

# Discussion Question 2

*Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieving your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors?*

## Table of Contents

Albuquerque, NM.....	1
Annapolis, MD.....	14
Asheville, NC.....	37
Bangor, ME.....	67
Berkeley, CA.....	77
Bozeman, MT.....	78
Charleston, SC.....	92
Chicago, IL.....	105
Concord, NH.....	128
Fort Pierre, SD.....	147
Godfrey, IL.....	154
Golden, CO.....	156
Grand Island, NE.....	184
Grand Junction, CO.....	196
Helena, MT.....	205
Hyde Park, NY.....	212
Kissimmee, FL.....	217
Lawrence, KS.....	239
Los Angeles, CA.....	242
Minneapolis, MN.....	263

<b>Missoula, MT .....</b>	<b>273</b>
<b>Nashville, TN.....</b>	<b>309</b>
<b>Philadelphia, PA .....</b>	<b>317</b>
<b>Poughkeepsie, NY.....</b>	<b>334</b>
<b>Prior Lake, MN.....</b>	<b>366</b>
<b>Salt Lake City, UT .....</b>	<b>369</b>
<b>Seattle, WA .....</b>	<b>373</b>
<b>Spokane, WA .....</b>	<b>399</b>
<b>Written &amp; Online Comments .....</b>	<b>401</b>

## Discussion Question 2

*Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieving your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors?*

### **Albuquerque, NM**

She is convinced that one of the reasons for the crime is the nature gap in children. They have no fundamental underline joy for the earth that they live on. They do not have enough community centers for children. If you are going to convince the kids to go outdoors you need to make the experience pleasant.

Great Animals and he would like Secretary Salazar put more protection of them.

Cultural Resources. These resources are part of the landscape and anything that affects the land affects those resources. They are fragile and non-removable. There is a lack of appropriate scales where the state and federal government is involved. There is no plan and so one of things that need to be in place is conservation plans at the regional level. He was involved in putting together the Sonorian Dessert Conservatin plan and should be considered as a model.

She feels the biggest challenge is bringing people to the outdoors. Teachers are isolated in their classrooms so they are not connected to the outdoors either. They have parents that don't care.

She formed her own coalition. There are 6 members who are very committed to the community and the land. They have a relationship with Cochiti and Santo Domingo. They are not waiting for anyone and are doing what they want. She wants the Federal Government to have a vision for the 21st century that increases public lands and have an agreement with private land owners. Northern NM wants the toxic chemicals ceased and from getting into the waterways. She would also like to see a continental conservation protection plan.

Collaborative effort help to keep them moving. Teach them young and recruit locally. If you plant the seeds in youth there is ownership. Give the youth jobs and training so they can go to college and get educated in the environment and have the opportunities. Federal Government is not marketing these tools.

Challenges is communication. Many agencies overlook pueblos and tribal government. Anything tht deals with water and lands, they want to know about it. They worry about what is happening upstream. Conservation thought is already developed. There is a tremendous need for development and technology. He remembers farming with horses. What works for them in the pueblo community is to allow them to have the steering and guidance in projects. They have the conservation but there is the problem of dollars. Under the Federal Government is agreements. Tools and resources are themselves to make the earth better.

The federal government role would be to amend Bill 2747 so that tribes are eligible. He would also like to see the 1872 mining law reformed.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

There are lots of opportunities to be outdoors. The outdoors is free. Make more opportunities for free outdoor activities. Because of all the fees that exist it makes it difficult for families that can't afford it.

He has done a lot of programs with the federal and state agencies and people are very generous with their time but it is very hard to sustain that as a teacher. He feels that there needs to be a youth involvement plan. Things are not going to happen without a plan,. It's a hit and miss. Since the federal leads now want to do something, how about a plan.

BLM was told no more wilderness policy. That is the worst given about public lands to greedy corporations. Use it as the great outdoors and not as a market for greedy corporations.

She is involved with trying to preserve a wetland. They need to work more with federal and state laws and jurisdictions. There needs to be more coordination with agencies on preservation efforts.

His group formed a non-profit to accept monies. The BLM was designated as a lead and he doesn't feel that they would have been funded if the BLM staff wasn't involved. One of the things they do is hire youth to do watershed restoration. You have to work with your neighbors and designate an agency to get the staffing.

She has a problem with drunks when she takes her boy scout troops out and has had to pack them up and leave.

He brought a group of students from Gallup to the Youth Session and he works with youth conservation corps, planting trees, making trails and restoring tributaries. What they need the most is an agreement from the Federal Government to create and sustain conservation jobs. What ever happened to the agriculture workforce? Why isn't there more agriculture education in schools instead of welding? There is too much screen time in the schools and homes.

More marketing. No one is marketing these sort of jobs. They don't promote to these groups the opportunities that are out there so they have failed in that. They need to cross the threshold on how they can set monies aside if there are grants in their own federal organizations and how you can commit to these groups.

One of the biggest problems is that the motivation and encouragement for youth to be outdoors is not there especially with a society where there is more emphasis on image. Need to start encouraging in schools cause they are students and spend 90% of their time in school and the community should get the image out there. They should get more emphasis from the community and schools. She would recommend to the Secretary of Education that there should be more community gardens and outdoor classrooms in schools. Making sure how important it is and making it part of the curriculum. Kids do not see the importance. Having student mentors is another aspect.

Unplug from the indoors, Ipods, computers etc. and do something outdoors.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

Indoor distraction is an influence

NM is now his home. Has been working with the youth of NM and one of. Meaning of nature and holding it true and invest in the regions. Live in different worlds but how do you get them together. Whole week and bring youth together

Accessibility is big problem. Some kind of transportation would encourage people to get outdoors more.

Trash makes you fall behind. You need to try to get rid of it.

Access to recycling bins is a another big issue because a lot of people would like to recycle but don't know how to take it

Is a member of several clubs and they try to get other students involved and try to do different events but hard to get students involved because it requires money

Biggest issue is gangs and graffiti on the west side where he lives. Kids are afraid to go out.

Not doing a good job of marketing the outdoors. Many wonderful programs available but do not put monies aside this year for next year. There are non-profits that they can go to.

Rio Grande Schools gets the most rap in the state and because of this the school gets small profits.

She feels what we are dealing with in the big picture is a lack of perceived value of being outside. It is no longer considered a priority to get kids outside. Media can help curb that and we need role models. Perceived risk is huge problem. Making outdoors safe for everyone is really important

Biggest problem is money because they employ 30 students and pay them minimum wage. Money comes out of their school budget

Trash. It is dumped on the roads. It is not only cans. It is old cars, sofa's etc. If there was a way to get rid of trash they would get outdoors more often.

Scholarships and Money. Try to focus on the youth. The younger kids look up to someone who works outside. Use that as an incentive. If they see someone outdoors they will want to work alongside of them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Albuquerque, NM***

***(cont.)***

One of the biggest issues in the Gila Wilderness where he works is the fact that the trails, the corridor and the access to trails is deplorable. The budget for fires is huge and trail budgets are small. The signage on trails does not exist. He spends countless hours flagging out trails to find some sign of a trail. He sometimes literally searches on the ground looking for any sign of tread.

Lack of older mentors, supporting role models, education, more service learning based curriculum. It is all connected with taking care of the earth. It should be done through after school programs. Funding stream and supporting the budgets that are crippled. Sustainability of funding for programs that are educational in nature.

Access speaking from the urban setting like the Alb. metro area, urban youth have challenges and barriers even getting into nature. He thinks more organizations can be supported. He thinks connecting it with education through curriculum is important. Supporting conservation efforts through student employment. Working on Organic Community gardens. Catchment and conservation. Getting youth to tend a garden is good. Pollution is huge and that can be combined with education too and how can you protect the land for future generations

Thank you for coming to Albuquerque for a meeting to talk about "Wild Lands". I want to save our wild lands in New Mexico as well as other places in the U.S. and have worked to protect Otero Mesa and Valles Caldera and more needs to be done.

A major concern with me is keeping wildlife on our wild lands. The wild horses and wolves are not being protected properly.

The B.L.M. roundups are decimating herds in the West and their lands taken away. It is called "zeroing out". Every last horse is being removed, some being run to death by deadly helicopters. A foal had his hooves worn off and in Nevada many mares aborted their fetuses! Just this week twelve horses died as a result of a roundup in Nevada making close to 200 deaths of wild horses resulting from round ups just this year.

I oppose these roundups and object to sending horses to holding pens when there are already too many there, in dire jeopardy of contracting "pigeon Fever" many horses are suffering and several have died from that.

Being a cattle industry advocate you have proposed moving thousands of captured wild horses to preserves in the Midwest and East, which is like moving the Statue of Liberty to Hawaii.

Wild horses belong in the west and are a symbol of the West! They evolved and developed hooves as a result of the western range. By relocating herds to sterile lands or zoo like conditions, the rich forage will cause many to sicken and die.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

Access from an urban setting is challenging. Hard to get to outdoor areas, even the ones in the city, because of inadequate public transportation. Need more opportunities for youth/students to get out and apply what they learn. Need more youth conservation jobs, student employment. Community gardens are a great education tool and beautify the environment. Organic techniques are very important, we need to reduce chemicals. Need more agricultural areas, we are not practicing sustainable food operations in this country. Tending a garden teaches you where food comes from and gets you outdoors. Need to reduce pollution to maintain lands for future generations.

Access to recycling bins is an issue. Wants to recycle but doesn't know where to go. There are a lot of water bottles associated with sports activities/programs. Tries to recycle bottles and take them to bins. She is a member of other clubs and tries to get people involved in public service and campus cleanup. Her school doesn't have money to do a lot of the projects.

Big picture – there is a lack of value. People don't value outdoors and don't care for them. Something happened in the last couple generations that people don't want to go outside. Media and role models can play a role in getting youth outdoors. Pro athletes and celebrities aren't always the best role models for encouraging kids to get outdoors. We also need to make city outdoor areas safe.

Children are disconnected from wildlife, distracted by consumerism. Wildlife corridors are being destroyed. Her organization is trying to promote ecotourism to provide jobs and economic development. They are marketing wolves, wild horses to draw tourists. Government agencies should be using wildlife to market for tourists.

City transportation and general transportation is lacking. Need better public transportation to get around to different areas in the city. Need shuttles that take people to outdoor areas farther away from the city.

Distractions are an issue. Wants to go outside but indoor distractions (cell phone, TV) stop her.

Entry fees for public lands need to be affordable so parents want to/ can afford to take kids there.

Funding is our biggest obstacle. Government and other organizations don't properly market what's being done with taxes. Need to highlight the successes and profits of paying taxes. Need to show the public what their taxes are being used to accomplish.

Lands are being drilled for gas and minerals. Chemicals injected into soil. This makes lands unusable for ranching/farming.

Level of danger. This young man lives on the west side of Albuquerque where there is a lot of gang activity. The local basket ball hoop has been shot out twice. There is graffiti everywhere. He's afraid to go out because he could get stabbed/shot. His friend was jumped at the park and now he is afraid to go there.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Albuquerque, NM***

***(cont.)***

Lives in Albuquerque's south valley, gangs and graffiti everywhere. There also aren't very many sidewalks to use and litter everywhere. They need better community centers. They want to play soccer but don't have safe parks/areas where they are. They can't ride bikes since there are no sidewalks. They have to drive to another part of town to do these activities. School is making a green house and she wants to do composting for garden/greenhouse. School is important but kids also need chances to get out and learn about the environment. They're from the "bad school" so they don't get very much funding.

Money is a problem. The YCC program pays students minimum wage. Just to afford salary they must partner with other organizations. Need more money for transportation and equipment.

One of the biggest problems is motivation and encouragement for youth to get outdoors. There's more emphasis on sports, college applications, materialism/consumerism. Need to encourage outdoors in school since this is where kids spend 90% of their time. Need media to make outdoors part of our culture, just like they encourage shopping. Kids are too busy right now. (Sec Salazar – What would you suggest we do in schools?) Community gardens and outdoor classrooms. Emphasize that what you do in your everyday life affects the environment. Need student mentors. Youth need to be part of sharing the message. Kids don't always listen to teachers.

Physical access isn't the problem, it's the mental access. If you don't connect with outdoors you don't want to go there. Need to give people jobs and outdoor education that makes them appreciate this resource.

Technology, media are one of the biggest barriers but could also be the best marketing tool. Need to get kids unplugged. We need to provide real jobs. (What can we do to get them unplugged?) 7-8 hours a day spent in school, 3-4 hours doing homework, other time plugged in. Need outdoor classrooms. NM had funding for outdoors classrooms and that funding was cut this year. Teachers and parents have recognized that students are better behaved and happier after going to the outdoors programs. We need to lean on our education system to provide more outdoor opportunities

There are a lot of programs in existence offering summer internships. We need to do a better job at marketing these opportunities. As a rancher, she deals with 17 agencies just to try and conduct ranching. Too many overlaps, too many boundaries. Agencies need to coordinate.

There is no connection with wildlife, outdoors. Attitude change needs to start up high. If we are slaughtering animals what will our kids learn to do? Different interest groups need to work together for common goals.

Trash does make it difficult. Spend a lot of time picking up trash instead of gardening or recreation.

Trash is a big problem. On the road people are dumping bags of trash, furniture, cars. We need better facilities and processes for dumping trash.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

US Army Corps of Engineers Employee – We need to do a better job of marketing and showing the public what we have to offer. There are a lot of resources that address the mentioned problems but people aren't aware of them. We also don't try to align our mission/goals with what the public is saying they need. Federal budgeting process is an issue. Sometimes the timing for a project doesn't align with budget. For example, can't use this year's excess funding for next year's projects.

We need a garden in every school. Need to educate people on the difference between "zero-scaping" (rock) vs xeriscaping (native plants).

We need service learning based curriculum. Academics need to connect and tie to hands-on, on-the-ground learning. There isn't funding for these kinds of efforts. Need funding stream that supports all the ongoing efforts. People are doing the work but don't know if they'll get funding. Need sustainable funding.

We need to support outdoor environmental areas, including farms and ranches. These areas are open space, wildlife habitat. We need to maintain private lands because they serve multiple purposes. There needs to be more support for farmers and ranchers.

We need to teach each other how to appreciate the outdoors and educate each other on our cultural values and ties to the outdoors. We live in different worlds and we need to communicate those differences. (Sec. Salazar: How do we do that?) Take a whole week to bring youth from across New Mexico together.

You can be conservationist and be a consumer. Most suggestions being made are cost extensive. We're in bad economic times. We need to create income opportunities but wisely use natural resources.

Schools are not likely to be funded for field trip. Start small....one class, take them fishing. If you catch a fish, it may lead you to examine how you are going to help sustain their habitat

Fed government needs to help cash-strapped municipalities establish large central parks – no where to get close to nature

Government seems impossibly remote, policy is dictated in unilateral fashion.

Extension Services are underutilized. They can play a role.

Trying to create something for us, a lot of people don't like to go camping or whatever. I spend all my time outdoors. Most challenging things: forests up north have too many trees. If lands would be managed well, there wouldn't be so many fires. Need to maintain stuff. Where is this money coming from? Insufficient access, but we don't have money to spend

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

Working on uphill grade, because many communities are resistant to reclassification because they don't understand what the benefit is. Need education process on economic value.

Had to do a lot of talking with different groups just to get something to happen

Stop illegal shooting of wolves. Local regional director deploras it – FWS Director Tuggle. But nothing happens. Direct additional law to regional FWS office, request FBI involvement.

We need to educate community as well as children

State and national parks – lagging in implementing maintenance. They're starved for resources. Update plans, create a public process for monitoring.

Stay positive. Use words like entice, harmony, don't focus on the negative. Stay with the positive view. Then networks can function

Schools are held hostage to standardized testing. We can't get them out of the schools and outside.

I have been actively trying to find information on America's Great Outdoors since April – even went to D.C. and my congressman's office, and still couldn't get anything. Got email on Wednesday that this was happening – so many people couldn't attend at such short notice. Challenge is communication.

Website is an issue. It's not user friendly, it's too cluttered and busy.

Make it fun for people. Make it so they can touch wild animals

Concerned about wildlife on the land. Trying to have a wildlife corridor in Bernalillo, created beautiful murals. Photographers go, classes go, helps attach people to land.

There is an extreme distinction between government and private. Critical to break down barrier, private land owners get involved with federal agencies. Work with NRCS – because of them I'm still in business. Get word out to other private land owners, give more workshops

Shortsightedness – we tend to look at immediate problems. Look at bigger problems, longer range. Huge blind spot in forward vision – engage kids in conservation, land stewardship, recreation at a much earlier age.

Television can be a tool to educate. Not enough good environmental programming.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

We think provincially rather than regionally. Water, air, pollution, wolves, jaguars. Focus on larger issues, rather than 'my little piece of it'. Keeping kids here in State. Analysis paralysis. Keep going back to table. Eventually we have consensus, and it's time for action

"We are the only program fully run by Native Americans. A while back we were used as a model for other Native American Tribes in connection to the Public Lands Act that was put together in 2009. I would like to see something like this go forward. We have a great partnership with the Pueblo of Acoma and would like other tribes to have that option and to learn more about themselves, their cultural values, and their connection with nature. Tribes are losing their connection with traditional values, due to technology. Speaking from the point of view of Native Americans, I'd like to see Conservation Corps started on all tribal lands. We started with 42 members, and are now up to 80 members. We are very excited to see our program move forward, but we need some money. We train young adults to do preservation work on some of our projects. Working with young people is one of our main goals."

"Only 2 percent of our land is protected. Two pieces of legislation right now that could be passed in 2010 are those protecting the Rio Grande del Norte National Conservation area and the Oregon Mountains Desert area."

"What I would like to say, the most important thing President Obama needs to hear, is that nature is in crisis. We are currently in the middle of the sixth greatest extinction event on earth. The others were caused by natural disasters. I've been involved in conservation for all of my adult life. We judge our work on how good it is compared to how bad it could have been. We need to protect more areas, we need to protect more areas dedicated to nature. Another new frontier area is carnivore conservation. There is a tremendous amount of research on the importance of maintaining our large carnivores. Top carnivores are key players in the ecosystem, even keeping streams and vegetation intact. We need to restore large carnivores over landscapes so that they can operate in a way that is ecologically effective. In the Southwest, we have been trying to restore the Mexican Wolf. The Forest Service has not stepped up to the plate. We need bold new initiatives. We need to take a long hard look at all of our public lands policies."

"we're seeing more and more loss of trails every year. For those of us who are in favor of a recreational trails program, we would like to see that re-funded. And also, like everyone knows, it comes down to funding for the Forest Service. Also, we would like to ask the administration to direct land managing agencies to revise policies that hamper reviews - particularly overly strict criteria."

"You mentioned protecting wildlife. I am mystified that our government spends 100 million tax dollars to kill predators. That seems like an irresponsible way to use money, and it is used to kill things in horrible, cruel, violent, ways. I think DOI is about killing, not about stewardship. I think this is a great tragedy for this nation."

"100 million dollars is spent on sodium cyanide and other poisons to poison wildlife. I thought this was done by BLM and other DOI agencies."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Albuquerque, NM***

***(cont.)***

"We are the only facility that can deal with large carnivores and mammals. We got a mountain lion in yesterday and are over run with bears this year. I want to talk about the premise of historical use. What history? What about pre-human history? We can't make everyone happy. We can't accommodate all uses. Our starting point needs to be how we maintain the health of the land and the uses need to be secondary. "

"I take kids on walks through the Nature Center. We explore bugs, the pond. They love it and are fascinated by it. Kids don't even know often that there is a river here in Albuquerque. I'm constantly surprised with how little interaction these kids have with the outdoors. A lot of families don't take their kids outside. They don't have money for buses. I think that is one very simple solution . Once a year isn't enough to form a relationship with nature. If they do, they will actually care about it and form a relationship for the future."

"I am a big proponent of wilderness. In New Mexico, less than 2 of the state is wilderness, the lowest percentage in the entire west. But wilderness can't do everything. We need to take better care of our forests and stop fragmentation. The Forest Service is not using the best science and is fragmenting the forest with fuel breaks. I wish all fuel breaks looked like those at the Grand Canyon. Another thing is that in addition to using the best science, we need to focus on long range planning and sustainable use. We are going to use the forest, more and more people, more and more use, we have to do the right thing long term. Limiting motorized use in the forest, allowing wildlife habitat to expand."

" I'm from the Pueblo of Acoma, Southwest Research and Information Center (board member). We recently had an area near Acoma thing, designated as a \_\_\_\_\_ by SHPO. This was initiated by the Zuni, Acoma, Laguna, and Navajo. This is now being appealed by the mining industry. Acoma sits in the heart of the Grants mineral belt. This was the most important area for mining uranium for years. Not only are all aspects of our environment threatened, but our culture. The mountain has been considered sacred since before Christ was born. This is at the heart of our spiritual foundations. As the 50 year legacy of uranium mining hasn't been dealt with, we are concerned because of the gulf oil spill that has been taking place. We are concerned that one of the federal responses to clean and green power is nuclear power. Again, the 50 year legacy of uranium mining has not been reclaimed. We have ongoing litigation on the San Juan river that has not been settled. We want the Federal government to please consider this historical designation. Not respecting this interferes with our first amendment rights of freedom of religion."



## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

"I'm with the New Mexico Department of Game & Fish. Stuff that is working - recognition that natural resources are important. Government and non-government entities talking more on a smaller scale. I think what confounds the fundamental desire of a lot of folks is that we as a society are electing politicians to incentivize growth. We encourage growth. It typically comes at the expense of natural resources. The government needs to said "incentivize conservation of natural resources." Bureaucracy of government, it has been said all day long. Lots of projects, lots of ideas, but we need to get past the red tape. That might take a review of certain statutes on the books. Bureaucracy is often used in legal maneuvers. I think that brings me to my last point, we need to move towards encouraging sustainability as an approach to life. No group gets 100 percent of what we want. We are probably our own worst enemy with natural resources."

"As far as people mentioning about buses, yes, that's an issue, but kids aren't being taught about nature or the environment either. No child left behind is a disaster. Environmental education needs to be addressed. There is an enormous amount of material out there. Teachers can't use them though, because they are teaching to the test. The other issue is what is going on with agriculture in our culture. USDA. The corporate farms and the type of agriculture that is going on in this country is an environmental nightmare. I'm not a fanatic about organic food, but would rather have that then genetically modified. Often foods are not labeled as genetically modified. Tremendous travesty. One company more than any other which is responsible for this stuff is Monsanto; you need to educate yourself about that. All our conservation won't make a difference if the destruction of our native seed isn't addressed. Everything will be a chemically poisonous soup. President Obama said we'll tell Conga that it isn't the Department of Agribusiness, but agriculture. I don't see that happening at all. All of the people he selects are from that background. We are all eating genetically modified food whether we know it or not. Much of the sugar that you are eating is from sugar beets which have been genetically modified, this is also true for corn. We're not being told the truth and it is being exported to the rest of the world. Chemicals to keep soil going, degradation of the soil, with documented effects to young people."

"Dona Ana county - I'm concerned with border security – will it have mechanized vehicles?"

"Greatest challenge is working together as partners, not finding fault with others."

## Discussion Question 2

### *Albuquerque, NM*

*(cont.)*

"We were both at the youth session this morning. A lot of the youth managed to sum up really strong and significant points. It was inspiring. Youth are often full of passion and have new ideas. Everybody talks about this specific designation or this specific cog in the machinery; we need to see the big picture. It will not take just all of our organizations, but all of our organizations working together. Without the dung beetle, all of those savannah ecosystems would collapse. The dung beetle rolls the dung and carries it underground, keeping the grasslands fertile. That keeps all the elephants, zebras, etc., all of those well known animals, afloat. I know a lot of people bring up problems, but we need to follow those up with a solution. This morning we talked about a significant problem in getting kids to connect with the nature – it is just not a top priority for a lot of kids. "Mental access" someone said this morning. Also, not every kid lives near open land. Friends, shopping, preparing for college, etc., take priority. Mentors are key. We should make sure that nature is part of the way we all think. We need to get networking done right as we sit here. We've got to get all partners together to come up with solutions. This morning at the youth session, some girls talked about having a walk for conservation causes. That is what all of the 7 or so organizations I have worked for have been trying to do for ages. I think it is really important that we can all work together. Lasting change – part of that is seeing the big picture. The national picture. Implementing things that will protect places on a national scale."

"We need to raise awareness for everyone. There are people that don't think about conservation, recycling, whatever. Making things like hiking and nature tangible and enjoyable is key for people to find value in other activities – promoting stuff through media or any way you can. Nowadays youth just look to videogames and technology. A big problem that I see is using energy sources that are going to be renewable. My friends don't really care about what their car does to the environment, they just want to get places. We have solar panels at my house, but they are very expensive."

"Thousands of farmers and ranchers are not here today. We work at growing products for the world. Every one of us is intimately involved in agriculture. As we look at landscape management, if we cannot maintain our food supply, we can't recreate or worry about wildlife. We have to get back to our roots that allow us the time to do these kinds of things. I agree with a lot of things that have been said. In defense of the Forest Service, we think they are doing too much for wolves. Otero Mesa is a very special place. The reason it is a special place, people that have lived and ranched there for four generations. Go to Otero county, talk to those people. No one there knew that it might become a monument. It was the fourth worst drought in 100 years. We don't want to see gas and oil drilling there, but do we just give away that energy source?"

"I have some brief items. 1) Childhood obesity – lack of exercise kids get – implement some kind of farm in schools, on school property, don't turn it into child slave labor or anything. 2) Water. When you go into restaurants, why serve water if people don't want it? Water on all of these tables. It bugs me to think that it will be wasted."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Albuquerque, NM***

***(cont.)***

"I would like to speak in favor of the Oregon Mountains Desert area. We've worked really hard on it. We've had some surprising opposition from some people. The vast majority of people down there support it. I've been surprised at the deceitful campaign by some ranchers down there. One in particular brought forth issues regarding national security. These things are really hard to rebut. Thanks for supporting this. Subsidies - a lot of these issues come down to financial issues. The people who lose in the long term are poor people. Massive deforestation all around the world. More bio fuels, more soybeans, more pollution of natural resources."

"I'm with the Southwest Environmental Center in Las Cruces. Along the line of landscape conservation, I'd like to recommend a place known as Otero Mesa in Southern New Mexico be protected from being opened up for oil and gas. Rather than continue to fight with Federal Agencies, we'd like to work together to protect areas. "

"I'm a former member of New Mexico Mountain Club Conservation. The reason I came here today is that I would like to say "Amen" to this man about Otero Mesa. We have to keep some lands wild. We have to keep it wild in some places for future generations. I really came also to ask the question - how are the trails for these ATVs and these off-road vehicles that are tearing up the mesas, how are they related to conservation and maintaining the beauty and the wildness of this beautiful state? We owe it to the children not to let those expand any more."

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

Trail maintenance, don't have runoff into creeks, Advertise in outdoor retail stores, people in suburbs sometimes more ignorant of nature than those in city. Thinks sad that people don't appreciate physical labor that built this country. Likes Americorps, but thinks that kids in general are lost because the kids don't know what to do, he wants kids to start working with land. Wants kids to hike the AT. Agreed that it is easy for say 20 yr olds, to get lost.

Lots of people moving to the area (Washington-Baltimore) -conservation is absolutely necessary. Work with all levels of government—they can provide institutional support. This has made them successful.

Follow up on having enough resources, and local access to enjoy outdoors, have adequate protections and enforcing laws that we do have, mineral extraction, quality of special places is being affected. Take another look at outdated mining laws is important to outdoor experience and preserve for future.

Assume individual responsibility for conservation and environment. ? each have to be the catalyst, motivator, of community, family, etc. for conservation where you live and where you work.

We should tie in the programs of Piscataway park and the forest but we need more oversight from state and federal agencies. Sometimes the local land use decisions are made for short term profit instead of considering a more long term vision that keeps giving to the people. Mattawoman has been considered important for many different species but it might be lost because the local vision contradicts the more long term goal which would continue to give back to the public.

In school to be a teacher; working with best friend's mom who is working on projects for 3rd grade students to teach about recycling and ways to help environment

field trips with kids – instead of going to museums, take them into nature and to parks; school initiatives – because you can't go that far away on a school day (and national parks may be really far from you)

good idea to divide people randomly

Farms, DC environmental education consortium. Forest communities, people only concerned w/ survival. Childhood obesity is real problem. Growing own food- impress on young people how important. Low cost, low carbon imprint food. Expose kids to natural world, draw kids in, meet kids where they are and teach them. Teach teamwork, teach about parks. Edible gardens, people sitting around not doing work, put them to work in gardens. Agricultural runoff is #1source of pollution. Wants DOI and EPA to work on this. Agreed that community gardens for disadvantaged youth good, radishes grow the easiest, growing stuff has to be fun

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

We need an emphasis on Shenandoah part of CB watershed, CREP program gives incentive to get farmers to get interested. Often private firms supplement land trust. Federal government could look at VA examples and think of ways to leverage and expand on programs and create others.

Break down barriers: if it is perceived as not cool, break down stereo types. Get Gatorade type sponsorships.

Get out and experience areas. Limited accessibility

Thinks that an obstacle to young people is that they aren't exposed early enough to the outdoors and they don't know what they are missing out on.

Need to make water more accessible for people (eg public loading and unloading)

thinks the biggest problem is water quality. Runoff gets into food.

The cost of transportation is also an issue. Schools do not have the funding necessary to get kids to parks.

We need creative ideas. Funding is a common theme, but we know we will not be able to obtain enough funding to solve everything. We need other new ways to address these issues.

I also kayak a lot and I use bridges to access water. We need to work with the Department of Transportation (DOT) to create (boat) access at bridges.

Conservation Landscapes Initiative in South Mountain – PA Agency owns core of mountain, but foothills are fruit belt and they are struggling now to make it. Create an attraction to draw tourists from Gettysburg and market with agricultural growers and bridge gap. Landscape of apple growers is so tied to landscape in general. Agency is funding a buy local movement. CSAs popping up. Integrating working landscapes.

Private property adjacent to public land with no public access to public land. Someone needs to cover my insurance for people coming through my land to get to the public areas. If I am not around to grant access, then I'm liable.

we are not giving people an emotional reason to protect land in our watershed. Public access part is huge. Lesson in values is getting lost. None of this will happen with money until the emotional connection is made.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

Grants.gov is too complicated of a system to use. Volunteers need an easier way to get money for programs. It's much easier to get a permit than a grant - Improve the site! Eliminate funding programs based on no money in the budget. Lack of reliable dedicated funding for national historical preservation fund

Climate adaptation planning, such as done at MD state level, needs to trickle down to local level. Work being done needs to be shared up and down among levels of gov't.

There aren't enough events for people to enjoy the outdoors. I like the urban downtown parks, but people don't embrace it because there is nothing to do. There are events once or twice or year but we need more... events like hug a tree

Or if they made an app for the iPhone would help tune people in to the outdoors.

D.C. Parks aren't well maintained, but Virginia's are; Need to be able to get out easily - public access to trails

Young people don't go outdoors; my friends don't. I wondered why they don't go camping, kayaking, etc. It's because they lack the knowledge that the sites are there and the outdoors is available in general. There's also the fear of the outdoors. My boyfriend is from New York and he's afraid of deer!! We have to acknowledge this - people are fearful, especially around water! Boating can be scary. Providing assistance and training is very important. Also, the financial barriers are real - again, with water - boating is expensive. Even to rent a kayak or go on a guided tour costs about \$60 - most families can't afford that. Young kids make the family's schedule very hectic - we need urban (close by) parks. Families can't afford to drive an hour just to get to the site!

biggest problem is sewage and fertilizers getting into the bay. Also thinks MD building requirements need revision.

Access is the main issue. The outdoors need to be more integrated into fieldtrips.

larger buffer zones between roads and outdoor spaces. Enjoyable spaces are being ruined by having roads too close.

"No child left inside" Teachers need to be provided with lesson plans, training, or park service representatives to make the teacher comfortable outside.

There need to be bigger bike paths to encourage cycling and alternative forms of transportation.

Concerned about public lands. Need to designate land as protected.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

We need to ask what we can do better. May include real life issues like providing meals for kids.

Whatever you to engage children must be fun. Start early. Show job opportunities to your children so that they're environmentalists early. They have a pilot program: Woolly mascot, buddy bison. Where has buddy bison been:? Grades preK – 8 grade. Comes with toolkit. Come with local park maps. Buddy Bison website. Buddybison.org. Twenty-one pilot schools – new education centers in California, Nevada. Uses photos, stories, artwork. National grassroots movement. Connects kids through out the country. Biggest obstacle is transportation. Set up a program that's funded by scholarships for bus funds. High school organizations say if DOI would give jobs that are available, along with course work, developing skills, could increase hiring in the DOI. Little kids to older students; Simple and scalable. Teachers love it.

A program that has impact here and nationally is the NPS Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program (RTCA) – it is woefully underfunded. It gets more traction and leverage with communities than other federal programs do. There are a number of examples where RTCA has linked up local, state and federal agencies with non-profits. (\_\_\_\_\_ used to manage it.) One way to make it better is to fully fund it. The budget has been cut in half. I'm not sure everyone is aware of how much leverage this program has.

Themes : access, appreciate what say, need to figure out how we provide that access...schools, fed gov, work together. We hear you.

It's important to develop shared interests, for example, maybe people don't care that it helps urban environments to narrow streets, but community groups may see them as a benefit because they encourage slower speeds, shared goal but different reasons. Good economic sense = good environmental sense.

Sierra club, connecting kids to outdoors, need to get kids from all backgrounds. Get First family out there. Need good role models. Obamas, with two daughters, would be great role models. Climate change is an obstacle. Need corridors. Establish youth corps, get the kids out there to prepare for climate change.

job skills for youth are very important. partner w/ international masonry for historic place preservation.

An obstacle is that the outdoors is not 'group-orientated.' can make group orientated by having online community where encourage large groups to go outside together. Schools can also make the outdoors more accessible to groups by having available interships.

Kids need to be aware of outdoor activities. Have an online activity kit that they can download.

people would be more willing to ride bikes if there were bigger bike paths and if there was more awareness about cycling

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

Trash is a big problem; lack of recycling in D.C.

lack of interest among kids especially of color –getting the First Family out more often with media so people can see them – we need role models – climate change – need to establish a more robust youth corps and give them jobs to prepare lands for climate change

teachers don't appreciate this time spent outdoors.

Getting to the city parks is easy but getting to the National Parks around the city is very difficult without a car

Yeah, just more public access would be helpful

Yeah, it could even tell you what kind of birds you're looking out

We need to take full advantage of available right of ways including levees, power line openings, railroad lines, etc. Any sort of right of ways. Make the public use(s) compatible with the original intent of each right of way.

Indifference is an obstacle. People are not aware of the outdoors and what is at stake. They also lack transportation.

educate people on what is recyclable

safety as a concern

also has to do with mindset

Worried about group that cannot teach others about wildlife. We have a lot of educational tools and we must get the kids out there.

spending too much time on facebook

stay positive though – try to be safe and keep boundaries; don't go in areas where you aren't comfor



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

nothing to do in parks; basketball court, swing set, ropes à don't want to be there when it's dilapidated and vandalized

rushed – more time; extend it

recycling is inconvenient; government only collects trash one time a week – put up more recycling bins

mandate recycling

Incorporate games, projects into songs, education, etc.

quality of parks; distance and lack of accessibility

everyone is on facebook; accepting change; communicate with new people in a new market and new way – THROUGH facebook

Be outdoors next time

Environmental trust - no transferable tax credit for MD like in VA - driven by federal tax deduction sparked rapid growth. We need to get state tax credits going through congress to take the next step

Lives outside of Philadelphia, there are not enough places for people to go. Need to finance. Land and water conservation fund should be funded. Work with programs we already have. Invest in local communities.

We need matching funds for stewardship - invasive species removal projects.

Q #4 – land conservation – where has federal government made a big difference? From federal government need scale and plan component, really took state wildlife agencies forward. That was a federal requirement. States took money and invested in plan know that there will be little money to focus on their mission. Stateside land water conservation fund, has been consistent for states to do outdoor plan and that got states in open space planning business. How about we take that to local government level? How do we get local communities to do local open space planning?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

I haven't heard anything about climate change today. What's going to happen to our conservation efforts without consideration of climate change. We need national strategies and funding for what is going to change and how we can adjust our strategies. Rising sea-level is going to change everything and the federal government needs to dedicate funding to gain a better understanding of conservation techniques based on the changing environment. We are already seeing the changes in the environment.

National Capital Parks -- Preservation of land. Their challenge is historic structures on historic lands. They are mothballed, or run as historic houses, due to lack of funding. Could do so much more with funding, but it's not there. Would be excellent sites for social studies and history curriculum. Challenge is that social studies program isn't supported in PG county. 27,000 acres have been preserved.

There's a problem with safety and health due to the way our parks are managed. We've exceeded carrying capacity for the white-tailed deer – lime disease is horrific and has ruined my life. Where is the wildlife management in our state parks? We have to improve the plant and wildlife communities – and indirectly benefit the people.

I've worked in national parks. They have the tools—biologists, ecologists, etc. - doing all these surveys regarding park management practices that benefit ecology and wildlife. The Park Service is not listening to its own experts. You need to listen to the strategies they are recommending in order to increase biodiversity. Implement their strategies. There are great published papers out there developed by Park Service personnel!

give people facts, make changes convenient; talk to people – best way is to communicate – educate them on importance and make it EASY for them to do it – inequalities exist based on where you live

it should be recycling; we have a huge pile of plastic

mass distraction of virtual worlds – needs to be a reconnect to Mother Nature

Engage through brook trout, fishing, enroll CREP not for striped bass and crabs, but for native brook trout, so they can fish with kids, we can gain a lot about focusing on local amenities of each area. We have CREP programs, temporary easements, need to migrate to permanent so have ecological function of floodplain, is there a way to increase flex in purchase easements. States don't have funding sources and want to protect land but don't fit wetland reserve, or don't fit CREP, need to think broader about funding sources.

should raise awareness about going outside, people do not know about outdoor activities nor do they know how to do them. Make outdoor activities more accessible.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

In urban parks, people are deterred because of expensive parking. Talks about federal hill and how it is impossible to get into because of parking. Connecting public transit to outdoor spaces would promote outdoor activities.

He is a 3rd grade teacher and believes that there should be connections with schools to promote parks.

Thinks that an obstacle to young people is that they aren't exposed early enough to the outdoors.

More public transportation. Refers to Hampton which is near the city, but nobody can get there because there is no bus service.

Access to our public places. Hard to get from Point A to point B, not close to beaten path. Need buses. Ex: NP by Baltimore but not on bus route so not used as much as it could be...need transportation to beach, etc more parking and public transportation

How can we work with you (federal programs) to make these things work? The key is to work together.

I have a concern and a question. Climate change is a huge issue and our policies are not keeping pace with the changes on the ground. What legislative changes will make a true difference? I'm a spiritualist – I work with our American Indian tribes. Why don't we require Ecology 101 for our legislators?

There's an overall lack of planning in these parks. Various trails are built but no parking is planned. Horse trails are developed but there are no places to park the horse trailers. In Howard County, there are parks surrounded by houses but there's no access provided from the houses to the parks.

Need multiple dimensions to make conservation happen. Ripple effect- multiple kinds of interests and programs and groups. Clinton admin had a program that worked well, but wasn't fully funded: American Heritage Rivers Initiatives (Loretta Neuman ran this White House initiative) State initiatives have great models, but not nearly enough funding.

Free events!

