passage of ANILCA. Second, we address our concern that the revision process has thus far not satisfied the mandatory participation requirements of 36 CFR section 219.
- 0777-003 Third, we address our concern that the Chugach National Forest Planning Team has not provided the public with complete, concise, unbiased and readily usable information, and that the scoping stage of the Forest Plan revision process accordingly should be extended until the Chugach National Forest publishes complete information for the public to use in the planning process.
- 0777-007 For over a decade the Chugach National Forest has managed the College Fjord-Nellie Juan Wilderness Study Area and several Research Natural Areas in just this manner without congressional approval. The revised Forest Plan should bring management of this area into compliance with applicable statutes.
- 0777-008 The Forest Planning Team must implement management practices that accomplish and further the intent and purpose of ANILCA.
- 0777-010 Roadless Area Inventory The Chugach National Forest states that it has inventoried 98.8% of its land as "roadless." While it is not clear what the Forest Service is attempting to accomplish by performing this Roadless Areas inventory, 36 CFR section 219.17(a) states that roadless area inventories are to be conducted for recommendation of those areas into the wilderness system. Because ANILCA obviated the need for further wilderness designations in Alaska and prohibited unauthorized studies whose single purpose is to consider their establishment, the Forest Service should neither evaluate nor recommend land within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest for any new roadless area or wilderness area designations.
- 0777-011 EVOS Trustee Council Land Transfers The Exxon Valdez Oil Spill ("EVOS") Trustee Council has purchased and is in the process of purchasing a tremendous amount of privately-owned surface estate within the boundaries of the Chugach National Forest. These surface interests are being brought into the public domain as part of a comprehensive habitat restoration program, and they represent interests in a significant portion of the private land holdings in the region. As the owner of the subsurface estate, CAC has significant rights in the lands being acquired. The Forest Service must implement management practices that acknowledge and are consistent with CAC's valid rights in lands the surface of which was acquired through the EVOS habitat restoration program. The Forest Service, through its Revisions newsletter and comment maps, has made no mention of the significant addition to its land base that the EVOS land transfers represent, nor has it indicated any provision to offset the loss of private land in the region.
- 0777-012 Consistent with ANILCA'S intent and purpose, the Chugach National Forest must balance increases in habitat protection with increases in public access and resources available for multiple use development elsewhere in the Chugach National Forest.
- 0777-014 The recommendation of new protective designations in the proximity of CAC's land holdings would frustrate efficient management of the forest because it would place the Forest Service in the conflicting position of being legally obligated to both facilitate and restrict access across the same forest lands. The Forest Planning Team should avoid recommending protective designations or implementing management practices that will cause legal conflict and confusion, frustrate efficient forest management, or diminish valid private rights of use granted under ANCSA, ANILCA, or the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0777-015 While it is appropriate for the Forest Service to periodically revise its Forest Plan to stay current with changing conditions, it is not acceptable to change the fundamental balance Congress sought to achieve, and the certainty it sought to give private landowners in the proximity of federal lands in Alaska, through the enactment of ANILCA. The Forest Service must revise the Forest Plan in a manner consistent with the intent and purpose of ANILCA.
- 0777-017 The Chugach National Forest Must Provide the Public with Complete, Concise, Unbiased and Readily Usable Information throughout the Scoping and Forest Plan Revision Process The Chugach National Forest is currently in its "scoping phase" of the revision process. It is critically important that the Forest Planning Team give the public the information necessary to provide the Chugach National Forest with informed, diverse and meaningful input into the revised Forest Plan at this stage, and that it remain objective in its information-gathering role. This includes accurately educating the public as to the Forest Service's mandatory and discretionary activities.
- 0777-018 Unfortunately, the Chugach National Forest appears to have been somewhat pre-decisional in its planning. For instance, the comment map and Revision newsletters appear to lean heavily in favor of habitat preservation and dispersed recreational use. The current comment map does not identify those areas within the Chugach National Forest that are suitable for destination tourism, oil and gas development, timber harvest or mineral exploration. In the May 1997 newsletter, the Forest Planning Team asks whether commercial timber harvest is appropriate on the Chugach National Forest. This sort of question tends to mislead the public into thinking that timber harvest, commercial or otherwise, is a discretionary activity of the Chugach National Forest. Yet another example of the Forest Planning Team's failure to provide the public with complete information concerns the public comment map dated August 19, 1997, which failed to show the access guaranteed to CAC under paragraph 8 of the 1982 CNI Settlement Agreement. Even after a Chugach National Forest official assured CAC that future maps would show this access, it did not appear on the planning maps.
- 0777-019 Nor does the power site classification in place on Nellie Juan Lake and River appear on the planning maps, even though this very lake and river system was found eligible for inclusion into the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.
- 0777-020 The Forest Planning Team did not include or describe any EVOS land acquisitions in the comment map or the Revision newsletters.
- 0777-021 It also failed to include other ownerships on several maps used at public meetings, thereby representing the entire area as under Forest Service jurisdiction. It is difficult to believe that thoughtful and informed public comment can be generated when the base information given to the public is so incomplete and potentially misleading.
- 0777-022 All potential land uses must be identified on the information that is given to the public so that the public can provide informed and balanced input into the Forest Plan revision process. The Forest Planning Team must be completely unbiased in its presentation of potential land uses and proposed land management objectives, especially at this important stage of the process.
- 0777-023 It should educate the public about the multiple use mandates to which the Forest Service must adhere,
- 0777-026 Currently, the Forest Plan Revision Public Comment Map is an inappropriate document to serve as a basis for public comment. Because it is still early in the revision process and the concerns we raise are significant, the scoping phase should be extended until the Chugach National Forest publishes complete information for the public to use in the Forest Plan revision process.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0777-027 The Chugach National Forest Must Take an Active Role in Managing National Forest Lands under Its Jurisdiction The Chugach National Forest Must Fully Implement the Land Management Plan It Adopts through this Process The current Forest Plan was never fully implemented, and when a revision has been deemed necessary, it has been accomplished without public notice or participation. For instance, the withdrawal of all salvage logging by the Forest Supervisor without public notice or process was such a unilateral revision. The Chugach National Forest is once again encouraging Alaska residents to commit enormous amounts of time and energy into developing the new Forest Plan. This expenditure of resources must not go to waste. The Chugach National Forest must ensure that the Forest Plan is fully implemented, and that any subsequent revisions are the product of an appropriate public process.
- 0777-029 The new Forest Plan must apply proven forest management practices to its timber resources to improve the supply of raw materials to local communities and industry and to restore and improve the basic health of the forest.
- 0777-030 The Chugach National Forest Should Consider Land Consolidation as Part of Its Management Plan for the Forest The pattern of land ownership within the Chugach National Forest, along with additional surface acquisitions from Native village corporations through the EVOS habitat restoration program, creates a very difficult management situation for all landowners in the region. Because management strategies will invariably conflict, management of either the surface or the subsurface in a coordinated and mutually agreeable manner will be difficult, if not impossible. The Chugach National Forest should consider land exchanges with private parties to consolidate ownership and simplify management within the forest.
- 0777-031 The Chugach National Forest Must Manage the Forest in a Manner Consistent with Its Multiple Use Mandate The Forest Plan revision process thus far appears to be severely predisposed to non-development, pro-dispersed recreation designations for most, if not all, of the forest. This is in direct conflict with the National Forest System mandate of multiple use. Multiple use means more than recreation, subsistence and wildlife habitat.
- 0777-033 The Chugach National Forest Should improve the Public's Ability to Access Public Lands within the Forest With over 5 million acres of land, most of which is inaccessible except by air or water, and with clear and substantial public demand to use much of this land, the Chugach National Forest should be seeking ways to increase public access, both motorized and non-motorized, to meet that demand. With so much land available, the Forest Service should be able to accommodate all user groups.
- 0777-034 The Chugach National Forest's proposal to completely obliterate the existing road across the south end of Montague Island from MacLeod harbor to the Nellie Martin River at Patton Bay is an unfortunate example of the Forest Service's recent management decisions that seem to ignore its multiple use mandate. This road travels through some of the most unique and spectacular scenery in Alaska which would otherwise be virtually inaccessible to the vast majority of the public. The private company that built this road offered, at no expense to the public, to convert the road to a non-motorized trail and maintain it in perpetuity through an endowment established specifically for that purpose. This road has the potential to provide a unique recreation experience and should be converted into a non-motorized trail.
- 0777-035 The Forest Planning Team should consider providing enough areas forest-wide to meet the demands for all access needs, including designating the former Montague Island road bed as a non-motorized trail.
- 0778-001 In general, I support the Chugach National Forest Land Management Plan as it currently stands. Especially as it pertains to ORV use. ORV's should not be given access to any more Chugach National Forest Land.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0779-003 In future revision newsletters, I would like to see point/counterpoint opinion pieces about fire and forest health. I would like to write one in counterpoint to logging as the response to the changes beetles have wrought in the forest.
- 0781-001 We urge, the Forest Service to continue to manage these lands to maintain these qualities by prioritizing low-impact uses on the forest. While we realize that legislative designation for wilderness may not be possible with the current Congress, ACE and its membership urge the Forest Service to manage it as such. Over 90% of the forest qualifies for wilderness designation.
- 0783-001 1. Legal Mandate - The first item in the Plan should be a summary of the applicable legal authorities that apply to the management of the forest and specifically the Forest Service Organic Act and how this mandates multiple use of the forest. It is important for the public to know the reasons for which the Forest Service was created.
- 0783-003 3. Prohibition Against Study for New Conservation System Units - The Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA) stated that the need for federal Conservation System Units had been met and it mandated specifically that federal government agencies (including the U.S. Forest Service) were not to even study areas for CSU designation unless specifically authorized by Congress. Congress has not specifically authorized any such study and therefore this Plan cannot include considerations. In addition to prohibiting study for National Parks, Preserves, Monuments, and Refuges, this prohibition covers designations for Wild & Scenic Rivers (W&SRs). It is therefore illegal for the Plan to consider W&SR designations.
- 0783-004 4. Minerals Prescription Areas, with known mineralization should be given a specific minerals prescription and designated for mineral development. Minerals opportunities should be given a specific chapter in the Revised Plan. The minerals prescription areas should also include all areas where mineral production has occurred in the past. USGS and US Bureau of Mines publications will be of major value in defining both mineralized areas and past production areas. The BLM historic mining claim records will also provide a source of this information. Specific items that need to be included in the chapter on minerals include: - geologic maps showing all mineralized areas; - maps showing all identifiable past mining areas; - a narrative description of past mining for each general area/drainage; - a narrative description of past mining for each of the specific mine for which such information can be found; - a bibliography listing all known published material on the Chugach Forest area. 5. Minerals Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must be a certified minerals geologist or a registered mining engineer. Additionally, at least one minerals geologist from the USGS and one mining engineer from the UAF School of Mineral Engineering should be engaged to participate in development of the minerals prescription and the minerals chapter. Minerals are an important aspect of the Chugach Forest and it is essential that someone on the Planning Team have personal education and experience with minerals development.
- 0783-006 8. Commercial Tourism Representation - At least one member of the USFS Planning Team must have training and experience in commercial tourism