We're trying to engage youth in the outdoors? The best way to engage youth is with an adult in the outdoors. We need to focus on the adults in order to get the kids out there! We need to influence family choices. I'm with Ducks Unlimited – if you take a kid waterfowl hunting, you'll change his/her life.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Anacostia Park was one of my favorite places to go, but they tore up the track so I can't run. I had to find another place. I would look at the river and be disgusted at the water. In Richmond, I love going to the parks with rivers or lakes and the body of water always attracted me, which is what I liked in Anacostia. The other place at Hains Point was a great park... I liked the statue of the man that's coming out of the ground.

Concerts, plays, movies

Some type of public transportation to the parks... on weekdays or holidays would help.

Increase access. Non profit support of public transportation in order to eliminate or decrease fees

Out west have problem in forests don't have enough money to refurbish forests so we are going to beneficiaries from forests. Why would they be part of solution. Out west water providers. In west reach out to water providers – need to be partner with FWS to help restore lands, your land your water will be jeopardized. If you want healthy forests we need your help forests and maintain campgrounds and trails so you need to be our partner. How outside of government do we get private sector to join us? They have stake in maintaining community, forest community. How do we get new constituents into this?

with the Show Institute in DC – working lands and recognizing value of preserving pristine landscapes and keeping land productive and economical – financing and funding for conservation we need to rethink how we fund it – organizations base their work on donations and industries that do poorly in a weak economy – needed financial security will secure a long-term future

grant to Commicut City Farm for seeds and making better connection of people with land – fear and fatalism we fight a lot – memories of elders and dreams of kids we can put together – elders baptized in streams and farmed fields here – idea for heroien users to start selling produce instead and it worked and the Marvin Gaye Amphitheatre is now there where the drug dealing was – celebration for the tiniest reason – kids a short distance away don't know the Fort Circle Trails – kids enthralled when they got through the invasives and saw the forests – government can through money at it and it will take down

We need to get rid of our old thinking that spending time outdoors is a waste of time. We still have that attitude! Public policies are behind the times thanks to the Puritans. We know that spending time outdoors is not a waste of time - we need to rethink how we encourage people to use their time.

Access to trails outside the city

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Access: some areas are dangerous. Need for bus stops and side walks

MD - local land trusts - work really hard so we know what's worth saving - need more funding, not more data analysis. More money to purchase land - capacity building \$ to empower land trust (even \$25,000 goes a long way).

likes hiking trails near water. Notes how littered the paths near the water in the Chesapeake are despite efforts.

implement interactive activities. Kids are not interested in walking around places; they want to be doing something!

Education and engagement. Find ways to engage. Technology ideas good. Need to update Federal Technical capabilities

tax dollars for agriculture are a subsidy that benefits recipients and not taxpayers – same goes for cover crops – a corporate socialist system – ban our representatives from receiving contributions so representatives can better represent the people

teens see what others do, subject to peer pressure...kids will be afraid to step out..even if kids spent time outside, they aren't active, litter and smoke. Have to have meaningful experience when outdoors.

taking action on certain issues. Meadown Creek MD - this creek at brink of what it can handle in terms of toxins. he is worried that, if approved, a permit for a road will adversely affect the area. Thinks should use 60 millions for light rail instead. Connect light rail to metro. Also, driving down 210, he noticed that buildings are not used to full capacity. He is concerned about urban sprawl control, encourages smart growth.

can't eliminate recess, lose leisure time outside, curriculum doesn't value outdoor time for kids, Finland as exmple. Homework one example of why kids can't get outside.

kids will be in class 9 months/yr, have environmental education built into curriculum.

a lot of education takes place indoors, she was only required to take 1 semester of PE, half a credit..even gym activities took place indoors, we must push for environmental education...parents afraid to let kids outside, want kids to be safe.

State organizations don't have power over local authorities. More incentives to promote smart growth. That could change the bad local planning.

have to start young, have kids stop using plastic water bottles, they like knowing that they are doing something good for environment, reduce what use in first place.

## Discussion Question 2

**Annapolis, MD**

**(cont.)**

teachers won't let kids go outside if cold or hot, parents and teachers need to be involved.

Great to be here. Impressed with consistent themes. Been in DC 3 ½ years. Promote partnerships...biggest partnership with next generation. Introduced the “No Child Left Inside (NCLI)” initiative. Studies show youth spend about 7 ½ hrs day on electronics and only 4 minutes on outdoor recreation. There is a need to be tech savvy but something is out whack with those numbers. Support real resources to get youth outdoors. Primarily into school. Incorporate outdoor education. 1700 orgs across country pushing to get NCLI legislation passed. Hope to get included in education authorization. Gov has to perceive when people are pushing for new framework...new energy framework. Build new framework, the next generation, most aware of the environment, take over this issue, make it your issue, using social media you can become the leading edge in Environmental Awareness in this country. Most exciting thing in decades. Every high school should have an Environmental Club. Own it! Exciting prospect what you can do with this issue on the environment. Pledge to be a partner.

kids into tech, they are into social media, facebook, twitter - having activities outside should be a community effort. For example, sports to get kids outside.

People don't think it's cool to be an advocate for protecting the environment, kids have to know that it's good to be outdoors, must be encouraged to do things outside.

Potomac institute in dc. Working lands-- Use land for production of products. Financing and funding needs to be rethought. Connect to industry ecosystem services markets need to understand value of resources

State of MD hiring freeze. Losing key employees. Local government's red tape to hire employees. Job descriptions are limited. Government bureaucracy.

Children don't have enough opportunity to see the real thing—animals, specimens. Schools are overwhelmed and outdoor and environmental education often is cut from programming. There is still a digital divide—some kids don't have access to technology in support of programming. Some kids aren't interested in outdoor activities. Lack of funding.

Emphasis on environmental education

A lack of knowledge. We need outreach programs like flyers in neighborhoods. When people find out about these places and the problems they have, they want to volunteer more to help out.

People make choices by calculating the return on an investment. You can't do this for the outdoors if you haven't had that experience or don't know the options. You need to give people information to help them calculate whether the time and effort devoted to an outdoor activity would be worthwhile.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

In Baltimore, distance to open spaces and lack of accessibility keep people from getting out. One project that's been started is to change the community by converting vacant lots into green spaces. It's important to focus on parks in culturally different neighborhoods

Transportation. Kids may hear about opportunities, but never visually see it. To help with this, the Ground Works Team went to Great Falls. Some of those young people had lived around here their whole life and never seen it in person. You have to give them the chance to see it, and awareness that it's public space. So they can go home and say, "Hey, mom, you can go here, you can have a cookout there." People are not going to go out of their way if they're just going to be by themselves, too. It needs to be perceived as a popular thing to do.

People tend to put off getting outside because of time, weather, any number of excuses. You just have to know the right time.

People don't understand the benefits of getting out.

It's not just about getting people out there, but how to use it once they're there. Some people see a mountain as a place to ski, some want to hike up it, others just think it's pretty. You have to show people all the options of how to enjoy it.

So, one thing that it sounds like needs to be done is put all these ideas in language that young people understand.

Yeah, and it's really hard right now when teachers are forced to teach to standards. We're cutting gym classes and creative teaching activities because we have to cater to the tests.

So maybe that kid-friendly language more engrained in DOE curriculum standards

Some of the main issues that seem to keep coming up are making information available to open spaces easier for all people, and incorporating the outdoors into education- especially because school is the one thing that affects all young people

We could make programs that show the importance of the environment. We have one earth with limited resources, so it's important to realize that we need to make it better not by acting for more, but by improving our quality of life with what we have

we also need to find a way to accommodate standards while taking field trips, using the power of place to teach lessons.

Yeah, integrate the standards with place-based experience. You also need to do several lessons, take a systematic approach, with repeated emphasis. That's when kids really start to get it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

I think its when kids get to middle school and high school that we really need to try to get them. It's easy to encourage them to get outside when they're young, but just when they get old enough to really enjoy it, lots of other stuff starts to get in the way. More outdoor learning spaces would be good. Maybe new buildings that maintain the classroom focus, but allow students to be outside at the same time.

So the funding would come from somewhere else, and maybe NRCS or someone could provide directions to schools for how to go about it successfully.

Cutting school funding keeps out many topics, so we probably need to focus on alternative types of education outside of school. It might call for a separate campaign for environmental education beyond the classroom.

Again hollistic information about the outdoors and the environment

Work with department of Education to incorporate outdoor education into curriculum standards.

Provide alternative transportation, special day programs and route planning to help people figure out how to get out.

Voluntary private landowner program – have capacity to deliver those programs. How do we get new landowners? Need flexibility to work with new. Doesn't matter who owns land but just want protection.

Conservation is the “Moral equivalent of war.” (William James)

Is this cap and trade? Personally opposed to cap and trade. Need to cap and not give provision to expand. Areas of concern in MD farmers – farmers are painted with same broad brush, \_\_\_\_\_ have conducted water quality studies. Some conventional farmers can have good water quality. All farmers are treated the same. Second issue is ignoring residential sector – chemical contributions to the Bay. USDA bears responsibility. Lots of different messages that are contradictory. Bay has not improved because MD acts as if climate change is not a problem, and roads are not impacting the bay.

I am active in Mattawoman Creek . This creek has been well studied by MD DNR. In this case have tracked fish stocks along with impervious surface and can see where hit about 10% fish decline. An obstacle that I see is that the permitting agency (MDE) does not listen to scientist and conservation experts or DNR or COE so they are allowing development and not connecting stream health with development and impervious surface. How do we get the development community respect special places?



## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

We are all either in the choir or in pulpit and one thing that I hope this movement will lead to is somehow bringing together all of our various interests and tools and constituents because we all have tools and strategies for accomplishing our mission but if you think about all people shopping at LL Bean, tractor supply company not buying these things to recreate. So they are making the connection. Frustrating thing is to come up with funding, things get political very quickly. But tremendous constituency that have connection, how do we harness power of constituents to harness power from Washington?

connecting people to outdoors. How do we get consensus among groups to proceed. We are forgetting about we are choir, and we want to get people that aren't involved. Three obstacles: #1 competition – we are really busy and hard to connect young people need parents to go there and competing interests. #2 Cash – we don't have funds to take care of what we have. Land water conservation fund is only gotten 50% authorization. Historic preservation fund only received half of appropriation. #3 Condition- multibillion maintenance log at national parks, how do we expand when we can't maintain. If we are trying to get people engaged and they get there the condition has to be good.

Work for private foundation that provides grant to students in conservation. Connection to a specific place that has gotten to turning lives to conservation. Need to make sure those places are available and nearby so next generation to connect.

We have all these great ideas, but message coming from top, but involving public in message and having simple, NPS has amazing resources but get stuck in hole when on web site. It is hard for general public to extract meaningful info to public. We need to get fed government to simplify message for general public, it is as simple as get outdoors. That is message we need to embrace. Need simple and short message.

Analysis paralysis - "we need better GIS". There's a lack of communication between local and state / federal levels. They need to share this information so that they aren't repeating themselves. More time needs to be spent on the ground doing the work - local organizations aren't getting the information to the federal levels. GIS is hampering movement forward because we're always looking to improve GIS systems. If we can make all of the GIS information available, Federal, State and Local organizations won't be repeating the same data collection, waiting to make decision

community service, etc. service learning. One challenge she faces in federal service. Information is siloed. Information is not shared between agencies. Today is great example of sharing.

Concerned about the energy usage of family farms. One farm is putting in an energy plant that will account for 6% of P for the state of Virginia.

concerned citizen who likes the outdoors and grew up in Yonkers – as Boy Scouts we had urban overnights and overnight camps that I still remember and the biggest obstacle today is the prevalence of the computer and the indoors – change obstacle into a tool – a website by the NPS or others and TV spots and ads to direct people to an enjoyable summer

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

connecting to grown-ups – that group doesn't know how to do this stuff – NPS has tools such as Junior Ranger and Climate tools and education tools and resources at HFC, parks to help – the tool is the places to connect them

Education regarding climate change - how the landscape could be a viable resource to communities that could lose the wetlands and forests. They need to understand that these natural habitats are protecting their communities from natural threats.

Farming looks similar everywhere, but isn't. Farm Bill should be administered differently on different landscapes. Role of land trust should not be forgotten.

Federal authority to acquire property should be expanded to lands bordering federal lands. Use LWCF lands from state and fed to acquire property.

For next Farm Bill, count voluntary BMPs, more conservation easements need to have minimum conservation programs in place. Ag programs often the first cut out of school budgets. Need to continue Ag. New technology and energy to get farmers interested in working and living light on the land. What's permanent? Need to have people on the land—otherwise what is the point of conserving land. Buy fresh-Buy local.

Fort Monroe is a 560 acre area at the confluence of the James River and Chesapeake Bay. Is an Army base closing in 2011. City of Hampton tried to turn into gated community. Local citizens are advocating for the site to be a National Park, have gathered 7000 names on a petition. Site would provide bay access, trails, beaches, promenades. Her group is trying to overcome the challenge of how to convince leaders to be a combination of state and national park.

From a programmatic standpoint, one of the biggest obstacles is the fact that folks do not have the knowledge and the skills to recreate appropriately. Folks don't have the income to try recreational activities to find out if they like them or not. Through "Get Outdoors Pennsylvania" folks are introduced to recreation and it's free! People can camp, hike, kayak, etc. Single parents are one targeted audience. The equipment is available to check out. Each time they come back to the park, they can check out fishing rods, kayaks, and other equipment.

Funding is a problem. The Sport Fishing & Recreation Access Fund is good, but non-motorized boat access is still limited in Virginia. We reviewed the problem for the Secretary of the Interior – we interviewed the states. The outcome was: it is a "user pays/user benefits" program. Motorized boaters contribute to the Access Fund, so they benefit from it! Manufacturers of kayaks and canoes should come up with a funding mechanism to promote development of soft landings, etc., to promote non-motorized boating.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Getting people engaged in the outdoors; we have to get them out – on the water & on the trails. Here in Annapolis – the “hidden gems” are the street ends. These street ends often lead to water – they offer people water access and the opportunity to put a kayak in. Need \*increased parking and increased awareness (that these places exist.) [\*Some areas permit only 2 hours of parking which is very restrictive.] What works is: Making the lands open to the public so they can get out on the water.

Growing up in environment of cell phones, computers, and competition on young people and have attention to popular things. Way to connect youth to outdoors is promote mountain biking, white water rafting things that get blood going that are thrilling and exciting. Youth have been going to music festivals and where is NGO presence there and giving us info and telling us how to get involved. NGOs are not in our faces, you come here to see each other, but some see us where we are. What made you so passionate about outdoors? Young guy – response - Grew up in suburbs of Atlanta and seeing sprawl and watched Chattahoochee River turned brown to red because so much of land has been taken off so now have clay enter river. Chat national recreation areas and being able to walk to that and not needing a car that allowed me to sit quietly. Also parents banned video games.

Her group has been fighting a lot of battles on the Mattawoman Creek, one of best tributaries to the Chesapeake Bay. There is a new highway proposal threatening the watershed. Need to work on educating local planners and politicians on the value of local land use planning. Need a national toolbox for communities for areas that need to be protected. Need to protect best tributaries to the Ches Bay. Need national blueprint for green and blue infrastructure that syncs up with transportation planning that makes these types of projects ineligible for fed funds. There are opportunities through the new livability initiative and reauthorization of federal transportation act. Should also prioritize providing transit access to national parks.

How can we blend this with other objectives and goals? For example, farm for future in NC. Happen to have civil war site so get in guided tour to enhance. They are open to new combinations and approaches.

How do we get consensus among groups to proceed. We are forgetting about we are choir, and we want to get people that aren't involved. Three obstacles: #1 competition – we are really busy and hard to connect young people need parents to go there and competing interests. #2 Cash – we don't have funds to take care of what we have. Land water conservation fund is only gotten 50% authorization. Historic preservation fund only received half of appropriation. #3 Condition- multibillion maintenance log at national parks, how do we expand when we can't maintain. If we are trying to get people engaged and they get there the condition has to be good.

I do a lot of kayaking and canoeing and when I'm out there I'm wondering “Why aren't there more people out here?” Because generally there's an eight hour commitment from put in to take out (on a river). People are not comfortable committing that much time to a recreational activity.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

I live in Bethesda, which is increasingly urban. The “age” of the people making decisions is an issue – they are disconnected with the outdoors. Open space is seen as wasted space. Other academic fields promote development. The prevailing attitude is if people want to go walking and exercise, they should join a gym. What about enjoying trees, and the outdoors while you exercise? The issue of providing shade is never heard. On the west coast – there’s much more open space everywhere – it’s a priority there. My daughters moved there because they were fed up with the attitudes here in the east.

I lived in Maryland for many years. Now I’m on the coast in Virginia. I feel like I’m in the wilderness. One big issue in that area is the amount of access to the water is extremely limited; far less than Boston, New York or San Diego. A study was done regarding water access around the nation – we passed the study on to local governments (in VA) and it fell on deaf ears. Local governments don’t understand or appreciate how important public access to the water and access to open space are. Not everywhere is advanced as Maryland is. How do we get local governments to understand the importance of access? Seven acres of live oaks were in jeopardy in Ocean View because the city wanted to sell the area to developers. Concerned citizens took the case to the city, the local court, and then to state court – they won at the state level. These people had to sue their own city to preserve seven acres of open space! We need to distribute more information regarding how people can obtain access to the water and to open space.

In order to have access to the outdoors there has to be public access. Ex: Forests along the Potomac River in Charles county due to be developed stopped by the grassroots level until the state of MD bought the land and created areas for public access. Ex: Hard bargain farm - working farm that also gives environmental education. Ex: Charles county public schools includes visits to working farms in their curriculum

Just here as concerned citizen, no professional connect. Got interested in outdoors through boy scouts. Had camp in NYC. Remembers what he learned. Prevalence of computer obstacle. Change that obstacle into a tool...sponsor websites that are aimed towards kids. Get tv/ radio time to direct kids to conservation website.

Keep your friends close and your board of supervisors closer. Feels that educating kids is a key to building public support for national park protection. If the park had had a major education program 20 years ago, recent hearings [regarding proposed development on the Wilderness Battlefield] would have gone better.

Lack physical access to bay. There aren’t places where they can get to water. Even if physically get to bay, very hard to find places to get on water. Programs that run through an institution are best to reach people. People must use outdoors in way that is special to them in order to engage. Can do program through institution, but people need to know how to do it on own. Find ways to connect so they can do outdoors activity themselves.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Listening sessions are important. Here are examples that are “scale-able.” Kids won’t go where they don’t feel they’re wanted. In Los Angeles, there’s a park sign that has ten different “no” postings. We have to invite the kids - truly welcome them – otherwise they’ll go to the mall. We do need to overcome the incredible dearth of awareness about where open areas are! (Lack of) public transportation is an issue. Also, people don’t want to travel outside their “ethnic boundaries.” On the metro and on buses, we need to advertize how to visit Rock Creek, etc. That is not happening now.

LWCF doesn’t go out to states equally because Congressionals don’t get credit. Could do a block grant to states for consistency from year to year. Each NGO in a state would benefit. Constituency is not organized. One idea—“principles” tied to the state-side of funds. For the large landscapes, could use federal and state money in the same place. Need constituency advocating for LWCF.

Make it cool to be outdoors for the kids - they don’t need gadgets to enjoy the outdoors. Make the parks more interactive. DNR - you can form a parent - kid team to get free admission up to 10 parks over the course of the summer. You have to do some kind of challenge - hike a certain distance - fill out sheets based on what you learned. These parks should be made more affordable compared to going to a baseball game or movie. Increase domestic visitorship to parks!

MD - local land trusts - work really hard so we know what’s worth saving - need more funding, not more data analysis. More money to purchase land - capacity building \$ to empower land trust (even \$25,000 goes a long way). Make tax benefits permanent!

MD green party. Federal money that government has to hand out represents a subsidy from taxpayers to efforts. Conservation people will lobby to get tax money for their cash flow. Tax payers paying cost of doing business. Same for cover crops or corn . corn sold to chicken farmers, chicken waste goes into Chesapeake bay. Thinks we have corporate socialist system. Government officials bought by campaign donations. Spokesmen for corporate sponsors. Very worried about representation. Green party doesn’t accept donation

money is tight in this economy and parks on hold or get shut down or projects cancelled – we spend time now applying for grants to supplement our funding – we could not apply for some grants based on our narrow geographic scope – our trail was not long enough – a solution could be to reconfigure criteria or have dedicated funding sources for smaller-scale projects

More money for budgets? The budgets continue to be cut - agencies are already underfunded and under staffed - what is the federal government going to do to counter the cuts in funding?

National Wildlife Refuges have programs that are not well-advertised to universities and the public.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Need to go to general public in addition to water company. Pump died and could see from pipe how water had gone down, problem is water comes from VA which has been paved. If public knew that somewhere there water is affected, would do something.

Need to work on National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS), codified in 2009. What's worked: gateway communities; work a lot with youth. Obst. No one has heard of NLCS. Best tool: need a Secretarial order to mandate conservation prescription for these lands, would help with management. Better partner: would like to see conservation as a priority. Would like to see NLCS raised as a priority within BLM.

not enough places to go, especially in the Mid-Atlantic – financial means to make more places happen – federal funding through matching funding such as LWCF or other and working with delegation should make that happen and working

Notes that a big issue in the last two comments is that they will cost money. He feels strongly that need to fully fund LWCF. Is how federal agencies pay for land acquisition. He supports efforts in Congress to require OCS revenues to be spent on LWCF.

NPS has an order for partnerships (DO-21) that is so burdensome to the partners that it imperils the idea of partnerships. It is difficult for federal land managers to work with. Unfortunately there was previously no organizational guidance on partnerships; now we have burdensome guidance instead.

Obesity is a huge issue in our country and no one is mentioning it. 38% of children (under 18 years of age) in Delaware are overweight. We are about to do a project working with pediatricians to start issuing prescriptions to make the kids go outdoors. People make bad leisure time choices and poor food choices. How do we work with the manufacturing system in our country to deal with obesity? The Center for City Parks, the Trust for Public Lands – they should initiate impact surveys. We need to do economic impact studies regarding the importance of parks in our country. We need to focus on areas “close to home” first vs. the national parks!

of interest among kids especially of color – getting the First Family out more often with media so people can see them – we need role models – climate change – need to establish a more robust youth corps and give them jobs to prepare lands for climate change

oil spill in Gulf shows how fragile our public lands are – this should be a focus in the AGO

One of the biggest problems on the Appalachian Trail is the threats to the trail from energy projects – have proposals for three major transmission lines, gas lines and ten wind generation projects. Need a national GIS system which identifies important resources married with a look at federal incentives that are fueling projects that would compromise these values.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Annapolis, MD***

***(cont.)***

physical access to the water and Bay – not a lot of places people can go – even less people who can get on the water and to the shore – obstacles in Bay Network with adequate number – 2nd point: many successful programs are institutional and they are wonderful but many connections are personal through use that is special to them – person self-directed, but institutional context doesn't allow that extension of a connection to happen

Problem has been defining Conserved Lands and how they should be managed. Essential that you get people out there. E.g., Fear of ticks keeps people away. Inheritance tax is huge—still need to pay tax on conserved lands.

Protect & preserve habitat for waterfowl by focusing on the entire continent (migratory birds). Land conservation between Canada, the US and Mexico but it is implanted locally. What areas need to be prioritized? Track populations through migration to focus efforts.

Public access is very important. We have a dedicated funding source for Program Open Space in Maryland. We have an excise tax for water access. Those special funds are raided on a regular basis! If you are concerned about this you should contact your local elected officials and let them know. There is no mechanism to restore the funds to these programs once they've been removed. Carrying capacity is also an important issue. The call for more public access is drowning out the need for a study regarding carrying capacity for these sites. There's a reason there are only two parking spaces in particular areas – those sites can't handle 25 cars, and the nearby communities cannot handle 25 cars. Look at the sensitive areas – are we balancing their protection with appropriate amounts of public access? From state side, everyone is so interested in these efforts – we're seeing a federal effort that's "pushing down" on the states. The state's efforts need to be respected and looked at before the federal programs override them. We have many studies and programs already in place. The feds are forgetting that the states have already done a lot of work – they truly need to work with the states.

Recognition of the significance of the Bay beyond MD and VA is missing. Need designation of a National Park in each of the 6 states.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Regarding efforts to bring children outdoors - the public schools should have a role in doing this. During the Bush years we reverted to a test-driven school system and with "No Child Left Behind" the kids are indoors so much! Public schools have cut back on field trips – private schools are great, but the public schools don't encourage kids to spend any time outside. We need more field trips – not just to museums – but to outdoor sites. Reintroduce these parks to the children and send the information home to the parents so the parents will want to visit. In Montgomery County, we have no problem connecting people to the outdoors on the Capital Crescent Trail. It is used by thousands of people every week. Our county council voted to plan the Purple Line – they're going to bulldoze 17 acres of mature forest. It's good to build up the city around the metro stations but losing trees means our quality of life will be diminished. We're a "walking community" – we should not lose that! We shouldn't have to drive to Rock Creek Park. It's a noble effort to close the Red Line but the non-destructive alternatives have not been studied. The county is proposing to spend \$1.68 billion to do the most destructive proposal to create the Purple Line. The State is furloughing state employees and asking the federal government for funding! This is a very misguided initiative.

Remember that poor kids can't purchase technology; and poor kids don't have yards and safe places to go. We need to work with over strapped underfunded school systems that aren't focusing on the outdoor experience. We need more funding in school systems for outdoor educational programs. And we need to target young children to help them to become comfortable outdoors; children can be molded to think anything is cool if they're young enough.

Save Americas treasures, national trust historic preservation – public private partnership – we have such common ground here and yet we feel like the afterthought, but we cohabitate in so many different places. For example, Historic Annapolis has a student program where they take kids on boat to familiarize kids with bay and teach history and how Annapolis developed because of the bay. Parents telling people when their children come home, they are very enthusiastic, more so than when in school. We need to have strong alliance between environmentalists and historic preservationists. National Park Trails – thank Save Americas Treasures Program, through them secure funding. Echo those comments.

Scientific communication is key in effective conservation, show them how they can protect butterfly. Bring science and make science exciting to public.

Sierra club, connecting kids to outdoors, need to get kids from all backgrounds. Get First family out there. Need good role models. Obamas, with two daughters, would be great role models. Climate change is an obstacle. Need corridors. Establish youth corps, get the kids out there to prepare for climate change.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

Some of the funding is tied to matching grants. Change some of the grant administration policies because many of us don't have matching funds. Maryland has a fantastic program for forest conservation and we're starting to see efforts regarding agricultural conservation. There is no widespread tax break for the forest conservation program. Some of the land is on private lots – the people on those lots don't respect the intent of the easement because they do not directly benefit from it (as the overall landowner does). Provide a tax incentive for each individual participant.

started grassroots lobby for historic preservation and there is a caucus in the House and we would really like to be working closely with partners and conservation because LWCF and HPF have the same interests and ability to get things done

tax dollars for agriculture are a subsidy that benefits recipients and not taxpayers – same goes for cover crops – a corporate socialist system – ban our representatives from receiving contributions so representatives can better represent the people –

Tension between private ownership and desire for more public access. How to make it easier or more fun or more lucrative to give more public access. Create a different incentive.

The lack of funding - properties in federal parks are intended to be intended but are still in private hands. There are developments in areas where there shouldn't be. Create a competitive program for easements on private land that promotes the historical aspect. Provide more tools for neighbors of refuges to do great things. When other federal organizations don't respect federal conservation - Highways going through wetlands undermining the protection from environmental organizations. The park culture is outwardly focused is great - it used to be inwardly focused on themselves rather than rallying with other federal organizations - support this culture.

Want to discuss funding. Budget been hit. Parks on borderline. Had to stop projects. Spend a lot of time applying for grants. Reach out to government, her organization couldn't apply . grants only there for national programs. They didn't qualify. Trail wasn't long enough to apply. Federal government should look at grant funding scope. municipalities should be included.

Water quality credits (PA has thousands of credits but there isn't any demand) the EPA needs to enforce the law or else the credits have no value and no demand. The sewer authorities are borrowing from their clean water funds to build infrastructure rather than addressing point source problems of pollution. This affects land use - best management tactics are important.

We also have to remember some kids don't want to fish and play outside. We can't reach everyone.

We have 125,000 acres preserved through easements. We want to bring land owner tax incentives back and make them permanent.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Annapolis, MD*

*(cont.)*

What are obstacles? I am involved in fish testing and seen decline in Mattawoman – getting more impacted, and not only is inner city even in country now, working hard to get kids to learn about nature. But air is not safe to breath. Water they can't touch. What are obstacles? How can teach kids about nature, but we say don't touch water because you will get sick and don't breathe air. But until enforce laws in place, before we make new laws, we need to enforce what is in place. Until we come up with growth boundary line. Sprawl is killing bay, until we address that, won't be able to get kids out. We need a growth boundary line.

working lands and recognizing value of preserving pristine landscapes and keeping land productive and economical – financing and funding for conservation we need to rethink how we fund it – organizations base their work on donations and industries that do poorly in a weak economy – needed financial security will secure a long-term future

The programs touch so many different areas for preservation and agriculture. Including clean air, clean water acts. It has become an administrative wide effort, not just the problem areas that were mentioned earlier. These were simply examples of the areas of focus, but not limited to the scope of conservation efforts.

There are parks but places where students do not want them to go. Parks are where gangs are, and outside is dangerous, inside is safer. Those kids are getting obese. Going outside is actively discouraged, safety is issue.

There is inconsistent messaging across the public landscape; a mosaic of messages. The user doesn't differentiate between federal, state and local agencies and organizations. We need to create consistent messages regarding public use. We need to derail the negative messaging. Our messages cannot be conveyed only in English – we need bilingual signage. Spanish is the dominant language. We need to commit to bilingual signage.

Uncertainty around federal tax incentives - owners are putting easements on hold until they figure it out in congress. Make it permanent, it's supported already! Conservation easements - decline in land values and development pressure have resulted in lower easement appraisals - especially working farms that need the money. Problem with a lien on a property - banks are giving us trouble with easements because they are being too conservative. Banks need reassurances or incentives to allow them to make investments in easements. Banks with pressures from foreclosures are usually the most conservative.

Virginia does a great job developing easements on private land. However, the easements do not currently include public access to the lands. A little more credit (transferable tax credit) should be provided to the landowners if there is more public benefit included in the easement. Perpetual easements are given in Maryland and Virginia to figure out where the land will go/how it will be used. We should put a clause in the easements stating that "the land may be a park in 50 years", or something similar.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

existing challenge for Parks at all levels – who buys the property across the street—ie, gambling at Gettysburg, or Walmart across the street Zoning for commercial business too close to historically significant sites. Education and understanding

Funding is shrinking and not available. Funding needs to be more flexible for conservation and other easements.

Parks and rec. leisure activities not seen as an essential service, enhancing property values

More roads are built in suburbs to handle traffic- need to be designed to handle bike traffic

Nature Conservancy-working—funding for outdoor spaces was good- but not now being funding at level LWCF- \$900 mill a year by revenues from off-shore oil drilling but did not get to them at the level authorized for.

Connecting to people. “The Last Child in the Woods” really opened the much broader topic of relevance. Relating to this is important. For people who don’t have any basis to develop the relevance, what is needed is a process to introduce the opportunities to engage. An example of this is the Park Service Science Centers. Experience of children in these centers are then brought back to the school systems.

Federal Government Role that is a real challenge. Big South Fork River and National Recreation Area. Five federal agencies with involvement with this watershed and four state agencies with involvement in this watershed. The federal agencies do not have a basis for interacting with each other. Interagency cooperation is a big issue. Agencies need to be directed, from the office of the president, to manage their resources so that no action taken would not prevent another agency from reaching their mission.

Intern. The people that are running the parks are “old”. Need to remember that to connect with younger people and to recruit younger people, you need to think like them and probably need younger agency people involved. Need to have young people at the table to be a part of the solution.

Parents today are overly concerned about safety. How do we lessen the fears of the parents so that they’ll take them outside?

Making the recreation opportunities that parks/forest provide accessible and known to the public. Need to do more publicity/marketing of these opportunities.

Use USGS more to provide more information- integrate with states and pvt groups who collect information- NOAA is absorbing some but doing it badly- USGS should be the clearing house

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

As a parent we had to look hard to find a neighborhood that was outdoor-friendly- most areas have no sidewalks- need to be able to get to green spaces without driving

There isn't clear alternative energy development. Need clarity regarding energy policy development. Speaking to example of tradeoffs between preserving viewsheds and supporting alternative energy – windpower.

The Rocky Fork tract still has not been fully funded. Critical to get adequate funding. Need to engage communities with regards to land planning/ green spaces in an ecological context which goes beyond biologists and conservationists to the general public. Need to have funding to explore those processes in a collaborative approach.

Need more emphasis on how to use MOUs and volunteer groups. In the face of climate change and invasive species, it will require a bigger base of federal employees.

Need more education- a key motivator is parents- educate parents in the positive effects that being outdoors has on the kids- need to see more of it- parents need to model it- talk more about how it makes people better later in life

Majority of the wildlands in this country are owned by private individuals. Owners are challenged by the high rate of taxing. Creative tax incentives would facilitate not sub-dividing parcels.

We have to start looking at the internet as a tool and be connected with the land.

Most land is in private land ownership. Need to create an ethic and mindset that there is a value to having more than developments and golf courses on private lands. And secondly provide the funding for protecting private lands.

Only major country where climate change skepticism is still a majority. We have a lot to overcome regarding climate change. Need strong public support from the federal gov't. Fed. Gov't has an obligation to educate the public regarding the validity and consequences of climate change. Would like to see more public education.

Look at signage in parks/forests. Many people unfamiliar with outdoors are scared by signage in parks warning of hazards. Signage should be encouraging, not discouraging visitors.

tie in together protection work with restoration work and land protection , ex: you cant get out on the river unless you clean the river and make it healthy

Put more money into river health and purchasing conservation easements to buffer river, buying land in the flood plain. Pointsource pollution issues need to be taking into consideration to protect water National blueways initiatives. Establish some sort of funds with national initiative to protect lands near water. Specifically in floodplains.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Reasonable salaries for such employees/staff people

Encourage passive recreation in parks.-also for consideration: equestrian recreation and more specific trailheads made to suit their needs

teaching young people that , what's your is yours' private respect of lands. Wesser Bald example of Public use on private land- Imminent Domain ruling took her families land. Crimes with proximity. Law Enforcement Challenge- not enough man power to enforce the law.

Conservation Easements are interesting to many people but for most people they're "land rich and dirt poor" and unable to take advantage of tax benefits because they need to find an income source; as a large landowner he'd personally like to put his land in an easement with some sort of sunset on it. Tie up land for generational easements and pay much less over time? Many local land owners don't trust government – the main thing they want to know is what happens after I'm gone That would buy a little time/bandaid step to get some things preserved – and address permancy issues

How come things are getting worse – kids obesity, kids spending less time outdoors. Technology is contributing to this.

Diversity of forest visitors and park visitors. Different races are not comfortable in the woods and enjoying the outdoors. Socioeconomic studies and need different strategies.

Virtual science museum would benefit from technology.

A lot of federal land is tied to certain uses (range, farming) and recreation is not an integral part of those land uses. Growing conflict between recreation and other land use.

Hard to convince youth that it's more fun to be outside than on video games, ipod. There's a perception that it's not as fun to be outside.

Challenge to get people over their fear of nature.

Economic impact of public lands and places where people can recreate. The long-term is that these places pay for themselves. In the short-term, the most immediate are addressed – housing, food, etc.

Streamline management planning- cut red tape-agency processes are not keeping pace with society--- recreation must be a purpose ....BLM's I and conservation program does not have rec as a purpose-need that authorization

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Has been a contraction in recreation access- only 24% of federal budget is discretionary, most of that goes to the military- how do we maintain rec resources on federal lands given funding limitations- rec organizations need to help- processes for managing public land are becoming much more complex- processes necessary to authorize are becoming much more complex- beyond the scale of local units- need to operate more efficiently - need to restructure- less overhead, more \$\$ to the ground

Access to information is a really big challenge. Free information is often not well organized.

Lot of federal areas restricted due to threatened/endangered species. Need education before we send them outdoors – perhaps areas wouldn't be as restricted.

Cultural resources (landscapes shaped by human activities). There are still historic features in the woods that no one knows are there, battlefields, etc. Nonprofits cannot do everything on their own. Recognition is important – if NPS would recognize the contributions of the nonprofits. Funding is also important (land acquisition) for less glamorous sites.

Live in Asheville neighborhood- no one outside- very surprising-

Physical Education! Education as a priority is minimized. Don't hold elected officials (county, state and federal levels) to the mark in order to fund education. Education is the root of the challenges we have discussed.

County, state, and national parks are available often for free.

Level of funding not keeping up with the changing needs of the NPS and other organizations. Should make sure we are applying for federal grants – however those fundings are being cut as well. Current federal budget suggesting that these areas need to be cut. We can't get ahead either way we look.

Take high school kids out (usually from urban areas) to parks and they will have the same response as the Statement made by Fred above

Investing money for maps, etc.-some of the ways to get information to the public is too expensive

have better access to information and make it more readily available

Grew up in a Maine mill town- conservation groups are often viewed as in conflict with local business- need to partner with businesses, eg a greenway for employees to walk at lunch- give businesses a chance to see themselves as stewards

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

taxes – agricultural easement limitations due to the requirement to make at least \$1000 from their land annually – hurts the elderly; reappraisal in 2006 – taxes went up significantly so people were forced to sell their farm land to developers

Leadership in scouting is missing. Mentors are needed.

Having a region embrace, as a core value of connection to the land and wellness. Implementation of this value by employers, school systems, health care systems.

100 million more people by 2050—where are they going to go? Open land now, will be gone—challenge federally to recognize/prevent. Wall-to-wall people- Population Growth.

Same problem—stewardship \$ for donation for easements- if Gov't would help contribute \$ to subsidize these.

No landscape vision for what these lands should be, should contribute to. Need a landscape-level vision for the Appalachian corridor, especially given climate change issues. State purview stops at state lines. States need a federal entity to bring together a landscape vision. USFW Landscape Collaborative is a new effort in this regard.

Represent horse enthusiasts- 600 acres/day disappear from equestrian uses- planners tend not to include equestrian uses in multi-use trails- horses are not the detriment commonly believed- disappearing because we are not being included in multi use trail planning

Community development block grants-need to get grants to design recreation

Riverlink- Climate change - really don't know all the impacts of that- Polarization of the country hard to accomplish anything,

Private funding is also down. The public and private partnerships are not there as in the past. A lot of public mistrust that develops when public land is used to generate public funding – ie mining, forest harvesting.

Technology, the internet, facebook, etc. is a challenge. Get people to take their iPhones in the woods or whatever so that they can connect to living outdoors.

personal – Spring creek easement- many farmers would like some kind of a farm trust- Madison Co not as well off- unrealistic to think they could come up with the transactions cost/ fees to help put farm into an easement – surveys, appraisal, inspections etc. Huge Problem for Rural counties to come up with funding.

Kids in cities can't understand what is so close (mtns). Local budgets are being cut and green projects are going away and losing opportunities to connect urban kids to land. Budget cuts impact existing programs. Nonprofits also have less money to assist urban programs.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Move USFS to USDI-would eliminate accidental clearcutting

Provision of services should be local. Facilities need to be provided locally. Need to make things happen where they are accessible to the people. In this economic environment we have the opportunity to buy land

Challenge of how do we wrestle with the roles of government? Gov' t should set a tone for conservation and recreation.

Need a national strategy of passive energy generation- need more discussion on pay-as-you go recreation- not supported by all

Local jurisdictions – Awareness in the community, outreach needed for economic benefits, quality of life, env benefits need to make them aware/proud of those resources—Educational Comment

Asheville facebook outdoor meet-up group for hiking. These young people are meeting on facebook and arranging a hike.

80% of country lives in the urban environments. Children growing up need to develop an appreciation of this. Children in many ways have no way to get outdoors. Need larger pieces of open space in urban areas. Kids only know asphalt. Develop neighborhood gardens. We are missing an opportunity to educate kids in urban areas. Need to leverage funds.

delays and lengthy reviews are prohibitive; strengthen federal law to maintain easements

LWCF mostly goes to the west and should come to the East; at issue is Southern Appalachian mtns' new road construction (interstates, state, forest service roads); states and agencies need to hold back on construction and look at more holistic approach

Eastern US has majority of population and don't have the land base that western states have; criteria for availability of Federal funding is a disadvantage to get LWCF and other funding; criteria needs to be scrutinized to go where the greatest need is

Look at incentives; temporary success with charitable contributions for Conservation Easements; temporary program should be made into permanent program; NC was 1st in credits to easement donors – 180,000 acres have been conserved; provides for negotiations with landowners; dollars stretched with state conservation dollars; credits are not currently transferrable

Authentic, inquiry based learning should be brought back.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Biggest Challenge To Youth and the Outdoors – reconnecting people to the outdoors: “Getting Kids from Inside the Schools” – maybe only get outdoors once per day. Moving kids from inside school – have more outdoor activities as part of the school day.

leadership needs to come from administration to raise awareness of LWCF needs

DOT’s may drive development – they should be here as a key stakeholder. Roads take away character of National Forests

Funding- non- profits are all competing against each other for the same \$\$- need to work together- example is sharing membership program with NC Arboretum, sharing lists-

Private working forests – millions of acres of timberland harvested heavily – ecosystem service (pulpwood) is undervalued relative to carbon value – government needs to move on carbon, set fair and reasonable price on carbon. Need to make sure that policies are based on current and future priorities as opposed to past legacies.

When economy is down, opportunities are created; full funding through Land and Water Conservation Fund for public agencies is critical now

Forest legacy and other initiatives require matches; is there a way to incentivize local governments with large tax base to use federal funding

easements benefit small farmers

Difference between convening people around species and connecting people and constituencies; equal amount of effort needs to be focused on the latter; National Forests float above the landscape at 2500’ – connecting with national forest lands are difficult since there is such a buffer of private land; funding from states for “small pocket connections” deserve attention; there are already plenty of species connection plans in place – need to focus on heritage and urban site connection planning

Connectivity of people is a critical need. An example is Old Fort NC where 1st piece of land was purchased under the Weeks Act. The Forest Service is at the table but isn’t able to invest much or offer communities’ assistance; needs to strengthen community assistance and cultural resource management; staff presence is a missing link; cultural and heritage resources are a point of connection between people – need to interpret local traditions, historic sites important.

Danger of creating islands where we conserve our resources, and we don’t connect those islands to the lands in which we live. Always be fighting the battle of exotics that are problematic. Funding (particularly from states) is perilous. Federal government could help with higher level funding (cooperative extension). Connecting funding sources to national/state parks would be great.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Contracting with federal agencies and the agencies difficulties in bringing on SCA interns is an issue. Bring youth as a capacity building function—have the youth bring new technologies and innovation to the federal agencies. Another issue is to get more training for youth leaders and also recruiting agency staff that want to be youth leaders.

Creating better pathways for young people to get jobs. Also providing opportunities for diverse young people.

communication between tourism groups and federal agencies-rules and regulation regarding access to public lands and marking areas (not enough signage in some areas about what resources, amenities, etc, are available)-directional services-policies regarding signage

little mgmt on multiple use area since court system is impacting us federally So hard.

Federal and State good, but State/Local good, but Fed/Local conservation easement not easy. Fed govt' needs to work better with land trusts. Need to have staff/agencies to do the work. Too many other things interrupting. Ability of dealing with easements on lands.

Time spent outdoors with a caring adult contributes to conservation ethic; need to increase programs like "No child left indoors"

Talking to people's pocket books can create initial interest and can create personal interest. Discuss jobs and duties outdoors. See outdoors in different light - Personal funding – can encourage to see the great outdoors is a positive thing – connect to jobs training, agricultural things. Inter - city areas

Consider methods to engage all demographics, not just programs for students.

Water sports, lessons and rentals. Nature groups in high schools. And promote americore programs for students coming out of high school and college. Youth conservation cores should also be more promoted.

Get beyond the EOG and connect the students by other means, music etc.

Fee areas, put profits earned back into the parks where the revenue is being made

more patrolmen to reinforce regulations and keep park users in check. (ex: lesson litterers)

So bad that you have to get in your car to go from one shopping center to another- need better urban design- needs to be a network, not isolated routes

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

obstacle is resistance from school systems and lack of willingness of leadership to speak out – it must be mandated for people to fall in with these environmental education programs.

people don't get outdoors, they have lost sight and knowledge of the "fun factor" of the outdoors in the forest-there is no talk about forest...

ENFORCEMENT! Need to be more enforcement of rules and regulations-needs to be more transparency when things are being funded, and there needs to be more accountability-more enforcement of already listed regulations

Wanted to know how involved the Department of Education is with this effort. One of the challenges is the state standards of learning/education standards/teaching to the test. Teachers are too afraid to break from the testing curriculum and take the kids outdoors.

Need to understand and go to where there is greatest need. This is inner cities and isolated rural areas. Currently, many of the programs/organizations working on these issues are concentrated and we're missing areas.

More marketing and information- awareness---need to put it on the stations kids are watching---fund LWCP and RTP

The funding is getting cut. Federal Funds, state funds, etc. This contributes to a maintenance backlog. Visitors don't have access.

Financial challenges when people have easements on properties, there is a tax benefits for those. The IRS is not wanting to honor those deductions. Work with the IRS for resolution of this issue.

LWCF; climate change will have huge impact – need to keep change in mind when prioritizing LWCF acquisitions

have a plan that everybody buys into that is long range and in visionary (ex: dikeman plan)-have collaboration (!!)

Richtop development and wind power--- fear of developing wind power mixes with conservation mandate. Needs to be changes in attitudes. Influence of fed government to show us an "equilibrium with nature" there needs to be marketing of the importance of everything the outdoors has to offer as well as how we should continue to practice conservational efforts to better maintain such valuable recreations Tougher and tighter regulation of what goes into the rivers. (ex: pigeon river) make private industry sectors more accountable, they should be using their profits from dumping to also clean up the waters, etc.

Reorganize the priorities of where our government funds are going.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Some programs work really well, depending on the budget. Exposing kids to natural and cultural resources. Use art, poetry, etc. to engage young people. NPS site stories should be relevant to today's life – creating 'schema' in interpretation. More about the 'people' than about strategy.

Teacher for many years. Best things she ever did was getting kids out of the classroom. Too much funding associated with teaching to the test to allow teachers more flexibility to get kids outdoors and in "Muddy Sneakers", e.g.

Most city facilities don't really operate sufficiently (don't have the money and budget). We've grown up in a culture where public facilities should be free to us. There is a balance between the value of activities and the costs to the public.

Youth Learning Institute (Clemson) claim to impact 100,000 youth each year. Lots of organizations working with youth. Opportunity – get some of these groups sitting around the same table, one organization may have fundraising arm, and another has the curriculum – mega opportunity. Reduce duplication, and don't worry about who gets credit as long as common goals are met.

consolidate program opportunities; had a hard time finding SCA program info; if he'd know opportunities were available in while in high school he'd have been working every weekend but was never exposed to it and when he heard about it, hard to find info; military recruiters are in the schools all the time; fed govt can help with better exposure to opportunities and possible career paths.

Ecosystem services – where to put your \$ - conserving lands does more than recreate on –clean water/clean air - talk about this in way people can understand- Federal gov't could help

embed groups in the communities to tie the economic benefits

More staffing to enforce protected areas and increased surveillance.

FDA comment period open for 2010 dietary guidelines. They are proposing that we reinstitute recess, physical education, home economics into curriculum. We need to get these things back into curriculum for number of reasons including childhood obesity.

Obstacle is how to reach parents of young children. How do we get the parents outdoors.

Communicate with those who are not enthusiasts in a way that they can feel comfortable

Government agencies need to be involved in dialogue with partners and communities

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Fully funded LWCF in 1964 would be \$3 billion now; current requests in NC of \$7 million might “break the bank”; there is a huge scale of unmet needs

difficulties with land protection work – timing is an issue on the federal side of LWCF projects; properties often end up owned in fee by land conservation groups for two years or more; individual landowners are forced to wait a long time for closure; Forest Legacy is not currently a successful program in NC

Lack of appreciation and feeling of inclusion and being part of community. Different lifestyles need different methods of awareness and some need assistance with funding.

Losing entire hemlock forests in Southern Appalachians; direct more \$\$\$ to treat hemlocks and save the species; this is a great tragedy of our lifetimes

community planning , community efforts, educational components, give more opportunities to the citizens-lacks of conservation funding-or inappropriate expenditures/allocations of funding

education of land owners and users and citizens... educate them about our facilities

Find that land trusts will help negotiate conservation easements; but finding that USFS in particular is not interested in taking on the property because there’s a permanent conservation easement on a piece of property they’re being offered. #2 Access to public lands – federal agencies sometime block off access points when navigating between federally and privately owned land

as NC expands lands programs, it would be a lot better to have more access to federal and state agencies – find out what lands are strategically important to all of us; work through acquisition process with federal land managers – historically hasn’t always been what it could be

confusion at all levels that are involved with Clean Water-*ie.* City of Realign want to shut off flow but Corp said no—National Priority needs to not fluctuate in direction and goals

Quality of life issues and funding. Would like to see dedicated, full and equal funding for state side funding. Specific request for NC Parks and Recreation (Hickory) that Land and Conservation fund be fully funded and that state side would be equal to the federal funding.

Senior Citizen, went along with Muddy Sneakers one day. The teacher and the naturalist sat down before hand, and the teacher taught from this after the excursion. Funding is a problem – most is funded by donors, school system funds some of the bus expenses. Open to every kid in the public school system in the fifth grade in these counties. Funding would mean that every fifth grader would be able to get out.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Getting kids and families back into the outdoors. NPS could teach families how to use their time at parks. Supply recreational opportunities (eg. rent kayaks, bikes). Need system of teaching unfamiliar outdoor families how to connect with outdoors.

Consistent funding

State side of LWCF has been even less consistent than federal. No commitment to states.

Disconnect in understanding that conservation and recreation use are an economic engine- there is a dearth of knowledge-we are working to develop economic data-people don't understand how the hospitality industry develops around that, with products, services,etc- need to better understand the economic return....lack of awareness of what we have- natural resource heritage program very important to know what we have---- access is greatly limited to private lands- esp. where only source of \$\$ for local communities is property tax- local govt sees too much advantage in putting houses on the land-

grants for trail work received from DOT have to be built to their standards

cannot give public access to conservancy lands due to costs

Fees may be an issue, particular to lower income families. May reduce or provide free passes to NPS lands (maybe at the bottom of tax forms, if income below a certain amount, check a box if you would like a free pass for the upcoming year)

LWCF funds dedicated could help land managers better plan

Timber management – hard to do good silviculture in NC; losing early successional habitat; biofuels; education that relates to timber management

Urban forestry work --budgeting at local level (municipal) is losing every time without Federal/State funding—should not be Cops or Trees, but cops And Trees. Safety. Happiness and environment sustainability needs to collaborate and support-grassroots importance needs to be done.

Programs established but never funded. Private donations often make up the deficit, but not always. Cherokee Nation forestry program never funded.

We need a national priority for collaborative restoration of our public lands. Look at the species that we have lost – such as the American Chestnut trees. The urban and forest interface ordinances. Fire prone zone – you need a metal roof, safe zone.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

educating people on how to care for parks; example is abuse at ATV trails in Nantahala National Forest – people have built illegal berms, people have been injured, etc. Safety measures need to be implemented to keep the forest from being scary.

Private funding for advertising: how to get the message out there and promote awareness and education. There are just lacking funds.

“Commercial users fees” and day fee areas. Enforcement with fee areas

lives near Catawba river on Pisgah NF – has conservation easement (forestry program) on his land – feels like he is penalized in taxes on his land due to neighbors activity

need to break the cycle and get to young people to help address long term conservation – find models like Muddy Sneakers and others throughout the country; need to create a seamless web for exposure and integration so that people continue to want to work in these fields

local people don't want government to take property or interfere with their lives; may be inclined to sell land to a developer rather than a conservation easement or working with governments

20 yrs non-profit work-trend over time of DE-investment in staff, hurts overall. ARRA burst nice but gone after this year. Society needs to think do we want to invest in our public lands—if so how important and how to pay for it.

have more directional information, easily navigable user database with an inventory of recreational opportunities, and advertise it nationally (ex: great American outdoors online) have an index of all these activities

Educational field days-places/stations for schools to go out to and learn from park staff at these stations as well as learn recreational activities and safety.

Challenge is public fear of the federal or state government's role in land preservation and conservation. Public fear of losing private land ownership rights. Challenge to put an economic value on the land.

Need stricter zoning around NPS sites to prevent encroachment. Would be cheaper than buying adjacent lands.

What if there was a 'screen-door' Tuesday...just open your doors/windows on a Tuesday as a first step.

National Trust of Historic Preservation's campaign to help communities engage in their cultural resources; increase efforts to help people donate easements; fund Historic Preservation at a national level

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Conservation and cultural heritage are falling by the wayside, especially in public schools; there is a huge disconnect with youth and heritage

Not enough support in the right areas – schools, camps, educating the youth.

DOT is critical partner in this process – they need to be brought to the table

climate change is biggest challenge to land management; protect, connect, and restore; lands such as wilderness study areas need to be designated wilderness (keep promises); money needs to go to agencies for restoration efforts

Unfortunate that some public schools only get small opportunities to engage in outdoor education.

Watauga Parks and Recreation Authority has sponsored a newly formed Tourism Development Authority pushing for more outdoor recreation opportunities; very fortunate to have tourism-based community; state and federal parks cutting staff but more people are coming to local, state and national parks.

Continue to have the tax credits for conservation. NC has a state credit for conservation. On a national basis, encourage states to provide tax credits for conservation. Collaboration needed with Land trusts. State/Federal need to be open to re-purchasing the land acquired by Land Trusts.

Need to do a better job of interpreting and preserving the Rutherford Campaign, the southern frontier in the American Revolution. It's a national story and should be done by the NPS in concert with the Blue Ridge NHA.

Federal agencies need to be talking with each other. Interior and Commerce need to work together. What are we doing at the national level to build sustainability? Need to break down agency barriers to working together. Need to see it more broadly...find some balance and work together for noble and worthy goals.

unstructured play missing in today's neighborhoods/communities/schools; partly a safety issue; even if teachers want to take their kids out some principals and liability issues are discouraging it. Even local daycares don't always have grass – and when they do they're caught in issues related to bugs, etc.

more and better zoning regulations can bring sidewalks back to communities



## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Management of TNC's lands and private lands – use of fire as part of ecological land management; 4 states in the mountains have gotten partnerships to help the needs of wildlife and reduce fuels in forests. Partners on state side, NFS, NPS help people realize that fire is critical component of ecology. An obstacle: concerns about effects of smoke on human communities, roads, etc; small window of when prescribed fire can be implemented; need to work with EPA to develop a more realistic window for burning

Taking kids out into the woods (fieldtrip style) : take the kids out for a few days, and then they want to take their parents out.by teaching the kids about the outdoors you are indirectly teaching and reconnecting the parents.

There is a fear factor: people have never been in the woods and are afraid to get out there because they are so unfamiliar

Mass transit systems that connect people with national parks, forests and open spaces. Need to put mass transit into the equation for connecting people to the outdoors.

NPS good at interpretation. FS is good at managing forests. BLM has different focus. Would we be able to reorganize agencies/public centers to have the people who are good at one thing be in charge of that aspect.

Planning logistics of outdoor trips is time consuming and needs expertise. Classroom teachers don't always have the resources needed. What is needed is a position, Environmental Education Coordinator in the schools who has the job skills and desire. Even during depression we created National Parks; therefore, earmark funds for these activities.

Need to assist small, individual farms in competing with the big players. Until the government stops subsidizing food and have experts look at farm bill and not lump all growers together. Let consumers choose local food over mass produced food. Make connection with the outdoors and local farms. This also creates jobs and labor and better foods.

State tax rarely touches family farms.

Bureaucratic obstacles (laughter). Excellent opportunity for Trail development but bureaucracy got in way on the Cherokee NF. Simplify ways to get trails in – too much red tape.

During economic hardship, land prices are cheap and there are tons of opportunities, but not funding to capitalize on it.

Teacher. Many teachers out there who have an understanding/knowledge of the outdoors. As long as we define school success as a test or standards, everything else will be lost. Teachers and administrators are forced to give up physical education, field trips, recess, music, etc. so that they can demonstrate that they are using all of their time teaching test components. Problem is that the only system of accountability is the test.

## Discussion Question 2

***Asheville, NC***

***(cont.)***

Need full funding for LWCF. Never appropriated fully. Congress diverts funding.

Inconsistent interpretation of volunteer programs of work across federal boundaries.

Need to evaluate how many times young people make use independently of the great outdoors. This could be a measure of success. Challenge/obstacle is how young people are able to access the great outdoors, public transportation would be a part of this.

There are tons of interest groups, yet they don't always have opportunities to interact among each other. Perhaps a role for DOI/ DOA to assist in getting groups together and create awareness among groups to increase teamwork and unite ideas/funding/staff, etc. Creates an efficient use of talent.

Hope to expand and make permanent Federal tax deduction for conservation easements.

dedicated funding for land/water conservation; #2 need to do a better job of marketing the federal agencies resources – lands, parks, etc.; bring message to a wider audience and raise awareness through a variety of programs

Working on a number of programs for Fontana Foundation. Working to secure private funding—challenge. Also, helps with Stecoah Valley Center—historic and cultural resource. Obstacles are trying to raise finances to implement programs. They have the knowledge, but funding limits opportunities.

Liability is a big concern.

introduced wilderness to 10000 kids in past 20 years; do school programs, etc. – short term experiences are great, but need longer term opportunities when kids are so programmed with other activities, etc.; public school budgets may not be able to accommodate this additional exposure; her program focuses on private schools with a limited demographic and not much diversity

building playgrounds, etc; but nothing for older kids – ball parks are ok, but trail systems might help this challenge. There's money for shovel ready projects, but no money for planning- and trail systems take master planning; hard to build something and not always using effective

uses state and national parks for experiences and sees inconsistencies in permitting/application fees/etc – need more consistency across agencies

Ocmulgee NM expansion needed (11,000 acres) -great opportunities – 90 min from Atl airport in middle GA – would link some state, other fed lands, much land still private, not protected

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

66% of land in US private. Need to expend more energy on conserving this private land – limited activity now. Needs momentum

Farm Bill – increased ownership length requirements – eliminated lots of land owners from the program.

Roads are barrier to conservation activities. Cannot connect biologically rich areas. Roads are not designed for wildlife passage. DOT does not consider this. Road widening projects are not considering wildlife. Several examples of this given (US 74A). DOT needs to come to the table and consider wildlife crossing in planning.

Private land being used to preserve longleaf pine. 2009 funding was being delayed and got stuck – sitting on accountants desk on USDA

Transfer of Development Rights. TDR program ran into 2 issues – no funding to buy development rights, don't have any demand for development rights currently. Need to develop a source of revenue to buy development rights.

accessibility to outdoor recreations /liabilities

Money for staffing. Rangers are understaffed and overworked. They are also the ones working and connecting with the youth. Ex: junior ranger programs, campsite talks, they aren't being offered as greatly because they cannot be provided for

Can only continue to afford his land if the present use value program continues.

Importance of partnering with health providers to spread our message and to potentially counter-act the safety/parent issue.

Support the No Child Left Inside and Elementary and Secondary Education Act --would encourage supplemental education for teachers. EPA puts out environmental education grants for states each year and this funding is very limited—need to provide more funding and more grant opportunities. Also, create funds/grants for connecting people to the outdoors. Lack of funding needs to be improved and provide incentives for teachers to get additional training.

The positions that are cut first are the positions that are seen as supplemental...environmental specialists, sustainability specialists. State and federal levels need to tout the programs that are working.

Challenge of wanting adults to work with youth and the liability concerns that they have. Reliance on volunteers further exacerbates these concerns. Volunteer in Park, Volunteer in Forest program (workman's comp program in GSMNP) to see how we can cover child abuse/injury type liability issues.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Publicity for National Trails Day is very good. They use website to make all the opportunities known. Can the federal government create website where trails groups and other organizations can upload information about recreational events/opportunities for the public. Would be one-stop shop for finding rec. opportunities. American Hiking Society's National Trail Day website. Make it easier to find opportunities.

Teachers have not done a good job of documenting our successes or showing the impacts that our programs are having on children. Depth of experience may be as important than how many million kids we reach.

Federal partners need to bring partners in as part of the "family". Organizations do not want to be controlled by grant requirements, reporting requirements etc. Simplify grant process.

Form partnerships between public and private groups to help with funding.

from SC – funding sources from Conservation state programs has dried up. Lack of county support. Difficult to proceed.

Agrees with Jess (above) but suggest some government funding for groups such as YCC and summer programs for students and youth to continue volunteer spirits. IAUP: interpret, appreciate, understand, protect.

Challenges of getting message to Congress. Big returns to investments when it works. Brag on success stories. Get lots of return \$\$\$ for \$\$\$ put in. 4 to 1 investment return on Fed spending in NPS \$\$\$\$. Convey message.

Tax structure can also be disincentive. Estate tax is bad – causes people to sell land. Land rich, cash poor folks suffer. Land is sold and developed. Don't have money to give to people with good intentions for their lands.

We're not going to win the "leave your cell phone at home" battle. We need to better understand technology and use it.

The impact of the current drive for "national education" standards is challenge. The standards are not the problem, but the TEST is the problem. The test is the measure of success/gateway to next level and that is why teachers are teaching to the test. Pressure in education is not to innovate, but is all conventionally structured. Test drives educators with no tools to do only that which they know—conventional teaching methods. School administration is also a challenge—not willing to take risks.

Need to broaden the measures of success for land trusts. Should not just be measuring acres preserved, but community impact. Much broader measures of success.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Most people don't think about land conservation and associated jobs.

Less land to access within easy distance and. Discourage use of waterways due to pollution problems and overpopulation.

PSA's play huge role. Positive input is needed! Engage television audiences.

Need to have more hiring programs for youth like SCA or provide ways for more agencies to use SCA programs.

Conflicts among different federal and state programs. Those groups/agencies need to come together – prioritize and plan together.

there is no money to be made in conservation, America is monetarily driven

Refer to RTP, funds derived from gas tax-ability to access the funds vary from state to state- small towns have a hard time applying- need staffing time

Convincing children that it's okay to be outside.

Kids using social media spread information to other kids effectively.

Knowing that spending time in SCA may benefit you in college, earn college credits, makes it a more attractive program.

We don't have the resources as park rangers to look outside of the parks to see who we're not connecting with.

Ecosystem services – new USDA small office- Office of Environmental Markets?? –they Should tie back to local – fund the things we need to do adequately like clean water, rangelands etc. Also – need to communicate Clearly with local for economic opportunities,. Recognize local gain is vital to local, since no more timbering etc, no more revenue

wildlife corridors and biodiversity is being affected by land fragmentation; fragmentation makes prescribed fire for restoration difficult; conserving land or resources

BRP viewsheds overgrown – volunteer partnerships help but staffing is cut in half so how to accomplish

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

There's a lack of inertia, a disconnect between outdoor education and kids. Programs start but don't follow up. Offer competitions outside on youtube to attract youth.

We need a park service ambassador to visit schools to promote programs.

\*\*\*STAFF STAFF STAFF

Ref LWCF funds-Congress diverts 85%to non-rec purposes. Need a fully-funded NPS-operate at 2/3 baseline budget- we are fortunate to have such a large park in our region

work in an area with national forest that only comprises 23% of the proclamation boundary; working to acquire more land – need more LWCF dollars to acquire more

Never see advertising on TV promoting careers in NFS/NPS etc...

Funding is biggest challenge for private (NGO) groups in land management – such as conservation easements; bureaucracy – grants are so labor intensive to apply for and hard to administer; grants all seem to have different deadlines and matching requirements; relevance to the public – need to connect environment to people; public misconceptions about land management; no land use zoning in South Carolina; urgency – people do not see the need

policies are prohibitive

Boulder and Portland good examples of bike-friendly communities- known for best place to work, retire, raise family, etc.- not an accidental connection

We're competing against people going to the mall, message not out there that nature is readily available. Most think it's too far away.

Mapping paddle trails-many opportunities sbut not enough providers- liability is a big obstacle esp on non-federal lands-

Focus on access to green and blue ways when developing communities

LWCF needs full funding and re-examine how funds are distributed; need more money in the east due to population centers; how are federal agencies using LWCF; huge disconnect in where the money is going – example Uwharrie NF

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Too many multiple mandates for the federal agencies- these can be very conflicting management directives-recreation does cause some damage- how does that info get across to people- how can the public better understand all the impacts

bureaucracy – FS – local Rec area had to be closed – Volunteers offered to pick up garbage etc but the FS imposed such cumbersome rules that group could not do the work and collapsed. Group would have had to be non-profit and pay incorporation – in the name of liability

Valey fill permits and Mtn top removal process- Federal gov't has not set penalties -High enough so companies ignore and pay penalties and keep going as is.. West VA in particular- BP oil created giant island of gravel so they could make a loophole

Too many obstacles to getting a park service job. Too much red tape.

get Congress to Act in legislation – House Nat Resources has voted on offshore oil, land etc. Would like more support of that

No brainer-need more\$\$- pvt foundations looking for joint projects- trust funds very important-many states would kill for the kind of \$\$ we have in NC-more collaboration among groups needed- need to use trust fund \$\$ wisely

Using science is a good way to connect to nature.

We have met the enemy and it is us---we cannot wait for the fed govt to act

Encourage “No child left inside act” !!!!! Oriented to \$\$ for schools to take buses into national parks and national forests- teachers need to get the students engaged. Currently the testing systems actively discourage teachers from teaching outdoor education- only given resources to teach what is on the test

Also 80% live in cities, where parks are not- lack of parks in urban areas

Agencies have multiple jurisdictions --don't communicate with each other- volunteers have a hard time getting agencies to talk to each other- when they do, great things happen-volunteers are the mortar between the bricks- initiatives don't come together unless the volunteers do it

dedicated funding for the farm bill, not subject to annual allocations can help individual farmers

The connection to Federal tribes: US needs to be as good as Canada in connecting with native peoples. An example is the Cherokee tribe and connection with GSMNP; shared management structures with native peoples – National parks and national forests are tribal lands

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Cobb county in TN – will take a collaborative effort not only from traditional stakeholders; need more funding in LWCF – did congress forget about this? Need to work in partnership with congress

What can we do to offer benefits/rewards to kids for going outside? Offer rewards for time spent hiking/camping etc... Once we get them out there they're more likely to stay.

Coordination – one program doing the same thing as another – need to work together

Aging of volunteers

Inconsistency of legislation – varying tax credits and funding of programs. Need long-term consistency.

USDA appraisal process does not work well – takes forever.

Missed at least one generation of getting folks outside. Need to focus on 1st graders and their parents as well.

LWCF has no mechanism for reimbursing administrative costs.

Americorp program works well – support conservation and gets kids out.

-contact college, etc, to engage student in community service work or public work

Money (!!)

The burden of taxation on the local level is misunderstood. People are afraid of tax increases., which leads to lessening of maintenance of recreational greenways and trails as a result of lacks of funding and communal involvement.

-Issues with pollution and how to watch that/supervise how it is kept cleaned or protected

Recreation centers for kids: interactive games (ex: bike pedaling games where you are getting a work out/exercise, but it simulates being outdoors)-use the technology out there to promote (non-nintendo style)



## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

How do you make going outdoors “cool”? (ex: gogreenzing.com)

-keep up to date !!

Initiatives towards institutionalized “fitness” campaigns, as well as recycling campaigns and Go Green type pitches. Get kids outdoors, childhood obesity and benefiting the land.

-they are also the personnel who help maintain safety in the recreational areas and parks.

Needs to be a reframing of service on public lands. It needs to seem less like work, chores, or punishment. Education provided to help lesson impressions such as those listed.

Conservation tax credits.

Full LWIC funding.

Collaboration and Cooperation to maintain lands uses as they are meant to be.

the first place people call for info is local parks dept – don't have resources – no clearinghouse for outdoor tourism information – need a data base for this

LWCF needs support and funding. Strong local support

orienteering needs a detailed map – unique skillset – don't hold on NPS lands because of management changes – would like to create MOU to use fed lands – landowners don't support because they don't understand the low level of impact of the sport

no incentive program for “good” development patterns – need to consider incentive program similar to cons. Easements, & like credits for historic preservation or LEED building – hard to get lands for greenways – can we increase tax benefits for greenway easements? - Need to increase \$ for CWMTF – supports local growth.

½ of trail complete – mostly in WNC – barrier – no camping allowed for camping on BRP – if allowed for trail, would promote use of the trail.

local challenge – communication w/land managers – not sure, inconsistent about what the clubs are allowed to do formalized w/agencies

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

need more agency partnerships – will help us do a better job – access to areas also a challenge (where we can ride)

lawyers & politicians the challenge – must convince them the value of recreation – should be a core mission for local govt – for lawyers, legal challenge regarding liability for private landowners – state/fed legislation to fix this?

State pop. to grow – but most growth in a few counties – outdoor rec is a (maybe the) legitimate growth strategy – rural counties need to adopt to grow in the future – also tout health benefits of outdoor recreation

Youth Summit held in NH – a Dr. mentioned how the next generation will ID their preferred location – will be looking for life opportunities first, then find a job (a switch from previous generations) – also needs help with liability issues

need to look to Europe for outdoor liability models & consistent, integrated signage

getting more diversity outside – more minorities need to be drawn outdoors

Urban youth not traditionally a part of the outdoor conversation – most opp's are city parks – to change, need to fund urban school programs to offer greater opportunities – didn't have parents that did this, also need to give “safe” access – in the area and getting there – “NPS Outdoor Nation” an example – need to be given the skills to gain confidence

Infrastructure Working fund – used to fund project for rec on NC in the past – need to look at current examples like this (CO) – bring opp's closer to urban centers – a shift from extractive mgmt to rec and sustainable management (esp w/FS) – partnerships can help move further in this direction – look at groups working together to find solutions for these – land managers need autonomy to work with local groups – when lost, things get difficult

FS trails is appalling – major problems – too many “bad” trails were adopted from other uses – too much pressure put on volunteers to try and maintain and fix bad trails – NF's NC/Pisgah has not provided the management needed to help (their job mostly a firefighter) – poor trail knowledge by FS trail managers – must increase manager's trail education – trails needed to get people on the groups – and to put people there in a sustainable fashion – must reinvest – more emphasis being put on small parks/trails, but major land areas also important – not good knowledge of trail assessments – need to better assess need to take advantage of available resources

Confusing to know the rules in each NF unit – “can I have a beer here?” - not communicated well – need to get the info out better for the public

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Asheville, NC***

***(cont.)***

In GA, had the same problem with family services, made a small sub-agency from representative of the larger agencies to help public navigate the bureaucracy

NEPA is great, but is a hurdle for trail management – moving the trail often improves the land, but too expensive to do the NEPA to clear the projects – allow more CE's for this work – often keeps trails in bad locations – need to reallocate these human resources – look for good examples abroad – Wales is a great example of management integration between parks & forests – 5% of GNP made up of trail use/tourism and infrastructure – need a tool to show green infrastructure and econ development are inter-related – also tie to the “value” of the health benefits generated – also, how to let trails help cut use of fossil fuels/oil dependency – more walkers, bikers in a community – problems managing trails in Wilderness (not enough sawyers to keep open) – need more flexibility

Would like to see volunteer liability coverage extended to cover issues of using youth in trail maintaining

Create consistent standards for Wild & Scenic River designated areas – need a designation of “wilderness lite” to allow for a great breadth of human-powered use (like bikes) -could be a permanent congressional designation

Problem with kids – no money/time/knowledge in schools to take kids to nature area – need to teach kids what they are looking at – doesn't have to be a beautiful forest, could just have weeds in a back lot to get kids connected to nature

Gang activity is due, in part, to lack of recreational activities. People are afraid to go to public housing because of the 'label' or stereotype. Connections that older people had with the land aren't there now.

African Americans do not want to go “in the woods” because of the history of how they were treated in the past. Have to make things relevant.

One of the reasons these wonderful programs are being developed is because existing programs aren't very good. Programs being developed outside of schools are better than ones “officially” part of the curriculum. They should be the ones in the schools, and throw out the existing programs.

See exhausted and frustrated teachers. Not just taking kids out, but also training the teachers how to do the program (Muddy Sneakers)

Need to revamp how we conduct education in this country – maybe have pilot school – try

Oftentimes federal and local governments are tasked more with enforcing laws and regulations.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

The city is challenged because of funding insufficiencies. Public spaces not getting enough money to maintain and enhance. How do we use private dollars to help with these funding inadequacies.

Intrinsic conflict between urban and rural population regarding taxes and funding for public lands.

Lack of funding to take care of the lands we have. See that with the EPA, statewide only 7 people to do erosion control. Things fall through the cracks when you don't have capacity.

A challenge in education is that we haven't reached the educational policy makers. There is a fear that kids won't meet appropriate mandated national education standards.

There is a challenge in reaching the staff – educating the teachers.

Funding. Upgrading and maintaining our parks.

Greenway development. Referred to British government as a model for preserving green spaces.

Old SCS (NRCS) is an excellent example for ecosystem protection. Need a regional look within the federal perspective to align investments. Focusing cost share money where it can make a difference. Ultimately the private land needs a stronger focus.

Issue of fear of engaging in nature.

Federal agency emphasis on consequences of climate change.

Advocacy is not generally seen as part of a federal employee's job. It is difficult for public agencies to be advocates.

Agencies who want partners are not the ones who are writing regulations. Too much red tape just to do anything on forests ervece land. Need to streamline means to work with partnerships.

Better labeling on food needs to occur. Need to crack down on big agriculture and focus on small farms. Federal gov't should be a better educator regarding food labels.

Preservation, protection of honeybees.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Asheville, NC*

*(cont.)*

Technology and how to get young people away from this technology is a problem. Technology is probably a positive and a challenge. Understanding technology and how to best use it is important. Solitude idea is also important.

Local foods initiative by Michelle Obama recognizes that parents are audience we should be targeting. We should follow this model.

Need way of funding the programs that can demonstrate that they have made a difference.

Many sources of funding are confusing. Most people don't know about the various sources of funding, especially with state funding. The challenge is to know what funding is really available and that it is used most effectively. Potential for funding is lost in administrative and government processes.

Physical connectivity with the land. Parks were created based on the land that was available, and maybe not the best locations for the parks. Connectivity of all of our public lands and how they work together to preserve and conserve our environment.

In certain communities there has to be a lot of trust and communication. So you don't lose land to heir disputes by the petition sale. The land is gone, developed, and the family members get no compensation.

Keep our waters clean. Protect the headwaters of our stream

The cost benefit of public lands is not communicated well to the general public.

What about the scouting organizations? If it works, then we need it. The problem is not leadership.

Social media and technology – challenge to see those as tools for communicating and encouraging participation outdoors.

Challenge – Diversity – getting children interested is a great start

Sustainable development. Most of current recreators she sees on trails do not reflect the population. Many people have to spend their \$ on gas to get to work or to pay their utility bill, not for gas to drive to a trailhead. Need to go to Girls Clubs, Boys Clubs to teach kids how to enjoy, conserve and live a more sustainable way.

Challenge is to figure out a way to use the preserved, conserved lands for communities. Need to find a balance between preserving and use.

## Discussion Question 2

***Asheville, NC***

***(cont.)***

Challenge of more outdoor activity in schools. Fear on the part of parents and school administrators. Need to find a way to make Outward Bound type programs more affordable to all. Need to find a way to fund outdoor equipment for schools.

People in Washington are totally disconnected with people in the real world. People in Washington need to spend 2 weeks working in the programs they implement.

Access - closer natural areas

Safe access

Safe transportation

Marketing - jobs, funding, more local, community-based advertising

Fear of nature

Cost

School buses, transit buses can be used

Free time

Video games

Interesting incentives

Parents fearful for children of nature

Lack of knowledge, what will I gain from going outside?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Asheville, NC***

***(cont.)***

Integrating outdoor learning to classroom setting - making a connection with nature

Having a specific area for teachers to teach outside

Connect children to their specific environment

Transportation

Greenways

Turning dammed rivers into natural rivers

Have something available for all ages (disc golf)

Increase awareness of outdoor opportunities like SCA

school

don't have a car, access to trails

electronics - tvs, computers

parents (afraid kids will get hurt)

people don't know what to do outdoors, show them what there is to do

make gym class outdoors

shut down nicklodean TV so kids will go outside

## Discussion Question 2

***Asheville, NC***

***(cont.)***

more showers, nicer bathrooms in campsites

keep open/.reopen road areas for four-wheeling

not many roads you can bike on without cards

more money into programs to get kids out

read

shopping

work/school

I enjoy outdoor activities when others are enjoying it with me. I'm often deterred if I can't find others to go with or if I don't feel secure.

Safety definitely an issues for young, single women

Experiencing nature is a new phenomenon, rather than just watching in on TV

urban areas, gang violence: lot of parents don't have the time to go with their children, and refuse to let them out on their own

Lack of it being explained and taught in schools (history of the parks, etc.); normally just about going to visit what we have in Washington, DC

part of the challenge is how to get people who don't have nearby outdoor recreation activities to participate. lot of people take the opportunities they have for granted. have to break the original barrier of getting others outside



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

Local land trusts need more help with stewardship, woods wise get that out it works and funded, recreation trails Fed highways and recreational transportation enhancement very successful , but limit of no ATV's, fully fund the LWCF, pocket parks

Challenge is not fully staffed national monuments

Recreational opportunity and the since of community, a persons concern for the local environment based on experience, community development and stewardship based on recreational opportunity. Fed comes in and interferes with recreational opportunities. Recreation angling for Atlantic Salmon would have benefits

Sense of scale 1.3 Million, upper right corner of transportation corridor, doing a pretty good job of managing private lands, please pay attention to Main scale is small impact is BIG.

Farming example, Fed owns lots of land in the west farmer graze cattle in the west pay a fee to GOV, in Maine how about State pays farmers a grazing fee for the "State owned" Wild life (Eco Serv)

Keeping Maine's forest and keeping Maine's economy, broadband access to the rural areas of Maine, limits future business success. Public and private partnerships to

Landowners under stress to maintain public access, all levels of Govt to help landowners to keep land open instead of purchasing

There are different perspectives on the fact. There needs to be information to drive decisions and policy. For instance, landscape planning is expensive, but something that is desired. Science, data, education needed. Infrastructure is a great need. Infrastructure and promotion needs to be increased to increase the public use of these areas. Big difference between Acadia and the Northern Maine Woods; there isn't support for infrastructure to take the burden of private land owners.

Federal programs: there are a lot of niche programs so they are inefficient to deliver. Could niche programs be combined to make them more efficient to deliver.

No kids left inside-Maine is working on this effort. Having environmental education is a big priority with youth 15-25 years old, as heard in an AGO youth session this summer. Kids are saying that they want environmental education.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Owns 150 acres in Maine that is open to others for use. Uses others lands for hunting, etc. With open access comes challenges. Could there be funding to enhance users of private land on impacts of that use. Funding is very low for current programs and are the first to be cut. Understanding use responsibilities would help to decrease cost of maintaining the private lands. Users should be as respectful of private lands as they are of public lands. Also, if there could be funds available to mitigate issues from usage that could result in environmental law infraction and fines. EX: dumping happens near population centers.