***Comment # Comment***

- 0783-007 9. Access - A specific chapter should be devoted to access. All historic access throughout the Chugach National Forest should be shown on all maps. Access was historically, and remains today, an essential element in use of the forest. Without ports, roads, trails, and airfields use of the forest is limited to a very small part of the general public and only a small portion of the uses mandated by the Forest Service Organic Act. Roads and trails should be identified, numbered and a history of usage included for each. It is essential that historic access and historic activity be shown to insure that the public knows the history of the area. The Plan should define new roads that will provide access to meet the needs of logging, mining, and destination tourism. The Plan should include evaluation of keeping Logging roads available for the general public after the logging operations are completed. There is a tremendous need for access roads to meet the growing needs of the recreating public. There is need for more road access to help disperse the public activity on the Forest and reduce the current crowding. These same roads benefit both the recreational and commercial segments of the mineral industry. 10. Access for General Public - One part of the Chapter on access should focus on access needs of the general public. This should include motorized access for tourism of all types. A growing segment of our society involves the elderly and their needs for effective access must be considered. Many areas of this state are closed to the elderly because they are not physically able to stand the physical rigors of remote hiking and associated boating. It is not fair for these Americans to also be excluded from use of the Chugach Forest. The Chugach is located near several of the few population centers that exist in the state and the Chugach is therefore the most feasible area for providing effective access for the elderly segment of our society.
- 0783-011 14. Destination Tourism - As with other commercial activities, opportunities for destination tourism must be considered. Most of the population of this country is not able to practice strictly remote/primitive tourism or recreation and this segment must be considered in the plan.
- 0783-012 15. Scoping Data Ineffective - In many ways the scoping data does not effectively prepare the reviewer. Access routes, rights of way, including RS-2477s, are not shown. Past mining and logging area are not shown. Private Native lands where EVOS monies have restricted the surface use are not shown. The rivers being considered for W&SR designation are not named and shown in a way that allows the reviewer to see the impacted areas. The result of these deficiencies is that the reviewer gets a very different picture of the forest as compared to the actual situation.
- 0786-002 Q. Are there any improvements that you would make to the workshop that you participated in today? A. Not this one today. I went to the meeting with my ORU Issue #1 in my mind. I now understand that the process is best served by the rules set down at the beginning. It also helps knowing how the different issues affect my issue & area.
- 0787-001 I would like to, see the forest managed primarily for fish and wildlife viability. To me this is an important indicator as to the overall health of the forest, and thus surrounding economies and the state. It is the fish and wildlife which provide for economic livelihood of the peoples of south-central Alaska and Prince William Sound areas.
- 0787-013 Prince William Sound needs further protection to help recovery from the 1989 oil spill of 11 plus million gallons. Please do not allow marinas to be built on public lands and no more mooring buoys. I would also like the public to be informed of the interdisciplinary team meeting