Protection is hard while trying to be a good steward. It's hard to share when people do not respect the land. Thinking that posting is easier, but doesn't want to close of access.

What is landscape scale conservation? Islands are not urban or rural. LWCF and partnerships are important. 2 million people per year go to park and expect undeveloped views of islands. Like to see administration help us create partnerships that don't stymy progress. Trust fund, challenge fund for citizens by Fed Govt instead of something tied to apropos. Desert Island bus is a great partnership but need more bicycle lanes, more funding for gateway community to make area safe. Friends group is not allowed to lobby because of 501(c)3 regs. That is not fair. Should be able to advocate.

We live within 8 hours of 30 million people. Keep protected. His group is focused on resource extraction. Logs going to Canada, gravel is going to Europe. People don't want to see clear cuts. Be wise about shipping raw materials out. Windmills are not going to improve economic development and tourists won't like to see them around every corner.

Sawmilling living traditions need to be economically healthy and viable. Logging activities give access to remote places. Rural Maine traditions are [based in] conservation. Living traditions need to be retained and people educated about them in rural Maine.

1) In Acadia National Park 1.1 million visitors come to the park and I guide them. Primarily working with adults from cruise ships, no young families. Need to get young families and teenage groups involved. This is a small national park, 40,000 acres, with a small amount of staff. Need more permanent qualified staff and need to conduct research on air, water, soil quality, shore birds, wetland birds and habitat conservation. Friends of Acadia are volunteers doing a great job. Need new research on Schoodic Peninsula and Winter Harbor. 2) Need more involvement with scouts (girls and boys) and ME schools and summer camps. 3) The proposal of a northwoods national park needs more research and cooperating agencies and other partners. Science and local politics are involved. This area of Maine is a nursery for Bald Eagles, Canada Lynx, migrant birds and is the heart of the forest products industry. 4) Encourage TWS to get involved in education especially youth groups and schools. Woody Higgins and his group issued 33 \$1000 scholarship going to camperships.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Economy is bad. Forced into looking for pots of Federal money. Some fit, some don't. Need flexibility. The need for federal match is a problem. It is hard to find the [non-federal] match. Don't have a lot of time. Endangered Species Act creates a different playing field for different industries in the state. Balancing act. Need a level playing field for industries and still protect species. Streamline the Endangered Species Act (ESA) Section 7 and Section 10. Development of ESA Conservation plans need to be coordinated by all agencies, e.g. USFWS and Marine Resources .

It is hard to make money from growing trees. Pellets and chips are energy sources that we could encourage, but Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is an obstacle.

Nearly 1 million acres have been conserved and 10 million acres needs to be conserved for sustainable supply of wood. HFRP is very creative and enabling language allows it to be used beyond endangered species, but in Maine it is only Canada lynx. Look at that program to see how it could be used by industry for non-endangered species. Healthy Forest Reserve Program (HFRP) allowed the use of University of Maine to do creative management planning. Private land conservation easements also work but can become a problem depending on the easement terms. HFRP may allow for protection of certain sensitive areas while giving landowners funds.

Need to look at common ground, breakdown distrust and work together with feds, especially financially. There is fear of fed involvement. How to get beyond. This meeting is a start. Private landowners are critical stakeholders here in ME. Private ownership is good and should remain. As Land trust representative, when we take on an easement, the job has just begun to monitor and manage the land. Most easements now include stewardship funds, 5-10%. Fed programs should also allow land trust to hold the easements and build in stewardship funds. Forest Legacy and HFRP are good programs and need to be promoted.

Came to Maine because private landowners can do what they want without regulation on their land. [I was asked not to come] What works is without federal intervention. We don't need the feds. Federal government can't do anything right. If you get involved, what are the regulations? Do we want to trust the feds in Maine? Around this room are the betrayed and the betrayal. The whole wildlife project is backed by the United Nations. Executive Order is part of wildlife policies. Look up on computer that the feds and United Nations are in this together. Federal government and the United Nations want to have a wildlife refuge from Maine to the Adirondacks. Head Water Project - land acquisition and land grabs. Conservation Easements want to have Public/private ownership. U.S. does not allow this, but land trusts are what that is.

Fed match grants are 50%, this hamstrings efforts. 75% [fed]-25% is a better match. USFWS data is consistent with state agency. State data sets are not necessarily consistent within the state. Conflicts occur with what is on each type of maps and known species [location]. Hard line reading of the Clean Water Act hamstrings doing effective work. Beginning With Habitat program is not getting implementation funds so not getting down to the local planners in order to do the conservation planning. Funds have dried up. Need more funds for this.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

For achieving large scale conservation, the Feds have done a good job to get programs going but only have a trickle of funds. These programs are underfunded. Need to increase the money. Current Farm Bill has caps and that makes it harder to do river restoration projects.

[not] Fully funded Land & Water Conservation Fund

Project SHARE focuses on salmon restoration. It is successful because we will put up with the process. So much process is associated with fiscal year funds, that it is hard to sustain long-term programs. Farm Bill - NRCS was key partner with WHIP in 2006 and 2007, but the new Farm Bill put cap \$50,000 per client per year, so the new laws prevent doing large dam replacement projects. It is a statutory [obstacle]. It would need a legislative fix, not a rule fix. The land has to be privately owned, it can't be state-owned. State owns land under dams.

U.S. Forest Service State and Private Forestry grants have been reduced and that makes it hard to do the conservation work that needs to get done. They have changed from formula to competitive awards.

Transportation for field trips gets cut, kids don't get outdoors

Promote the outdoors, let's have a program called "No child left indoors". A lot of our volunteers come from such an education program. We need to push the youth outdoors. Most Maine jobs are outdoors, like forestry, fishing, recreation. Keep the kids here by educating them as to what we have. We need value-added such as in the recreational activity, site-seeing, and furniture.

Need scholarships, transportation, and equipment to get kids outside. Maine has camps that the kids get the outdoor experiences and kids talk to their parents about their [outdoor] experiences.

Amend the federal estate tax law. Right now we don't pay any estate tax. The current exemption will be reduced to 1 million dollars and over 1 million will be taxed at 55% in 2011. This will effect a lot of landowners and forests. A lot of land will change hands [because the financial tax burden may cause landowners to sell their property].

There is a decline in the fragments we have left of important [undisturbed] forests [in Maine]. Find the places that are natural and preserve them. On our watch, dedicate resources to preserve the best of Maine natural resources.

Q2: Focus on one tool in particular. Important that the people at the table were comfortable and in agreement. The tool is really empowerment. Allowing the people that do the work in the field enough authority and autonomy to do the work and move the ball forward. In order to advance a conservation we must use resources wisely. Penobscotts makes decisions for seven generations into the future. Do the federal employees in the field have enough power to move a project forward? They need to be able to move forward, not just go back and forth between agencies. Empower agency employees.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

By working with the system as a whole then we can really get the context for the river down We tried to take this approach (landscape) 30 years ago. It wasn't until we were able to get the river in context of the landscape that we could really make a difference.

What happens in the rivers really affects what happens on the land and vice versa. What happens on the land affects the streams. What happens in the stream affects what happens in the ocean. Look at the Machias River Forest which has been protected so that the watershed can be protected and produce healthy Atlantic Salmon.

Recreation: Snowmobiling is extremely important to the non-coastal areas of Maine. In these areas winter is THE season. The visitations to these areas has opened up winter; fortunately in that particular area, we've had great report over the years with land owners. Dealing with private landowners is something I greatly enjoy because I'm in the position of having a back and forth relationship with them. The federal gov't could help us by making funds available to help us. We cannot sustain ourselves without snowmobiling. It's disconcerting to me when I have guests who find snowmobiling environmentally unfriendly when it is our driver for the economy. Snowmobiling is very important to the non-coastal portions of Maine. In some areas, winter is "the" season for economic strength. Canoeing and kayaking have dropped off in central Maine. I work with \_\_\_\_\_.

Dollars is the biggest challenge. We need help. The land and water conservation fund is a great place to help. But we also need flexibility in the funds we have now. We need to be able to move money in order to fund projects. I think that the challenges that the federal gov't has given us has really put a spark plug underneath us to get things moving forward.

I think good use of dollars is also important. This Penobscot River Restoration project is good use, where as there are other projects that may not be.

Go back to \_\_\_\_\_'s points: we need the leadership \_\_\_\_\_ pointed to, but we also need a culture of 'yes.' It was a real collaborative effort. Solutions start locally and if the culture is the same all the way up it makes it successful.

We also need a long-term time commitment. These commitments go longer than political cycles. It takes a long time to make some of these things come to fruition.

It takes a collaborative effort, we all take a role to maintain the sustainability, the imposing Federal regulations that could shut down biomass plants, proposed regulations, and no longer considering woody bio plants carbon neutral.

Carrying cost associated with owning land. Farmers priorities sometimes compromised to meet uses and objectives of recreationists, no compensation to landowners.

Posted no trespassing signs

## Discussion Question 2

***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Generally no one funding source to complete an entire projects, requirements of multiple funding sources start to collide with conflicting needs.

Many fed programs many landowners are not eligible for many programs in the already fragmented lands.

Wildlands and Woodlands to conserve 30 million acres will take a long time and require

EPA, ESA,BMP Maine has terrific wildlife management plan, Fed is coming in and upsetting the apple cart with Lynx, EPA new green house gas rules will be a problem in Maine, BMP works beautifully in Maine, new fed court ruling determines log roads are a point source and again upsetting the efforts and work.

FLP consider some of the money going to LO comes back

Local land trusts need more help with stewardship, woodwise get that out it works and funded, recreation trails Fed highways and recreational transportation enhancement very successful , but limit of no ATV's, fully fund the LWCF, pocket parks

Agency blinders, like the multiple funding sources but limitations of specific funding, fund only remove dam, only fund fish way, paperwork of grant reporting 6 weeks of work after project was down, separate record keeping.

Money, depend on time and donations of people, getting harder and harder to find money, Federal money more infrastructure and signage to get people out on the land and interest them in the land and more likely to donate.

Grants tracking takes lots of effort, difficult to find the matching requirements

Open access why I come to Maine, the threat of a National Park, many areas are of limits and limits the enjoyment of large areas, jobs would be eliminated.

Polarization of the groups that want NP and the groups that want it the way it was 25 years ago, open large paper lands.

Accessing available dollars to get the youth to work on public lands, difficult in knowing that the money is out there but how to get to it. There are 1000's of young people who want to serve. More systematically more effectively fund the programs to protect the lands

Endangering ESA for development puts wildlife photography at risk

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Climate Change big challenge, need adaptation plans, conservation models, habitat and wildlife corridors.

Caps in programs to limit funding amounts in single year, guarantee phase funding to do landscape,

Invasive Species. Prevention and management is a large challenge. Education and outreach efforts regarding forest pests. There are not enough state resources. NGO's have to fill in were state and federal officials cannot.

All messages have to relate to local impacts so that people can identify with the NNIS problems.

Just not enough resource to be able to act quickly enough. The global economy also presents problems with NNIS.

There is more to Maine fisheries than Atlantic Salmon. We should look at all fish.

Look at non-traditional funding opportunities. Look at kids with obesity. Look at getting kids out of urban area and into the outdoors.

Acadia is like Swiss Cheese. We have \$8,000,000 in land with willing sellers and we have only \$1,000,000 to purchase land.

No Child Left Behind SHOULD include outdoor education.

There is often much debate about creating a National Park, but there is almost unanimous support of a National Park once it has been established.

Some federal grants require matching funds that preclude some really small projects.

Reward risk-taking in federal and state organizations. A failed risk should not be a career-ending decision.

Solve the most important problems through creative solutions. We need flexible programs and flexible solutions.

We do not have time to protect forests. We need to be humble and come up with solutions now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Although the local grade school had great natural resource education, but the high school had budget cuts eliminate natural resource education. Our school standards do not require that students learn local biology - where a student lives and the students relationship with biology.

Pharmaceuticals damage the environment. We have collected nearly a ton of un-used medications and disposed of them properly. This was fist funded by the federal government, but that money has run out. The State has back filled funds, but the money has run out. This needs to be fully funded.

Fully fund the LWCF. The Allagash River is a special place. Participated with people of Maine's Forests , Penobscot River RP, Land use Conservation Fund. Canoeed the Allagash Waterway- It is a huge success, but its a narrow strip. It needs more protection. <http://www.nrcm.org/>

Loves Maine and loves the world. Is a researcher. Struck by opening panel's emphasis on working forest and that the panel emphasized motorized recreation. Panel should have represented and activities where humans tread lightly. Those areas are as important as working forests for our heritage and need to be emphasized.

Models for future of Maine could be Florida now, Presidio, perhaps Ches Bay. Takes people with common goals to work together. Should look at all resources throughout ME and find best administrative structures to make everything come together. Going after individual pots of money from Feds may work, but larger line items need to be in the President's budget for a large variety of projects. Could be for ski trails, snow mobile trails. Need LWCF funds to finish acquisition of land at Acadia NP. "Finish" the Penobscot project. Scuitick Fish facility needs to be funded to educate young people and do research. Give serious consideration to implementing Keeping Maine Forests.

It's incredible how far wildlife conservation has come in the last 30 years. Conservation must be tied to economic development. Been in business for 25 years, and not considered viable operation by the bank. SBA loan is way too lengthy to be efficient (his was 6 inches thick). There must be benefit to local community for eco-businesses. Forest product industry is suffering in parts of State. Recreation is an industry in ME and that needs to be recognized.

Wants to speak to urban end of spectrum. The mentality of people in Bangor that have camps don't think of conservation in the city. Not everyone has a car so it's important to have outdoor recreation opportunities in the city. #1 problem is finding funds for land acquisition. Stewardship and invasive species. Purple loosestrife is creeping along in the city. Don't have resources and guidance in how to deal with invasive and climate change. Need help. When do you fight and when do you resign self? Environmental literacy thread running through school programs is needed. Our agendas need to be in other branches of the govt. Transportation corridors. Planning should involve how project will reduce sprawl. Need good overall philosophy on how to deal with invasive.

Need to deliver on promise of LWCF. Nat'l parks are America's best idea, but at Acadia it is unfinished. Need to follow through. Acadia is how I developed my love of the outdoors. There are 130 unpurchased parcels.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Manage 1 million acres of forest in ME. He tried to get working forest in the KMF initiative. Private landownership works. Maine worker is an endangered species sometimes. Try to find ways to help us. Not sure federal money is a great thing, but could work on inheritance tax relief. Now people have to liquidate crop they grew or sell. Capital gains treatment has to be preserved for purchase timber off lands. Bank rates are phenomenal (bad). Feds could be careful with regulations. Broad brush impacts mills, foresters negatively. Land for Maine Future is a tremendous program. Straightforward conservation easements are excellent. Feds don't need to own much land to 'preserve.' Land needs to be in production.

We live within 8 hours of 30 million people. Keep protected. His group is focused on resource extraction. Logs going to Canada, gravel is going to Europe. People don't want to see clearcuts. Be wise about shipping raw materials out. Windmills are not going to improve economic development and tourists won't like to see them around every corner.

We manage 1.1 million acres. Landscape planning scares hell out of him because others are deciding what land should be. Northern ME is in good condition. Different land holdings have different objectives and when someone from the outside says what the vision should be is wrong. When you leave it to private ownership the mosaic is more diverse. Work should not be in north woods, it should be south of Augusta due to environmental issues that need to be addressed. Conservation easements are not worth it because landowners are dictated to by what they can do. Generationally, you have to focus on youth. No interest in the outdoors for visiting. We're doing a good job in North woods, but leave us alone.

Funding. We're in a key moment as Senate votes on oil spill bills. LWCF, Forest Legacy Fund have been great. ME is an excellent place to use Fed funds due to prices. Want to see sense of spirit Congress had in enacting this legislation. See continue to focus on whole ecosystems. Fragmentation is a problem. Whole communities of interest for partnerships. ME Forest Biodiversity Project worked together years ago. State's Land Fund program is a coalition that benefits the environment. It comes out of common sense - ME has always made sure forests were taken care of. We've had engineers from China come to see Penobscot project. Keeping Maine's Forests is a discussion, not a final report. Economics have also been linked to the project. We need Fed participation in KMF program. There is a ton of work ahead not done by email, or a meeting every 6 months. A lot of people are talking about what the forest industry needs. This didn't happen 10 years ago. Conservation groups understand now that everyone needs to work together.

Haven't heard much about work in southern Maine to protect coastal estuaries. NAWCA, Coastal Program (FWS) people are incredibly helpful. Appraisal process with FWS is a stumbling block. Recovery Act funding to protect buffers were great. We have to piece these things together, though. Make sure that land trusts know they can reach out to FWS Regional Office in Hadley, MA. NAWCA grant limits to a 1:1 match. If you have a \$6million match you can only get \$1million which is disadvantageous. Set priorities each year regionally that can move around to get more funding. NOAA should have been involved in this process.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bangor, ME***

***(cont.)***

Interesting paradox: Landowners like to share their land, want others to use their land..BUT lots of users don't know how to use the land. Landowners are not necessarily getting an economic benefit, but would be more happy to see an education program to teach people to be responsible USERS of land that others have opened for access. Visitor's need to realize they are there at the grace of the landowners. There should be no dumping; they should carry out what they bring in. There have been people who have four-wheeled through a wetland that could have caused him to be fined for an environmental infraction. Maine is 92% privately owned, so there is plenty of opportunity for private land use if people are respectful.

Laws are good, but enforcement needs to be increased-bolstering availability so that there are wardens available to enforce laws and be available when there's trouble. There isn't federal funding to assist in hiring more wardens.

1. A lot of people that come to the park want to know about volunteerism and how they can become involved. Government needs to leverage that desire through maybe a volunteer credits system that will equate to discounts later on? 2. Leveraging private dollars with federal dollars, i.e. Centennial Challenge?

Most landowners are not looking for money, but working farms need to count the dollars. Special areas should be protected but impact the bottom line. Perhaps alleviating the tax burden on these areas would be helpful.

Tree growth tax going away will increase development because of tax burden to the landowner. Inheritance tax is also an issue in protecting open area.

Air quality effects the aesthetics of the views at the park . High mercury in aquatic species is a direct effect of water quality. Severe storms effecting the forested areas and shorelines. Species in danger of being lost due to climate change. Biomes are in danger of being lost.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Berkeley, CA***

Poverty, access

Distance

Pay kids/legal resident aliens

Volunteering for X and getting Y

NPS narrowly -- defining role to include local and state natural areas

Mission alignment

Continuity

VIP -- 50 mile barrier

Hub for youth in each N.P.

Must move past cultural and language barriers

Parents don't understand the value of letting children participate in activities

Youth development and public land agency partnerships

How do we institutionalize partnerships? Through schools? Possible issue with funding gaps

Need funding for transportation costs

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bozeman, MT***

To put into practice the multiple of environmental evidence on protecting our wildlife, their dispersal and migration. This needs to be a priority, especially for wildlife corridors near national parks, specifically Yellowstone in this area. An educational component is important to educate the next generation. The surface Transportation Act of 1991 adapted by Montana that allows commercial semi trucks (long haul) to go on any Mt. roads. MOOT has therefore made all roads accessible to the large semis and not all roads should carry semi trucks. Work with Montana Corridor association to agree to preserve our ecologically sensitive areas. The things that work are the Montana Dept. of Transportation and local community support.

Funding for parts and balancing "mixed". Human caused destruction of our natural resources, such as global warming (climate change), uncontrolled logging, mining and it associated consequences such as the current crisis in the gulf.

Protecting wildlife migration corridors like the Madison valley. Protecting and preserving water sources. Preserving land.

Reduce traffic speed and eliminate long-haul trucks from the Madison Valley. Implement setbacks on riders and eliminate dumping and pollution. Corridor development and get more land into conservation easements.

It is critical that outdoors activities and the facilities to provide them are able at all levels. Local governments and states have increasing use, aging infrastructure and limited staff and operations to provide these types of opportunities close to populations and with easy access.

Fully fund the LWCF with equal funding to the stateside to provide operate and maintain local recreational opportunities

Water and energy conservation, requiring a paradigm shift from the currently unsustainable "American way of life". Ensuring access to public land boundaries

Support grassroots efforts with federal and state money. Tough legislation to face individuals and cooperation to take appropriate action.

We are not creating any more lands, but we are supporting more people. We must preserve our diverse and unique public lands and landscapes, watersheds, wildlife, fish and bird habitats for future generations and engage young people in their protection. Uses must be appropriate not destructing public lands belonging to all Americans- whether or not they even visit them- they are out national heritage. Local people must avoid seeing these lands as theirs not ours. Politics, money and climate change.

How do share access to wilderness and out doors without people feeling left out- There should be NO snowmobiles in National Parks- but there should be places for them - some with atv's on some trails ect. Balancing is the key!

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Climate change and building resilience into our ecosystems so they can adapt to this change. Connecting people to natural landscapes and fostering future conservation leadership. Protecting our remaining core habitats on public and private lands that do not currently have permanent protection

1. Climate Change 2. Land Fragmentation 3. Resource Extraction

Many people in our country have a short term. Selfish, greedy attitude

Manage our resources for future generations not for short term profits

Fractal landscapes from development sprawl, great demands in fewer resources - (water, air) as well as transportation routes. Threat of "no net gain" of public lands is strong in Montana, but is very shortsided and destructive. Please protect against "no net gain" policies.

Climate Change- Environmentally destructive energy development . Development of critical national ecosystems habitat alteration/ destruction. Human Population growth.

Reconciling agenda 21 goals and maintaining private property rights. Agenda 21 specifically eliminates private property rights as well as most agricultural freedom. We cannot destroy these freedoms without destroying our way of life.

Revise our game flow to promote not destroy private property rights. Most of the best managed lands in America are privately owned and the worst are federally owned

Fundamentally, recognized that current populations density and levels of resource consumption create pressure on ecosystems and wildlife that did not operate as strongly in the past. Consequently stronger policies for preservation of ecosystem function and species conservation are necessary.

Loss of land at alteration/ development -Climate Change - Degraded/ Damaged landscape

Perhaps the most overlooked conservation challenge is the impact of invasive species. They harm our ecology and economy in many ways but the impact is often hidden in ways that prevent people from understanding the extent of the threat.

Most land managers recognize the impact of invasive but lack of resources and egony commitment,. I reenergizes NISC give it the same emphasis as the Clinton administration did. 2. include basic funding for invasive in agencies and field units.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Lack of understanding that all the natural world is connected and we are part of this web. Showing how a philosophy of what is the common good is important not just "what's in it for me"? Implementation use of education in schools about connectedness. Get children off electronic games. understanding how to show people to understand what each does and what one state does affects all of us. ( environment is not a bad word)

Keeping connection to outdoors in forefront of children. Lack of understanding of importance of natural world, everything we were given for free! We cannot create new native shows how native Americans, an ancient cultural sites are important

1. leaving natural resources , especially wildlife, of NPA Parks unimpaired for the use of enjoyment of future generations. 2. To easy, inexpensive access, for use and resulting degradation, to our public lands, by private interests at the expense of public interest . 3. dewatering rivers and streams 4. continuing decline of wildlife toward endangerment.

1. NPS get back to its most basic, oldest mission 2. revise update the 1972 Mining Act 3. Fully fund LWCA 4. Strategic land trades and purchases to enhance public benefits of public lands.

Climate change, all land management units within DOI must have explicit mandates to manage their lands for both present and future climate impacts. Decisions should be sound science. climate smart management should four on 3 main tactic 1. protect adequate core areas, buffer areas and connecting corridors 2. limit non-climate stressors (logging, ORV use, ect) 3. Interagency coordination with state and local counterparts to develop and implement ecosystems-wide climate-smart management programs

Pryer Mountains of south central Montana needs better protection of anchant his tried sites and better protection of the land with control over 4 or 2 vehicles

More patrol over the mountain ranges to control vehicles and looter who raid ancient sites that are owe thousand or more years old mountains should be under one agency

Support financial and with policy local watershed/ conservation groups. Support flexibility with work and school programs to encourage people to get outside. Start educating kids about restoration early -middle school, continue through college, Support these programs. Support financiers for salaries for people working on these efforts.

1, keeping lands open to monitories access, youth and the age will be better able to access these places, house specific trails/ paths for motorized access., Have specific trails for non motorized activity. 2. raise the estate taps or eliminate it. Better/ easier easements. Incentives for youth farmers/ ranchers 3. developed new oil strategies on lad not 50 miles out in the ocean.

open spaces, wild places, intact ecosystems, climate change

## Discussion Question 2

**Bozeman, MT**

**(cont.)**

Loss of native wetlands (prairie pothole region) North central and north east MT. the Dakotas.  
Access to public land and those public dollars have been used on private lands

1. over-zealous use of minor technicalities within the endangered species act.

Climate change, human intolerance, human indifference to conservation needs and values.

Corporations wielding illegitimate power over election, public policy, public agencies and more.

Water quality and quantity

Global climate change, motorized use poorly managed, over grazing on public land

1. Do not lock up public land (national monuments) to eliminate timber, mineral, oil extraction. Especially in the Baitken Shall Area 2. Do increase access to public lands. Even through mandatory easements. 3. man made climate change is bull shit.

Top Issue: global warning + plans to adapt to it for example. Beetle killed trees cover 1/2 of our forest in some places, when the entire forest burn this summer or next, where will the wildlife go? How will be handle the remaining bare hills for the next 20 years? How will we address the water degradation, spill its too late to save the tree but not too late to have a recovery plan. Another example is the declining waters- drill more water wells, dam some streams have the coastal communities use desalinized water from the ocean rather than keep taking fresh water from the west.

1. the lack of awareness and knowledge of the role of agriculture in this nation 2. the lack of wildlife management by federal agencies wildlife belongs to public, state of Montana

The influence of lobbyists and legal action is causing very little to actually happen. Almost all groups that use the lands wont to preserve and develop better opportunities to use land. All the involvement is causing very little action

Pine Beetles and blisher rust in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem

Remember balance between natural resources and cultural resources

Global Warming. Dwindling interest in the outdoors among children.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Kids are out future conservationist, and they are spending, less time outdoors and more time on the couch. We need to find ways to re-connect children with the outdoors, whether on a large scale (trails, national parks) or small scale (urban parks)

Sprawl, development pressure, special interest influence pork barrel politicians, programs and policies working at cross purposes, lack of definition of the public interest

Funding, climate change, energy demand. Pollution, education

Protecting water quality, ensuring adequate water supply to meet our growing needs. Understanding critical connection between air quality- water quality, resources. Fostering stewardship ethic among youth through education (k-12, informal education, after school programs etc). Curbing the trend among youth to remain sedentary and inactive. Public health issues are enormous, there needs to be a cross-disciplinary interagency efforts to address these or the healthcare budget will overshadow everything else and become our biggest priority.

Climate change and lack of funding for the agencies responsible for management of open spaces (forest service, NPS, etc). Corporate resource extraction co leasing unsustainable extraction techniques over use as the U.S. population increases. More open space is becoming criticized for both humans and wildlife.

Destruction of wildlands by motorized recreationalists

Using public lands to protect winter ecosystems and opportunities for non-motorized winter recreation

Climate change, Ecosystem degradation, fragmentation. Public values for ecosystem, natural resources.

Education and empowerment of future generations. Lax attitude of ability to change anything

Climate change, energy, natural resource protection

Addressing climate change to preserve our natural landscape. Access to outdoor opportunities- climbing, mtn biking, hiking, skiing etc. Exposing youth to outdoor activities. Protecting wildlife corridors. Support local sustainable food.

Safeguarding and expanding the large-scale, contiguous wilderness areas needed to ensure the continued existence of ecosystems and animal populations. Lack of public understanding of the precious treasures that America enjoys and which are no longer found in highly developed areas of the world.



## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Getting kids outdoors and interested in their environment

Outdoor education programs in schools. Modern technology in National Parks so that kids will be more excited to learn and visit

Thank you to the President and U.S. Government for taking on this very important issue. We must protect the environment we live in and the animals with which we share this environment. They cannot protect themselves and if we do not do it, it will be our undoing. Our children must carry on the legacy in an even stronger way. Montana Dept. of Transportation and other organizations that can make a difference to make this wildlife corridor issue and immediate priority. The Western Governor's Association suggestions regarding wildlife corridors must be implemented.

These meetings need to be held in a town hall format in all of the small communities so that all of 8-5 working people and at producers can attend not be an inconvenience to them, and not cater just to the special interests groups.

A problem is that these sessions allow all comment, but does not encourage dialogue. The guy next to me is a logger, I can learn from him and he from me but we wont really get to talk. Smaller groups would be better to organize but would create better understanding and better ideas that are supported by all. so this was a good start- how can dialogue be created? smaller groups.

Agriculture other suffer additional restrictions when public lands are discussed. The populations of the world is to be doubled by 2050 and agriculture must represent to feed this inexpand. Countinued and increased funding for agriculture research in land, water and terrain, that will allow increased food production must continue. access to public lands for all people must improve.

A healthy environment is the foundation our public health, our quality of life, and out sustainable economies. It has been overlooked because of the pressures on the Obama Administration from the problems inherited and some new ones that have developed (recession, war, oil spill ect). However we need to think about solving all our other problems within the framework of a healthy environment based on function natural ecosystems.

Any initiatives must enhance and protect private property rights, Every infringement and regulation that hinders property rights destroys the fabric of our nation. So much emphasis is put on accumulating more land in the public trust the emphasis should be on the stewardship repsonsibility of what you already control. The most unhealthy forests and watersheds are on public lands and some of the healthiest are on private grounds. There must be real meaning behind public/ private partnership.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

I appreciate "Washington" coming to Montana. I appreciate that the issue are complicated facing the Administration regarding putting a value on nature. I am worried about what is happening in the worlds oceans- over fishing, pollution. I thank the administration's for cancelling the Bush administrations last second oil and gas lease sale and instituting needed reforms for onshore drilling. End the BLM's "No New Wilderness" policy It's wrong to have surface and subsurface rights separate surface owner should own subsurface. Ranchers should not bar canoes, boaters, fishermen from access at bridges. RS2477 is being abused BLM and Forest service are asked to protect and sell off for lease land- allowing land abuse is this the fax guarding the hen house? No more natural world is being made, It's vital to our health- mentally, physically and spiritually.

We have our agencies in place use them and stop appeals in could. Help us use or land practically with out governing. Money which this our hands, If we could count our timber and open our mills it would bring dollars back to our schools put our people back to work. We don't need more govern closures on our lands, NO MORE WILDERNESS land of no use. If people want more trails and parks raise money privately and use volunteers. My main concern is loosing my ranch three government control by zoning and not allowing me to do raise on my land. I wont our water rights lift in Montana not sold to out of state.

Montana Black Management Program, which allows hunters to access private lands for a fee needs expansion and more funding. Both recreationalist and hunters and landowners want this but the program is limited by funding which only comes from out of state hunting fees. America needs a mandatory service year followin high school to give urban and rural kids experience in the outdoors that otherwise are unattainable.

Stop promoting Teddy Roosevelt if uou are truly going for a ground-up approach. Many people associate President Roosevelt with resources socialism.

The price which consumers pay of oil and gas should reflect the true cost to the environment

Winter needs to be considered when developing strategies and the allocational of resources.

There are so many people in the discussion (70+) each person speaks approximatly 2 minutes. Each person has a great deal to say.

## Discussion Question 2

**Bozeman, MT**

**(cont.)**

In the limited time that you - that we all - have to restore our relationship to each other and to earth, I believe it makes to focus of a few overarching issues that simultaneously govern the multi-faceted challenge. The single most important thing this administration can do is to help alter our agricultural subsidy systems which has led to a disproportionate dependence on the corn-soybean-feedlot machine. The perverse incentives inadvertently created by the systems are at the root of our core issue. Dependence on petroleum, disruption and contamination of hydraulic systems of pollinator systems; immigration and labor imbalance, urban/rural divides; loss of habitat for away and other habitats, rural crimes, rural and urban obesity, diabetes, and other health issues and even inequitable unstable international relations. I value greatly our national efforts to care for specially designated protected areas, but this issue supersedes even that.

Regarding bruceccsis in wildlife in the Greater Yellowstone Area: bruceccsis eradication is not a reasonable goal. Reuse animal and plant health inspection service bruceccsis regulations. Clarify that bison are values native reublic trust wildlife just like eck and other wildlife. Promote systems that manage livestock reasonably and wildlife ecologically. Phase out USFWS feedgrounds in Wyoming and promote habitat preservation work on better livestock vaccines-not wildlife

if we don't use our own resources we will be owned by midwest oil.

why do people come to these meeting and complain about drilling for oil and gas, tthen get in their cars and drive off.

Estate taxes on farms and ranches in burdensome. This will cause "old time" families to sell their lands to pay the taxes, passing ranches on to the next generation is becoming difficult at best. This is either breaks the lands into small parcels or locks it up by wealthy owners. Conservation Easement should have the tax benigits reinstated that sunsetted in 2009

allowing recreation in our public lands is going to be a dying mission. The agendas of groups to allow their type of recreation is going to limit all recreation from happening. Trail maintenance and trail; building is going to be the future of forests. Do not allow public lands to become wilderness areas. allow all to use out lands

Keeping roadless areas is important. Roads are poorly planned and don't take wildlife into account. Watersheds and recreation are important. Don't take stand one way - need to work together. Involve kids.

Indian trust lands have only received 25% of the conservation dollars that private lands have. Need parity. Tribal irrigation projects haven't been funded for the past 20 years so they haven't been done - yet EQIP requires that to be eligible land must have been irrigated for 2 of the last 5 years. Needs a policy change on irrigation history requirements for EQIP. Wants USDA and DOI to work together as a package deal. Wants to get schools involved through outdoor classrooms and community gardens. USDA/DOI should set up a committee to work together on natural resources on tribal lands.

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Concerned with wildlife corridors in the Madison Valley. Problem with animals crossing the highways. A lot of commercial vehicles are using the roads. Have been working with the MT DOT. Need to protect the wildlife corridor and educate children why it's important. Needs federal support for their efforts and funding.

Has outdoor TV show about hunting/camping. Access to public lands is important. Fully fund Land and Water Conservation Fund. Funding will always be an issue. Hunters and fisherman already pay - now time for other user groups to pay. Private land incentives are important. Must have local buy in. Political process may be unduly influencing federal agencies in carrying out there public trust responsibilities. Feds need to be more adaptable. Gave example of inflexibility of APHIS on brucellosis issue. Need more flexibility in management to get easement. Also need flexibility in land exchanges to be able to deal with small local parcels.

Using science and social expertise to raise awareness to the plight of white bark pine in the Yellowstone ecosystem due to pine beetles and blister rust. 95% infested. Investigate solutions. 200 + volunteers. Testing anti-beetle solutions. Role of federal government is to give exposure to the problem. Tools - using modern digital media to document and monitor decline of forest and determine what should be done.

Is 74 years old. Has given up backpacking. Depends on ATVs, horses and snowmobiles. Concerned about lack of opportunities. Wants accommodation for senior citizens who can no longer hike or backpack. Local knowledge is important to help agencies identify best options. Federal role is to back off and leave decision in hands of local people.

Motorized recreationist. Small farmer. Can't make a living on farm due to wolves, brucellosis, dead timber. Too many lawsuits. Solution is to remove all pending lawsuits. Go with the local agencies existing plans. Logging roads could be used for ATVs and snowmobiles etc. if managed right.

Take personal responsibility for kids outdoor education. Don't need federal dollars to do it. Concerned about Treasured Lands initiative locking up land in eastern MT. His kids like 4 wheelers and don't like to walk.

Concerned with ecosystem health. Wolves are good. There's too much motorized use. Need better bison management. BLM need to improve sheep grazing management in southern UT

4th generation rancher. Likes easements. What's to reinstate 2009 tax benefits for conservation easements. Estate taxes are a major issue for rancher - need sell part of ranch to pay them, resulting in breaking up the operation and potential subdivision. Need to fix estate taxes.

Concerned with large corporations taking over agriculture. Gave example of how corporations control USDA funding for dairy supports prices.

## Discussion Question 2

**Bozeman, MT**

**(cont.)**

Encourage, partnership state and local govt. with Feds. Fed \$'s sustained state side funding down. Written testimony, meager budgets, can meet 50 f\50 grant share, support full, Higher level decisions hurt local communities & local demands are not being met- Communities are not able to find 50% of funding Bring equity to the program so everyone can enjoy the benefits

Can do? Find a way to let land managers & foresters do their work on the ground Taxes? Not so high have to sell & take land out production Grow trees on property instead of subdividing, manage fed. Ground, challenges – FS – hands tied, litigation, safety – millions acres dead trees in MT, rec. on ground, huge issue with hazard trees, need to address, FEDS – Find way to let land managers do their work on the ground. Tax issue – to high forced to sell

ARRA funding, fund authorities, matching funds, tough to meet, support youth corps act of 2010, good changes, 25% cash match (big deal for non-profits), work with existing non-profits rather than creating own corps workforce

Lines on map is challenging-need regional approach Need to know what watershed you are in-bioregion Example -Upper Miss. Watershed alliance

Orgs motivated to work within themselves and with others, face challenges with \$, Ag lands – disconnect youth with great outdoors, remedy – prioritization on locally grown foods, eat foods grown in own backyards, ask where food is coming from, empower agricultural producers on their own lands

Wildlife corridor & traffic, don't mix, Feds restrict long haul trucks causing issues, identify and sign wildlife crossings

14 listening sessions around MT - riparian habitat, impacts to riparian corridors, transportation issues, snow plowing, connect rural to urban areas – riparian habitat conservation. Protect these, education , involve youth, plantings, supported by Fed. \$\$'s – keep \$'s coming, challenges – BMP's competing and conflicting policies

Get youth involved in conservation-get them away from TV, PC's. & video games

Need more education-keep youth involved

Expansion of wilderness limits agricultural development, access – overlooked, lack of senior citizen participation, don't restrict access to outdoors to seniors with more regulations, trail bikes, snow machines, bikes restricted

Wanted to reiterate ideas-FS has local needs-keep roads plowed in winter for use-animal migration corridors important-get youth involved with efforts-facilitate more people to engage in activities

## Discussion Question 2

**Bozeman, MT**

**(cont.)**

What works-Public/private partnerships Accelerate conservation on the ground-working together Programs successful when done the local level Challenges-Government programs not matched well with local needs-lack of funding-NRCS program adapted to allow grazing on wetlands-

Build on state and tribal issues, locals know what works on the ground at the local level, need local involvement, need inventory on what is happening on the ground. Communication is needed across all. Kids are not involved? MT maybe not the same as other places, youth are outside, urban parks serve far more people than YNP, Feds need to support state efforts, utilize partnerships, need to participate, protect water Thank you for listening!

Civil collaboration works-appropriate uses while preserving lands, watersheds for future generations-support more folks on landscapes, need to preserve lands, No destructive uses!! Local people need to see land as "ours not theirs"

Invasive species, affect ecology and economy of the US, hydro power invasive species, impact us all not recognized as a #1 priority, clean angling program, inspect clean and dry gear when done, private sector deliver this, Fed role is commitment to national invasive species council, fully fund state aquatic nuisance program, encourage partnerships, simplify grant programs, need social marketing tools to change behavior, youth education, successful programs are long term, keep them outdoors on a frequent basis, Need \$'s for teachers not products,

Need clean rivers and lakes, with access. Need access!! Thank you for being here! Promote fishing and boating, gateway to youth to the outdoors, local organizations get kids on the water, LCWF successful-need to consistently fund, Challenges-clean rivers, support Senate Bill 2427, get \$\$ to FS & BLM, Public access is needed-\$\$\$ for invasives

Enforceability is needed, ensure ecosystems and wildlife can adapt to changing climates, protect core areas, LCWF \$, connectivity across private lands (Assistance to landowners to help out)

Ski area prospective-pine beetle-safety of forest lands Ski areas responsible for removal of infertive trees Climate changes-huge issue Alternative energy needs to be a priority-pursue cleaner energy development Tourism-play larger role- Any help from federal govt appreciated to promote snow sports

Do better job in sustaining national resources, Feds, much to do but little thunder, 1992 GAO Fed. Lands – inadequate public access report, worse now than then, derelictions of Fed. Workforce, access to boundaries is the issues, can't get to the fed. Lands then can't recreate, Leadership all need to get serious about this issue, collaboration – cosmetic exercise, not used for policy making or decision making, beltway policies (sell these vs develop at local level), human communities – keep all the pieces not just a few

NPS return to old mission leave as is, bison of YNP, LWCF need full funding, access is needed; revision of the 1872 mining law, degrading public lands, repeal now, balance public uses of air water and land, uses have been skewed to private uses vs. public uses, need to find balance for today's conditions and populations

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

This outreach great, maintain populations of plants, animals in concert with humans, protected areas of parks are not large enough. Need community based partnerships to preserve for future, Challenges- energy development, climate change – don't compromise the environment, support scientific best science available, help funding, guidelines & regulations where necessary

Local businessman-Build snowmobiles Access to public lands important to business Don't recognize snowmobiles have zero impact on the environment-quieter, sensitive to environment Oils synthetic-want to help Lack of forest management-dead & dying trees-need to act soon-maybe too late-fires-endanger land, air quality Needs to be less words & more action See more designated for motorized activities-

Ranch owner, multiple use – timber mgmt , grazing, hunting, motorized and non-motorized, doing this for 120 years (family). This is just a start. 8 – 5 folks missing as well as rural, need town hall meetings at night not during the day. Ag communities keep the open lands, avg. age +60 young folks are coming on, hostile to grazing (public) lack of grazing mgmt principles, Special interest groups hostile to agriculture. Public comment of everyone is a problem, Stage 3 allow diseased bison to roam, Gallatin NF, uses impacts from motorized is very small more being taken away. Decline in use do to this.

40% of FS budget is spent on litigation Reduce litigation!! Get NEPA sufficiency to multiple use lands-NEPA wastes money-big cost to the Forest- Many projects are litigated-cost to private, govt.-wastes time and \$\$ Reduction to multiple use access contributes to reduced use and outdoor activity Language is important-definitions need to be cleared up-get on the same page

failing way behind on demand, not suitable for existing uses, propose initiative to get trail construction project going to get folks to work like in the CCC days – Feds need to do. FS no \$'s, woefully lacking \$

Cultural sites-all federal agencies lack-not protecting cultural sites Some sites carbon dated-1000 years old!! As a Crow Indian-can tell Crow story by looking at paintings-Pryor Mountains - Need protection! Under 3 federal agencies, NPR, BLM, FS,-NONE WORK TOGETHER!! All agencies should work as one unit-all federal agencies- Work against each other-programs do not work together- Biggest complaint-FED AGENCIES DO NOT WORK TOGETHER!!

protecting landscapes, need to think about eastern part of the state as well. All now is in the mtns in the western part of state, Good areas exist in the eastern part of state, Protect landscapes, Pryor Mtn's – Ekalaka, Chalk Buttes- short grass prairies by Malta, Terry badlands, Need to protect landscapes, need enforcement, restoration, conservation easements, access to all, challenge work with the right people at the right location Protect Pryor Mountains of Montana!

## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

Open spaces-un-roaded spaces like the lungs-keep land open- The west lands open Thank you to the Administration for starting the listening sessions here Thanks for cancelling Bush's oil drilling in Utah No new wilderness policy needs to be revisited Lands in Utah open to ATV use & abuse & oil drilling BLM has authority to San Rafael Desert protect-do not road illegally Don't stretch authority so thin-can't enforce infractions What's working- Private groups Challenges- Group coordination Dollars stretched thin Time stretched thin Need to be showing how everything is connected vNeed to speak for fish, birds, animals, and water Like to see fear combated-change causes fear-working together is strength not weakness Vandalism-Big problem-makes her sick Teaching connectedness will help with vandalism- Last child in the Woods great book Last word-we are all connected

voluntary program, incentive based, buy real estate rights and convey to other non profits or feds, Need \$, Fed Role, huge need in MT, cash strapped landowners need to some cash, WRP, GRP, programs funded thru farm bill need more \$'s, fully fund LWCF, appropriated program but not appropriated, \$'s critical to feds to implement program. Don't revert \$ to other efforts

concerned about private property rights of individuals, 40% of lands in MT are in public trust . Need to do a better job of mgmt. mostly from private lands, run like Germany manage the lands better

Strong advocate of public ownership for hunter & angler access 2 programs have been great- Pitmann Robertson Act Dingle Act- Industries-hunters & anglers spend large amounts of money for management of wildlife & fisheries-working & working well Need to improve & expand on program-state wildlife agencies are strapped for funds-expand product or user based LAWCF funds-can't emphasize how important program is-needs to be expanded-support working landscapes & improving access

Recreation, education, & Stewardship - Water is important, Feds – help strengthen clean water act, reconsider private land ownership and split estate ownership for subsurface rights. Put surface and subsurface rights back together

Collaborative effort to protect ecologically linked to health of the public lands. Broad partnership started by FS. Locally community involved. Preserve livelihood of folks who live there, voluntary land easements, sales, restoration, use land use plans from locals, need \$'s for LWCF, public land managers reach out to neighbors to encourage partnerships, Feds – don't do projects that will harm these type of projects. Wildlife habitat.

The influence of money and status is gradually destroying the heritage the average citizen has enjoyed for so many years. Individuals and corporations are subtly turning those resources into commodities for sale to the highest bidder, or in the case of the very rich, into their private playground. In doing this they are committing violations of the public trust doctrine that would make Theodore Roosevelt turn over in his grave.



## Discussion Question 2

***Bozeman, MT***

***(cont.)***

No one is asking to hunt private property without permission but the problem is not confined to public wildlife on private land. There are vast tracts of B.L.M. and National Forest land unavailable to the average citizen due to property boundaries and closed roads; roads that are vital for such activities such as fire suppression and law enforcement. But neither federal or state agencies aggressively challenge these closures.

Numerous large ranches have changed hands and are now charging up to \$14,000 to harvest a bull elk--A public bull elk. They have manipulated the system so that they can also determine who can legally hunt on their ranch by misusing a program that was designed to help outfitters have a more stable income. An outfitter, who will follow the ranch owners orders, will sponsor selected hunters and they are awarded an automatic license. Hence, the big spender are selected to harvest Montana's biggest and best game at the expense of the citizens who have underwritten successful wildlife management in this state for so many years.

Several western states have already lost control of the wildlife allocation process by implementing unabashed programs such as Ranching For Wildlife where landowners sell the opportunity to harvest big game on their property. The average hunter now often refers to these programs as Wildlife Ranching For The Rich.

If this trend is allowed to continue we will see more and more citizens turning away from their outdoor heritage. The public trust will have little meaning beyond lip service. If we allow our wildlife and access to public land and water to become just another commodity to be purchased by the highest bidder, outdoor activities such as hunting will become less tolerated in our society as fewer young people choose to participate. It could very well spell the end of those values that gave us the greatest system of wildlife management ever devised; the North American Model.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

if you don't have natural areas this is all for naughts. Tax incentives work – we had enhanced tax incentives for conservation easements – we had easements rolling in until that ended; renew the tax incentives that existed until end of 2009. CRP works – an investment of half a billion dollars; need a re-enrollment program that allows Los to sign up for a second K and requires mgmt such as thinning trees to 70 sq basal feet, frequent burning, and planting native warm season grasses; we have commodity, peanut, etc programs, but we don't have it for the forests – why can't we do the same thing for the forests. If you remove the cropping history for CRP, more Los will be able to participate. Fully fund land acquisition, LWCF.

we really don't have a program that helps land continue to be managed properly –no financial incentive to retain it in longleaf – kind of like CRP but what's going to happen at the end of the day to retain llp when lo dies or land is transferred; lots of little tiny farms on worn out land that continues to be farmed because there's a federal subsidy to grow things we don't really need – corn, cotton, etc. they do it for a federal payment – locally called insurance farming. Why can't we do something about that

1000 pound elephant – estate tax/death tax; most people who own land are land rich cash poor so her kids will have to sell off the timber or sell off the land – that's the issue – the fragmentation. Constantly having to look to the future to figure out what the tax situation is going to be. They're trying to figure out which parts of the land should be sold first to pay the taxes. 30 to 50 years you own land; value of land is risen but you have no cash; there has to be a way to look at that.

agrees with \_\_\_\_\_. A major challenge is most forestry and usda programs do not apply to small landowners in her community – they have one acre properties. How can they do llp; 4 to 10 people own a 15 acre property – they won't qualify for the program. Thinks you can't have a group of people apply for a program like CRP – they won't qualify. Plus they need financing. If zoning could change sso you could get tax credits if they use sustainable practices.

most landowners aren't able financially to attend an even t like this; if it were a Saturday then perhaps we could reach landowners. Almost every event like this there's only a handful of landowners . they can't afford to come. If you are truly trying to listen we should have it on weekend. No wonder they don't trust us or they aren't engaged or we're not reaching them. Evenings, have a meal; take care of local business .

Gullah sea island coalition does food and drink and meeting on you and your land and how it can benefit you or zoning changes and how they can affect you; that pulls people together. People of color are not on the lists to get in meeting slike this. There's no trust factor because we don't know you exist so there's no trust. How was I gonna go, I had to work. And what about my children. Need a different mindset about who are you trying to reach. Everyone communicates differently, too. To \_\_\_\_\_, easements sound really good; to Gullagetchees, it means theft. Need educational campaigns geared to different cultures. We need to taylor things so they see themselves in it. If I can't see what you're saying, it won't work.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

silos of natural resources preservation; cultural preservation and ; there are also silos of government agencies, but everyone wants the same thing – sustainable communities, etc. but they don't talk to each other.

costs in planting; costs in management; so if you're going to have LO's successfully planting ll, you're losing \$\$ so they're planting the more productive, faster-growing pines that they can harvest after 15 years or so whereas for LLP

challenges – lots of folks use watersways for subsistence but there are no laws for that so these families get caught in the middle. The Savannah River Plant pollutants are coming down because of this and the feds just gave the plant more \$\$ so causing more issues for the subsistence fishermen. And why do the studies if we're going to finance harmful activities anyway; one agency worried about toxins, but another funded what created the problem

CRP typically targeted farm acres – how do you get to acres that have not been farmed? The small farms?

1000 lb. elephant is the Estate Tax. Most people who own land are land rich, cash poor. Children would have to sale the land to pay the taxes. Landowners love their land and they are having to sale so the children will not get stuck with taxes. This is another way the land is vanishing away from the conservationist.

Most landowners are not able financially to attend an event like this. Suggestion would be to hold this type of meeting on a on Saturday. This would reach landowners more than through the week. If the gov't is really trying to listen to the landowners- then the meetings has failed because the landowners are few in attendance today. Suggestion is to go to the events that the landowners – local landowners, tree farmer meetings attend at night with dinner sponsored by local business and a local educational experience such as local Forester or Clemson Ext. agent provides instructions. Trust is not there since Govt is not meeting with the landowners.

The bottom line is the land owner. When planting longleaf pines the landowner is concerned with the higher costs of planting and decreased profit in the end because the production is less that the loblolly pine. Those that plant long leaf pines will lose money due to less production, higher costs of container seedlings, etc. Land ower needs incentives after 15 years - they can only thin with little profit and they have been patient for 15 yrs. Survival rate on longleaf pines is not as good as the loblolly pine.

growing loblolly, redhead woodpecker loves the long leaf pines. The matured long leaf pines in the nesting ground for the redhead woodpecker. So when there is a presence of the woodpecker, then regulations are in place that say a land owner can't cut the trees because of the endangered species presence. Coordination from the agencies to eliminate this regulation is necessary to encourage the planting of long leaf pines.. This has the appearance of a being a penalty for planting long leaf pines.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

Gullah Sea Island Coalition does have sponsors for meeting providing food & drink. Like today, minority groups/individuals are not usually invited to these type of events. She suggested an Educational campaign to the different cultural of people. The only way to make the Great Outdoors successful is getting the people to see themselves in it.

Challenges – waterways used for subsistence but there are no laws & families get caught in the middle between State/Federal laws. There needs to be a better coordination of regulations.

silos of natural preservation – same goals for all agencies – but they do not communicate with each other. Everyone wants the same thing –sustainable communities, etc. but the difference programs for the agencies are so territorial but the practices are the same/similar and working toward the same results.

Budgets are a major factor with providing education to meet conservation goals, recreation and reconnecting people to the outdoors for the Extension Service. Hire more Forestry Experts. More funding for Forestry Commission across the southeast to put in prescribed burning teams to facilitate burning under proper conditions

Establishing a new stand of longleaf pines requires seeding, fertilizers, etc. People need more grants to cover establishment costs. Landowners need more updated growth and yield tables so they can make sound investment decisions regarding longleaf forestry

Keeping the minority landowners on the land. Convincing people that working with others is important. People do not trust the federal government

prescribed Burning education for the public. Federal recognition that prescribed burning in conjunction with forest management is needed to provide endangered species habitat, propagate plant species native to the lands, prevent wildfires using burning, prevent non-native species from encroaching, and improve sustainable wildlife habitat. Stop mandatory hoops to jump through to receive federal funding. Forest management plans are worthless because landowners do not understand the information. Keep programs simple. Add more funding for long leaf reforestation after clear-cutting. Implement a mid rotation pine release program for offsite hardwoods and non-native invasive species. Promote burning in all southern states through cost share programs. Campaign nationally that prescribed fire is good. Federal agencies are not utilizing prescribe burning practice because there is a liability issue.

Take the opportunity to allow people to fall in love with local parks to appreciate the outdoors through government education programs

Key to good management is working to educate landowners and add more incentives for reforestation costs

working w/ military to establish buffers. Landowners waiting to see if federal incentives going to come through. Back log funds in jeopardy. Get people outside. GET KIDS OUTSIDE. The kids ARE THE FUTURE.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

Chas Audobon – educating children. Charleston Co Parks system – educating adults/children, getting them outside. But it's not enough. More children outside. Protect what we have in the future.

Less recess time for kids at school – emphasis on testing insane. Making grass roots effort.

Pushing child left behind has led to no child left outside. Kids LEARN while outside

Teach mom and dad, too. Going to the woods, where you learn what is important. Kids don't know about hunting culture and natural resources. Summer camp program in national forests, national parks.

Private timber lands used to be owned by timber companies, they leased hunting rights. Tax credit to a timber co for allowing recreational hunting would be a good program.

youth events. Depends on USFS, USFWS. Costs involved with events – grants such as more kids in the woods. Keep competing for that grant \$\$\$ for MKIW.

Promote technology that is attractive to youth (IPOD apps)

simple land ownership. Connecting the dots between ownership, public education/knowledge. Hunger for knowledge. Lots of information out there. No matter how large or small your ownership, small landowners do not know where to go get information. There is disconnect – folks within the conservation community disagree – about hunting, for example. Even residential landowners need to think of their backyard as “landowners”.

OHV groups. Motorized access to the woods for hunters/anglers. There are places appropriate for motorized recreation. SCORE. Unmanaged trails – claims (incorrectly) that there are less than 100 miles of motorized trails in SC (there are over 200 miles on USFS alone).

Use of fire – how do we burn 8mm acres every 2-4 years. Air quality issues/regulation in conflict with need for prescribed fire. 800k acres in NC of fire dependent ecosystems that need to be burned every 2-4 years. Not getting it.

Liability issues – are a huge concern for private landowners. FIREWISE. Working w/ communities in WUI. Hunting/public access. LONG TERM FAMILY /ESTATE PLANNING – community planning. How to manage towns and communities. DOD – how to get public access to military installations.

Leadership through policy and vision. Need to protect private/public properties so public can still have access.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

Need to reach out to young leadership of color. The generation coming behind us needs to be recognized. Demographics and changing population.

TRUST – the larger the organization the less people trust it. Work from the bottom up.

BUDGET - this is a critical issue. We are telling the public that federal land conservation programs are not important. Reconnecting people to the land – leads to political will.

Estate tax – window this year, this is a huge issue. Working farm being forced to sell their land upon their death because of estate tax. Can get a huge conservation bang. Extension of favorable tax incentives – make it permanent, not 2 years at a time.

Budgetary. Cost for maintenance of Ft Sumter, etc. is huge, in this coastal environment because of heat/humidity. NPS needs to receive enough funding for backlog maintenance. Increase diversity in workforce. Education – public schools, let kids learn their local history.

preservation of hunting heritage. Adults may not have ability to take kids out to hunt, experience public lands. Can't infringe on adults rights to hunt.

Walkable bike-able communities – LWCF. Bicycle commuting needs to be emphasized. Bike lanes. Bike friendly communities.

while in Chicago saw urban sprawl overtaking the land; doesn't want to see such changes happen; has concerns over development pressure

effect estate tax has on fragmenting and management of conservation lands

expressed concern over water quality; need everybody working together to maintain/enhance keep water quality

need to start early in order to reach kids and make them ambassadors of interest in the great outdoors; following initial dialogue need to work at building relationships and trust; made reference to the declining number of hunters and evolving recreational interest

mentioned that it was difficult to validate changes in participation in different pursuits or recreational activities with no registration or licenses to track

when developing and implementing the plan(s) need to get in touch with the right people

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

inclusiveness of everyone, especially those you wouldn't normally think of, especially in urban communities; when you exclude partners, you really undermine your efforts; building relationships is important; some kids in Jacksonville may never have seen the ocean; need for parental encouragement, children's interest, opportunity, available resources, and access to come together and everyone might be more inclined to get involved in the outdoors; we need to provide resources, for example, a free day on the bus/metro system to get people out to the woods or the beach; or find out who in the neighborhood can take others to the outdoors; made reference to restrictions related to land ownership affecting national trail connectivity because of individual parcels of land being owned by different agencies

importance of getting people out to experience "real" versus "manufactured" nature

open access to private lands especially in the Southeast is not commonplace; number 1 reason why people no longer hunt and fish is loss of access; need to fight the negative perception of visiting public land during hunting season being unsafe; all related organizations need to talk about this

Legal issues with federal acquisitions/easements and grants compromises county donations (USFWS) in Charleston County

number one obstacle is transportation, linking people with interest to available places open for access

needs increased consistency with how federal agencies deal with partnerships; policies don't change and partnerships affected as individuals change (as an example changing priorities associated with change in National Forest Supervisor); inconsistencies between agencies regarding federal funding/matching requirements

outreach to kids is great but don't forget the parents; need to educate parents as well; if parents not interested it will be difficult to recruit kids

hands on events initially get kids and others involved; but once exposed it is important that follow up activities take place to retain interest; access to such opportunities may be lacking; how are they going to recreate, reconnect with nature and cultivate that interest if there is no place locally available for them to do so; access, both public (Making Public Lands Public) and private (Voluntary Public Access) initiatives need to be encouraged and expanded to enhance ongoing outreach and incentives, especially to private landowners, to make more lands accessible; spoke to each affiliation must first support the mission of their own organization, but that there are many commonalities that we can all work together on, making reference to longleaf pine restoration and the newly signed agreement between USDA, USDI, and DOD; expressed concern over the continued loss of rural lands to development

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

mutual interest among federal agencies has got to be there for partnerships to succeed; you can't start from scratch with an incentive, the interest must already be there, incentives just make it easier to pursue the interest; federal and non-federal partners in the ACE Basin are all "landowners"; and some landowners won't deal with federal funds because they are too much of a hassle

Done research on landowner; most won't make money on the land but still have a connection to it; Nat'l survey on recreation and environment showing people's use of/connection to the land has been going on since the 1960's but in jeopardy because of fundin

Pollution is a challenge; hard to encourage use when air and waters are polluted; aging sewer systems, storm water runoff, sedimentation issues; mercury contamination of waterway. EPA enforcement of 208 plans

Aging stands of longleaf attract RCW's – endangered species issues; environmental laws need to be incentive based, not penalty based; Safe Harbor a good thing for RCW but Estate Taxes another deterrent; Need to have better environmental education so that

Permanent conservation easement a road block – something more short term (20-30 years?) more appealing?

Used to be that you got perpetual tax benefits for gift of 30 years conservation easement – but no more. When the gov't took that away, they deterred a lot of people.

Paperwork that accompanies some of the Fed. programs is a deterrent; landowners are basically afraid of making errors for fear of what gov't might do.

Money given to counties by the Fed. gov't to help with infrastructure placement – no one living there but have added infrastructure – now the development follows – not most efficient use of funds. When you continue to give the money to the counties for i

Placement of infrastructure not only encourages sprawl but costs the landowners – not a good way to achieve the goal of protecting 8 million acres of LLP; In some ways, septic systems (when properly installed and maintained) are better than running water

Inconsistency in how programs are interpreted – not only across the nation but within the state

Staff the nature centers, keep open, fill positions and have them work on the educational programs Stay open on weekends Environmental literacy, related to state standards, but it would be better to be required

Healthy markets, capitalism works non-industrial pvt landowners, tax codes need changes, help to owners keep Land prices/hard to keep in forests Conservation Reserve Program works



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Charleston, SC***

***(cont.)***

Stability, what will be in there to provide consistent support, newer programs more complicated  
Will it be there next year and 5 years and beyond Lack of time to build relationships

Long Leaf system, different agencies, classification of long leaf ---no ecological benefit to just planting 600 long leaf trees per acre, need all ecological components—direction he would like to see ecological restoration Value longleaf for economic benefit also, but Need to further define what practices are appropriate for feds to give money so that it is clear and consistent Establish what we are doing Some people have knowhow, but have had failures, If you know soybeans but not long leaf you are the wrong guy to be giving instructions—need training for foresters and others No disturbance, no herbicides, problem to uses farming techniques Education needed

Control pasture grasses, re-establish native cover, burn

Protected a lot, resources to manage that, burning issues around smoke, how to work with neighbors

Low country swamps important also, keep those ecosystems too

Prescribed fire

Forest fragmentation Tracts broken up Ecosystem services—whole suite of things not paid for, can we pay the private landowners Thinnings and pine straw vs Conservation Reserve Program incentives Green belt tax laws (Florida) need knowledge of

Recreation hurt by sprawl, can't get to areas due to the is that is why connection is broken zoning important (as Louise said) Take care of current built environment we have so we can build less

Private lands burning hard to meet demand for svcs to burn enough Liability insurance coverage, max coverage/liability

Worst issue—fire—fire will be essential

Access to land, urban kids an opportunity to get outside! Have a place, and funding to make it happen Grants available

Salaries, ok to fund!!!

Not enough money available,

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

South Carolina forestry commission is too focused on old school forestry programs, and not progressive conservation

Natural Resource Conservation Service—commented that he sees some emphasis on more progressive use of Federal funds We need a Land Stewardship think tank—they determine where the \$ are going to get the goals met, more successful More academic driven distribution of funds

Longleaf understory, native grasses can be used for feed stock or livestock funding gone

Charleston County spending for conservation—public needs to understand the full public benefit! Causes a problem when this conflicts with public access. Can't all be accessible, some areas are sensitive or on private land. Conflict there unless there is understanding, also public benefit on Private lands or off-limits areas make a difficult debate, sophisticated concept

Southeast most is private access not always possible, but cleaner water, air, etc. benefit

Santee corridor—Francis Marion National Forest, Cape Romaine National Wildlife Refuge, Santee---comprehensive plan—ISSUE that Fairmont Plantation (hunting rights not able to be retained—simple problem) could not to be incorporated/retained due to this problem

Where are the properties that allow the public access?? Whatever this initiative spurs, easement location needs to be a part of it. I believe in public lands when they can be afforded and well managed and in the right place. Some of our SC parks have little visitation, and I wonder if that was a good place to put that park. I hope as we move forward that we look closer into where public dollars for public access is going, and is it well thought through? Being able to drive the same road, and they want that place to look the same, that corridor, they want to see the things they have always seen, and that's value, and sentiment, and for example Hilton Head, we watched that change drastically, and if you look at Bluffton, to see what had been done on commercial forest tracts--it was clearcut--and now it's gone, and that's what could happen to Charleston, but easements are a good way to help prevent this. I think Richard Louv's "Last child in the Woods" should be required reading for all educators. There is a major disconnect between urban/rural residents. If you don't see it and live in it, you don't understand the rural vs. urban. Someone in the breakout group asked him if there were other ways, other than easements, to protect private land. He answered that there were other options, like for a landowner to allow for public access, on an easement, or one week of the year, open their property for use by school kids. It isn't incentivized, but it is the right thing to do that. He concluded that an easement was the best option.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

Outdoor recreation is important to him-I grew up outdoors, spent lots of time outside. What lands you can and cannot go to? You have to go to 20 different resources/places to figure out where you can go, and we need a central place to go to get this info. What do you do when you get there? Maps-some are up to date, some are very old, and common person/middle class dad isn't going to know where to go/what to do, and we need to have a better info. system. How the average person, who doesn't have much outdoor experience, can get more experience outdoors It doesn't have a to be PRT, but also other groups. Letting public know what they can access. That's when they will become an outdoor advocate...when they can become involved

MONEY-it's our challenge. The county is doing well. And the half cent sales tax has been functioning, despite the state economy, it's had a huge effect on Conservation Bank. Easement purchase-landowner gives up some, we pay some. When you don't have that funding source, lots of protection is stalled. And without that, it's stopping the progress. We have a great plan going on in Charleston, but with more money, and multiple funding sources, it could build momentum, and incentivizing landowners, and giving tax advantages, it really impacts the landowners and motivates them

We don't have enough money. Politics. Challenge to deal with politics, and strike balance. Elected officials listen to constituents and listen to needs, and we have to sometimes defend why projects were successful. The Nature Conservancy has used sales tax funds to purchase properties, but there is so much bureaucracy at the federal level, so if we can realize that we all have same purpose and try and work together we can get further and accomplish more

Money. River pollution. Not enough incentive for smaller landowners to protect riverside with corridors/buffers, which protect from stormwater runoff. In Columbia., we have rivers that experience over 150,000 user days per year, but we have small utilities that pollute the water and they are not even required to report to public that they contaminate water, so there needs to be more money, a mechanism to address these things, but the bottom line is that we need clean water to recreate in and drink and without a doubt, the highest environmental concern nationwide is clean water, so we need to really think creatively on how to address this

Boats that use water for recreation. We have access points--Broad River, and public lands. Sumter National Forest, Chattooga headwaters, and there is a debate about allowing landowners to go in and kayak on upper regions on Chattooga. Not a lot of boaters go in there, but everyone is entitled. Greenways, in towns, in Columbia. We have a good greenway, but there is a 10-mile stretch that is privately owned that is a barrier to continuing this greenway b/c 4 or 5 people, private landowners, are stopping this. Uneducated people who don't follow laws, they ruin a good time for others, and we don't have enough money for law enforcement

Money. We try to be creative and partner w/ outside groups, and this is the only way we can deliver statewide programs

## Discussion Question 2

***Charleston, SC***

***(cont.)***

Conservation easement concept is great, and we need to go with this. Over ½ of our easements are donated, so I don't think funding is major obstacle, rather inconsistent and short lived tax strategies is the issue. We haven't done any easements b/c we cannot tell them what the tax implications are yet b/c the tax law is not written, and it will be at least September until it's done, which leaves us just three months to complete a years worth of work. This is inconsistent and we cannot keep up with USDA rules and regulations. Tax issues are at national level/federal/estate tax

Capacity is an issue. The way federal money gets filtered down is driven by programs. OMB is saying that's not good enough, we need to see what's going on--on the ground, and we need to prove this work, when they say \$ that is coming to your state for accomplishments has to be designated to a specific project, thus you lose capacity. If you don't have folks to provide technical, on the ground assistance, you won't get the project done. I feel like we as natural resource agents tend to hang our hat on the most current solution..here's the silver bullet. I am afraid conservation easements are the silver bullet. While I'm a big advocate—for example, CRP land was a silver bullet years ago, and now there are others, my fear is that cons. easements are great for a limited portion of the population, and we must create more tools in our box to reach out to other landowners who can't utilize them. We need a multitude of tools to make the reconnect happen.

Consistency would help. It makes it hard to plan. Must consider tax ramifications. If it isn't there consistent you are up in the air

Money is always a problem. We have done all planning and we have built ideas, and on conservation easement side, we have done special area management plans, and we have pulled groups together to get done stuff without money, but you have to have some money. Don't need a lot of money...we can take dimes and turn them into dollars. Conservation easements are a great tool. Property is protected/plans are in place, but there is money in Berkeley County that is needed b/c some of our landowners can't rely on a tax-write-off to donate property. Their property is a real investment. We have landowners with conservation ethics, and they want to do the right thing, but we need money too

The challenge is consistency on part of gov't/. They don't have education to be able to develop a vision. The elected gov't officials want to be leaders, but they don't develop a vision, b/c they have particular expertise, and they drive that, and forget overall good for the community, and that's a problem. They have a vision, and they don't prioritize, they don't get funding

I spend lots of time explaining the tax code to landowners and I get the same basic questions, b/c it's so complex, that people cannot grasp it, and it takes so long. The biggest challenge is funding. To keep our jobs. If you look at educating public, we meet with young people and put them outdoors, and we educate landowners and the agencies that are doing this are getting hammered with budget cuts and loss of staff. People are retiring and this experience is leaving, and the landowners rely on this experience, and the lack of people is hard. We can't educate without the expertise

## Discussion Question 2

### *Charleston, SC*

*(cont.)*

We need to be more flexible w/ funding sources. No two states are alike or forest stands. Need to

Our landowners want to do the right thing, but we have made it so hard for them to do it. We have made it so hard they are doing the wrong thing and they don't know it

If we could get the agencies (we can handle private sector) to look at the conservation programs they have, regardless of agencies, as an equal system approach, that would be key. Each agency has its own single program and approach and they need to come together and interplay and the opportunities will be there. The folks that control the game need to get together and make it happen. Equal system plan. Try and get a handle on what's out there. We need coordination at the top

Recognition of our successes. It doesn't cost anything. We have Earth Day, and we talk about why we are where we are and what we need to do, but we are not celebrating or recognizing our successes. Talk about our nat. resources. What we have. Let folks know. We talk to ourselves too much—not our audience—Joe Public. Folks everywhere—New York City, and rural areas. Everyone needs to hear our message

Federal hydro-power dams - comprehensive plans are not in place. This has negative impact on recreation and species. We are still operating under 1940s understanding.

Need to fix certification

Need cost share to level the economic table for longleaf.

Closing Comments: Listening Session was valuable. It shouldn't be conservation vs. industry. Great that all agencies are working together. We have the tools we must work cooperatively. Fix capital gains tax.

Mandating that the LL forest be thinned by a certain year (negative impacts on pine straw \$).

Forest fragmentation, large industrial landowners that have sold huge acreages.

US tax code penalizes NIPL's

## Discussion Question 2

***Charleston, SC***

***(cont.)***

Clean air, water, wildlife habitat and recreation - all public benefits from forests that the public doesn't pay for. Ecosystem services should not be free. US citizens want to enjoy the benefit of forests, they need to pay for those benefits (National park system has admission fees, USFS has user fees, US taxpayers pay to run NF's and NP's...then they pay to enter and enjoy them. NIPL has only taxes...all he does is pay.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

The National Trails System is 42 years in the making, yet only one of the current National Scenic and Historic Trails is complete (the Appalachian Trail).

Altogether, 9,700 miles of the National Scenic Trails are currently open for use. But their total authorized length is 16,400 miles. That leaves some 6,500 miles of gaps in our National Scenic Trails to be filled mostly on private land that will need to be purchased from willing sellers.

For 16 of the 19 National Historic Trails, about 1,000 key natural and cultural resource sites still need to be preserved, according to the National Trails System FY09 Annual Report.

Without adequate agency operations, LWCF, and Historic Preservation funding, the necessary efforts of Federal agency and non-profit partners to complete the Trails land acquisition, trail construction, and trail interpretation will not be possible.

I am the plaintiff pro se in litigation against the U.S. Department of the Interior in which I seek to invalidate the March 2007 final rule promulgated by the Bush Administration removing Endangered Species Act (ESA) protection for grizzly bears in GYA. The litigation was commenced in August 2007 and is pending in the federal district court in Boise, Idaho. There are two other cases involving the same goal that I will mention in a moment.

In my opinion the Bush Administration was the worst in U.S. History from the environmental standpoint. All key positions in the most important agencies, the Interior and Agriculture Departments and the EPA, were occupied by anti-environment ideologues who sought to reverse environmental regulations and policies that had been painstakingly developed over many years. The ESA was a particular target for the Bush Administration. The father of modern environmentalism, Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican, would have been heartbroken by the actions of the Bush Administration.

The Interior Department in the Bush Administration sunk to a new low for government agencies from the standpoints of integrity, morale and faithful accomplishment of its statutory mission. Interior's Inspector General issued scathing reports with regard to Interior's derelictions of duty.

In this context I voted in 2008 for President Obama with the highest expectations that an Obama Administration, under his leadership, would mark a new beginning for the environment. I was euphoric when President Obama was elected.

It is difficult to find words to express the level of my disappointment when President Obama's performance in the environmental area to the present date. The disappointment began with President Obama's appointment of Ken Salazar of Colorado as the Secretary of the Interior, succeeding Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho, who succeeded Gale Norton of Colorado, a protege of an earlier infamous Secretary, James Watt of Colorado. Secretary Salazar's ranching background in the West virtually assured that the days ahead would be difficult for wildlife, and the certainly has proved to be the case.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

Grizzly Bears. At one time there were at least 50,000, and probably as many as 100,000, grizzly bears in the western United States. When they were given ESA protection in 1975, only about 1,000 remained as a result of human-caused mortalities; about 300 were located in the GYA (Idaho, Montana, Wyoming). In March 2007 the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), an agency of the Interior Department, removed ESA protection for grizzly bears in the GYA. At the time of delisting there were only about 500 bears in the GYA, an increase of only about 200 during over 30 years of ESA protection. There were only about 1,200 of the bears in the western United States; almost all of the bears not in the GYA were in the Glacier National Park area in Montana. Three lawsuits are pending against Interior and FWS to invalidate FWS's delisting of the bears. Two, including one in which I am the plaintiff, are pending in federal district court in Idaho. The third was filed in a federal district court in Montana, and in September 2009 the Montana court issued a decision in which it invalidated the delisting and restored the bears' pre-delisting protections under the ESA.

President Obama's Interior Department, rather than accept the decision of the Montana court, has appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco. In other words, Interior continues in litigation to preserve the Bush Administration's removal of protection under the ESA for the relatively few grizzly bears that remain in the GYA.

Wolves. Many good and dedicated people worked incredibly hard to reintroduce wolves in Idaho, Montana and Wyoming after they had been eradicated by human-caused mortalities, but the slaughter resumed in Idaho and Montana due to the Obama Administration's removal of the wolves ESA protection in April 2009. A federal district court in Montana (the same court that issued the decision for the grizzly bears) issued a decision on August 15, 2010, restoring the wolves' ESA protection.

The Obama Administration, instead of conceding the issue, has stated that it is considering whether to appeal that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In light of the Obama Administration's appeal of the same Montana court's decision with regard to grizzly bears to that court, as previously mentioned, it appears likely that the decision will be to pursue an appeal in the wolves case.

Polar Bears. In May 2009 FWS issued a News Release stating that a special rule issued in December 2008 for protecting polar bears under the ESA would be retained and that FWS would closely monitor implementation of the rule to determine if additional measures are required to conserve and recover the polar bear and its habitat. Polar bears are listed as threatened, not endangered, under the current rule. The rule also states that incidental take of polar bears resulting from activities outside the bears' range, such as emission of greenhouse gases, are not prohibited under the ESA. The rule has been properly criticized by many persons on the ground that it does not sufficiently protect polar bears.



## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Loaded, Concealed Weapons in National Parks. President Obama signed a law in May 2009, originally introduced during the Bush Administration, with the backing of the National Rifle Association, that allows loaded, concealed weapons to be carried in our national parks if permitted by state law (as is the case for three states within the GYA). That law surely will lead, among other adverse consequences, to the deaths, through poaching and otherwise, of wildlife in our national parks. We already know of the shooting death of a grizzly bear in Denali National Park in Alaska in May 2010 as a result of this new carry law.

Those of us who care very much about the environment and who were euphoric about the Obama Administration's replacement of the Bush Administration have been let down by President Obama. Today we feel that President Obama's campaign slogan, at least in the environmental area, should have been no, we won't instead of yes, we can. President Obama's Interior and Agriculture Departments appear to be no different from the standpoint of wildlife than those departments under President Bush.

Returning to your original question for this hearing - How can the federal government be a more effective partner in helping to achieve conservation....? - the answer is that President Obama must take charge of his environmental policy. He must make clear that the goal without exception, consistent with his yes, we can campaign rhetoric, is to preserve and protect the environment, including wildlife, public lands, water and air. He must ask any and all officials in the Interior and Agriculture Departments and EPA who do not understand, or want to implement, that mandate to depart immediately and replace them with more enlightened officials.

Poor public image. The public must have confidence that parks are safe, well-maintained, and readily accessible.

Increase the opportunities to connect Americans especially our children to the Great Outdoors

One barrier is that volunteers who want to work with youth have to be finger printed and background checked prior to volunteer which can be pricey

There are barriers for adults who want to work with young people: the costs of getting fingerprinted & then having a background check maybe the federal government could subsidize this in some way?

When I work with young people, I have to get fingerprinted and give \$65 per person to get background check at local police department. This is a barrier for volunteers. It creates a hurdle to volunteer. Most programs don't pay for this and it falls on

As child I would just take off all day and only go home at night. Now as a parent, I need to know where my kids are at all time. I don't know if real or perceived but greater fear about leaving your child alone. Now my kids are more programmed. I drop

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Recommendations are that everything starts at home & parents need to encourage kids; need to focus on security & safety be conscious of where going; this is also a community issue the community needs to think about youth & needs to make a change; during

Youth don't understand what is going on outside, going bike riding.

In Chicago Public Schools system is physical education still a requirement? Response is in theory yes, but in reality no. This time can be a study hall; physical education be a requirement in all public schools K-12; we are having to make up for it befo

In sessions yesterday and today & defining what it means to be in the great outdoors for some means riding a motorcycle or ATV, or firearms use; need to define it as how people actually use it; it's not cardiovascular exercise, but it is a way of enjoying

One suggestion: Make it not so hard to hire people!

Perceived as "nerds" if they were interested in outdoor activities.

Way we talk about it prevents people from coming out talk in way that sounds exciting

We need help in how do you define outdoors? forests & lakes? Or just being outside your door

Heard a lot of innovative things being done by park districts in Illinois and Chicago. They have been able to do these things because they have funding. Many other states they are cutting services, One of the first to be cut is parks and recreation. S

His recommendation is that if students can't go to programs, provide funding to make programs go to students; go to schools and be in the auditorium or gym to show what's outside like forests & plants

Land managing agency professional staff are natural resource or history specialty professionals; they are not trained to do youth programs; need person on other side of partnership, language, time and volunteers available on weekends need different level

Most land managing agencies have professional staff with degrees in conservation or law enforcement or history or biology. They are not trained to work with kids. If the volunteer cannot work with the people, you have created a huge invisible barrier to

Most of the land managing agencies are in a profession of natural resources, law enforcement, etc. Not trained to work with youth- If you don't have the person on the other side of the partnership who can work with the people you've created a huge invis

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Older individuals were taken to parks and outdoors- challenge to getting youth involved is getting their parents involved to take them outdoors and engage them in outdoor activities

The adults I know were taken to national parks when we were kids. Now the challenge to getting kids outdoors is to get their parents to take them out. So must appeal to the adults to take the children out. Appeal must go out to families.