***Comment # Comment***

- 0789-002 A RECREATION AND TOURISM STRATEGY for the Heritage Tourism Industry must not be left out of this plan as it was in 1984. The consequences of ignoring the inevitable growth and demand of the world's largest Industry could be detrimental to the future multiple use management of Chugach National Forest. Environmentalists claim that there is not room for everyone else on the forest now that they have secured their ecotourism slots and venues in Prince William Sound. The grand buzz word is "sustainability", which by its very definition suggests that most other activities are "unsustainable." In multiple use management, such a term seems to border on heresy! The very word is another triumph of image over reality! Confusion in forest management has come from a reluctance to view the whole nature of the ecosystem. Forests are more than units which produce timber, minerals, outdoor recreation and commercial products. They deal with intangible values which feed the spirit and mind of humans. These intangible values are sold within the heritage tourism industry, an industry which can partner with the forest to invent experiences specially designed, for forest visitors. Moving beyond traditional roles of outdoor recreation, the modern and international tourist has different needs and expectations which the forest planner must understand. Sightseeing and flightseeing are valid uses which directly relate to the forest unit. 3. A Integrated Resource Interpretation Study (IRIS) and Visitor Use Plan should be undertaken early in the planning process to understand the now relationships forming on designated forest lands. While this approach is somewhat foreign to traditional forest management, such planning for the future visitor is the only way to avoid conflicts between the tangible and intangible resource sale demands emerging in the 21st Century.
- 0792-001 Due to poor forest practices, roadless areas in the U.S. are becoming more and more rare. The Chugach National Forest, over 90% roadless, is a national treasure. I urge you to implement Wilderness designations on all parts of the entire forest that could possibly qualify for Wilderness designation. In particular, the proposed Nellie Juan/College Fjord Wilderness Study area must be retained for Wilderness designation.
- 0798-001 The Chugach is described on the USFS website as "primarily a recreation, fish and wildlife forest." I hope you will manage this forest in the future not only to preserve in this manner, but to enhance these qualities. Specifically. 1) The Nellie Juan/College Fjord Wilderness Study Area (WSA) should continue to be managed as a WSA (that's the law if I am not mistaken) and full wilderness designation should be sought. 2) Chugach should establish other WSA to enhance the above-mentioned qualities.
- 0800-002 Forest Health Forest health problems continue to appear across the CNF. With leadership, imagination and creativity, existing problems can be addressed and future problems avoided through management on those parts of the forest that will allow such management. The consequences of doing nothing can be seen over large areas of the CNF.
- 0800-004 It is a proven fact that forests providing habitat types through the various developmental stages offers the maximum benefit to the widest diversity of wildlife species. This, due to the nature of the CNF, can only be achieved through management. It is further a proven fact that there is no long term impact or threat to water quality or fisheries that results from such management if done, properly.
- 0800-005 Balanced Use It is important for all to understand that only a small percentage of the CNF is available for forest management. The impacts on all other uses will be small with the development of a well managed harvesting program. However, this approach offers a balance that does not now exist on the CNF and addresses the important issues of long term forest health, wildlife and the economic future of Alaska.
- 0802-012 Mining Claims: When reviewing mining claims for permits, address them as part of an environmental assessment. Currently, they are permitted under categorical exclusions, which gives the public no information about how their resource is managed or what impacts are expected. Please do a watershed cumulative impacts analysis which includes mining.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0802-016 With large-scale clearcutting of private and state lands near the Forest, it is especially important that lands on the Chugach be given added protection.
- 0802-018 Our members support protecting the Chugach's pristine forest and want the Forest Service to develop a plan that permanently protects this unspoiled wilderness.
- 0802-019 Please consider a management plan that accommodates the public's interest and stops the destructive management practices of the past.
- 0806-005 We support the Chugach National Forest's decision to put-to-bed all roads across Chugach Forest Lands following the completion of logging on native land on Montague Island. We feel that this was a commitment to those of us who opposed these roads that led us to withdraw our opposition. It would be unfortunate if the Forest Service were now to change its policy. During the last planning process, we were very concerned with the range of alternatives offered. For example, alternatives that we might have supported for several reasons were several reasons were lumped together with options that we would not have supported in any alternative such as widespread prescribed burning for game species habitat improvement. We would appreciate the opportunity to be involved in considering the range of alternatives during the planning process. We also remain concerned about the status of the inventories on which the planning process according to the Fed. rgs. is based. As you know, this was a point of concern during the previous planning process. The recreation inventory, for example, had a statistical reliability of 0 and included all the ice, rock and glaciers; the timber inventory was based on aerial photographs and not ground proofed. This led to statements such as "There is an unlimited supply of recreation lands and a limited demand." as well as "There is a limited supply of commercial timber and an unlimited demand." We are most concerned that the analysis of the management situation, alternatives and economic analyses be based on accurate, statistically reliable inventories. We look forward to reviewing both the inventories and the analyses of the management situation. When this step is completed, we hope that you will make them available to the Valdez Public Library. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
- 0807-005 with the help of ADF&G, we have been dealing with land managers, most problems with the Kenai Peninsula Borough, to insure that fish and wildlife habitat is considered during planning and before development. If the Cooper Landing AC can be of any help, let us know.
- 0808-004 Please be careful about relying too heavily on comments generated by national campaigns by so-called environmental organizations that really do not have Alaska's best interests in mind. Instead, consider well-balanced advice from seasoned veterans of managing Alaska's forests and others who have lived and worked in this state for a long time.
- 0808-005 More wilderness designation is not necessary to protect this valuable forest. Proper management is.
- 0809-001 For this reason, we offer the following recommendations for consideration prior to release of a final CLMP. FOREST HEALTH: The Spruce Bark Beetle epidemic has been multiplying over the past decade to the extent that it is becoming a safety hazard to those individuals and communities in the Chugach area. While we understand that forest management includes conservation of said forest, we would hope that the plan would also include the use of timber harvest as a means to offset the potential hazard of fires in the area. It should be noted that the use of timber harvest in the area serves two purposes: to offset the threat of catastrophic fires and maintain the multiple use mandate for which the National Forest System was originally mandated. Timber harvest also gives professional foresters a management tool to aid in controlling the growing spruce bark beetle epidemic. Without such management of these areas and maintaining various species and age classes, the reforestation process cannot begin nor sustain itself against future beetle infestation.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0809-006 The Chugach National Forest must apply proven forest management practices to its timber resources to improve the supply of raw materials to local communities and industry and to improve and restore the basic health of the forest.
- 0809-007 There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative analysis of the plan.
- 0809-009 In addition, will there be conflict with local native corporations over their subsurface rights to certain areas of the Chugach National Forest? We understand that the Chugach National Forest is gaining vast surface lands due to the Exxon Valdez Trustee Council even though the regional native corporations still have ownership of the subsurface properties. Such a dual-ownership situation makes well coordinated surface and/or subsurface management difficult, if not impossible.
- 0811-008 There is a need for a community-by-community and alternative-by-alternative analysis of the plan.
- 0811-009 Chugach Land Management Plan Scoping Page 3 ADDITIONAL RESOURCE EXTRACTION The petroleum and mining industries also might have a future stake in the outcome of CLMP. For this reason, they should be noted as future stakeholders and added as a factor. What will be the impact of these industries, both environmentally and socioeconomically?
- 0811-010 We believe that a subsurface analysis should be conducted.
- 0811-012 It should be noted that we support forest management as a tool that takes both the health of forested areas and the socioeconomic health of surrounding communities into account before making long-term decisions
- 0812-001 We believe a dynamic forest plan, which recognizes advanced technologies for resource development and public lands access, is highly desirable for the Chugach National Forest. The USFS must defend the rights of citizens to access and develop the resources of the National Forest System.
- 0812-003 Chugach Land Management Plan revisions should define limits for the NEPA appeal process. Appeals need to be limited to legitimate science based questions of concern. The Plan must allow multi-use to occur without threat of appeal based on emotional philosophy or opinion polls with built-in bias. Requirements of NEPA are specific in outlining potential impacts of a particular use, appeals should be limited to addressing specific impacts that were overlooked. Appeals obviously disagreeing with the intrinsic value of the activity cannot continue to be heard if multi-use is to continue as a function of the National Forest.
- 0812-007 - Wild and Scenic River designations which lie outside of Wilderness Study Areas should reduce wilderness managed areas to equal a no net loss of acreage for multi-use activities and the economic resource base. - Of the 760+ rivers and glaciers in the Chugach National Forest, approximately one third, or 250+ are in Wilderness Study Areas. Wilderness management provides these glaciers and rivers the protected status sought by Wild and Scenic River classifications. Giving the Wild and Scenic status to a river in a wilderness area is redundant. - Designation of rivers and glaciers outside of the Wilderness Study Areas creates additional, unwarranted wilderness protection and unjustly prohibits certain user groups. Wild and Scenic River designations go beyond the protection necessary for roadless areas in the Chugach.
- 0812-011 Consider these points in drafting forest management alternatives: - Identifying access points for resource extraction should include analyzing potential for future use by recreational groups.
- 0812-013 Not all areas of the forest need to be designated in this revision process.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0812-016 Development reserves must be identified for areas deemed to have high potential for tourism and recreational activities. Reserves may change general location or anticipated prescription as demand for activities change, however, the need for identified reserves is critical for planned development. All ranges of visitation identified in the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum must be accommodated by planned visitor center developments.
- 0813-001 The development of the Whittier Access Road has raised concerns regarding the need for planning to deal with future tourism and recreational growth, particularly in the western portion of Prince William Sound.
- 0813-002 The Chugach Forest Plan will play an integral role in determining the future of the Sound. We view the Chugach National Forest as serving a wide variety of uses. A large portion is under study for Wilderness designation; some areas may be designated for timber harvest and still other land may be designated multiple use. It is within the multiple use areas that the majority of competing land uses are likely to occur. The Chugach Forest Plan needs to be specific enough in its allocations to create degrees of future certainty to encourage investment in and adjacent to the Chugach National Forest for tourism operators. The Plan also needs to provide for a broad spectrum of tourism operations from wilderness opportunities to more developed sites able to accommodate larger numbers of people.
- 0813-003 The issues that need to be addressed from a tourism perspective in the Chugach Plan Revision are identified below, in no particular order. 1. Tourism and recreation need to be adequately defined and distinguished in all planning phases, and their unique needs must be considered. While there is overlap that must be considered between tourism and recreation land uses and activities, each segment has unique and special needs. The revision plan must address tourism in its present form and provide for future growth on an equal footing with minerals, timber, fishing and other land uses. Tourism must be acknowledged as a legitimate use of the forest. Recreation, by contrast, generally refers to leisure activities pursued by local residents. It is distinguished from tourism because recreationists pursue these activities for their own enjoyment rather than financial gain.
- 0813-006 The USFS should tap into the expertise of other agencies and organizations such as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and hunting/guides. Detailed information on fish and wildlife resources and their use should be included in the GIS inventory system. Cultural resources and geological artifacts should also be documented. This type of information will further identify important areas for tourism and recreation and identify other resources such as minerals and timber important to fulfill the multiple use management mandate. Sea bird colonies (including nesting sites for semi-palmated plover, arctic terns, etc.), waterfowl and migratory bird resting and staging areas, harbor seal pupping beaches, harbor seal, sea otter and sea lion haul out areas, or killer whale rubbing beaches should be identified and protected, as needed. By ensuring the comprehensive collection of the best data available, the plan will more accurately estimate the affects of various alternatives, build greater consensus among all forest users and produce a better plan.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0813-007 Land Use Designations (LUDS) and Management Prescriptions should include detailed standards and guidelines on tourism as a viable economic activity in the forest, comparable to minerals, forestry, etc. LUDS and management prescriptions specific to tourism should be developed. Activity specifics as to wilderness lodges, wildlife viewing areas, large group excursions, small group travel, hut-to hut hiking, trail systems, aircraft landing sights, coastal paddling, camping routes and areas, large scale resorts and day-resort "anchor sites", etc., should be addressed. AVA was actively involved in the development of tourism prototypes for the Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP). The "Typical Tourism Developments and Activities by Land Use Designation" cover a wide range of visitor activities anticipated on the National Forest over a 10 year period. We request: - these tourism designations, representing several years worth of effort, be used as the starting point for the tourism element in the Chugach Plan to take advantage of previous work efforts. - Chugach staff directly work with and involve TLMP staff, such as Ron Freeman in the Alaska Region Forest Service offices in Juneau, to understand and initially apply the tourism components in TLMP. TLMP made significant strides forward to clarify and address differences between recreation and tourism. We hope the Chugach Plan revisions will continue to work in this direction.
- 0813-011 9. Land ownership patterns and the proposed management of non-forest land should be shown on base maps and considered during alternatives analysis when planning for forest lands. Base maps and planning analysis should also reflect lands that have been acquired for specific management purposes such as the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill property purchases. Identification of land ownership and management patterns will provide a comprehensive overview of the regional resources, identify the capability of the aggregate land base to meet various resource demands, and ensure Forest Service land use is compatible with adjoining properties.
- 0813-012 10. Twenty-one rivers and three glaciers have been identified as eligible for inclusion in the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The proposed designations need to be weighed carefully in light of potential multiple uses, types of tourism, and future access needs. The designations should be based on a careful review of proposed land uses and resource potential. The plan should define the three types of designations under the Wild & Scenic Rivers System (wild, scenic and recreational), and clearly spell out the allowable uses and access for each designation. For example, mining is not allowed within one-quarter mile of a wild river. Other examples would be specific types of tourism operations that would/would not be allowed in each designation such as development of a base camp of operations for rafting or guiding. The plan should also identify the management responsibilities and the relationship of a federally designated wild and scenic river compared to a river defined as navigable by the State of Alaska. Rivers deemed navigable by the State should be identified on maps.
- 0813-016 The economic benefits to local communities resulting from preservation of scenic -qualities should also be recognized and addressed.
- 0813-017 12. Site specific and more general waste management must be addressed from human waste on increasingly crowded and popular beaches to garbage. The Chugach plan should establish no or low-impact guidelines for scientific party field activities and work crew camps. Increasing garbage along shorelines, around scientific research camps, from fishing boats and floating homes, cabins, recreational campsites, etc. needs to be addressed. Garbage and human waste is an on-going problem that detracts from the area's scenic quality and can have an adverse effect on wildlife habitat.
- 0813-018 13. The revised plan must address conflicts between forest user groups, such as motorized and non motorized use.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0813-019 The plan should also identify a methodology and procedures to resolve future conflicts between resource groups that may arise after the plan is adopted, without the need for lengthy, additional planning efforts. The zoning concept of "front country, mid-country, and back country", used in British Columbia should be explored as a method to address different uses in the Chugach. This concept is also discussed in the 1993 Destination: Alaska documents produced by AVA.
- 0817-003 GAP Analysis The Chugach Forest should seriously consider cooperating with adjacent land management agencies to conduct a regional Gap Analysis for the Chugach Forest and adjacent lands in southcentral Alaska. Gap Analysis is a landscape-scale inventory of regional biodiversity. Using GIS technology and biological inventories, Gap Analysis identifies ecologically significant lands, determines where they are and what proportion are protected, and helps natural resource managers identify high-priority conservation needs and strategies.
- 0817-009 Recreation and Tourism Planning Outdoor recreation and tourism is increasing rapidly on the Chugach Forest and is one of the highest values of the forest. The plan revision must address recreation and tourism in a comprehensive master plan. There are many expectations for this area and many competing uses. Now is the time to sort these uses and users out and develop some kind of zoning approach to recreation/tourism management so that many uses can be accommodated in a sustainable fashion with minimal environmental impacts, It is not practical to consider multiple use management on the same acres of land. Instead, through creative planning and zoning in time and space, we should be able to accommodate a diversity of users and uses while minimizing conflicts. The Forest Service should work cooperatively with AWRTA and AVA in this process. The time to do this is now, before conflicts become significant.
- 0817-012 Forest Economics It is inevitable that many of the decisions regarding future use of the Chugach National Forest will be driven by economics. Consequently, in order to avoid situations where a decision to utilize one forest resource results in significant opportunity costs with other forest resources, it is essential that the Forest Service undertake a comprehensive analysis of the economic value of all Chugach National Forest resources. This analysis should include not only significant commodities, such as timber, but important amenities, including fish, wildlife, outdoor recreation, and scenery. Also, the recreational value of nonroaded versus roaded areas needs careful consideration since this will likely be a contentious issue. Because the value of most amenities tends to consist mostly of nonmarket values, it is important that the Forest Service use the right methodology for this analysis. We recommend an effort similar to a recent study of nonmarket economic values for national forests in the Pacific Northwest; Role of Nonmarket Economic Values in Benefit-Cost Analysis of Public Forest Management by Cindy Sorg Swanson and John B. Loomis (PNw-GTR-361) by the Pacific Northwest Research Station. While an analysis like that mentioned above will result in better information for decision-making, it must be remembered that economics generally expresses value in monetary terms. This may be suitable for commodities, but is often incomplete and lacking when applied to amenities. The value of an amenity is usually determined using indirect means (i.e., shadow prices) that often excludes some intangible or nonmonetary values that are difficult to quantify (spiritual significance being a good example). To avoid situations where the Forest Service compares the value of a commodity, using fairly complete estimates of the benefits, with the opportunity costs imposed on amenities, using only partial information about its respective value, the Forest Service needs to also consider other methodologies that are not strictly quantitative. These methodologies include the Precautionary Principle and Safe Minimum Standard, both being more applicable to protecting values, such as biodiversity, than benefit-costs analysis.
- 0817-013 ATV Access There appear to be problems with unlimited ATV use on the Forest.
- 0817-015 It will also be important to provide some kind of zoning to separate motorized and nonmotorized recreation