I think we are demonizing youth in the language we are saying- society is built on children being in front of a screen- well who puts them there? Parents. So I think we need to listen to what we are saying, we have to be careful that we find ways to mes

It is a challenge to define what youth is and how we talk to segmented demographic. Is a 16 or 17 year old a youth? Sometimes youth incorporates up to 30 year olds. How do we send the proper messaging to different segments of "youth"? Biggest distinct

Struggling defining what youth is...very segmented demographic. Youth Summit in NY went up to 30 years old. Inability to define what a "Youth" is has made it a challenge in how to communicate goals. Biggest barrier- making decisions as an adult or as a m

We demonize youth when we say kids today spend 6 hours a day in front of a screen and now we are saying get outdoors. When I try to get my teens outdoors they are upset that their iPhones are going to be taken away from them. Should we try to mesh techn

What is youth? youth can be a very segmented demographic; are 17 y.o.s kids?; a NYC Outdoor Nation youth summit included persons up to 30 y.o.; many people there resented being called youth as they'd been living on their own 6+ yrs, etc.; in other words t

There needs to be a sea change in how to sell youth on the outdoors; right now the language being used is demonizing youth; in all the talk about kids today, speakers have highlighted that kids spend 6-8 hrs with TV; but parents/adults put them in front o

In talking with coworkers at Arboretum learned that field trips are opportunities for kids to experience nature; often what holds many back is that programs don't have enough money for a bus to bring kids; suggests providing federal funds to schools/prog

We have a lot of field trip opportunities to have kids experience nature. The things that hold schools and kids back is that they do not have money to pay for a bus to bring kids out. There might be Federal funds to schools to pay for transportation cos

Some kids stay in cause it is dangerous outside

In meeting with an urban group learned importance of understanding sounds of country before going on other experiences; sounds of silence, owls, etc were unfamiliar and scary; consider getting youth ready & familiar to hear sounds, not just educating with

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

We were talking to kids they told us they did not feel comfortable with the sounds. The silence, the hoot owls, were unfamiliar to them and they were terrified. So to get them ready, they need opportunities to get familiar with sounds.

Crime and Violence- not just automobile accidents. Needs to be addressed in communities

Safety- she does not feel safe cycling

Safety. She doesn't feel safe biking in Chicago on the streets; you can't without having practiced doing that a lot. If you haven't been brought up that way, you never feel comfortable doing something like that.

Obstacles and challenges are kids are not excited; need to get youth excited & make it appealing; talking about going on nature walk is not fun, instead focus on experiences great hikers have had, tell stories; show that while appreciating nature you can

Meet with a group of urban youth and they expressed they did not understand the sounds of the county- the hoot owls, etc sounds were terrifying to them. Part of getting them ready was getting youth familiar with the sounds not just the words.

Certain types of activities do not fit in with the Urban culture- need to break that thought that certain people do certain things. Should start with schools, get parents involved by talking about all different types of activities and the kinds of people

Among ethnic groups and urban areas, there is a belief that certain kinds of activities don't fit into their culture. Other people do that. They think: "We don't rock climb. We don't ski." We need to change thought. Needs to start with schools in ver

It is challenging to engage students, esp. urban, students. There is a tendency to use a language that is very elitist when talking about outdoors. This language does not have traction. It makes this "other place" seem so very far away. Language is cr

No longer a time when can give 10 kids to park ranger for a day program. The law does not allow it. Also, he is not a youth development specialist. Many conservationist are not educated in youth development.

There is also a challenge with managing risk. When work with minors have larger insurance costs. Transportation also presents insurance challenges. If I transport minors to programs or I take them out in kayaks, etc. , my general liability cost is huge

Leave No Child Inside program successful; have Outdoor Bill of Rights; did an event with parents & kids around this Outdoor Bill of Rights did stations based on Bill of Rights; showed parents they can go to city park and not have to go far; also suggests

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Make sure there is accessibility to outdoors; the outdoors is not accessible for many; some can walk near the forest preserve, or it might take 3 CTA buses; suggest more buses that to straight there or even PACE buses; Chicago crime rate is high; need it

Violence- it is safer to stay home

Accessibility: getting parks closer to home and making them more accessible In Chicago, the outdoors aren't very access able to a lot of people. To take 3 City busses and a train takes a lot of effort. If there could be stops for outdoor

Gang violence. Is easier to stay indoors and watch TV than going outdoors and risking being shot because wearing the wrong colors. Need to take the extra step and fix gang violence so kids can feel safe walking 3 blocks outdoors

Accessibility to outdoors. For many people in Chicago, the outdoors is not accessible. If you live next to the forest preserve, fine, but some of us have to take 3 buses to get to the forest preserve. Take public transportation is very hard. Open more

How can we use the technology to provide rewards or opportunities?

In my neighborhood. Programs for little kids, not teenagers my age. Just anything to do that gets me out of the house that is fun, not boring like chess. Interacting with other kids, animals, gardening.

There is a lack of actual programming; outreach & offer them something give pay or show something they get at the end; be in 1- 1 contact & in their face & show what they can gain; Young Life was a great organization working with Chicago school systems t

Lack of programming in Chicago. Need to reach out and get them involved, be it pay or an incentive to show them what you can gain. One on One Contact is a great organization- got kids to get outside and do homework and the kids would earn points to do o

Safety problem, not save n neighborhood; not a place to go. Parks are not cooperative, gyms are not open. Need a safe place to go

A park manager is not a youth development specialist; there is a void between park managers and youth development specialists park managers have a lack of skills to do group activities; youth development specialists are often young people themselves; con

Are so climate controlled, that kids don't know how to be comfortable outdoors. Prevents people from going out when it is hot, cold, buggy. Kids are just kind of wimpy to these things because they are so climate controlled

Climate controlled culture- people are uncomfortable in warm, cool, or wet weather

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Barriers can be not having a safe, clean environment; might not be able to travel to downtown to enjoy a cleaner environment, or barriers because of asthma; recommend helping to bond with outdoors have competition and tournaments; do Wii tournaments on b

Adults also spend a lot of time in front of computers too. Not just kids

Education and awareness. Not a lot of kids in her community know where to go. Places that are safe, not easy to get there. Safe travel is not there to get to safeplaces. Can not afford transportation to get to safe parks. Can't go to local parks beca

If we don't define the great outdoors we allow for some outdoor use and but say other outdoor activities are not good- Cultural difference in how we look at these things

Kids are constantly terrified of trails, snakes, bugs. Have never been outdoors long enough to know they wont be attacked by coyotes. Kid cried when she picked up a toad and showed it to him- kids spend soo much time inside, instant gratification from i

Not out there that it is safe to go to forest preserve and be outdoors and have fun.. Young kids are not going outdoors to have nature walks, go there for family outings

Tendency to use a language about the outdoors that does not have traction with urban young people and does not connect to their environment within their community. Transportation is a huge liability when working with urban youth- especially if you want t

The way adults talk about it- does not encourage kids to get outdoors

A lot of people can't get to programs; why don't we send programs to schools/communities. Bring animals to schools and show kids what they can see if they go outdoors.

Message needs to start at home and get the parents involved. Have parents kick kids off facebook and get outdoors. Safety awareness; community needs to take heed and invest in youth and invest in future. No one will make a change if kids aren't encoura

Have organizations at a local level that can provide opportunities, and access to funds/resources. Transportation is an important issue, getting kids to places. Use media to create funds. Create something global on a marketing scheme to get funds.

Funding is an issue. If we can't get students to programs, bring programs to kids. Send anybody to schools and show students what is outside, in forests- plants, animals.

No child left inside- many schools cannot afford bus costs for field trips

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

They have a lot of field trip opportunities to get kids out to outdoor places like arboretum or national parks, but schools don't have money for transportation. If there could be federal funds to pay for this. For a lot of kids, their only opportunity t

To get kids excited about going outdoors, because now they are not. Until they go out and see/learn things, they aren't going to know how great it can be. Also to have opportunities closer to home.

SCA summer internAccessibility: getting parks closer to home and making them more accessible In Chicago, the outdoors aren't very access able to a lot of people. To take 3 City busses and a train takes a lot of effort. If there could be stops for outdoo

Keeping parks cleaner, keeping a safer environment. Kids don't want to go out because not clean or safe. Kids have asthma and air is bad. Getting WEE tournament outdoors on big-screen.

In Chicago, there is a lack of programs. Need to have programs that offer them something- pay, something they will receive. Need one on one contact, and show them what they will gain. Young Life= great organization working with kids on after school pro

No child left inside act-covers what kids do in schools. Most of the field trips to the arboretum are cancelled because the school can't afford school busses. If the fed gov can provide \$\$ to schools for field trips to outdoor spaces

What is outdoors? Parks or walking outside of the house in the neighborhood and feeling safe

-Nice to have access to playground, outdoor space to stay off the couch, especially in the summertime

National parks, far off places, not accessible

Most youth do not know ecology, need to understand more about it to enjoy wilderness

Lot of outdoor work, sweaty, nasty; arms got big cutting invasive plant species, burns calories by working outside. Feels good to get outdoors, get exercise.

Is also a parent have 2 kids now & need to know where they are at all times; perception of danger is a challenge; kids are very programmed with people all the time because of such concerns; maybe needs more programming to have safe supervision for young

Weight issues, people need to know about active lifestyle and food that provides good energy

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Obesity- friends buys lots of candy and junk food

Obesity why? When younger it was bad for your kids if go outside, video games instead. Rather be playing X-box or Nintendo games than going outside tossing around a football. More interesting to be in front of the TV. Aren't really any places to go is h

Physical education is only a theoretical requirement in public schools. In practice, gym time can also be study hall or other things. The Feds can make physical ed a requirement in all public schools in US, K-12. If it isn't we send the wrong message.

How special exercise is- you have to take time out of your schedule to go to the gym. IF there was a safer environment to incorporate walking into your day ,It would seem like a lot less of a challenge to get in the time to exercise each day.

Language can contain a lot of elitism creates among ethnic groups and especially in urban areas; must address cultural expectations perceptions that we don't rock climb/ski/etc. & that only certain people from certain cultures do certain things; should

Asthma harder to stabilize breathing, people who are littering are not helping to keep environment clean and is a problem

People don't eat, good , fast food restaurants, go there to spend a dollar for a burger and salad is \$5. Parents don't serve carrots or broccoli or if they do serve broccoli it is broccoli and cheese

Noticed that in working with students, especially in urban programs, programs are using elitist language to refer to out of outdoors; youth connect to their environment & this other place seems far away and foreign; risk is also an incredible barrier; he

Her mom walks on the lakefront each day. Once you start wllaking long distances, you have to find a way to get back; can't just jump off the treadmill- you build up endurance. Better way to get exercise is outdoors

Requested to improve physical activity within adults. You can take time during your lunch break to workout but you won't be paid for it- start in the agencies and encourage parents to go outside and show that the government endorses the outdoors during t

Sometimes being the great outdoors means ATV and hunting to kids. Is this how we are defining it? Are we minimalizing their definition of the "great outdoors". By not accepting this definition (hunting and motor sports) are we perpetuating the conflict

We requested to improve physical activity among adults at our Federal agency. They told us that we could take time during lunch break to exercise. We could take a full hour if we were exercising, as opposed to the 1/2 hour normally given for lunch. But

Obesity, kids eating lots of candy; if they knew more about getting out and getting healthy. IF they knew about the forest preserves, they wouldn't be getting unhealthy



## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Ninety percent of a stream is in Cook County forest preserve yet has not been maintained. It is a resource that should be utilized for outdoors recreation for example game fishing. Nature preserve is being over run by coyotes. There may be a sewage issue

Concerned that children are hearing too much scary information about the environment. All should remain developmentally appropriate when engaging children  
David Sobel has done research on what is appropriate. Different levels for 0-3, 7-10, 10-12, 12+.  
We

Need to bring additional federal agencies corporation for community services. It is not a priority on paper to some agencies. We are trying to work with DOL, DOJ. DOI is working well.

Concerned that staff of those agencies are not interested in developi

Reach out to kids via social networking to raise awareness. Popular culture does not provide good role models. Kids are not apathetic, they are ignorant and lack information. There is a loss of story teller generation. Both parents work, even grandma isn'

When she was talking to park service, there is a reticence from staff workers who say "this is not my job, I don't have time for this."

Lake Michigan connections are not always clearly understood (drinking water supply, beach closures)

People don't have time for destination-oriented activity in nature and don't realize there are opportunities in their own backyards

Equity issues arise in urban areas that are devoid of green space so programs need to recognize the need for parks and open space for all residents

How to be effective at landscape scale across a complex, multi-jurisdictional metropolitan are where there are vital natural resources and 10 million residents.

The regional approach to conservation through partnerships and collaboration is still ahead of its time; it is not yet well aligned with how local and national funding organizations conceptualize conservation work and metrics of success, or with their partnership and support guidelines.

Lack of regional planning capacity to coordinate growth patterns across borders with local jurisdictions. In Illinois, the myriad of local government jurisdictions control land use decisions, which do not take into account the regional nature of planning decisions that can protect, water quantity and quality, landscape scale conservation for wildlife, and recreational corridors. (Illinois' fractured planning system has 6000+ local jurisdictions, more than any state in the nation, and four times more than New York.)

## Discussion Question 2

***Chicago, IL***

***(cont.)***

Fragmentation of habitat and landscapes occurs through unplanned growth.

Lack of technical ability to gather regional information into one comprehensive overview of state or regional (greater metro) infrastructure.

Lack of organizational capacity to educate and provide technical expertise to local jurisdictions on green infrastructure

Lack of funding to make landscape-scale linkages: including funding fee simple/easement purchases, buffer lands and linkages, and funding for site-based storm water practices

Lack of strong recreational liability protection in Illinois for landowners who open their land to the public for recreation.

The ability to secure local groups of government to coordinate with each other and follow the recommendation of the regional plan.

Communicating the needs to land managers, integrating the science research, managing planning, and incorporating research results into planning.

lack of technical ability to gather regional information--specifically integrated GIS/geospatial data information.

The prevention and management of invasive species

Barriers to connecting children with nature are diverse, often varying from community to community.

Parents' and caregivers' own feelings of discomfort with outdoor activities.

Lack of access to safe, quality sites for outdoor play, or the lack of resources for transportation to appropriate sites.

On the program delivery side, a common barrier is the established conservation organizations' lack of capacity and knowledge of how to market and structure programs in a manner that resonates with a diverse urban audience.

Also on the program delivery side, organizational inertia and other factors can often work against the ready sharing of "success stories" and useful resources among conservation-minded institutions.

## Discussion Question 2

***Chicago, IL***

***(cont.)***

We are very bad stewards of the night sky. Light pollution is a great big obstacle that happens when people make careless decisions about light choices and practices. Light trespass and sky glow not only block starlight from view, spoiling ambiance, inspiration, recreation and research, but study after study suggest disruption of circadian rhythm. Artificial light at night is harmful to the environment, nature, wildlife, and human health. A bigger obstacle: failure of many organizations to recognize light pollution is a serious issue that affects all conservation issues. We have a problem when people think light polluted skies are normal. An NPS study shows that, by 2025, less than 10% of people will ever see a starry night in their lifetime.

The land in Chicago (77,000 vacant lots plus vacant industrial land) comes with baggage (contamination). We need federal funds to clean up this problem, caused by businesses, carelessness, and it's making people sick.

Lack of connection, fear of the natural world especially in urban areas and lack of stewardship opportunities, especially via schools

There is so much to be accomplished to protect our environment in so little time that everyone needs to work together on it. I think that if we spread our knowledge and told people of the problems, they will want to help too. In my mind, more kids should be targeted because they are the ones growing up with these problems, and they are the ones best able to change the course of the future. If they are targeted for environmental education, then their knowledge gets spread throughout the family. Everyone wants to make a difference and if we all work together that difference will happen.

I think we need to put more money into acquiring parks in urban areas where there are no parks and increase access to nature in backyards in the form of gardens and native restoration by offering education programs and incentives.

We need to provide more public transportation to natural areas and resources such as a map with bus and train routes to natural areas and a list of activities.

We need more youth programs to get people outside and exposed to natural areas at a young age and at a high frequency.

We need help with authorizing local schools to program in and/or develop course guidelines to allow students access to open spaces outdoors at least twice a week. To authorize hands-on activities in elementary school settings via gardening, nature outings, trails and waterways

Finding funding for projects; Army Corps permitting takes too long

How do we get the lion's roar heard and amplified by federal agencies whose charge is to provide services for psychologically and physically damaged veterans, children in need of healthy outdoor experiences, senior citizens who want to make a difference, youth with more time on their hands than money and others who would benefit from CSI programs?

## Discussion Question 2

***Chicago, IL***

***(cont.)***

There are many obstacles that exist between conservation, recreation, and the connection people feel to their environment. Many forget how the people before us worked with the land and used it as a tool. Today, hardly any people think about what can be beneficial for the planet and us as well, I was told that we live as if we had five other earths. Things need to change; I do the best that I can by volunteering my time to help improve our planet's quality of living. Conservation should be used as way to bring together different people to address issues they all face as a community. Communities should come together and form local recreation groups, to help improve and also get outdoors and active.

In the disadvantaged neighborhoods where my Community Greening program works, it's often not safe to be outdoors, especially for children in unstructured situations. We support situations that bring children and adults together outdoors -- community gardens do this.

Lack of grant funding for trails, natural area restoration, and environmental education

Taks more money for (to support) sustainable open space until programs take hold. The spectrum of government programs for green technology is too small.

Highways, both federal and state are often bordered by miles and miles of invasive plants. These plants cause two harms: seeds that invade adjacent public and private lands. Also, these weed patches that look wild cause those that drive by to think that natural areas are unkempt and undesirable.

Funding -- not just monetary but un-used equipment, etc.

Today's topic of concern is the economy.

People need a place to go and relax, unwind, exercise, and find comfort that they can afford

Parks and open spaces are the place to go.

Amusement parks and entertainments are too costly.

Families need a place to spend time together and be active and have healthy exercise.

Families who cannot afford to have two motor vehicles need to find another source of transportation

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Walking and cycling are the way to go.

Transportation to work, schools, libraries and shopping is needed.

A safe place to travel to work, schools, libraries and shopping is needed.

Walkers and cyclers should not be endangered by motorists who are talking on cell phones and texting their friends.

Trails are the way to get there safely.

Trails need to connect neighborhoods to work, schools, libraries, and shops.

Roadways should not be barriers that divide us from our places to work, play, shop, and exercise.

Gaps and connections need to enable residents to access where they want to go using a trail.

Des Plaines River Trail is wonderful but has a lot of gaps.

Interstate I-80 is a barrier to the I & M Canal Corridor, the Old Plank Road Trail and Wauponsi Trail in Joliet. This needs to be corrected when IDOT implements their new plan.

I believe the economy will improve but in the meantime we can become healthier, happier, and more cohesive family group by using walking and cycling to get somewhere. Meet your neighbor and say hi. Don't be afraid. Things will get better if we make changes and improvements in our lifestyle even with less income. Greenways and trails are the way to get there!

Need to better connect our families and children in the city to state parks and national parks. The government needs to tap into this audience -- they are ready and interested. Chicago Park District strength to learn from -- strong role models to connect people to our nature in our parks.

I recently visited Glacier National Park, Grand Teton National Park, Yosemite National Park, and Sequoia National Park after an interval of about 20 years. I was horrified by the commercialization and degradation of all but Sequoia. Allowing private concessions in the parks is a disaster: Disneyfication rather than light foot-print conservation and outdoorsmanship

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

I also recently went on a hiking trip in the UK. Their "freedom to roam" laws allow trails to traverse private lands. This enables walkers to enjoy the countryside, walking from place to place without having to carry a tent, food, water. This is a great way to give access to the outdoors that is not wilderness conservation land. Local, preserve green space as green space: museums, game courts, farmers' gardens, ice rinks etc. are great but should be placed on new lands, not on existing green spaces/parks. These should remain green, not paved over and free to everyone's use.

State and local government budgets are facing incredible constraints. These constraints are severely limiting their investments in conservation and outdoor recreation, which hampers both public and private conservation efforts.

Poor public image. The public must have confidence that parks are safe, well-maintained and readily accessible.

Public awareness, people may see conservation as a middle class luxury

Inability of government agencies to cooperate

Connections, fees maintenance, hours of parks, fear of being sued. Lacking connections, either bike paths, sidewalks, trails for both people and animals (we're cutting off their migratory paths). Fees -- sometimes prohibit use of parks/facilities already in place or deter those newbies. Fees include state parks, recreation trails, boat registration, boat launches. Developers need to set aside good green space.

I work to train secondary biology teachers and teach biology to future elementary school teachers. I see the tremendous need to give outdoor educational experiences to those future teachers. They will touch the lives of many more youth than I, yet they have little knowledge or experience with the outdoors.

I would like to be more informed on where I can apply for funds to create programs that train future teachers and in using nature that is nearby. Like many, I am so busy I find little time to search for grant sources and write grants -- another problem.

The outdoors to many of the students I teach at CSU is their immediate urban outdoor space. They do not have resources to travel -- so creating local educational programs that promote use of urban green space is essential

Today, a big challenge the Forest Preserve District of DuPage County faces is maintaining its efforts to continue to acquire lands adjacent to rivers and streams in order to further protect the region's valuable, irreplaceable waterways and provide additional flood-control features for county residents.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

Another is to establish new greenway links between forest preserves and other open spaces in order to create travel corridors for wildlife, healthy recreational options for county residents and expanses of uninterrupted natural scenery for everyone.

But the Forest Preserve District is also tasked with finding resources and creative ways to develop new recreational and research facilities that can encourage residents of all ages to enjoy the outdoors as they learn about wildlife, habitat restoration and the wise use of natural resources. Of paramount importance is discovering ways to give young people formative educational experiences that will foster the awareness and civic responsibility needed for them to develop into well-rounded, healthy individuals who care about their own well-being and the protection of the natural and cultural resources that make DuPage County a great place to raise a family, work and play.

...A very visible obstacle to conservation in urban Chicago is the failure of the U.S. Department of Housing, Dept of Environment, Dept of Health to include green infrastructure practices in the demolition of (for example) -the largest public housing development in the United States. Between 22nd Street on the north and 51st Street on State Street, high rise buildings were torn down. Many of the sites remain vacant now 10 years later.

Application of best practices for air quality improvement, green jobs, green infrastructure are obviously not on the radar when deconstruction / demolition is done in Chicago. I remember the vast number of death certificates that came into the office I worked in during the demolition of Robert Taylor and Stateway Gardens. Cause of death was asthma. I have wondered if any one has really measured the impact of tearing down those buildings had on the air quality and quality of life, (high shift of homelessness), crime, employment, etc. in the Bronzeville / Grand Boulevard communities (1999-2003).

NOAA Community Restoration Program itself and its various regranting and other non-government organization administered partnerships have been potent factors not only in restoring coastal river system and benefiting diadromous fish passage, but in developing environmental stewards among the many volunteers involved in their programs. The impetus for community-driven, small dam and river barrier removal provided by the Open Rivers Initiative lacks only depth and significant, secure and continued funding.

Indeed, the success of such programs now taxes and is limited by the staffing levels within the administering agency, the Department of Agriculture's National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). Farm Bill money also contributes to--and could contribute much more--to staffing of much needed, broader scope conservation efforts and to capacity building within the conservation community through that agency's Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative.

Abandoned mine clean up is something Trout Unlimited and some other conservation groups would like to undertake on an even broader scale than they now do. Acidic water drainage and heavy metal leaching from hard rock mines kills fish and taints water supplies. Indeed, mine drainage taints 40% of western American streams. However, the liability risks under current federal law are insuperable.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

According to a 2007 Center for Disease Control study, Illinois ranks 10th in the nation for the percentage of children aged 10-17 who are overweight. Illinois ranks 4th behind Mississippi, Georgia and Kentucky in childhood obesity. The cost in dollars alone is astronomical, \$117 billion according to a 2000 study by the U.S. Surgeon General. It is now recognized that the number of people who die prematurely from obesity is greater than the number of people who die from smoking.

The administrative burden required to deal with grants is wasteful. "Administration" is roughly 10% of our effort for private sector work, but makes up 30-40% of our budget for grant-funded projects.

It's not that there is not enough being spent on the environment -- it's how it is being spent. The federal government does not solve these problems -- it adds to and perpetuates them, resulting in less going to what matters.

Enactment of protective designations has been hindered and sometimes stymied by divisive battles among the users of federal land. Many have recognized that, where such controversies rage, local efforts to reach compromise plans are valuable tools to secure more designated protected areas. The effort to end Montana's twenty-seven year hiatus in new Wilderness designations through the Forest Jobs and Recreation Act is a case in point.

US Fish and Wildlife Service National fish Passage Program is a model of collaborative, meaningful conservation targeting a collection of the most significant causes of habitat fragmentation for aquatic species and for those terrestrial species with life history ties to stream corridors. In a region with some 15,000 inventoried stream barriers over six feet in height and uncounted impassible culverts and other smaller barriers, Trout Unlimited members in Illinois are acutely aware of this problem. We are equally aware that many of these wounds will never be addressed with current levels of program funding and current partner match requirements.

Access to private lands has greatly diminished during the last half century as Illinois members of Trout Unlimited are only too aware. This State's stream access law is among the most arcane in the nation, it is behind the majority of other states in promoting incentives to landowners for allowing access, and Illinois lags behind all other states in indemnification of any landowner who might permit general recreational use of his land.

Chicago does not have adequate park space to serve its population. Fifty-five of Chicago's seventy-seven community areas do not have a basic 2 acres of park per 1000 population. The national standard of the National Recreation and Park Association for a healthy community calls for 10 park acres per 1,000 population.

What is making a difference for the biodiversity of the nation? I say people. Take the success of Chicago Wilderness, Kansas City Wilds and Houston Wilderness. These efforts work because of people. As a land manager and a regional planner with Chicago Wilderness, I speak from personal experience that several factors are issues for biodiversity in this region and they are, in no particular order: invasive species, climate change, the need to acquire more large core preserves, research of restoration efforts, and the inclusion of children and inner city residents.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

Lack of perceived large public lands near Chicago (some exceptions are the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie)

Perceived disconnect between city dwellers and "nature lovers"

Public does not make connections between urban biodiversity and national biodiversity (e.g., migratory bird pathway)

Disconnected relationship to urban waterways as a place for nature and recreation because of historic use for sanitation and industry

Public transportation linkages to natural areas may be limiting factor for many

The same challenges exist in obesity today that existed years ago. More funding is needed to establish collaborative, cost-effective, sustainable solutions to eliminate obesity. Stop making people aware of obesity (because they already are) and focus on solutions. Use people who are innovators, problem solvers, etc to solve the problem as opposed to organizations.

Protecting public health through cleaner water. People are constantly using Chicago parks and rec., especially the waterways. Chicago is disagreeing with sanitizing 1.2 billion gallons of water as recommended by EPA.

Questions for audience:

Health Care providers in room?: Minority of room

Who has been told by a physician to go outdoors? Not many at all

Better link health care system in public lands.

Current health care providers are trying to get in and outpatients.

Ideas:

Education as physician – learn how to prescribe these resources

Patient needs information – how to ask questions on what type of outdoor activity they need

Need database to tell where to go? Can patient have access?

Very excited about the huge potential for new public health opportunity with great outdoors initiatives.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Chicago, IL*

*(cont.)*

Building a Healthier Chicago

Nutrition in inner city

Partner with dr Galloway

Consider safety in underprivileged area – day to day safety is #1 priority

Large open areas/buildings to move freely in urban areas

New innovative ideas need to be promoted more to inner cities –

Working with police dept in inner cities

Opportunity to take advantage of the current schools – as well as not used land – build small parks in communities

Utilize current resources.

Critical children develop outdoor recreation at a very early age

Create comfort in toddler years – introduce children to nature

Not just talking to kids – talk to parents

Suburbs abused – economic justice

Project they maintain – soft trail lake – not maintained and been ignored

Issues about watershed

Flashiest stream in all NE Illinois

Provides game fish

Cant provide b/c its being ignored

Nature reserve suffers by being overrun by coyotes - No more beavers

Thorton reservoir – world’s largest toilet bowl – no environmental impact study

Urban kids are scared of outdoors, break down barriers to appreciating outdoors; Concerned that agencies don't trust data gathered from volunteers in the field

Concern hearing from staff not interested not increasing partnerships and volunteers; Need to make it easier with staff to get involved w best practices and volunteerism DOI working well with trying to use STEP program to get jobs, how do we want to make things easier to work w

NPS workers say that partnerships are too difficult to manage. Too cumbersome to utilize. Staff say that fostering and using volunteers and partners is not my job.

Recognized that membership & support of youth in conservation is low, try to get youth interested in conservation, exposure at young age. Developed program for schools called Project Webfoot, teachers interested, failed due to cost & funding. Conservation needs to be a part of school curriculum. Need to become partners with school systems, conservation organizations & state & Fed need to s

Resources, many programs around the country are replicable and it boils down to resources. Feds can provide resources. State, local and community programs and NGOs have good programs, based on science and have the ability to be replicated.

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Why is it that no one talks about global warming? How do we get kids and adults to understand this and change their behaviors? How does the government help us make that leap? It is also the churches, etc. It has to happen at a very visceral level.

As a child I was exposed to the outdoors through public school athletics. Luckily for me, I could run right in my neighborhood. Safety was a major factor for that. We need to address a proximity barrier. Or even the psychological barrier of thinking that

I think the biggest barrier is that we lack a clear vision for what we're talking about. Lack of vision will delay America in getting in shape. I think putting gardens in schools, getting them to connect to nature and getting them moving is critical.

Build trails that are shared-use and sustainable. The tension between conservation and allowing uses. Recreation falls into the category of high use. There is a need for science to look at true impacts of recreation on our natural resources.

We have a swimming pool in the HS but it doesn't work. Do not have a playground, need funding from fed gov for playground, and to fix pool. The students want to use it, but cannot. They have healthy food, team have a peace center for Jews, and prevent th

A barrier is a lack of information. People don't have information about what is out there and what access they have.

People do not know where to go to recreate. People could use the phone to get access to information. There is an opportunity to work with companies to get information from their phones (e.g. I phone apps)

When tracking Health impact on students in environmental programs these records become subject to HIPA. The technical expertise required for this records management is a barrier to environmental professionals. For inner city youth of poverty, there are social and behavioral issues that environmental organizations are not equipped to deal with. SCA has tried to balance the societal and environmental expertise of staff to round out experience for the youth.

There are so many competing interests for adults and youth that prevent them from getting people outdoors. We need to figure out how to raise the profile of outdoor activities.

Barrier is that we cannot get our foot in the door into high schools to create awareness. We are a small organization and people from the city

We have lost the way of counting what is useful (i.e. the greater society invests value in built environment and commerce and things that generate money). Figure out how to invest value in the non-built environment.

Crime is a barrier for children whether it is real or perceived. Most activities had to occur indoors because after a certain time period, it was unsafe for children to be outside.

## Discussion Question 2

**Chicago, IL**

**(cont.)**

Funding needs to come from agencies to support initiatives in the community. The community should decide what we are going to do and then get funded. We have encountered a lot of problems to get kids outdoors because of insurance reasons.

Department of Labor dedicated 20 million to workforce investment dollars to support work on our public lands which is very exciting. The technical issue is that workforce development folks don't know how to manage workforce investment act money and it is beyond many organizations.

We need to instill in kids how to go out and discover. How do we light this fire in the kids, Education. Schools are geared to reading, writing, and arithmetic and there is nothing about exploring and discovering, fix this.

Federal government could be more effective if there were more collaboration between the federal agencies that are not normal allies. For example, you should link education and health and human services and national park services to get kids moving and doing environmental activities. The lets move initiative is a good example of how these things can be carried out.

Awareness of parks recreation opportunity

Need info on how to get to these places, e.g. Indiana dunes nat. lakeshore, need car/transport to get

Transportation issues. Silos of fed agencies are an impediment. HUD DOT need to be involved.

Got kids w diabetes in the parks via partnership w Kaiser, 2nd year couldn't get enough kids. Need better communication with health care providers.

Shrinking amt of natural areas, casinos, etc. infringe on natural areas. Road access diminishes the very place you want access to.

Barriers with language

Work in chgo, land not available in communities so kids can walk there safely.

Fed money went to Cook County, but not yet distributed to the local groups. Make the county accountable in how they use the money, make sure it gets to the community/ local groups.

We are competing against electronic games. Need to give a thrill outside. Maybe motorized recreation. Sailing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Chicago, IL***

***(cont.)***

Clemson Beaver Pond overrun by coyotes and beaver population; Sawk Trail Lake & dam abandoned by Cook County Forest Preserve for past 50 years, filled with silt and not in compliance with Clean Water Act; Thorton Transitional Composit Reservoir- lacking environmental impact study and will destroy groundwater resources

We work on issues that affect our communities, families, and schools in Chicago. Listening to you today, as an organizer, we walk door to door talking to people on issues, we need to have this information in our communities. We understand and know that in order for anything, no matter what it is, you must go to the source first to find out what they need in order to correct any problems no matter what the problem is. Whether safety, health, education, or family issues. Every step we take is a step toward a better future.

We know that physical activity is an important factor in healthy children and adults. Studies have shown where there are neighborhood parks and trails in close proximity, residents increase their frequency of exercise. Conversely, the same studies show that where there are no parks, residents often go without exercise. In dense urban environments, particularly in low income neighborhoods, parks, playgrounds, greenways and trails are often the only spaces for children and adults to engage in play and fitness activities. In these low-income communities, people do not have access to nor can afford health club memberships.

Chicago does not have adequate park space to serve its population. Fifty-five of Chicago's seventy-seven community areas do not have a basic 2 acres of parks per 1000 population. The national standard of the National Recreation and Parks Association for a healthy community calls for 10 park acres per 1,000 population. According to a 2007 Center for Disease Control study, Illinois ranks 10th in the nation for the percentage of children aged 10-17 who are overweight. Illinois ranks 4th behind Mississippi, Georgia and Kentucky in childhood obesity.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

Requirements for Rural Enterprise Zone are too restrictive. USDA needs to make this designation more attainable for small, rural communities.

Wood pellet boilers are growing in popularity. I have just installed a large wood pellet boiler in my small business. What will happen to the forest when the economic incentives to cut often and early to meet the demand for biomass? Will biomass efforts actually adversely affect forest sustainability? How do we make sure that biomass production is sustainable?

Furniture industry has vacated low and middle market. Foreign low end design and marketing has been very effective at lowering costs such that our industry can't compete.

Ad valorem property tax has been terrible discouraging for forest owners. The World Bank conducted a study on the ad valorem tax and set up 12 (?) guidelines for an effective tax. Vermont violates 6 or 7 of the 12 guidelines.

I have been with this organization for 30 years and our goal for 30 years has been to enhance the value added capacity of the wood products industry. We are not effectively realizing our value added. We are shipping raw materials to Canada and elsewhere - we are acting like a third world country by exporting our precious resources. This is a lost opportunity.

Regarding energy. NH has a good system of independent power producers. We are aware of the inefficiencies of producing energy from wood chips. We are trying to encourage smaller scale heat only systems. Obstacles are that there are not economic incentives for thermal projects as there are for electrical projects.

Wood product manufacturers will locate in communities that are economically viable. Traditional financing for forestry and agriculture is not currently available. Wood product manufacturing is an "orphan child" for economic development efforts. USDA needs to increase emphasis on Forestry and Agriculture industries to help provide support (financing opportunities) for these businesses to grow.

Four states and political boundaries pose challenges for long term management of forests. Our council has to sometimes make four separate applications for one project - one for each state. USDA needs to standardize forms and regulations so that we can manage across boundaries.

Innovation and multi-jurisdictional approach will have best long term effects. We need to look at all Forest resources, including recreation, is essential. Engage the private sector in developing public policy. We need to accelerate our positive efforts - we don't have time to wait.

Green Building. USDA needs to draw a hard line - BUY AMERICAN WOOD.

Recently received a USFS grant to build on our agriculture "buy local" program. MA is in constant warfare between the wood products industry and the environmental movement. USDA needs to show the environmental movement that cutting a tree is not on par with murdering someone. USDA can help provide information and examples of good forest management.

## Discussion Question 2

***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

I am also afraid of federal involvement. I have used federal cost share programs and think I can do a better job by doing the projects myself. Conservation Easements are not the answer. Markets are important, but you must get the costs down. Between taxes, access costs, inheritance taxes, etc, I have not made a profit on my forest lands. We need long term policies that favor landowners.

The USFS must change its climate change plan. Advocate for green building NOT advocate for LEED certification. (LEED is a "brand" and the government shouldn't endorse a brand.) USDA should advocate WOOD>

Engage EPA upfront on all issues that will affect forest landowners. EPA should consult with USDA and viceversa so that both support the needsof

Average parcel size is getting smaller. Who owns these small parcels? New owners. What is the message they receive about forest ownership? The County Forester is the most important messenger to provide educational outreach to new land owners. Our service foresters and cooperative extension foresters are critical for continued forest management on the parcels owned by these new owners.

In MA, we are working with temporary conservation easements. The farm and forestry viability program helps landowners write a business plan that includes temporary restrictions on the land (10-20 years) and allows the landowner the assurance that the forest will remain and allows a timber purchaser to know that the land will be available for forest management, yet it does not confer permanent easement rights. The program has been successful in MA.

Although NH is well forested, there are species that are still in peril. There is still great need for forest restoration and that depends on diverse markets that allow a variety of prescriptions

USDA must help citizens make a more clear connection between their lives and lifestyles and forest management. The wood we use comes from trees that we cut!

Very concerned about economic growth in Maine. We are against the "America's Great Outdoors" movement. We are worried that there is a movement to take over the State of Maine with any sort of conservation easements. We don't like the work "perpetuity" - we shouldn't saddle our children with agreements that we made for things we need today. We are also watching the whole state of maine being sucked up into conservation easements and then the land is not available for future economic development. Maine is broken up into small communities and small woodlots. Maine Woods Coalition supported the Plum Creek Project, but the enviros didn't like it. We are afraid that if the feds get involved, we will lose local control.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

NRCS established the Technical Service Providers program; many foresters tried to become certified, but it was too arduous. Subsequently, several employees of the Vt Dept of Forest and Parks became Technical Service providers. NRCS should recognize the professionalism of consulting foresters so that they can approve forest management plans without going through the arduous task of becoming Technical Service Providers. (The program is changing to reduce some of the requirements to make it somewhat easier, per Rick Ellsmore)

People cannot readily see the peril of the demise of forest.

Working on a commission formed by the New England governors to develop a resolution ([www.negc.org](http://www.negc.org)) regarding to managing forests across political boundaries. A listening session like this in the state of MA would really assist MA in its conservation efforts.

Land conservation must also include the economic effects of management decisions. Keep farms as farms. Keep forests as forests. Protect coastal areas. Connect people to the land.

We have worked with seven state foresters, managers of LWCF, and agricultural staff and have designed five national demonstration projects and on July 12, all five governors have endorsed these projects. These projects recognize the relationship between the welfare of the environment in small communities directly effects the welfare of the small communities that depend on them.

Wetlands conservation, Fish & Wildlife, etc. North American waterfowl recovery. Joint ventures to implement. Has brought together state, private, and federal. Most successful in the world. We should use it as a model for other programs. Preserves habitat and connects people to it. Continue funding. Continue encouraging private landowners. (How adapt to forest concept?) Has already been adapted. Great Bay partnership. Forested land. (was a valuable partner. [submitted statement])

Board made up of fed, private, non-profit. Work with teachers to get kids outside and learning about the outdoors. Lot of great pgms (Project Learning Tree). Teachers frustrated with No Child Left Behind – teaching to the tests for fed requirements that don't fit. Would love to see federal mandates that cater to outdoor pursuits addressed.

Speaking for private landowners, I've heard overwhelming requests to raise money for education (I support this). Another is to buy developments. Wouldn't it be easier to educate landowners? Tax reduction for allowing recreational use on private land is 20 percent (amounts to about \$35 a year). I can post my land, still get current use, and only have to forfeit \$35. If I enhance rec benefits, pay me for it. Shouldn't be either or situation.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

Oldest interstate hiking trail in Northeast, older than AMC. The 21 mile trail crosses 34 privately owned properties. Two problems with our northern trail terminus: land is designated forever wild, so no cutting or improving trails. Also, MOU with USDA prohibits dogs on trail. A private land owner whose property trail crosses trains dogs and was told that's illegal. Another regulation prohibits jogging. For many years a race on the trail has been allowed once per year. But no parking available at northern terminus. Would like a half-acre for parking there. For first time, a landowner refused to let trail cross property. Had to reroute. Later comment: A unique program is Municipal Trails Act: we fund easement for existing trails and turn over to municipality.

Paid attention to what was attracting people to northern NE. Read that Forestry association had evidence that proximity to trees actually improved health and quality of life. Even being able to see trees from a hospital room is beneficial! From Emerson and Thoreau to our own experience, trees are important. I propose that there's a real power that has the economic capacity to drive people to do something that is healthy to them. But no one is paying attention to that benefit. That underlies all the conversations we've had today. Why they call it a natural attraction. We need to learn more about it.

We depend on private forest in New England. Re Current Use: huge amt of private forest and people aren't aware that this occurs. Need more collaboration. At \$35/year may be more incentive to go another way. I think we could build on relationships. New models south of the border. Make most of fed benefits. Later comment: Two areas govt can connect with: INVEST IN RECREATION. Challenge cost share pgm (50/50) match to local investments in trails. Reduce our reliance on automobiles, find rec close to home. FUNDING! Landowners have liability protection, but still can get sued and have to protect themselves – how to further protect them from this.

No Child Left Behind is a challenge. One of our successes is bringing kids to the outdoors, but need access. We have wonderful places, but schools don't have money to visit these places – busses are obstacle in connecting to tree farmers. Field trips are the first thing taken out when budgets tight. Instead, we have to focus on school yard to learn about habitat. Hard time getting this generation of kids to think critically about things that are complex. We need to get them to look at local issues. What works and barriers go hand in hand.

Challenge is making sure that purposes are upheld. Lives will change/environment will change. Feds should realize that forest legacy program is a great program. Stewardship is ongoing. Funding needed for education and the whole scope of resources. Change is happening, from climate change to what the public needs for rec and what landowners should do to remain economically viable. Agriculture is a challenge – change from 20 years ago. From B/W Holsteins to how can I bring agritainment? (pgm works but challenge is monitoring) Monitoring and Stewardship together, working with land owners to achieve their goal.

If we look at anything as a standalone problem or solution we're going to fail. I would offer that there be a communication strategy that integrates solutions. Growing disconnect with outdoors. VT is integrating schools and environment. We think of the outdoors as an add-on, a separate piece. Integrated solutions or value, impact is lost.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

Reconnecting to outdoors. We have wonderful resources in White Mountains, but we do very little to tell people about the cultural resources. We have historic roads, abandoned homesteads. Need signage to tell people what's there. Signage would be inexpensive. If people know would out they would be more likely to support.

What works. We are nature center and shelter in southwest NH, and a land trust. What works well is that we are in a mosaic of protected lands, created largely by conservation easements and land trusts, and what works is the opportunity to lead programmatic trips to protected lands. A great asset to have these places to show off. Every weekend we have hiking trips with 40-50 people going. Without the mosaic of protected land we wouldn't have this. Need to provide more incentive to landowners for conservation easement, funding to make it possible to donate (many are land rich and cash poor). Also think about ways to connect people and children to outdoors by linking to strategies such as sound health, combating obesity, promoting healthy minds. Target is health and getting people outside.

We are model of grassroots conservation groups. Help six towns talk to each other on shared issues like drinking water protection. Land trust with strong educational component. Ranch and Farmland protection program, along with 600 donors that protect farmland south of the Sandwich range. Hire grad student every summer doing research. Takes us months to get a stipend for them. Need a federal program that would allow us to pay the stipend and ensure we continue the program.

NH strength: collaborating well; only way to get things done. Challenge is what's happening in school system. Passage of No Child Left Inside act would greatly impact what states can do. Supports teacher professional development, also connecting schools to outdoors and supportS field trips. Funding must be appropriate, and more than \$100K/state. We know the benefits of getting kids outdoors – they do better on standardized tests, problem solving, become more holistic citizens. I'm also watchful wildlife coordinator. In 2000 we had funding but those dollars have dried up, and we need a dedicated fund. Look at extension of existing programs. People need to thank their hunters and anglers because they are paying the bill. Later comment: Some places should be left wild, with no human influence. Education is critical; holistic approach needed.

Govt role should be providing consistent funding for various funds and grants. Also community assistance facilitation. Private landowners under pressure to host trails. Govt should do more than just hand out money.

I have 40 acres under conservation easement and am preparing for final 20. Foresters and extension service have been helpful. Keeping connected is to allow people on to see what is going on. But 100 acres abutting has been sub-divided for lots. When I asked for non use of fertilizer, was told OK as long as 50-foot buffer not violated. I'm concerned about what happens to landowner when changes happening around them. Trying to get people to bear the expense is hard. My son doesn't understand the land, wants me to sell to someone who does. Program to match people looking for such an opportunity with people like myself.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

NH's inclusive nature makes it special, has promoted more harmonious relationships. Work with private landowners to include motorized recreation, often maintaining roads at own expense in exchange for access. Offer donations to landowners for privilege of using land. Often there are restrictions such as prohibiting summer motorized use. Federal government can help by extending RTP (Recreational Trails Program – dollars from gas tax). The greater the amount of motorized trails, the more money received.

In NH a number of state-specific programs to encourage recreation use on private lands. State has hold-harmless law which encourages landowners because it reduces their liability. If you receive payment, though, this doesn't hold true. Another encouragement of public use of private land is incentives from local property tax – more land, more money. Network of trail clubs (e.g. snowmobile clubs), self policing, helps out. Maybe a model at national level. Challenges: simple economics: if I can't afford to own land, it becomes a liability. Government should support local markets for lumber/timber over imported projects, should also support alternative energy (windmills). Expenses: vandalism, management costs, taxes. Sunsetting of estate tax break will hammer private landowners. Federal government should be an example in the management of their own lands, showing public how active management works.

A unique thing we do is stretch federal and state dollars, as well as funding a lot of volunteer programs (Fish & Game and others do this, too). Volunteer programs get the word out beyond what we can do as staff members. Challenge is how do we fund them /support them (e.g., conservation ed, Urban Forestry). Federal funding should be made available for these efforts.

Hidden challenges: The number of NE hunters is dwindling. The result is reduced funding for NH F&G and others. Excise tax on firearms also goes into state and federal budgets. [Submitted statement]

Wildlife Action Plan, funded through state wildlife grants, is celebrating tenth anniversary. We need to plan for next ten years. The program has allowed our game and wildlife programs to thrive. Specific to working forests: public needs to be educated about term clearcuts, needs to understand that a 5-acre cut is important for wildlife habitat. Planning for future, we need to incorporate that notion and help people understand how important to future to habitat and wildlife in general.

Focus is changing from management to stewardship, resulting in less timber harvest. In northern Maine, clearcuts are no longer allowed. Federal government should educate people in importance of harvest, provide incentives to wood products industry (e.g., mills facing closing). Message should be the importance of forest products to overall economy.

Need to build appreciation of nature and connect general public. Experience is exponential – will last a lifetime. Federal government should offer events to encourage this, to promote "ecotourism" and public awareness of pollution (such as Give a Hoot). The Ken Burns series on national parks is a good example of education.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

Company manages 3 million acres in New England, New York, and Canada. Education works – get people outside. White Mountain National Forest is good example of management and research. Challenges include committing to education, especially about working forests. Also to help private landowners with the costs of keeping land open and for trail and road maintenance. Incentives, especially tax incentives for landowners to maintain working lands. Win/win situation.

The poor economy has increased use of state parks; people seeking low cost, nature-based activities. Challenge is how this will play out: private landowners face new expectations from enthusiastic new users who don't want to see cutting, hear chainsaws. Need to educate recreating public on multiple use, working forests.

No Child Left Behind focused attention on testing, not experience nature/outdoors. Money is a barrier to nature-based field trips. No Child Left Inside will go a long way to help. Target should be on the family unit: they come back and bring friends. Forest Service could help with conservation education funds. There is gap in awareness of connecting with nature and understanding working forests. Can't approach this piecemeal.

collaboration at the National Level is needed. Landscape planning regarding conservation lands is also critical.. These relate to strategic conservation goals. Maine gets less money per acre of forest ... than many states with low percentages of forest land... and thus conserves a much lower Percentage of their lands than could be conserved in Maine and NH, and Vt.

Conservation of lands... resulting in loss of tax revenues (PILT) is causing some resistance at State levels.

Property owner who wants to pass on the land and legacy to his family, with the assistance of the government (deduction , etc ) to make an incentive to put land into conservation easement - as opposed to costing money to do so.

Incentives, investments, and partners are about where to conserve lands and whether these tools are applicable in all areas of the country or under all economic situations. Saving special places is not the whole solution to the question of land uses, and the solutions vary from region to region. Market incentives (by policy) are more important thru incentivizing markets - thereby allowing private monies and landowners to work towards this goal. Government funding is not the total answer, leveraging private interests will provide a lot of motivation and results. Easements are not for everywhere, and there is not enough \$\$ to purchase all protections that are needed. Economic incentives and market forces would create the same results for working forests.... The dis-incentivising of private working forests through rules and regulations (of these wood markets in general and the bio-mass market particularly, etc. ) would also prevent natural market driven forces from maintaining these working forests.

## Discussion Question 2

**Concord, NH**

**(cont.)**

We have compact lands with multiple ownership in N. E. With 400 land conservation land trusts - each doing their own projects one at a time - is inefficient. A new initiative is proposed, where by in western Mass.... Combining 72 individual projects was combined into one project purchase (needing about 21 Million \$). But the efficiency, synergy and collaboration approach has huge benefits through combining knowledge's, economy of scale, and individual landowners being part of a larger effort. Another ongoing effort combines 120 land trusts and 400 purchases - but requires a large amount of funding and (hopefully) federal assistance to complete the process. Aggregation and bundling saves money on administration. People like that they are part of a large effort, part of a large conservation effort.

Carbon releases from 57 million acres of pvt. Land if turned into developments.... Would kill any change in climate change that other efforts might accomplish. Incentives are needed to maintain these private lands in forest status. They have to be economically feasible for this to occur. The future needs to be conservation - not fragmentation. Reducing development, and the subsequent reduction in carbon sequestration will be detrimental to the environment. Additionally, increasing incentives for wood product heat sources versus continued increases in oil heat would benefit the climate concern scenario as well. Tax incentives for developing markets and providing raw materials for wood markets will be key.

The value of these lands, acquired through enormous energy and conservation effort, includes taking on a huge effort dealing with government bureaucracy and incentive programs. The government should rather allow for normal market fluxuations (supply and demand) and tax conditions to provide for land conservation, rather than government intervention.

Towns in ME have fallen on hard times, and deforestation in all NE states has doubled - like a second wave - in the recent decade. The need for conservation that can aggregate cons. Lands , and we need a climate and carbon initiative where small landowners can take advantage of these incentives (normally fir 1000 acre lots +) and 3rd. Private landowners and landowner outreach - is not technically up to speed - a method that would connect these landowners is needed. and finally - facilitating landowners as part of a solution to energy issues and policy.

Fed Govt separate programs needs to work together to provide efficient successes at these goals.

Getting kids in the outdoors is important and part of that should be about observing what kind of vocational opportunities there are working in woods related industry (timber and recreation, conservation and wildlife mgmt.

Need policies that will be with us and set the course for the next 100 years.

Private landowners, ready to donate but due to costs are hesitant, due to the costs for land surveys and title search. Fully fund LWCF . quality Carbon

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

The working forest is my 401 K, and is so for many other people. Owners need to be able to entrust good stewardship of those lands to their heirs through a conservation easement that can be adjusted, or updated with the current needs such as things (like tax laws, or even resource requirements, etc. ) Situations change over time and could require adjustments, whereas locking into strict easement without the opportunity to adjust to change over time is like having a "mutual fund" or 401 k that has no flexibility. Not asking to break the "core" purpose of that "easement" .

Couldn't get much money for anything: LWCF needs to place more emphasis on forest land and maintain recreational facilities. Landowners are discouraged because the process takes so long to complete.

The challenges for land trusts and conservation easements are in part that each landscape is unique and complex. Lots of variability in the needs and opportunities, and also on the stewardship requirements.

Due to complexities of regulations and limitations, communities find it difficult to get through the process and hold easements in their towns

People with land who want to donate can get some help with costs for donation but no monies are set aside through federal funding programs to fund the 'stewardship' monitoring of these easements. That is a critical absence and need for the future protection of these lands. Funds for Stewardship of conservation Lands is critical.

Rules are complicated, professional and Federal staff often have to wade through a pile of rules, to understand them. Would like rules to be straightforward and workable, and to be brought forward without delays . The process is not being simplified - new rules are merely added, but the process is now quite cumbersome and needs to be simplified and streamlined.

Conservation decisions must be based on Conservation science. There are studies and documents that outline which resources are most important to conserve. Local knowledge, and local entities at the County and state level should be driving these decisions.

Small woodland owners need to have more access to these programs. A small woodland owner acts as a conservator on his property. Regarding easements, an environment needs to be created where land owners are looking more positively toward long term ownership and allowing recreation on his/her property. Problem is landowners " Get No Respect" , so a program that would help encourage them to continue providing these benefits on their land is important. The message that small woodlot owners cumulatively are so beneficial and important to the "conservation of lands goals" is needed, and might then encourage other landowners to do the same.

Full funding for I and C Conservation fund, and forest Legacy fund. These programs tend toward large tracts and smaller <1000 acre sites cannot compete at the national scale.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

Community space and open forest Bill, (w/ 50% matching fund is valuable but getting the other 50% funds at the local level is difficult, even when people from diverse interests agree on the ultimate goal. But additional funding is critical for these small towns, or increasing incentives. Forest Legacy funds one purchase per state. In the densely forested NE states, there is need for more parcels or purchases to be funded.

Need to create a market for forest landowners to sell their carbon credits at.

Management funding for community forests, which are run democratically, is needed. They are currently excluded from EQUIP and WHIP programs.

Not enough discussed for small tree farmers. Many programs and assistance designed for larger land holders. Obtaining government assistance for stewardship, for tax relief, and to make improvements is tough. The soon to return 45% estate tax (the break on this tax sunsets next year) would prevent many landowners from being able to pass on to their heirs their land, and pay the 45% estate tax as well. This is resulting in extreme difficulty for maintaining working forest lands within families through the generation.

We need incentives for good management and for protection of community and state forests.

Municipalities are easily forgotten in the incentives programs and yet the general population benefits, so they need to be considered in legislation and policy.

Communities are starting to do good forest plans but they need help (incentives and grants), especially now as planning boards are not as busy as in a normal economy. Now is the time to utilize their availability.

Has protected up to 50,000 acres in the area but what is needed to continue this conservation effort - \$\$ is needed.

\$\$ is needed for Maine forests.

It has become increasingly apparent that deforestation is big contribution to greenhouse gases and climate change. We can play a critical role in mitigating climate change by protecting forests and getting people out in nature/forest. It needs to be a combination of education and awareness—if you know something you're more likely to care and more likely to protect it.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

Their area became an Americorps site for land conservation, protecting 24,000 acres. 7 regional land trusts came together (240 towns) with 20 staff to do conservation and stewardship. There is more of an economy of scale with a larger organization of partners. They want to incorporate strategies in selecting projects to help mitigate/adapt to climate change, but are having difficulty finding direction. There should be more connections between local/regional land trusts and the feds, partnering at the federal level to implement policies. We should also be talking more to the public about how what we do in our daily lives affects climate change.

He expressed a concern about the stated purpose of this meeting. Obama said that ideas from these meetings will help better protect our natural landscape and history in the future. People here have not used "natural landscape", only working landscape. Why are we avoiding using this term? He does not log his land, and is allowing it to return it to "natural landscape". He don't sell woodchips, etc. So we should remove the "working forest" from this discussion—it does not belong in a "natural landscape."

The definition of "working forest" is very limited in that it means logging. Forests can "work" in lots of different ways. There are alternatives to a working forest as logging. Response: this particular session was focused on "working forest" and that is why it was presented that way. Lots of other benefits from working landscape—carbon sequestration, water quality/quantity, etc, but we may not convey this well to the public. "Marketing conservation". We need to do a better job of marketing what we really do.

Public utilities are encouraged to have a certain amount of their power generated sustainably--using biomass, for example. A recent study (Manomet) says that biomass is not necessarily sustainable unless there is cogeneration. The government should more carefully evaluate what is "sustainable" when power companies are working toward these incentives/laws, because they may not actually be sustainable. Power companies should not be allowed to do these things if they aren't really sustainable. We don't want to dig ourselves into a bigger hole. People may be trying to "do the right thing" but may not know what that actually is regarding sustainable energy production. As a private citizen, she would like the federal government to step in with scientific knowledge and provide guidance.

Studies in NH show that there are enough NH forests to sustain a certain number of biomass plants, but there is not enough information available to know if this is actually the case. Concern: we are having a difficult time sustaining our state parks. NH is the only state in the country that doesn't provide any general funds for state parks, which are at risk and have millions of \$\$ of infrastructure needs. These parks are a great education tool for climate change and natural resources and they are at great risk. Is there a way in this initiative to help improving state parks.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

With climate change our ecosystems are under greater stress and it is important that government and private folks look at protecting areas and creating corridors for habitat from ME to northern NY. One way would be federal encouragement for towns to buy and maintain town forest. If there were federal tax incentives for managed town forests or federal grants for key corridor purchases, it might help offset the fact that towns will lose tax dollars if they have more town lands.

A carbon analysis should be included with logging proposals and with woodburners in the state. This is not required in state process currently and will be difficult to do because of all the details involved. This would help determine what is actually "sustainable", including carbon accounting for things like trucking, etc. We might find out that what initially appears to be the "greenest" is not. We need to tackle this and hold the public trust that this renewable energy is truly renewable. When NH signed RGGI (Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative), that is what it was about.

Haven't heard about what the monetary value of carbon is? We don't know where to get information on the value of carbon. This conversation should begin with discussion of the global carbon market. This will affect the value of land in "current use" because if carbon has a monetary value, the value of land will increase if you let trees grow. The government should do something about this.

Challenge 1: We need to better understand forest genetics in order to help forests transition in light of climate change. What species should we be planting? We need help. How are we going to help forests adapt? Challenge 2: Lots of landowners are driven by economics, therefore economic incentives are necessary to keep these forests. Low-grade markets, including biomass, will help and result in more carbon sequestration. The MA study about biomass does not say that it is not sustainable if you look at it from a lifecycle analysis. Another important component is green building—no better building material than wood from a green/carbon standpoint. How can the feds encourage green building? Federal policy to say "American wood first" as opposed to other building materials. More thought needs to go into the green building certification process.

There is a fear factor when people talk about climate. We need to build trust and acknowledge that a lack of trust will hold us back. Another challenge: resources. There was a grant program created in 2008 Farm Bill, but haven't been able to get money in it. Biomass: created program in 2008 to provide \$\$ for communities to buy biomass facilities, and heat schools, etc. Haven't got any \$\$ into program yet. Tools are there but not the resources/money.

These listening sessions are great ideas but are they going to go anywhere given our political situation, partisanship, and political agendas? There is a challenge that needs to be overcome on the political side.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

Most American forests are owned privately. Families need healthy markets to keep healthy forests. They need lots of tools in their toolkits—easements and markets for green building. FSC is not the only certified sustainable market—American Tree Farm system as well, people should not have to go out of state to buy FSC green-certified wood when ATF wood is available. Families need incentive programs to protect their forests and store carbon. At the end of the day, healthy markets equal healthy forests.

Parks are such a doorway for getting people to learn about the great outdoors, continuing funding these programs is so important in showing the value of forests.

The general public is unaware of the role that forests play in climate change--we need to get the information out. People have heard about climate change but don't know what to do about it; they don't understand that keeping land in forest is key in mitigating climate change. We need to communicate without scaring people away and share that the land conservation we're already doing is making a difference.

FS shows real desire to put all the pieces of the puzzle together—"all lands" model is mission critical for success, especially in New England. Updating to federal grant criteria is taking climate change into account, including LWCF. Any program that isn't already updating their program should be doing so. Forest Legacy program, etc. If it still feels like there is a missing tool it would be that we need forest and agriculture carbon incentives programs. This would maximize carbon benefits on the landscape.

The federal government should not encourage wasteful practices such as using biomass harvesting and then burning wood quickly in a wet condition. Burning (and transporting) wood that has not dried is inefficient and wasteful. Focus should be on wood that is harvested close to where it is burned, and is burned in a dry state.

The reason we have forests in the US now is because we stopped burning so much wood and instead burn fossil fuels. Now we are talking about burning forests again--this is not good. A healthy forest: has no invasives (log trucks bring in invasives), is free of logging, is free of species under human management. I take issue with us saying we're trying to get healthy forests—we're trying to degrade the forests we have today.

The National Forest Protection and Restoration Bill, which died in 109th Congress, would have ended logging on NFS lands. It may be time to revisit that, especially if we ever get a value on carbon. Thinks that there is probably more timber harvested on private land than on NFS land. There are lots of forest products coming from private land. Urge someone to take a look at this bill because some things have changed since it first came before Congress.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

We are looking at the perfect storm—intergenerational transfer of private forest lands over the next 10-15 years combined with the repeal of the estate tax—this is very serious for family forest owners. Have to look at value of different forest properties—not a one size fits all solution. Working forests have less of a tax burden. Also--the federal government should play a significant role in helping get kids outside--federal resources for environmental education should not be an afterthought, but a core part of the education curriculum.

In response to a question by the moderator about potential sale of State parks: The state of NH is facing a budget crisis and one option is to sell some state park properties. That is just one idea, just one option out there.

We have small populations and low unemployment comparatively and so sometimes we don't get as much in way of resources. Often the rural areas don't get what they need and that is really important.

Youth Promise Act--being able to engage kids that are in the juvenile justice system in environmental service projects. We are seeing juveniles charged for minor infractions. There are issues with lack of parenting, etc. In many cases these kids are just bored. They have programs called diversion, and are required to do community service. Perhaps build off the SCA programs and develop some opportunities for these kids to spark their interest and engagement.

Biggest fear is that we will get more programs on top of other programs that we don't have the resources to fully implement. Emphasis on building on what is working and incorporate the new ideas with what is already working.

Mr. President: we are in a climate crisis, arctic is melting, more methane is being released and is going to eclipse the GHG effect. We have to re-freeze the arctic and enable farmers and forests to serve as carbon sinks (biochar).

In our society we live on instant gratification, so need to get across the idea that working forests are for the future.

We are in a climate crisis! I don't think any of us will live out our lives without seeing the effects of climate change on our forest.

We have a financial system that is about to collapse and anything involving agriculture and the environment should be long term if it is going to be sustainable. Would like to see strategic banks, instead of NRCS being bureaucratically focused, would like to see the funds spent correctly as a representation of trust. Strategic banks need to be built to fund those starting out.

Reduction of bureaucracy to enable good decisions by EVERYONE.

It is challenging for next generation to take over small family-owned forestry business. E.g., he has lumber, dry kilns, sawmills, etc., but no funds to pay his sons to become involved.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

We need to increase the biological literacy of citizens. Suggest we need to find a way to make parks "destination points" and so individuals can watch them change over time like working forests do, including signage built locally from local materials.

The nation is also facing a shift of race and culture in America. We need a way to connect across age ranges, as well as across all types of diversity--such as youth in urban areas.

Being in a place like VT, is quite a contrast from DC which is so culturally diverse. At the Marsh-Billings Rockefeller site, they have a 200 year land ethic history and that is part of the mission. There are examples of Hispanics preserving land in the SW or native Americans in other places. These stories often get left out-it is important to keep these stories alive. They recently had a program with urban youth brought to the park to camp and participate in a program (cleaning trails, etc.). Felt this program was a success and really brought a hands on and close connection to the natural environment. How do you replicate these programs and secure the funding to keep them up?

Environmental literacy is development and sequential. We often let the bottom numbers dictate what is taught because the teachers may not have passion or education to teach science. "No Child Left Behind" has been detrimental-it has squeezed out science and made it difficult to get kids out for hands on experiences. How do we scale the Manchester SCA program out to other school districts? That works when there is a really interested teacher or an administrator that really understands the importance. We can do huge things to change the experience for kids.

We are asking teachers to take children outside, but the teachers themselves need some help in understanding how to take kids out and mitigate the risks of going outside (some teachers are hesitant to go outside). E.g., program focused on learning more about your back yard.

Would like to increase the ability to work across the Fed. government. It is really hard to work across agencies and if that could be streamlined it would be easier for programs like SCA and others.

She would have nature parties for her son and it was surprising to her that many of the kids had not been out in nature. Accessibility is an issue, e.g., for families that can't reach out to provide those opportunities. Making choices that are smart for our children, such as providing experiences outside, is so important.

We have a generation of parents that are afraid to take their kids out. Some teachers are just as bad. Need to expose the kids early in school--so they go home and ask their parents to take them out.

As a parent, there is such pressure to enroll children in structured programs and pressure to do the best by our kids. Richard Lourve's book was monumental in allowing kids to have free time. Another good book is: "The Blessing of a Skinned Knee." Scheduling a safe outside experience for families has to be a first step to allow them to be comfortable to provide kids these experiences (unscheduled) in the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Concord, NH*

*(cont.)*

A lot of the concerns and ideas that have been shared are also going around the historic/preservation community. There is a rift between the preservation and conservation communities and we should work together better. Maybe some different partnerships we could think of more holistically. E.g., hike to ruins (combines the two). In a broad sense, having these conversations, can help with this issue. Also looking at historic buildings in addition to the land that is being focused for conservation.

He gave seminars on White Pine and was called to help with planting density for a program. It was successful-the trees are growing a great rate. If they do the right thing, they should be able to generate \$100,000 per acre every year, but they may not be able to keep it up due to lack of funding.

It would be neat if we could find a way to remove the danger of people being responsible for their selves and taking a look at wildlife that moves and trees (that don't move).

It is important to recognize regional differences; the potential of a particular area may be not recognized enough when compared to species in other regions of the country.

Schools around here do their testing in October and that is during the time that would be good to get the kids out. So it would be helpful to move that testing time frame to a different time of the year so it is not an obstacle to getting kids outside.

School administration be aware of outdoor opportunities close by and connect that to the required school physical education program.

Need to also provide access on a socio-economic level. Having parents that are available to take kids outside is really difficult for some, e.g., single mother working and struggling to make ends meet.

Programs like the Great park Pursuit also have great value. But looking at families, it is also important to have programs that are extracurricular and are not parent let. Kids need to be getting muddy at much younger ages!

Looking at how different racial and ethic communities relate to the outdoors: a lot of communities (esp., non-white) are coming from families that are of a such a broken nature, e.g., single mother, working and no free time, etc... it is difficult to get the experiential, place based education, and they are leaving the education up to the institution. The institutions are busy dealing with issues like gang violence, etc..

Challenge: every region needs something different and there are different ideas that will work in each place. The Federal role is to stay out of that to allow flexibility. Provide funding from programs, but allow flexibility in the solution. If we can "infect" the youth and future leaders that will make the difference. The Fed. gov. role is to understand the individuality and that it is by the people and for the people and stand back so the good programs can succeed.

## Discussion Question 2

**Concord, NH**

**(cont.)**

Idea for an insurance product on a nationwide gov. level that could be created to cover liability for school env. education programs. To allow school programs to take the kids out into nature. Liability is often the reason used for not being able to get kids outside. If the school system is accepting fed. funding--would there be an opportunity to do this nationwide--and utilized nationwide?

Forestry curriculums throughout the nation have eliminated hands on experiences due to liability concerns.

Development - difficult to maintain land in forests. Planning Boards are there for assisting in the development not discouraging it. Development is leading to pesticides etc, no infrastructure to support it. TNC Wilton Community Farm – kids can learn fa

Taxes too high - people being forced to sell land.

Lack of funding source (sales tax, income tax). General funds get tapped into. (LCHiP funds)

Our prime aggie lands are getting development

Development affects hiking trails – new land owners not always allowing access to trails that start on private lands.

Local decision makers' need the information regarding cost of develop so they can include them in their Master Plans and Zoning rules.

Lots of passion for all nature resources. At National level may not see the working together.

Although much has been accomplished. more work remains and more collaboration is needed. In order to build upon this success It will take increased funding to meet the backlog of interest. America's Great Outdoors Initiative will bring much needed attention, funding and cooperation to help protect and restore the important natural resources In New Hampshire, and most importantly, yield critical benefits to Its citizens.

Currently, we have the tools necessary to inform, coordinate and collaborate; what is lacking is long-lenn commitment, in terms of both consistent funding and available human resources, to making a difference, especially when you are talking about conservation at the landscape scale.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

Given the topic of discussion today, it is appropriate that this Listening Session be held in NH where approximately 84% of the state landscape is covered in forest. Historically, the vast majority of forestland has been owned by timber companies and thus managed for forest products. At the same time there has been a long-standing tradition to keep these lands open to the public for hunting, fishing, hiking and other forms of compatible public use recreation. A Governors Task force on Northern Forest lands some time ago warned that changes in land ownership from the timber industry to property development for second homes and the like, would likely have an adverse impact on open space, forestry, farming and recreational uses on private lands. As downturns in the economy of the forests industry occurs, millions of acres of timber company lands are often offered for sale. When this occurs at time of a strong regional economy, working forest land is at risk to developers and prospectors interested in recreational developments. In the face of growing development pressures, we believe the need to preserve the landscapes that shape New Hampshire's quality of life has never been greater and programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), NAWCA and Forest Legal Program (FLP) grants mentioned above: provide federal dollars to assist state and local conservation

Government bureaucracy and red tape continues to be obstacles to effective and efficient partnership response to enhancing conservation and increasing opportunities for outdoor recreation. While adding another layer to the federal bureaucracy seems counterintuitive, collaboration among federal agencies would probably improve with the establishment of an inter-departmental coordinating council or committee. The secretary of the interior would likely head said council.

#### **Making Public Lands Public**

- A 2004 report to the House Appropriations Committee concluded that more than 35 million acres of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service (USFS) land have inadequate access. The Federal Lands Hunting and Shooting Sports Roundtable was created to improve partnership efforts between the BLM, USFS, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and 40 national hunting, fishing and shooting sports organizations to address access to federal lands for hunting and shooting sports activities. Roundtable efforts are coordinated with the Wildlife and Hunting Heritage Conservation Council and the Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council. Roundtable projects found that access to federal lands could be improved considerably through an average investment of less than \$10 per acre

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Concord, NH***

***(cont.)***

NWTF programs and activities to reverse the current trends and introduce people of all ages and genders to the outdoors: Inadequate access to land is often cited as a primary reason hunters and anglers stop participating in these traditional sports. Since 1987, the More Places to Hunt Initiative of the NWTF has worked to reverse this trend. To date, the NWTF has spent nearly \$10 million helping to obtain and retain more than 428,000 acres available for hunting and fishing.

Tragically, native grasslands and wetlands-the natural resources that make the Prairie Pothole Region a national treasure- are disappearing at an alarming rate. It is imperative that we conserve enough of this unique grass-wetland landscape to secure a viable future for waterfowl. If we fail here, it is unlikely that we be able to meet the population totals established by the North American Waterfowl Management Plan-an international effort set forth in 1955 between the US, Canada and Mexico, that provides a blueprint for the recovery and long-term sustainability of the continent's waterfowl. Farm Bill programs such as Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and Sodbuster have thus far played a critical role in preserving millions of acres of prairie grassland that benefit many species of wild life. We strongly urge that they continue and expand.

#### Voluntary Public Access

- The NWTF, in support of its State fish and wildlife agencies and other partners, works to improve access to private lands as well. Private lands are critical to walk-in access hunting programs of many western States. Through such programs, States lease private land from willing owners and open it to public hunting. Implementation of the USDA Voluntary Public Access and Habitat Improvement Program administered by the Farm Service Agency would greatly aid State and tribal government abilities to build upon this success and open additional private land to public access in the future.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

I'm wondering if we can keep LWCF funds from being raided for whoever needs it, and if there's a way for protected lands to stay protected forever?

Is there going to be a report emailed back to the participants in the listening group? Desire to have the notes from this session to the participants.

One concern with government agencies is that we throw money at the problem. A lot of ranchers look at NRCS as a place to go for money for water development, but they don't understand what water development is all about. Educational disconnect between people, the landowner and the people that benefit from the land. There needs to be more emphasis on education than legislation. If you don't educate then you can't pass on what we are trying to accomplish. It's not just about the money but the conservation benefit that it brings. One thing we are doing in SD will see next year, Leopold Conservation Award, we showcase people that are doing good conservation, showcase what people on the land are doing. How do we get reconnected with them. We have an open door at our ranch to show people what we are doing. I was raised that there is not a wetland that could not be drained. Government was paying us to do it. Had help from game and parks to blast wetlands and make them deeper. It is tough to overcome those old ways of thinking.

Why does all the money go to GFP. Nothing in it for the rancher - GFP take all the money.

Few people but population is growing, 39 species of bird flying byways as a kid, but restudy shows only 15 species today. Other wildlife populations diminishing too. Growth of prairie dogs, poisoned in past killed other animals too (coyotes). No longer living in wilderness area, grass not that tall. Civilization crept in. South Dakota is growing. DM&E railroad study of fugitive coal dust, deer migration, hunting will be very little - Virgil became active then. United Farmer Ranch annual convention attended. Wants to become active again, haven't been for some time. Wants to be part of answer, happy to be here.

Protecting the resources defines – children exposing them to the outdoors. Having another generation following. This is taking our children out of the outdoors – computers etc. They worked on getting their match. 2 things that are unaffected. Funding has diminished about 10 fold. State side represents 10% now. States and locals are left with hardly anything. Do contemporary things to get the kids outdoors. Must get them out or there won't be anyone to enjoy it in the future.

I had a question about re-evaluating contracts/easements written 20 - 30 yrs ago. When sold to another party why can't the terms of the easements of the contract continue? What flexibilities are there available to change? Is there a way to change the contract to continue?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

Programs can either work or be an obstacle. With these nationwide programs, one size does not fit all. The more flexibility we can provide, the more entities can utilize state programs, the more opportunity there is to be creative while meeting program requirements. We need flexibility on both the state and local levels. Choices are good. What are the needs of local people? NRCS is wonderful in our state to work with. There are very diverse issues across the state. All areas have different issues, different opportunities, so we need to adapt to the needs of the landowners. She lives within 15 miles west of the Missouri River and another producer lives the same distance away on the east side of the river, but she doesn't qualify for a lot of the programs, due to this. It frustrates her because her land produces the same number of ducks.

I am a 4th generation on my ranch, my son, the 5th generation. The real challenge will be figuring out how to pass the knowledge of managing a ranch, and the actual ranch, itself, due to huge taxes through the estate tax. More people are moving to cities because they can't afford the tax, so ranches are being broken up. The Federal Estate Tax is an issue and a real concern. It's an issue we need to deal with. We need to challenge the Federal Estate Tax.

One of the things that are very frustrating is the whole NEPA process. It's very cumbersome, it takes forever, and you don't see results for years. You're not sure what you're going to get. We need your vote to actually count, which the Forest Service is working on. The process needs to be upgraded to keep public interest. We need to streamline the process to fit the faster moving society. It's very frustrating for the lay person. Another issue is the struggle with the many different land agency boundaries. When off-roading, you need to pass different land agency boundaries. Do these agencies talk to each other? The meetings must be in secret, because I don't know about any such meetings. I would like to see and know about the different agencies talking to each other; need to at least witness what they are doing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

I was raised on a farm in eastern South Dakota and have been involved in conservation, and have been fortunate to utilize our precious natural resources, the grasses and wetlands. I am very concerned today witnessing the broad scale landscape changes through tile drainage and the impacts on semi permanent and permanent wetlands. The pressure to drain wetlands is increasing, along with converting grasslands to crop. The demand for alternative options is also increasing, such as easements through WRP, GRP, and the FWS. Through the farm bill all these programs are viable options. I suggest that we all need to work strongly to the best of our ability to achieve strong funding for LWCF funds to fund the high demand of easements. Critical benefits I have enjoyed from wetlands and grassland include flood control, improved water quality, reduction in soil erosion, and providing wildlife habitat. These things are being taken away from our children. It is serious. We need to continue the things we know work and are successful. LWCF funds are needed to provide land owners options. We need to reconnect people to the land. If we can't continue programs, we can't provide opportunity for people to stay connected to the land. The challenges faced are very real. It's not a matter of competition of the programs; it's just a matter of funding. The demand is there. There is a tremendous demand for GRP and easement programs; this holds the same for FWS-they have a very long waiting list for their programs. Interested in these programs continue to promote the part. The pressures to drain and convert are real. We all have our own financial realities. We need to make management decisions so we can improve upon funding. Expand partnerships is critical for landowner to have an option to stay on land.

There are between 800 - 820 landowners on the list that are interested in services in grass or wetland easements. They would like to have options available. Issues landowners are looking at are other way to optimize and manage their land. There are lots of people who value grass. It's out there more so than ever and stewardship is happening, not because it's mandatory, but because it's voluntary.

To follow up on\_\_\_\_'s comment, I'm involved in Missouri River work groups and issues. There are lots of things happening. The government spends lots of money to process things. The funding needs to be reprioritized for on the ground projects. More dollars need to go to program delivery.

If this was carried and manifested, you would gain a lot of public confidence in the government agencies. The public sees the USDA agencies as cumbersome, out of touch; it takes them too long to get anything done. People lose interest. This is perilous. Losing interest and public land stewardship, the land starts deteriorating. There are lots of obstacles, lots of laws to follow; it's too cumbersome and broken and we're losing public confidence.

Farmers and ranchers have changed for the better. They are no-tilling, leaving residue on the cropland; there's less erosion and more cover. Farmers are doing a better job than in the past. It's a business, so when the regulations come more and more it becomes more difficult to pass the farm/ranch onto others. Someone has to be out there doing the farming.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

There are a couple of challenges to point out. There is a nature deficit disorder. The last report stated that the average American child spends 7.45 minutes less than 1 hour outdoors, and less than 5 minutes in a non-structured play environment. If kids are not outdoors where does our conservation leadership come from? I live on the Missouri River. The way it is managed there is no natural system to form. Regulation reform with the Corps is giving higher weight to wildlife. I've worked in conservation for 40 years and believe there is a strong need to get a hold of climate change, carbon emission caps, and we need funding to help address adaptability for wildlife. Addressing climate change is the biggest environmental issue that our generation faces today.