***Comment # Comment***

- 0817-028 We recommend that the Chugach Plan Revision address the special conservation needs of sea lions, particularly in relation to transportation, recreation, and tourism activity within Prince William Sound. The Plan should ensure that information and education efforts are adequate and that compliance and enforcement with federal regulations is adequate to minimize conservation problems.
- 0817-033 As more important population sources are roaded or developed and become "sinks," the brown bear population on the Kenai, as a whole, may begin a long-term irreversible decline. These are incremental steps toward a declining bear population. Since bears are wide-ranging species of landscapes (not just small habitat patches), the cumulative impacts of future development actions on the Peninsula may well influence the distribution and conservation of bears beyond the Chugach Forest to include other regions of the Peninsula including the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. We strongly recommend that the Chugach Plan Revision incorporate a major effort to address the long-term conservation of brown bears on the Peninsula. This effort should include: - establishment of a Kenai Brown Bear Task Force charged with developing a comprehensive conservation strategy for Kenai Peninsula brown bears. The Task Force should be composed of the Interagency Brown Bear Study Team plus representation from conservation, recreation, tourism, fishing, and timber interests; - GIS analysis of current brown bear distribution and movement data relative to topographic, watershed, vegetative, human developments (transportation, industrial, urban, residential), and land management jurisdictions and objectives; - interagency cooperation and a Peninsula-wide assessment across all land management jurisdictions; - a cumulative effects analysis; and - a time frame of 100 years. The opportunity to address this issue with a proactive, cost-effective conservation approach is now. If we wait until later, we may be forced into costly reactive management, the potential of ESA listing petitions, and a diminished chance of successful conservation. The brown bear conservation strategy will also help managers deal with other species that are sensitive to increased human access such as wolves, black bears, wolverines, lynx, and marten.
- 0817-037 Revision of the Chugach Forest Plan provides the opportunity for developing a proactive strategy for maintaining the forest's ecological integrity. An effective plan must incorporate an ecosystem perspective including long-term planning (e.g., 100 years), access to a comprehensive biological inventory, a landscape-scale analysis using GIS technology, evaluation of cumulative effects, and interdisciplinary and interagency cooperation.
- 0819-004 I don't know a lot about the issue, but I feel confident that the environmental groups alternative plan will be good and appropriate and I urge you to adopt their alternative.
- 0820-002 We urge the Forest Service to continue to manage these lands to maintain these qualities by prioritizing low-impact uses on the forest.
- 0820-004 The new Forest Service chief has indicated his desire for a shift in overall management from logging, mining and grazing priorities to priorities which include biological diversity, wildlife habitats and ecosystem health. The Forest Service is in the unique position to forward Chief Dombeck's vision of national forest lands on the Chugach while maintaining recreation and wildlife habitat as the traditional management priorities.
- 0820-019 In determining an appropriate level of logging on the forest, ACE would like the Forest Service to utilize the "forest ecology" concept laid out in the Forest Health section of this document. All forms of logging should be merged into one number for purposes of the forest plan. We would like to see the following types of logging merged for this purpose: green sales, salvage sales, personal use firewood, permitting for commercial use firewood, campground and roadway thinning, and other forms of logging we may have inadvertently left out. Fire:

***Comment # Comment***

- 0820-021 f ACE would like the Forest Service to evaluate fire over the rest of the forest f ACE would like the Forest Service to map out areas of concern where fuel load is particularly high and/or where there are inhabited structures. Where a fire danger is high closest to communities, ACE would support selective logging to create shaded fuel breaks. However, using salvage logging as a way to address fuel loads could actually contribute to uncontrolled fire, as has been witnessed the past few summers with both Granite Creek and Crooked Creek fires ACE would like the Forest Service to map out areas of concern where fuel load is particularly high and/or where there are inhabited structures. Where a fire danger is high closest to communities, ACE would support selective logging to create shaded fuel breaks. In addition, ACE would like to see classification of lands mapped out. We believe economics must be weighed when addressing fire. To give the backcountry the same level of fire protection as are afforded to communities is not economically appropriate.
- 0820-033 Wildlife: We are fortunate that the Chugach National Forest is has large tracts of pristine wilderness which supports an abundant wildlife population. Several sensitive species or species of concern reside within the forest and ACE would like the Forest Service to analyze potential impacts to each of these species in the different alternatives. ACE would like the Forest Service to fully consider current scientific review and programs which are already in place for conservation of these species, i.e. the Partners in Flight WatchList, to maintain the current viability of habitat.
- 0820-035 Transportation Planning: ACE urges the Forest Service to create a transportation plan on the Chugach that includes motorized and non-motorized uses on trails, roads, marine highways systems and other water corridors used for travel. There are several travel corridor-type proposals which would significantly impact the forest if carried through.
- 0820-038 Further, ACE would like the Forest Service to come up with a transportation plan which abides by the agreements and guidelines set forth in the Seward Highway Corridor Partnership Plan (the expected completion date is January 1998).
- 0820-039 Non-motorized & Motorized Uses: Natural quiet allows us to enjoy natural noise-like wind in the trees, snow falling, water flowing, and birds singing. Natural quiet is rapidly disappearing and is a resource that's easily taken for granted. We would like to see it listed as a primary resource, like fish and wildlife, recreation, scenic beauty, when analyzing proposals to the forest. When an activity of significant impact is proposed, for example the construction of a logging road, the effect on natural quiet and on primitive recreation should be analyzed and given serious consideration as are other impacts.
- 0820-040 In order to do a better job of planning, ACE believes the Forest Service needs an understanding of the existing situation/inventory/baseline. A Resource Report, including a detailed map, that describes designated use areas, rules of operation, and policies for private and commercial motorized vehicles (as described below) should be developed for the planning process. The report should include rules in Forest wilderness areas, such as study area, plan recommendation, or congressionally designated
- 0820-042 ACE recommends the concept of utilizing a carrying capacity model for motorized use on the forest. At this time most motorized vehicle use is allowed to grow uncontrollably as a result of minimal oversight and regulation. Carrying capacity analyses need to be done for all motorized uses, and limits therefore set on the extent of those uses.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0820-048 subsistence: Many of ACE's members utilize resources from the forest to maintain a subsistence lifestyle. ACE would like the Forest Service to ensure its compliance with Title VIII of ANILCA, which provides direction to protect existing and future subsistence opportunities, by addressing the issue within the cumulative analyses requested. Projects proposed on the forest, which may endanger subsistence opportunities are unacceptable. Alaskans, those who have lived here for thousands of years and those who came later, have a tradition of utilizing the resources the land and waters provide. These uses are, in general, much more compatible with maintaining wildlife viability, watershed Quality and ecosystem health than most other uses on the forest. In the past, the Forest Service has addressed the issue of subsistence in various proposals, however, assurances for mitigation have been weak. ACE would like the Forest Service to seriously consider potential impacts to subsistence in each of its management alternatives with an equal consideration given to mitigation
- 0821-025 Because of its unique national profile, its internationally recognized fish and wildlife values, and the lack of permanent protection for any Chugach NF lands at present, we are requesting the Forest Service hold public hearings in the lower-48 to gather citizen comments on management of the Chugach.
- 0821-001 Overall, Sierra Club advocates managing the Chugach National Forest to protect its fish, wildlife, and wilderness values.
- 0822-005 Finally, the information distributed to the public for purposes of obtaining scoping comments is very biased toward a park-like management objective for the forest. Not only are the issues framed with a pro-preservation bias, but there is a total lack of information on resources that could, and should, be developed when the need and demand arise. For instance, there is no information on the comment maps or in the newsletters on the amount or location of commercial forest types, mineralization, potential destination tourism areas or oil and gas deposits. Amazingly, there was no display of the thousands of acres being acquired by the EVOS Trustee Council for transfer to the Chugach National Forest. As a land manager by profession, I cannot imagine how your agency can possibly think it can responsibly manage its public land assets without knowing what those assets are. On the other hand, if the Chugach National Forest does have this information it should consider very carefully the serious ramifications of withholding it from the public during the scoping process. The Chugach National Forest must delay closure of the scoping period until all the information about the Forest is compiled and distributed for public review. Thank you for the opportunity to submit scoping comments on the Chugach National Forest Land Plan revision. The Chugach National Forest can truly be the "Land of many uses"; I am confident that your planning team will find innovative ways to meet the needs of all users of our local forest lands.
- 0826-003 3. The plan also needs to determine how to best look at cumulative impacts of management actions on national forest lands in relation to watershed or landscape level planning. The national forest should consider land management actions of other landowners and should cooperate and provide incentives for private landowners to work with the forest service on broader scale regional plans. At the same time private landowner rights, particularly under ANCSA, should be protected and reaffirmed.
- 0827-011 Additional Comments: I have visited Alaska many times. I am continually appalled by the horrible management guidelines of the Forest Service. "They have destroyed a great National Forest and a superb rain forest at a huge tax loss to our citizens, to remove any future joy which could have been achieved by a Wilderness experience in this fabulous non-renewable forest. Stop the clear-cutting and pandering to timber interests. Let them go South. Save this wild habitat for the fisheries, tourism and the wonderful animals and subsistence livers... who respect and utilize this great resource in a non-destructive way. Start the New Year off on the correct footing for a change.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0830-007 HABITAT PROTECTION. Continue land purchases and comprehensive planning.
- 0832-012 Permanently Protect the Copper River Delta: In 1907 President Teddy Roosevelt created the Chugach National Forest primarily to protect the forest and wildlife of the Copper River Delta. The Delta, up to and including Miles Lake and Baird Canyon, with millions of birds and abundant wildlife, must be permanently protected through the new forest plan by recommendation for legislative designation.
- 0836-007 Vegetation Management Proposed timber sales, salvage sales, etc., should be identified and cumulative impacts discussed. The Forest Plan should direct timber sale analysis from a holistic (landscape scale) approach, identifying sensitive habitats, travel corridors,
- 0836-009 The Forest Plan should include ample old-growth retention blocks. The Plan should address retention areas to be managed to maintain the uneven-age structure of old-growth habitat components required to maintain population levels of old growth dependent wildlife. These retention areas are critical in conserving old-growth habitat.
- 0836-013 Timber harvesting on private lands should be included in analysis forest-wide to determine the full affects of each sale area in relation to cumulative impacts and direct loss of habitat.
- 0836-015 Mitigation plans should be encouraged forest-wide that address clean-up measures and timeframes for restoration actions to be accomplished for such effects as bark accumulation, mooring of logs, non-point surface drainage (i.e., bark leachate), erosion and sedimentation, improper disposal of solid waste materials (i.e., pipes, cables, oil drums, plastics), and chronic petroleum product spills.
- 0836-016 2 Travel Management and Access Roads, current and proposed, should be disclosed. Road closures, permanent and intermittent, should be identified. Permanent road closures should include removal of road beds and restoring to prior conditions.
- 0836-019 Additionally, the Black Oystercatcher population, a species on the Partners in Flight WatchList 1996, numbers 800-1,000 individuals in Prince William Sound. Increased boat landings on some beaches in Prince William Sound could disrupt breeding oystercatchers and foraging behavior of migratory shorebirds. The Forest Plan should discuss and provide management direction for neotropical migrants nesting and habitat needs. The plan should discuss long-term as well as short-term monitoring programs.
- 0836-021 The Forest Plan should minimize impacts to fish habitat and result in long-term maintenance of healthy fish populations. The Plan should address what measures will be taken to evaluate fish habitat, ensure adequate protection, and provide immediate corrective action if problems arise. The method of monitoring used to ensure compliance with NFMA, frequency of inspections, percentage of unit inspections, and cumulative analysis of past and current fish habitat losses should be included. The Service believes an index of health should be developed for anadromous and resident fish streams.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0836-022      3 Aquatic vegetation (sea grasses) occurring within the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries are important to a variety of aquatic species. The Plan should identify areas supporting significant sea grass resources and describe what measures will be taken to protect these areas. Degradation of wetlands caused by heavy equipment impacting vegetation and impairing natural drainage patterns resulting in a loss of nesting and foraging habitat for migratory birds and other species are of great concern to Service. These alterations can result in permanent or semi-permanent hydrologic changes and loss of functional wetlands characteristics. Degradation or loss of limited types of wetlands (i.e., fens) can have a drastic change to other adjacent habitats (i.e., fish habitat). The Forest Plan should outline how Executive Order 11990, as amended, will be met to avoid to extent possible the long- and short-term impacts associated with destruction or modification of wetlands. Removal, storage, reutilization, and/or disposal of overburden removed during road construction should be outlined in the Forest Plan. Reporting of cubic yards of material removed, acreage impacted, and acreage rehabilitated, should be part of ongoing planning and monitoring. The Service encourages the Forest Service to consider compensatory mitigation to offset unavoidable adverse impacts to wetlands which remain after all minimization efforts have been met (NEPA Section 1508.20). This approach also embraces positive stewardship of public lands.
- 0836-023      Process Comments The Forest Plan should attempt a broad landscape approach to ensure biodiversity. Maintaining viable, well-distributed populations of wildlife across the Chugach National Forest is required by the 1976 National Forest Management Act. An important first step in maintaining viable populations is to determine habitat requirements for species and then provide sufficient area of habitat for the desired population. This stepping stone approach should assist in making decisions for maintaining viable, well distributed populations. Habitat and other resources values should be documented to ensure there is adequate biological information available on which to make informed decisions in the planning process. The goal should be to provide a reasoned basis for predicting impacts associated with the proposed action and alternatives, and to define baseline values to which post-project conditions can be compared. Several types of habitat capability, landscape, and population viability models are available as planning tools. We suggest that the FS begin to collect appropriate information for use with these statistical models and to employ their use as soon as possible. The latest scientific information should be utilized to update existing statistical models. The Forest Plan should direct and include cumulative impact assessments at the landscape level to address losses of habitats and steps for assessing site-specific impacts throughout the Chugach National Forest.
- 0836-024      4 Forest-wide examination of cumulative impacts of past and planned logging activities should be analyzed. Survey information should be in sufficient detail to allow thorough evaluation of impacts of proposed plan. The Plan should include the number of or percentage of timber units covered. Maps should reflect this as well. Visual aids such as maps should be able to stand alone and be easily read. Key landmarks, names of topographic features, road numbers/names, etc., are most helpful. Additionally, cataloged fish strewn numbers and names should be included.
- 0837-001      Recreation The principal issue that will need to be confronted during the revision of the CNFP is the accommodation of the growing number of recreation users and resolution of the increasing conflicts between users, especially motorized and non-motorized users, both commercial and private.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0837-002 Components of this problem include: - The effects generated by road access to Whittier. This issue needs to be carefully evaluated given the potential for increased use. This access will generate increased use that will have effects throughout the western parts of Prince William Sound (PWS). We believe it is important to examine the potential effects of this change in the variety of its aspects: increased demands for parking and facilities in Whittier proper, increased usage of PWS. facilities, both federal and state; increased conflict between traditional users and newcomers; increased commercial use to accommodate the increased demand for access and its associated impact on non-commercial use; potential impacts on state and federal land likely to be impacted by increased numbers of recreational users; and the impacts to railroad operations. Increasing conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses. These conflicts will grow as the number of motorized users increases and encroach on areas that traditionally have been viewed as passive use areas.
- 0837-003 This issue is particularly severe in the area of Manitoba Mountain but is a potential problem for all areas having road or trail access with adjacent state land backed by upslope CNF property.
- 0837-004 - Increasing non-motorized uses. Areas that are easily road accessible should experience significantly increasing non-motorized use. Examples of potential conflicts occur on the Kenai River, Six Mile Creek, and Forty Mile River. Use of land tracts focuses on areas with popular trail systems, like the Resurrection Pass and Russian River/Lakes trails, with growing conflicts between mountain bike users and hikers. Coordinated planning of those areas involving state resources is important, especially each of the three rivers.
- 0837-005 - Increasing motorized use. Similar increases in motorized uses can be expected at the Manitoba Mountain and Resurrection Pass areas during the winter months, creating potential conflict with the non-motorized uses at Manitoba. During the summer, increasing off-road vehicle use can be expected on former mining roads or forest service roads and pressure for such use can be expected to increase in other areas of the CNF that are road accessible. Whether areas should be created for additional motorized uses may be a significant issue. DNR is especially concerned about those areas where state tracts adjoin federal lands.
- 0837-008 In the Seward and Moose Pass areas, the focus for state land is upland recreation issues. It may also be necessary to coordinate forest management activities in these areas given the problems of insect infestation and use of previous timber harvest roads. State lands along the Seward Highway are intended for development, to support highway related needs and the recreation oriented demands. A coordinated approach to the provision of land for commercial and related services is appropriate.
- 0837-010 In the Kenai River corridor, there will be the need to coordinate both land and water recreation related activity. The recently adopted Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan provides for a common management scheme for this area. A memorandum of understanding between the resource agencies having responsibility for the protection of the Kenai River is due to be signed in the next several months. The Forest Service is to be a signatory to this agreement. It will be especially important to monitor the amount of scenic float trips in the Upper River and to coordinate recreation facility development. It will also be necessary to integrate the Upper Kenai River Cooperative Plan, jointly developed by the state, USFS, and the US Fish and Wildlife Service for coordinating the management of the upper Kenai River, into components of the CNFP. And, more generally, it will be necessary for the CNF planning effort to integrate the recommendations of the Kenai River Comprehensive Management Plan into the Forest planning effort.
- 0837-012 The increasing demands placed on the western area of PWS through the improvement of access at Whittier will affect both state and federal recreation sites and these facilities will require improvement and increased management.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0837-013 The issue of coordinated recreation planning and management is particularly critical, and needs careful consideration throughout the planning process. The USFS is strongly encouraged to review these plans in the preparation of the CNFP. DNR will be especially concerned about designations in the CNFP that indirectly or directly affect the uses that are identified in the PWSAP or KAP. -
- 0837-014 The state is also concerned over the designation given upland parcels. These designations, to the extent practicable, should be sufficiently broad to allow flexibility in management and use. It can be expected that conditions will change over time and that the CNFP will not be able to anticipate all of these changes. In instances involving large tracts where use patterns cannot be determined with a reasonable level of confidence at the time of plan preparation, DNR, in its area plans, uses designations of a general type. These permit a number of uses, consistent with good land management practices. The actual blend of uses is determined in the future when development pressures are more apparent. The point here is that we would prefer that the CNFP use more general designations where use patterns may change over time, to accommodate the changing uses without the need for a difficult plan amendment process.
- 0837-015 - The CNF Planning Team should give consideration to the establishment of an advisory council or group that consists of user and special interest groups, similar to that used by the Bureau of Land Management in the resolution of their land management and mining issues. When used by BLM, they have been found to be quite effective in brokering solutions to fairly intractable problems in an efficient and low-confrontation manner. These groups do not have to have "official" standing. They have been formed to deal with a particular issue and have a limited life.
- 0837-016 - DNR suggests that the CNF Planning Team give consideration to the establishment of an inter-agency planning team. This group would meet regularly, on an as needed basis, to be kept abreast of the CNFP planning effort and of the planning/study activities of the agencies participating on the inter-agency planning team. Significant issues would be brought before this group for discussion prior to a position being set out in the plan. DNR uses an analogous inter-agency planning group in the development of its resource and land management plans.
- 0837-017 Navigability The state owns the land under many of the streams in the CNF that are navigable, all watercolumns, and all tidal areas in or adjacent to CNF. The courts have defined navigable waters as those used or susceptible to use for travel, trade, and commerce at the time of statehood. The state is concerned with designations affecting the navigable waters within the CNF planning area that would limit their use by the citizens of the state.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0837-020 Tidelands and Submerged Lands The state owns both the tidelands and submerged adjacent to the CNF. Use of these areas is designated in the PWSAP or KAP. An important issue to the state is the effect of the expected increasing recreational pressure in the western part of PWS on the tidelands and submerged lands. Anchorages and use areas are now designated in the PWS area plan, but it may be necessary for DNR to modify these recommendations in order to accommodate the increased water use recreation pressure. The CNF planning team should work closely with DNR throughout the planning process, particularly during the period when the preferred alternative is under development. It may be appropriate for the CNFP to accommodate expected uses in appropriate USFS upland sites rather than forcing these uses onto state tidelands. Conversely, it may be necessary for DNR to modify the area plan to accommodate upland recreation recommendations of the CNFP. If inter-agency coordination is lacking, the CNFP upland planning recommendations are going to be of questionable utility because of the close connection between upland and tideland/submerged uses in this area. It will also be advisable for the CNF planning team to work with the South-central Region of the Division of Land on tidelands development planning. This unit of DNR manages the tidelands of PWS and has periodic applications for tideland uses adjacent to both state and federal uplands, and develop of a coordinated strategy is desirable. We suggest a work session with the CNF planning team on tideland issues in January.
- 0837-021 Forest Management The revision of the CNFP should concentrate on forest health.
- 0837-023 Forest harvest for the purpose of supporting a timber industry is an important consideration but should not be the focal point of the forest management effort. Nonetheless, the issues of forest management exist, focusing on vegetative management to achieve the other objectives in the CNFP or to resolve forest health problems. The following have been identified as issues that need particular attention in the update:
- 0837-024 - Land use designations should allow for optimum flexibility in addressing insect and disease infestations.
- 0837-025 - The vegetation management strategy proposed should consider and discuss the impacts on adjacent forest properties. - The CNFP should detail the future desired condition of the vegetative cover within the CNF and how the USFS expects to achieve this condition.
- 0837-026 - Additionally, the results of the newly initiated insect infestation study for the Kenai Peninsula should be integrated within the CNF revision. It is to be finalized by June, 1998. This study will provide a unique opportunity for the major public land owners in the peninsula (Borough, State, US Forest Service) to develop an common understanding of the infestation problem, how it may affect the holdings of each entity, and how each agency can contribute to an integrated solution to this pervasive problem.
- 0837-027 Road access is another issue that needs significant in-depth review and discussion. The only way the forest can be fully and properly managed is by allowing road access for management purposes and user ingress/regress. Future desired conditions should reflect the necessity for access and the type of access should be decided on a case by cases basis depending on the land use designations impacted and the critical need for intensive management. Access (road) guidelines for crossing CNF lands should spell out the process and be streamlined to cause limited delay. This should be true for access requested for both private and state forest lands.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0838-007 Implementing a Plan of Action to Provide for Regional Landscape Level Management. I am introducing an outline that provides a means of implementing regional plans for the management of forest resources based on objective forest conditions. This outline is intended to provide an overview of a means for cooperative development of management planning on a regional basis. The implications of adoption of such a 2 cooperative plan are extensive and reflect on the heightened concerns being expressed throughout the region for a better, more effective means of conducting forest resource management to reflect the needs of the forest and society for a diverse, sustainable, and resilient forest capable of meeting a variety of needs for both today and the future.
- 0838-009 The Process of Integrating Landscape Ecology and Natural Resource Management. (The Decision-making process) Once the Ecosystem Diversity Matrix is completed, we can proceed with development of a process by which we can integrate landscape ecology with natural resource management. 3 In order to integrate ecosystem management into a natural resource management plan it will be necessary to develop working groups dedicated to various natural resources such as vegetation, wildlife, society needs, and Landscape level processes and provide a framework for their cooperative effort. This can be facilitated by organizations such as the University of Alaska Fairbanks. The integration of these groups will be further augmented with the utilization of a calibrated forest planning model such as Forest Vegetation Simulator Growth and Yield Model. The Alaska Cooperative Extension in cooperation with the USFS is seeking to develop 4 calibrated Stand Prognosis Model for the South-central and Interior forest region of Alaska. This model could become a valuable tool in the process of management planning integration. Tools For The Decision-Making Process: Ecosystem Diversity Matrix (identified above) Vegetation, Wildlife, and Landscape level processes working groups Human Dimensions Group (derived from a cross-section of the public and developed through the Cooperative Extension Program) Stand and Forest Growth and Yield Modeling Integration Planning Process to incorporate working group inputs Forest Natural Resource Management Plan: Piecing the complex Ecosystem Diversity Matrix together over time in order to provide a healthy forest through ecosystem management on a landscape level (such as is being conducted by the University of Montana for the Bitterroot Ecosystem Management Research Project).
- 0838-011 This outline was presented to provide an opportunity to see a new horizon for Natural Resource management and with a hope that decision-making for the future forests for Alaska will be made in a manner such that we are looking to a future condition and which reflects the needs and desires of society.
- 0860-004 Taking continued input as the impact of the road is realized
- 0860-012 Advance planning to prepare for use impact
- 0860-018 Careful zoning protects quieter more passive uses
- 0860-020 East PWS has received zoning management and attention as thoroughly as WPWS Naked Island group has not been touched by logging
- 0860-021 Leave the Forest alone Pristine and natural beauty here before us and will be after us
- 0860-032 A Forest Plan developed by organized groups of citizens of diverse interests working together to improve conflict situations
- 0860-039 West PWS protected while East PWS opened to responsible exploitation
- 0860-048 Continue under estimating number of people recreating on Forest
- 0860-050 Don't use existing research data

***Comment # Comment***

- 0860-051 Regulation on FS lands are not enforced Plan imposed through legislative or political process No citizen involvement in plan or except for interest groups Plan is not workable
- 0860-061 A plan that is considerate of all that we don't know about natural resource management and provides for conservative use
- 0860-062 To develop a plan through the use of citizen involvement to the greatest extent practical
- 0860-068 Maintain current Forest conditions
- 0860-069 Develop a plan that reflects a concerned publics appreciation for and desire to care for public lands  
A plan that emphasizes sustainable recreational and wildlife habitat value to assure that future generations and wildlife will enjoy the forest quality that we have today
- 0860-070 Worst Abandonment of planning Politics govern revision process management direction imposed through legislation. Forest Service required to implement a plan the public doesn't support
- 0860-078 Long-term plan with teeth and credibility to protect from short-sighted development
- 0860-083 Leave forest as is
- 0860-086 Managed for biodiversity with natural processes generally allowed to take its course
- 0860-090 Forest divided into areas that are managed differently
- 0860-091 A plan produced thru cooperative efforts of diverse group of citizens, agency members, and scientists
- 0860-104 Honor public land, including no "no trespassing" signs, and lots of robust discussion about management
- 0860-116 Public involvement in all aspects of management
- 0860-117 Timber harvest, destination tourism, and mining recognized as legitimate
- 0860-129 No appeal rights
- 0860-130 To work 3-5 years on revised plan with little citizen involvement, then receive an appeal and have to start over
- 0860-143 Management eliminates natural cycles
- 0860-153 Legislatively imposed plan
- 0860-157 Lawsuit gridlock resulting in legislated "solutions" Adversarial relationships where no management is possible
- 0860-159 To be gridlocked because we can't work together One group dictates what will happen Public input not considered
- 0862-001 Clarify management of newly acquired lands in WSA – Does ANILCA apply?
- Roadless – How does it fit with ANILCA
- What areas are available for sale of common variety minerals?

***Comment # Comment***

- 0862-010      Clarify restrictions in Portage Bear Valleys  
                  Firearms, Hunting, Closures  
                  Fed & State Coordination  
                  Portage Lake – Navigation managed by state???
- 0862-011      Carrying capacities for Outfitters and Guides  
                  Include in alternatives; complex, different activities, easier on public, need for activity.
- 0862-012      Unique resources will degrade due to improper planning/management sheer overuse without  
                  resource protection education and enforcement (presence). Possibility more authority for people  
                  in the field to expand FPO program)
- 0862-015      Management of Bear Valley  
                  Motorized/non  
                  Hunting  
                  Plan development/nondevelopment
- 0862-016      Motorized vs. quiet rights/non motorized tech advances access, closures, wilderness, WSAS,  
                  brown bears.
- 0862-025      Buoy Management? Liability, commitment, ecosystem management, marine
- 0863-001      Even flow sustainable plan which emphasizes partnerships to generate initial increases in  
                  resource and services production which is then maintained by increases in workload indicator  
                  outputs -?budget.

A plan that builds steadily from where we are and emphasizes our best and/or unique features and attributes.

A balance of resource uses in which a majority of people are happy.

No appeal.

Community support

The team remains sane

A plan that meets the needs of all users and that all users will accept.

Balance of uses

Protection of sites, especially high – use areas to prevent resource damage – Do thru use restrictions (Type & season), facility designs, etc.

Maintains the natural biological diversity of the National Forest

To have full, final say in the final plan implementation as a forest

Public/Legislature confidence in our leadership/stewardship

To have full final say in the final implementation

***Comment # Comment***

0863-005 The mission/goals of the forest service as an agency are met; some interest groups are happy, some are unhappy, but the plan accomplishes the agency's intent for moving into the future.

Interaction between Forest Service Management and public will be improved to new heights.

Natural resources were controlled at a reasonable level so they can be enjoyed by all people

0863-007 Direction to spend \$ on highest priority issues

0863-010 A proactive management plan that integrates resources management to meet used demands.

A plan that the forest actually commits to implement.

Reasonably address full range of interests.

0863-013 Recognize official existing infrastructure corridors and develop standards and guidelines for determining future corridors.

Have a mission statement and set of goals for the plan.

The plan should identify where there are conflicts for land allocation, exchanges.

The alternative should be analyzed for fiscal implementation feasibility.

That it's clear from the verbage and maps what the allocations mean.

And you know when that allocation has reached saturation.

0863-017 Management direction which sets public expectations which we cannot implement. Major concern is the change in the way \$ come to the forest. A grand development plan in most resource areas can't be implemented because plans do not drive budget – past performance drives budget.

***Comment # Comment***

0863-019

WORST - No attempt to meet recreation demand by creating new trails, facilities etc.

Not attempting to restore spruce bark beetle affected lands on the Kenai River

Not attempting FPR to further polarize interest groups. Planning used as vehicle and springboard for special interest management.

10 years of appeals and supplemental planning.

Decline of all wildlife species.

Power lines everywhere

Over developing the acquired land

Continued lack of scientific direction

No timber/vegetation management program

Continued enhancing pinks

More damage will be done to lands where the public may utilize for recreation purposes.

All of the natural resources are destroyed

That the plan does not come out the way you wanted. Very limited knowledge on the plan so can't really comment on either.

Lost public/legislative confidence in our leadership & stewardship.

Change scenic quality of lands

That we react to extreme preservation positions and lock up the forest based on emotional reactions of environmental effects

There was no sustainable timber program that was responsive to forest health - a variety of wildlife habitats – the local economy

No goals are met – no clear mission is accomplished, so many compromises are made that no one is happy.

Ignores the natural values of the area.

Get legal counsel involved early so that plan is more defensible in court.

Planning is a social process rather than a scientific process.

Deal with strategic issues up front.

IDT may ignore special activity requests because don't know how to deal with them? Ex. Communication sites, transportation, utility corridors, etc. How do capture specialist input in such questions?

Taking care of what we currently have before looking at new ideas, facilities, etc.



***Comment # Comment***

0864-001 Concerns and interests sheet

1. Situation Map question  
CODE Research Natural Areas and Special Areas

Copper River Delta mandate (ANILCA) I would like to see the FS maintain management.

0864-003

2. Issues important and concerns question.  
Code admin Land management planning

Because my background is Land use and Geography. I would like to see the watershed analysis process being used more as a means to inventory and organize information and data then using that information and data to address management issues across the forest- It would be nice to go through the process across the forest before an area becomes a "hot spot" or have the data before a "crisis" issue hits

0865-001

Each time Forest Plan revision comes up special funding should be supplied for a team of National Forest Specialist to develop document.

2 A specialized task force could be far more efficient due to experience level.  
Frees up our own staff to continue with our normal public service to provide specialist input.

3. A national forest plan task force would continually exist and be responsible for ALL NF revision plans. Congress would allocate funding annually for this team

4. Budget limitations. A bill signed right into law for this process

5. It relates to all aspects, as the forest plan is one of our primary directions. This concept may be highly idealistic but realistically we all have full plates; to use our own staff for the bulk of process makes us ineffective at "caring for the land and serving the people"

***Comment # Comment***

0865-002 Radio TV other communications plans needed. . 2) Minerals/fuels plans may be needed. 3) Specialized reinvention applied.4) wild as Scenic river designations. 5) land use designation necessary. 6) Access to trails mgt. Addressed 7) Forest uses camping capabilities assigned. 8) Free use and firewood addressed. 9) land ownership, conveyances and changing ownership. 10) Public access easements

2. My concern for all these issues is that they haven't been fully addressed or even recognized in the past. These are hazey issues which need consideration and a form of direction applied within CLMP.

3. See #1. 1) Radio TV other communications plans needed. . 2) Minerals/fuels plans may be needed. 3) Specialized reinvention applied.4) wild as Scenic river designations. 5) land use designation necessary. 6) Access to trails mgt. Addressed 7) Forest uses camping capabilities assigned. 8) Free use and firewood addressed. 9) land ownership, conveyances and changing ownership. 10) Public access easements

C

4. Other views. 1) State, USFS, law enforcement, USCG, & private communication organizations., 2) State, USFS, private and municipal, 3) USFS lands folks, state, private enterprises, 4) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 5) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 6) ) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 7) USFS, state, native corporations, private land owners, interested public, 8) USFS, local communities, native corporations.

0869-002 c) Improve land cover info in GIS to aid process.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0870-001
- 1) CNF improve mngt situation  
Provide more training (mandatory) in technological abilities. Long term
  - 2) Why desirable?  
Technology keeps changing and will continue to do so
  - 3) Improvement feasibility?  
A lot can be done OJT @ unit level.
  - 4) Obstacles  
None

**CONCERNS AND INTERESTS**

- 1) Situation Map
  - a) Management direction – Having clear workable standards and guidelines to work with.
  - b) Free use timber law – out of date for this day and age.
  - c) Subsistence – Not our baliwick – How much effort do we put into it which will be eventually wasted?
- 2) Concerns/Interests
  - a) Without standards and guidelines – There are no measures to base decisions off of.
  - b) Technology and population (human) have changed to where this archaic law may have impacts on other issues that need to be dealt with.
  - c) Not our baliwick – Takes a lot of time away from other issues that need to be dealt with.
- 3) Other views
  - a) Mainly internal managers
  - b) Anyone interested in free use wood.
  - c) ADF&G

***Comment # Comment***

- 0871-001      Need learn objectives and well defined methods with the results based on the best science & knowledge available with the clean intention of conservation of the resources.
- In the past the process has been destroyed by unclear goals and objectives, methods that change with the weather resulting in a poor product that arrived way past the implementation.
- It is easy to implement clear objectives if your overriding priority is conservation of existing resources.
- Take a look at the real world where natural resources take a back seat to exploitation of trees, water, etc.
- If you don't take conservation ethic, what is the alternative? Development for all? And where does that leave us in 20 years?
- Resolving issues needs to be driven by sound science and incorporating ecosystem management, that conservation is the primary concern.
- Conservation of existing resources must be paramount ( but does not necessarily mean that existing recreational activities be curtailed but that in the present state.
- 0873-003      No funding needed – able to use people and money we spend now to do what they were really funded for. Decision makers (FS/DR)
- It's a CFR that's a law – outside scope of Forest Plan so should figure out how we are going to meet that need and requests.
- 0873-005      Remember uniqueness of different areas of Chugach.
- Be careful of broadbrush “assumptions” or standard and guidelines. Temper for situation (ie. PWS vs Ressurrection Bay or Kenai). Don't forget reason people want to visit or live there.
- How to handle increased demands for visitor services while keeping some places less developed (ie. jewels in some peoples mind)
- Some people want everything developed and some want it primitive.
- 0874-003      Good science/research and citizen input should drive the allocation of uses & resources. However science should not be prostituted to meet the publics whim. We need to be able to look into the future and predict trends in social mores, technology and needs. The Plan should be proactive and designed for the 21st Century.
- Peoples views are the heart of forest planning – allocating uses and resources
- All stakeholders should have input, although all will not get what they want. Need to balance local needs with national needs. Local populations should be listened to
- 0875-006      Profit motive! At the expense of the resource and the selfish motive at the expense of resource eg. Four wheelers on the islands.

***Comment # Comment***

- 0876-001 Forest Plan getting bogged down and not have a clear direction.
- Citizens – Groups putting input as national groups and only a small voice from locals who live in the area and spend 365 days there having to live with impacts of non-locals.
- 0876-003 Local interest. Existing uses must be considered when designing improvements. Economic impacts to the local economy, environmental impacts, subsistence economy, recreational opportunities – lost or gained.
- Improvements
- Forest Plan: Try to state clear objectives designations etc. long term.
- Citizens: Involvement more local access, comments, request input, local talks; long term. Provide meetings to meet locals, Identify points of view. District Ranger, Forest Sup. District personal: Funded with Forest \$ Local development \$. Determining weight of one voice or group or how to weight these.
- 0881-001 P Updating plan with new (since 84 LMP) developments, studies, plans, issues (Upper Kenai River Comp. Plan; Sixmile; Res. Pass carrying capacity allocation)
- 0881-009 P Specificity of plan to ensure descretion vs. protection, loose direction vs explicit direction
- 0881-016 P ROS is adopted as standard rather than guideline
- 0881-017 P Use, existence fo roads in "roadless areas" (especially mining) ("trails" vs roads) (eg. Carter Lade). Is designation appropriate?
- 0882-001 I do have a couple suggestions for future meetings of a similar format. I noticed that about half of the crowd were unwilling to wait until the public discussion period. I suspect that most people were there to express a view and left without the opportunity. Perhaps subsequent meetings could rearrange the agenda so that the comment period precedes the educational portion. Or written educational materials could be made available at a meeting devoted primarily to discussion.
- Having maps on the wall provided everyone with good visuals and perhaps sparked memories and issues. The option of writing on the maps should be encouraged.
- I'd like to see facilitated small group discussions between the users groups. I envision and expansion of the one-on-one approach with the group size being limited to six or seven. A strong, assertive facilitator is a must given the contentious nature of the issues.
- 0883-001 What issues are important to me?? Motorized vs. Quiet Rights/Non-motorized. Access, Closures, wilderness areas (or study areas). Technology – Hunting??

***Comment # Comment***

0883-002 I still like the idea of areas “untrammled by the aspects of man” yet these areas should be located where use could be limited or regulated. I am concerned about increased dispersed use and elimination of use in specific areas.

0884-003 Often personal opinions become policy. We send a different message to public, lack of specific program direction. Increased work to satisfy individuals (\$),

0884-005 Consider forest health and recreational opportunities for the general public (not high end users, rich).

0885-001 These are important to me: Wilderness in the PWS, competing resource use and Forest Service presence.

The above are the primary management focus on the GRD. Fisheries conflicts/recreation development/community.

The following must be considered: State management plans, community management plans, interest group plans, commercial fish industry (PWSAC)

0886-001 What are the issues? Changing use patterns in the PWS. Resolving WSA issues as they relate to PWS.

Nonmotorized/motorized. Internal collaboration. Strengthening external contacts.

0889-001 This is my letter to reserve the right to appeal, intervene and/or, suit in matters of the Chugach Land Management Plan. As I make my living in the forest, I am very concerned. I hope to be very active in the Management Planning Process. Is the ID team going to go ahead with the issue to ask Congress to withdraw Land under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act?

0890-007 6) Analyze present and future demand for recreation and tourism use and development. The impact of these activities on sensitive areas of the Kenai Peninsula, Copper River Delta, and Prince William Sound must be closely scrutinized.