If you look at the pressures over the last 8 to 10 years in the public schools, if you go into the school and look at the schedule for the day, it is very much just reading and math. There is a lot less science and social studies. So, the Department of Education needs to be a partner. We are not teaching values, nor teaching science. We need to teach them to value what we have. Nationally we want to see support for environmental education programs. Also need state environmental education standards. I grew up in a farm community. Not even once did we talk about the value of wetlands, what happens if plowed over? We should know about local things. A lot of them (kids she went to school with) grew up to be farmers. I didn't hear about our local resources in school; we learned about oceans. I taught in Minneapolis; there the children learned information on oceans, they didn't learn much about the Mississippi, right in their own backyard, or the 10,000 lakes that were there. We need to put priority on standards, by communicating with the schools, allowing them to do that. Schools have pressures to delete science and environmental studies. Financially and time wise, schools don't take kids outdoors anymore. They can't do that anymore because of other demands put on them. Being outdoors in nature teaching science and environmental studies is the most effective tool that we have.

Problem – no one to help, B&B by badlands. Training is needed – no jobs.

Making sure we continue to listen and more often. Respect others rec passion. Maybe they don't have a passion but help them to get outdoors. Monetary support if we have something they will come. Common good – don't hear very often anymore. Gov't employees are suppose to be taking care of us.

Obstacles – blinders on because we have got our nose to the grindstone. How do we connect the different Gov't and state agencies. We provide for most of the kids – how do we connect to the Gov't agencies. Awesome thing to work for.

Children not getting outdoors – get the active again and if they are it will help with the bigger problem with health.

Respect – all have to respect others perspective. WE can show kids a lot on their ranch – to respect what the beef industry. Respect those agencies but hope to continue to respect the private lands as well and resolve that.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

Input the people from the local basis – been a disconnect there. There is only so much the congress can do. Having these sessions on a regular bases would help and relate that the congressional staff. Structure where there would be a possibility would be great. Real opportunities.

Government! Big supporter of Gov't and needed in this country and have a great gov system. Survey the people – to many rules and regs not enough talking between agencies, restrictions on conservation. Need communication and need to say we the people – fairness into restrictions and reasons why it is.

Schools, grade school – looks like prisons – fences (no nature there). Nice if the fed gov (multi agency) get together with high school math/science create a nature environmental center. Staff could be mentors to help get a science group going. Bringing science and math into school get rid of concrete put ponds, grass, trees. If they are not on grass how can they relate to the environment. If we don't educate them about the outdoors - later they might not have any concern in the future to fund the programs. Mentor programs in schools!!

Respect recon, as land owners we recognize to preserve and it is the goal to pass on to next generation. Regulations appear to be not based on scientific justification and get very frustrated. Must be science based.

Funding – National debt is our concern and challenge. We have a lot of great programs 13.4 trill in debt. Keep this in mind.

Tribes are also facing the same issues – getting kids interested in outdoors – hunting. Don't forget your tribal neighbor. They have a lot of things that they could do better and need help on. Bigger benefits for fed tribal wildlife program. 100 tribes apply 40 get funded tremendous need out there only a fraction funded. Those programs are what they really rely on but don't faze them out.

Missouri river recovery project. The river needs things done on the ground not in the meeting room. Walk the walk not just talk the talk.

Hunting and fishing is dependent on the upcoming generations. Access to private lands is one of the greatest concerns for sportsman (for hunting and fishing). Private land owners are key to the success of an access program. Importance of USDA conservation programs, need more incentives for landowners to allow access to wildlife and fish populations. Next farm bill needs to include funding provided to landowners to allow access to their lands so people can have a place to hunt, fish, and view wildlife. Currently, South Dakota rents 1.25 million acres of walk in access for sportsmen (in SD). Need more funding to pay landowners to increase access. Farm bill appropriations important for allowing access. Access is important to CRP, WRP, EQUIP and private landowners cost share important for future access.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

People have to be aware of how agricultural technology is improving. Cargill and other major agriculture companies are looking at states from Texas to North Dakota to produce more crops. This area of the United States has the highest potential of increasing the amount of bushels of wheat, corn, and soybeans. This new technology is going to put extreme pressure on native grasslands. We are going to lose native prairies at an exponential rate because of new ag technology. The federal government needs to take money out of production subsidies and put funding to conservation. When corn is \$5 and soybeans is \$11 a bushell, conservation funding currently does not meet those economics. Landowners do not the economic incentives for native prairie conservation or CRP when row crop farming is much more economically sound. Partners for Wildlife Program (USFWS) is important and critical to conserving grasslands and wetlands. Local control is crucial in how conservation programs are administered. Reconnecting people to outdoors can only be done from the local area. Conservation needs to be more convenient and economical. Federal government needs to get out subsidizing production agriculture and needs to move those dollars used for subsidies and fund conservation. Grasslands are threatened the most threatened areas in this country. The SAFE program from Pheasants Forever is important to private landowners and to conservation of grasslands. There is currently not enough funding for SAFE. Private landowners want to increase the acres of land in programs such as SAFE, but there is not enough funding. More demand than the funding available. Conservation has to be on the terms of the landowners.

Invasive species are having a major impact in our ecosystems. Emerald ash borer is a local example and is knocking at the door and going to affect riparian corridors in this area. Need funding to address invasive species issues. Funding is needed to mitigate against noxious weeds. Need to improve weed free forage programs. Invasive species is a significant challenge now and the foreseeable future.

Where are the school representation to this meeting? Why is there nobody at this meeting from the public schools and universities? We are missing those people that deal with children.

We don't know what is coming from technologies of row crop production. Row crop production is moving further west. Federal policy to preserve a way of life, need to understand what impacts the future impacts will be. Nobody in South Dakota wants our lands to look like Iowa. But that is where we are heading. Progress in agriculture is good, but conservation is going to lose. Conservation and agriculture plays against each other. Need to protect multiple uses. Agriculture and conservation is on two sides. Conservation always lose to agriculture because of economics.

Crop insurance is retarded, farmable wetland programs are good. Governments role should not have to choose between agriculture and conservation. Need to re-look at crop insurance program. SAFE is farmer friendly. Crop production always wins against conservation. Conservation has to compete. Acres have to compete. People are looking to U.S. to feed the world. Cargill sees this as profit. The economic pressures from agriculture is reducing what we can conserve. Funding needs to go to conservation

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Fort Pierre, SD***

***(cont.)***

Need state funding for conservation. Unintended consequences of crop insurance. Farming insurance subsidizes sod-busting. Can't be relying on the government to bail agriculture out when the land should have remained in grasslands instead of crop production.

How do we get a realistic result to the president?

The Prairie Pothole Region is the foundation of the outdoor heritage in South Dakota and is fundamental to migratory bird populations that travel the continent.

However, threats to the integrity of this vital landscape are great including the threat of conversion of grassland to cropland and the accompanying loss/degradation of the wetlands.

The sole limitation to protection of these important landscapes is funding. Fortunately, many of the remaining intact tracts of prairie and wetlands are owned by ranchers who are interested in protecting these areas through perpetual easements, but hundreds of willing landowners wait in line for funding of their easements.

We oppose wilderness and similar designations that isolate the land by employing a "hands off" management approach. Areas designated as such have proven unsuccessful as evidenced by the catastrophic pine beetle infestations in the Black Hills wilderness areas and those in other forests across America. Such practices have not "protected" the land, but rather created a situation that invites disease and fire.

The NEPA process is good in theory. However it is expensive, slow and can not adapt to rapidly changing situations (eg. Natural disasters such as fires, tornados, floods, etc.)

Expanding federal ownership of land is inappropriate and can not work in a broad conservation plan. The federal government should not seek to obtain ownership of private lands for any purpose. Our federal government can not financially manage the land it currently owns. Many land management agencies have huge backlogs just to repair and maintain what they have. Conservation funds should be used to improve forest health and infrastructure, not to acquire more land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Godfrey, IL***

I'm pleased to say that an overwhelming number of DU supporters are outdoor enthusiasts and participate on a regular basis in activities that bring them close to nature. Whether it be hunting waterfowl over an early morning marsh, boating on the mighty Mississippi or Illinois rivers, or simply enjoying a peaceful moment in a natural setting, they understand and support with their time and money DU's important habitat work and the relationship between conservation and the added value it brings to their lives. It is that kind of connectivity and passion for all things wild that needs to be generated in greater numbers of people, young and old alike, if we hope to kindle the political and financial support it will take to conserve enough of our natural heritage for the use and enjoyment of generations to come.

Need better trails for kids to learn and love horses. Paving trails isn't good for horses. National Forests have horse amenities but there are no local areas for horses. Need to convince people that horses are a lifestyle, part of economy. Greenways that are good for horses are good for people too. Need local help.

I'm against Casino's, but I still don't feel secure in any of our outdoor areas.

Tests water quality at ten sites along the Mississippi River. E-coli are more often than not, bad. USACE oversees more water than almost anyone else and are great advocates for water safety. Would like the government to mandate them to be as equally concerned with safe water quality. St. Louis has combined sewer overflows that were designed over 100 years ago. Raw sewage can escape into our rivers. MSD estimates that this happens 50 times a year on average. Need billions of dollars to fix this or it will only get worse.

Alton residents feel a physical disconnection to the river. How have other communities improved this?

DOI- Los Angeles-feels the same way. One of the rivers has cement sides, so they need something to balance the use of the river. Transportation to the river is a concern that is being looked at as well.

Elementary schools are cutting out Physical education. Keep it.

Turn out streetlights to be able to see stars better

USACE and USFWS manage over 300K acres. Need to fund a long-term program of stewardship for these resources otherwise any success is short term. Reconnection is directly related to the quality of stewardship. Adaptive management does not have to be difficult.

Access needs to be improved.



## Discussion Question 2

***Godfrey, IL***

***(cont.)***

Tremendous framework of local entities already exists here. We don't use this framework as well as we could. Need to use the local communities to reconnect people to the river. Don't focus on St. Louis, but think more regionally. Don't ignore the barges or commerce

We do a lot of commenting on permits and other USACE actions. Kids want to help and they are ready. The challenge they see is climate impact in the future on them. Don't scare the kids and tell them the adults are working on it. We have to improve the out

Losing IL River to sediment. Need appropriations from WRDA to fix this. Planning on how to fix the problem is done. We just need funding to put it into action. This is the most important thing for IL River.

AmeriCorps teams have partnered with state, federal and NGO for invasive species removal, cleaning, studies, trail maintenance, etc. AmeriCorps program is extremely cheap and you get a lot from utilization. The program targets youth and directly gets them involved. This program is already in place, it just needs more staff positions funded.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Golden, CO***

Bark beetle epidemic, what is a healthy forest is bringing together that have not in the past history. What do we want for the next generated. Now we can look forward for the next 50 years, how do we plan for the population growth (human). Access to public lands is crucial. How to balance it? Collaboration and conversation

Limited access to public lands through private land owners.

Making time to get somewhere

Transportation costs. Permission through school system to get kids off campus. Curicullums in schools. Electronic industries have overpowered the outdoor industries.

Youths are programmed a certain way. Schools, etc, programmed to wake up, go to school, go home and do homework and go to bed. There's not enough time to go outside. Schools should have gardening program to grow their own food and not have to buy the othe

Lack of knowledge, and fear hinders kids from going out at camps or just out to see the outdoors.

Don't have young peoples attention of the outdoors.

Transportation, less polution.

Fear of lawsuits keep people from allowing many to go to the parks and from the desire to go. Convince parks and others to not worry so much about suing over a twisted ankle and hndereing and scaring others to not go out.

Transporation to public lands.

social media, computer, TV, people are unaware of what they are missing, not enough media attention on what is available outdoors

video games are a habit

lack of transportation, parents not getting kids out, money not available, 16+ year olds need license to fish, rides, lunches not available, parents too busy to be around for new outdoor experiences

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

peer pressure, other kids not into going outside as much

lessons not available

ECO week at school no longer available at school, funding not available in schools, outdoor programs are not available at schools

people don't know where there food comes from, no gardening, not always have to be camping or hiking, needs garden, etc.

clinics mentors need to come to schools

Not enough people recycle

Littering is a problem

Not enough resources and recycling

Too many people do not care enough about the environment

Too many electronics

Drugs are a problem

Parents are working, which makes it tough to get outdoors

Safety is an issue, compared to the old days

The media is an issue. When we were kids, we didn't hear about all the issues as much as we do these days. Movies that are being made are so violent, which are scaring us. It also costs money.

We don't hear enough about the positive benefits of being outside

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Lack of access to the outdoors. With parents working, they cannot take their kids outdoors.

There is a lack of funding for outdoor youth programs. This seems to be the biggest barrier in the last few years.

Video games keep kids from going outside. Parents should limit the time kids can play video games.

people aren't motivated enough to go outdoors, too much internet/facebook time, need to spend more time outdoors with friends,

nobody exposes people to the outdoors, not talked about enough

too expensive to use the trails, some younger kids can't afford the fees at the more expensive parks/trails,

kids use phones/internet for everything, even when outdoors... no easy access to many parks

access to outdoors is needed for the youth, too many boundaries

living in apartments, takes too long to get outside if you live in urban environments

kids want to stay home and watch TV, not many folks realize they have the option to go outdoors

can't drive, hard to get to the outdoors if parents aren't willing to drive

some kids aren't encouraged by their parents if their parents didn't grow up in the outdoors

need balance between outdoor/indoor activities for kids, too much homework

too much homework, sun is down by the time he's done

6 hours of homework at night, too tired/too dark when he's done to do anything but watch TV

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

suggest that homework assignments include outdoor activities

Japanese have more homework, tougher schools so homework is good, but they balance with more outdoor activities

more homework for her son than when she was a kid, needs to be a better balance

too many states have taken outdoor activities off their agenda, too much childhood obesity, agrees with incorporating more outdoor activity into school work.

obstacles is TV, games, computers people would rather use them then go outdoors

Laziness in general

People would rather stay indoors. People are scared of getting shoot

Minorities hard for the parents to focus on getting kids outdoors, they are focused on just getting by. Snowboarding, skiing is looked at as a typical outdoor activity, they don't see some on the less expensive activities

Transportation is an issue, a lot of times public transportation does not get there

Go to the mall instead of the outdoors.

a lot of the places to go becomes developed and no longer available

Single parents have difficulty balancing just the regular live, live style and energy to spend on the weekend to take the kids out doors.

Resource, families do not know what is available, and what programs are out there. There is a perception the outdoor programs cost money. The schools could do a little better getting the information out there about the programs and have more available

Money, lack of funding for youth corps, and complicated requirements. To build trails and enjoy and participate.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

People think it is too hot they stay in doors.

Overcoming the barriers (ages 14-18) partnering with other groups to help fund the program. Group of kids have pitch in a small amount per kid and apply to grants. Snowmobiling and mountain biking, with the Rotary Club, REI Etc

SOS outreach go into schools get grants and scholarships to get kids outdoors. They teach kids the skills necessary and the equipment.

Environmental Learning for kids have programs for families and kids to get them outdoors and trips, camping, fishing etc. Free clinics for fishing for city families. To help break the cost barrier

Out doors and nature is a backdoor to nature. Nature is where you live too.

Air pollution may be a barrier

Most neighborhoods have parks. Maybe have neighborhood events to encourage community outdoor events.

Parks are not adequate, the water stinks, there trashed. Parks are well used. People are scared to use the parks with some of the people who use them.

Parks water is full of mercury, you can look but don't touch.

Gang member parks, not very inviting. Not in a safe neighborhood. Only child can not go to the park by them selves. Safety.

Don't learn that in school, that there is a national wild life refuge in the city. Don't see it on the news. People are not getting the message that the parks are out there

In reality teenagers do not watch the news, don't read the paper. The news is focused on the bad things.. Internet is a big thing but there is so much information out there and they are not searching for the outdoor news. There is not people populating

Signs in the buses and the streets people can see in the high visibility places in the city.

Video games keeps kids in all day and they don't want to be outdoors - 3.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Not a lot of public programs aimed at conservation - 3.

The subject of conservation is just not brought up a lot in his community - 3.

People don't recycle. We are imposing on the land that animals use. Misperception about how fun outdoors can be - 3.

Not outside because of video games and watching T.V - 3.

The opportunity doesn't present itself and parents don't want to take them outdoors - 3.

Not a lot done to spread the knowledge about the these conservation programs - 3. Kids don't have the motivation to go outdoors - 3.

People mispercieve what the outdoors has to offer them - 3. You must expose people to the outdoors - 3.

Hard to get the kids from the city into the mountians; transportation going into the public lands needs to be improved - 3.

Not a lot of willingness for people to get involved with clean up projects - 3. Programs need to be more accessable to members of the community - 3.

No can or bottle return program in Colorado - 3.

Street waste, and water run off goes into our water ways - 3.

Some public lands aren't not safe (urban area/gangs/drugs) - 3.

Lack of people to show you how fun it is to be outdoors - 3.

Lack of mentoring both from peers, and adults

No standardized way to promote outdoor activity to younger people, lack of transportation.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Peer pressure, caring about the environment is not "cool" to do.

Our culture has shifted - we used to live off the land but now people don't have the same opportunities. We have to find a way to introduce people to the world they just read about.

People think about how other people view them. In the city other people think it isn't cool to go outside, go camping, etc.

People need that first outdoors mentor - if not parents, there nowhere to find it. Youth corps, jobs are so great, opens a lot of eyes; change transportation, educational programs, Youth Corps, having jobs there, let kids know they can make money doing t

I remember when LWCF was fully funded; getting it fully funded again would be wonderful. We need to take a look at GOCO; we need to make it more flexible so entities that get funding don't have to use it for that purpose for perpetuity. Can take another look after at time to see if it is something you still need-skate parks, or something isn't working, you can reassess.

Need to support public health initiatives. I support passage of the "moving outdoors in nature section of the Healthy Choices Act."

What is really working is a return to a balanced perspective. The federal agency emphasis was on fossil fuel extraction. We need to recognize stewardship and other values, exemplified by BLM's recent plan for the Vermillion basin. It is a piece of the old west, and preserving those things for the long term instead of money for fossil fuel values, over the long term.

Need a stronger push for public awareness, not just physical wellness but mental wellness effects of connection to nature. Amazing what statistics show and how necessary it is for youth to be outdoors.

Fewer agencies and streamline agencies and amend existing laws.

Lot of discussion on getting youth outside, and public lands, but private lands, skiing is too expensive. A program where private sector can create a program or opportunities, lower fees for kids and others if they are a member of those youth conservation organizations.

Agri-business not touched on, if we stop agriculture practices that are not conservation-worthy, would allow more conservation-appropriate use of farming lands.

It's great to have these high level discussions but some mechanism to take this, and have a resource to filter it down so that all the efforts can be put rubber to road, a strategy to take this really good information, and how do you filter all that. I hope someone has an idea about what is necessary to take this info for our own use and even more, funding, grants etc, so we can enhance what we have documented today, how can we do something productive with this info?



## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Need tools/resources to make sure success stories are highlighted, such a breadth of topics, wheelchair accessibility is important-highlight success overcoming challenges and how. Wilderness on wheels, sustainability efforts, managing what we have, biofuels, untapped resources, plant the seeds to stimulate grass roots level.

Policies still in place from prev admin. Need to reverse the "no new wilderness areas". Concerned that we are opening up wilderness areas to too many uses.

People do not understand what we do with horses on trails and the competitive nature of OHV use on trails used by horse back riders. In some areas other trails are being closed for development of other uses like dog parks. Lack of funds and due to economic times we don't have support to educate about these issues and the benefits/fun of horseback riding in our open places/spaces.

When you are out in the wild/wilderness, and you have other uses (e.g. horses, ohv, etc.) you often get pushed out of the way. We need areas that offer both and do not get "over competed".

We try to teach folks with brochures, etc. But he agrees it really takes mentoring, to get the message across. Need to start with kids, but the problem is that many families do not get that opportunity. We need to build a program of stewardship over time to teach our public and especially our youth.

Inadequate education on impacts of certain recreation types on the outdoors. (e.g. OHV use and other motorized equipment use on trails). We need to have education programs that teach about the impacts of these uses to solitude and silence.

Overheard a lot of people funding non-profits that support outdoor programs. For him, I don't think funding is the issue. I think it is more about the quality of the program and timing. He thinks the greatest solution to getting kids outdoors is to make it part of the school curriculum.

Works with three counties to discuss water use/quality. Need people in the counties (not elected officials) to care about the creek, its quality, etc. Need people to understand its recreation potential (e.g. trail). First step is to get the people to care.

Discussed Project Learning Tree, Project Wet, Project Wild, and Project Food etc. Do a program annually called Camp Rocky that they use to teach youth about a variety of topics related to natural resources and have concurrent teacher workshops. Need to get the "project" curriculum and similar programs like Camp Rocky into schools.

Need education and outreach toward community programs. Access to lands is key to doing this. We would love to have people come to plains to help us build our environmental and conservation programs. We do trail rides, festivals, etc. that we do at minimal cost that get a lot of folks involved. Making connections with other communities, especially in urban areas, would be a key help to those of us in rural areas who want to do more and educate about our ecosystems (their importance and benefit).

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Funding is a challenge, but despite this we see tons of kids getting outdoors. It is all about possibility, and how much we do. So it is really important to get these programs going and people involved them.

Teach the teachers about the place. Thus they use a teach the teacher method for the areas which gives teachers the tools to do outdoor education and get their kids outdoors.

We do outreach to our local schools and turn them into feeder schools for our programs. Many of our parks are not very safe anymore so getting kids outdoors is really hard. On top of that parents are not able to get outdoors and many parks are run down.

We need to find that common thread and unite those folks with that thread. A common thread that can unite folks and bring them together, gives the opportunity for developing partnerships and creating opportunities for developing initiatives.

A huge barrier we have is that people are not clear about what their lands are and where they are. We need to do a better job educating them about this.

The great idea America had was setting aside open spaces. We would not have the recreation opportunities we have if it were not for our open spaces, parks, etc. In some places we took amazing wild spaces and developed them. In others we have let them go. We need to keep our wild places wild and not development them to the point of ruining them. He likes areas without signs, parking lots, designated trails, etc. Wild does not need to be manicured and paved.

As a society we have a done good job at setting lands aside. In CO, 16% of our landbase is wilderness. We have to applaud our current successes. The USFS has over 11,000 miles of trails of which only 2,000 are open to OHV. We are talking about encouraging people/youth outdoors. We know that our forests are stretching our current resources. It is a tough go for our land management agencies. We have this desire to get folks outdoors, we have more folks than ever outdoors, and yet our agencies cannot support this.

We are giving away our land for mining/leases/etc. at minimal costs. These folks are making profits on "our" minerals and yet getting them for a song. Maybe they would not take such risks if they were so cheap.

1. Use urban communities as a model 2. Create trust between rural and urban communities 3. Develop ecotourism 4. Create festivals for species 5. Create trust between fed/state/private

1. Mandate environmental education 2. Project Learning Tree

1. Successful environmental education programs--supervised youth education

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

1. Work with partners to bridge the gap between private land owners and agency partners

1. Bureaucratic rules are obstacles

1. Divide between rural and urban audiences--mistrust, lack of communication

1. Need to have environmental education from early childhood through high school 2. Need to have envtl. Ed. in wildlife and provide transportation

No money for managing forest service land

Cultural resources not to be cut-- Save America's Treasures, Cost Share Program

1. Need access to open spaces--must be a connection between where people live/work and where they play outdoors 2. Lack of access isn't just an urban issue--rural too

1. Ability to integrate between different agencies to incorporate funding sources--including private land and agricultural sources 2. Bringing together existing federal funding sources

Sustainable funding mechanism that generates revenue. 2. Research lab that focuses on environmental education--physical and mental health aspects

1. user fees are an obstacle 2. Look for stable funding for activities 3. Don't build unnecessary amenities

1. Look at successful existing organizations--best practices, engage communities of color and marginalized groups

1. Continue Challenge Cost Share Funding support

1. Support GOCO and CO Kids Outdoor Program

1. Attract kids to outdoors programs--classes should be integrated into schools

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

1. More \$ for easements through LWCF 2. Cooperation with county commissioners --Yuma County, allow current funding to be utilized 3. There should be more conservation easements-- more \$ for easements

1. Expand the benefits of the Farm Bill to small family operations

1. More monuments

1. Allow everyone at the table 2. Healthy level of funding for partnerships

1. Subsidize volunteer training so they can maintain their work 2. Communication and education for general public 3. Physical tools to maintain trails

1. Reviving CCC models

Some don't feel there should be motorized recreation. Have to fight wilderness designation, trail closures, fewer multiple use trails. We are looked on as the bad guys. OHV Registration program in Colorado puts money back into the trails. 3 million dollars annually goes to Federal agencies to maintain, restore and build new trails. Successful program. Greater demand for motorized recreation.

Funds are scarce. Have to reduce and concentrate on a smaller group of programs.

Same as Kirk. Even with GOCO, funds are tight. Programs that don't generate revenues are lower priorities. Less than 10% of State Parks funding comes from appropriated dollars.

Fears of outdoors (example bears). Support of teachers lacking.

No dedicated funding sources for operations and maintenance (local and state parks). Creating new programs is the priority rather than funding O&M.

Obesity rates. Fitness is a challenge to getting people re-connected with the outdoors. Also, fits with initiative of President to get kids more fit.

Knowledge challenge, don't see the outdoors as part of their lives. Getting unplugged is a big challenge. Understanding how to be outside.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Community level – lack of vision and priorities. Go out 50 to 100 years. Big stuff takes a long time to put in place. Having a master plan with vision and priorities. Resources get re-organized.

Getting youth unplugged. They have conversations with each other. Communication happens outside.

Chatting on line preferred to meeting friends at the park. Invite friends to go to the park, they will find out what can happen there.

Going places where you can't use the technology. Where they have to put it away for a week. I like not having phone for awhile.

Permitting from the Forest Service was a barrier to taking kids with disabilities up there. Requirement for insurance, fees, etc. Fund raising also requires Forest Service permit.

Family has a rule when they go outdoors that kids have to unplug. Some trails closed that have been open for a long time. As you get older, it gets harder to get to some areas on foot. Grandparents are very important to exposing their grandkids to the outdoors.

Heavy use of OHVs is not good for wildlife habitat. Without wildlife, the mystery of being outdoors is not there.

School that she started is a model. School in the Woods, Academy School District 20, near Colorado Springs. A public school that accepts fifty-two 4th graders every year. Chosen by lottery. Nature based schools.

Create more passports (like the Federal Senior Pass). Maybe there should be a youth passport? Make it more accessible.

Trips on the river include geologist, botanist, astronomer. Working with schools is very difficult. Used to do kids trips with Denver Children's home. Now the logistics (number of staff, managing kids' meds, etc.) make it impossible. Build multi-million dollars sports complexes but no tents, backpacks, etc. to connect kids to the outdoors. Getting kids outside is not viewed as part of the curriculum. Each school has to have a staff person who will lead it.

Hook kids with "fire, knives, and dirt". High adventure, fun, etc. is what gets kids interested. Need to attract kids on their own terms.

My sister learned that kids that don't go outside have less creativity.

Get the kids and adults out there but preserving the Great Outdoors is really important. Work of the Udalls in preservation. Conservation is huge. Has to be something there to enjoy. Plan ahead for conservation – look ahead 50 years.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Parents and adults need to train kids.

When there's a desire, it can happen. Took a group of students to SEACAMP San Diego. She had the backing of parents and administration. Hard to get the kids out of the classroom with testing requirements. Teachers don't have the freedom to do the creative outdoor activities with kids. Teachers need support and also more awareness. Networking is key. Sustainability is very important. Not much teaching about it.

Outdoor lab program in Jefferson County

Balarat program has been cut back. This was really fun. Should be more often.

BLM needs more authority to enforce regulations.

These forums should be scheduled differently to provide more participation.

Involving young people of today. There's been some disconnect between young people and the outdoors, need to get programs in school systems, even starting in daycares - recognition of the landscape, what it means, how to use it and how to preserve so is both useful and soul-satisfying.

Involving young people of today. There's been some disconnect between young people and the outdoors, need to get programs in school systems, even starting in daycares - recognition of the landscape, what it means, how to use it and how to preserve so is both useful and soul-satisfying.

Get to know your neighbors, your ranchers and others. They're not your enemies – your friends! Have to understand that person, respect their uses, look at overall planning and involve each other.

Concerns me – costs \$20 to get into national park for vehicle. Excluding large group of people by charging so much. Nonprofits that bring kids out – gotten so expensive for busses that they can't afford to bring inner-city kids out anymore. Out of inner city and into wilderness. Problem – national forests, even non-profits, have to buy \$100 permit to bring groups of people in. Why can't forests get together and have one annual fee to take groups out? If you want to get people out, you've got to make it easy.

Educate kids about surroundings and then take them a step further. Funnel money through non-profits who know how to use it and what to use it for.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

An obstacle is that the Forest Service has requirements for us. We want to provide education and motivation to get people out there, but because we're non-profit, it's cost-prohibitive and Forest Service agencies are mandated to have the permitting. That's become a real stopper for us. Need to provide transportation to get people out there, make not so many hoops to jump through.

Important that this initiative, that our lives, try to influence positively citizens to value public lands and resources because they are our life support system. "The lands have to come first – or else." We're not self-sustaining by any means, need to keep our life support system. Natural reserves and connections between them and us. Whatever we can do to heighten the way public values and understands what wilderness is all about – promote designations of new wilderness areas.

Have some sort of vision of success from the beginning – easy to get overwhelmed by details, keep in mind what goal of program is. Develop self-definition of being conservationist, recreationist. Important to conserve the areas that we love. As population, not as inclined to go there if not comfortable with it in our backyard.

Policy where within every 2 miles there's access to a park, if that's the vision seems like an amazing opportunity because then other programs are trying to get people out to places. Effort to reach out to generation in 20s and 30s?

GoCO - dedicated funding, as agencies do grants, should be requirements and funding given so receiving agencies would participate in education programs to let public know that offshore drilling royalties funded programs.

Using landscapes to teach across American West – easy in east, only way to learn about landscape is to be on it, landscapes are ultimate classroom, history, culture, biology, geology, powerful tool build respect for culture, need new landscapes set aside, NLCS provides vehicle for teaching about lands as entire ecosystem. Improved access to lands through government funding that provides classrooms. Provide competent and diverse teachers, need standards for outdoor education from Department of Education – crucial role. HHS needs to be eminently involved in obesity awareness, Department of Agriculture needs to undertake education for relationship food and natural systems, Interior. Outdoor-based curricula, comprehensive inventory of lands, public and private, which can function as classrooms, inventory teaching resources that are available, competent teachers, and link. Do away with public attitude of fear toward access to difficult places. People need to be encouraged to swim rivers, climb mountains, without having every piece of equipment from REI to do it. Teach how land forms and water shape human history. National Trust for Historical Preservation involved in campaign to do what wilderness society did with creation of NLCS, set aside cultural landscapes. Know and be able to teach how people at Sand Creek used landscape to save selves, grasslands shaped hist of Santa Fe Trail, etc. Teach about landscapes from landscapes – will get people out, make them healthier, engender tremendous appreciation for entire planet.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

People are programmed to think locally rather than seeing the large picture when working on conservation and outdoor recreation issues. We need to find a way to reach out and educate people on the need for cooperation among many groups, rather than solely in a local setting.

The primary bstacles are with education for youth - youth are not being taught at an early age to have the engagement with the land that is required to love the land enough to promote conservation.

We are not using the Clean water act legislation to effectively manage and protect wetlands areas.

CSAP requirements are preventing schools from teaching the natural sciences. Sierra Club has a program to connect youth with the outdoors which has been extremely successful regarding graduation rates and grades. The expense of transportation for youth in the city to recreation areas is cost prohibitive.

The permitting process is prohibitive due to the fact that youth groups and educators are being charged as outfitters. It would be helpful to redesign the process and give breaks for permitting for educational purposes. Allow easier educator access to public lands. \*another barrier are the folks within the conservation community...perhaps too conservative?

The DOW programs are comendable. The connection with nature creates invaluable influence in the lives of children. Once you make the connection, you are able to establish an interest that they can see and feel themselves. When kids are allowed the opportunity to learn hands on, their research indicates that there is a higher graduation rate, higher math and science test scores, and a higher percentage of college enrollment. Unfortunately, these outdoor programs have been cut from 5 days to 1 - 1 1/2 days to accommodate CSAP requirements.

resources, BLM enforcement of pbulci lands - orv prob lem and lands set aside too little money to educate and enforece what'S CURRENTLY IN PLACE

"Recognize that broad eco-systems are at stake and must be addressed beyond any particular state's preferences. The red rain that falls on the Denver area and covers cars, houses, and my expensive photovoltaic solar panels so that the sun can no longer reach them originates in abusive "historic" land practices---read over-grazing---in the Utah desert. If "scientific management" is the guide, why is this happening? Barren drilling and mining sites likewise destroy the land and water. Have we learned nothing from the Dust Bowl of the 30's?"

Works for conservation. This system of lands established in 2000. Challenge is getting the word out. It is wild and scenic areas. That this land exists. Wants to shorten the name.

Getting kids outdoors. Kids spend a lot of time indoors. How do we get kids outside even in their own backyards



## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Young people care about what their friends say. "why do you go camping?" People care too much about what others think. It's okay to go camping fishing, hiking

Can't push kids to go the parks. Not enough school shave the outdoor education programs part of their Curriculum. Funding for travel to get kids to programs.

Global footprint of carbon of driving up into the mountains. I feel that it is a sin not just against the country and the forest but against the people of our world.

Inner city issues within the education system: in CA, there is not enough resources to get the kids out, and can not go out everywhere and play basket ball because of risks such as gangs and being shot in different areas and cultures.

Private Lands Conservation---Raising money, but hard to come up with private cash match of the funds. Private fund raising is hard. Wyoming has a lot of private ranch lands which are important. Urban places are a big drive of our economic culture.

Industrialization of our public estate. Disorganized public and state. What my kids see is not outdoors and lands they love. Industrial operations causing harm. Grazing lands, sage brush os in trouble. Ranches have federal pastures taken over because BLM policies are not being enforced. They let people cut roads and ditches everywhere. Public estate is a big challenge. BLM knows they just ignore. Ranchers can work together to keeping the weeds off the sagebrush land. Have a call for sustaining ranches.

We allow million sof pounds of poisons to spread our lands. Changing sex of all fish to female and damaging.

NO big money. Has changed drastically. States are cashflow challenged because of hunnting liscenses going up. We could take money and give more to help recruitment problems and finding good spots to go.

partnership between federal and state. Sometimes the state asks federal government for oppurtunities to explore and explore, but the two agencies are not talking. Communication is a problem between federal and state. National agencies may not have the power to go out and see when the local state agency does. Communication is important

Comunication between agancies is critical. One hinderance is the Heirarchy. Park values are meant to be timeless for everyone, not for local businesses to exploit.

1)FRPPENG- Cash/match is really hard to raise. 2) Land and Conservation fund 3) Conservation wants to be measured in acres not dollars

Finding someone who is truly passionate about the lands

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Valleys with no way to get to them. Trespassing because these lands are held as though they were private. More access to local people

Matching funds, cash isn't there.

What is working: Cattleman's and the land trust are moving forward in partnership, and stronger organizational structure. Access for the public to the Sangre DeCristos. What is not working the IRS. They have a strong organization regarding access to the Sangre de Cristo Mountains.

Challenges: with SCORP is wonderful but do not have the funding to implement. SCORP is a problem implementing due to funding issues.

Challenges: CDT - inconsistent direction across the agencies regarding trails that cross jurisdictions. On the ground level is a issue. Find language that provides consistency with a cross country trail. National Forest, BLM and NPS interpret the National Trails Act differently. Hard to get consistent direction. Also, engaging private lands so that interpretation can be accurate from what Congress puts forth. This goes to how different agencies interpret language in an Act. Administration needs to push integration between agencies.

Challenges: Field Offices - Policies and Instruction Memorandums and Instruction Bulletins are not being translated and reaching the Field Offices. Fee structures are different across the country. Special Use permit issued differently across the nation. Information not trickling down. Agrees with Martinez's comments on enactment of Washington policy decisions being put into place by the states, counties, localities. Believes field offices do not volunteer information on changed/revised directives/policies nor even enact changes in a timely manner.

Challenges: Goes both ways. People on the ground not getting the best information and technology to do their jobs. No mechanism to put the students into this pay it forward membership program to help the environment. Getting information from the states, counties, localities up to Washington effectively among the varying agencies. There's no way to get all Federal agencies jointly involved with the same program at the lower levels to get something accomplished.

Challenges: Open space programs have been successful throughout Colorado. Problem eroding sales tax base because of the new internet purchases. The States want the sales tax that are due to them. Local government require sales tax now and the base back to them. Counties are receiving less money than in previous years. Keeps them from being able to buy open space lands. States are getting sales taxes from Federal government, but it doesn't appear that local governments are being given the same help.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Challenges: IRS fraudulent accusations, encourage outdoor use, increases the impacts and waste disposal on the land. Group size damage, impacts to the environment. Need to educate about what the outdoors are about and preservation. Concerns from San Isabel involve the IRS; Crystal Mountains and problems with massive trash, etc. from people who use and damage the area because some people being allowed to do whatever they want when there while others' accessibility is limited. Educating youth on preserving the area. LEGACY FUND.

Challenges: Office of conservation outdoor recreation coordination need to model the wildfire integrated management system. Create an Office of Conservation, Outdoor Recreation Coordination, which would be an agency to coordinate between all Federal agencies. Too many Federal agencies to contend with.

Challenges: Federal coordination

Challenges: Wind energy developing faster the regulations.

Challenges: Legacy fund with GOCO. Transportation (for children and others) – Make it easier for people to get to/from places outdoors.

Challenges: Transportation (access) Get out side is important to get people to the outdoors. Best use of funding. Design criteria that encourages implementing funding. Encourage flexibilities across programs – private/non – remove time limits on using funding, etc. Consider how landowners work their lands. Ask landowners how objectives can be achieved.

Challenges: Land owner have to be a partners, we have adequate funding it is how it is used. Be more objective direct. Look at the office of eco-services to help. People need to be flexible. Timing and how the objects work and be flexible where you want to be and go out the landowner base. Could do it fiscally responsible.

Challenges: USDA programs that are good, changing cash matching requirements. Funding changes, to make more available. Open up LWCF to private conservation efforts. Pilot program for Colorado administered by GOCO to achieve more local programs. Tax incentives. Conservation easement tax permanent.

Challenges: Funding aspects have to pay upfront and they then get reimburse. Have the funding up front that they can charge against (small non-profits.) Funding aspect – paying for programs across participants upfront and then waiting as long as a year to be refunded by the Federal government. That groups such as hers be given funding upfront and/or refunds much more quickly.

Don't acquire adequately at the FO level, one botanist for huge land masses.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Issue federal land acquisition process, not coordinated and brought up through the public input. Largely politically driven. Not through SCORP. Federal land acquisition process that, to him, is an uncoordinated process that isn't connected with organizations such as cattlemen's associations, etc. Process seems to be too insular.

Challenges: Personnel - quantity and back ground. Region 2 of the Forest Service hired a person for travel management that is not qualified. (let me do it.) The movement of Federal employees into jobs they're not as qualified to be in as someone in the private sector who has been in Colorado, which, she feels, causes programs to be handled inefficiently

Challenges: "Lets move" (First lady) initiative gets integrated, needs public support, the National Forest Foundation. Getting the word out. How do we get it down to the local level. How can the local groups help bring the program down.

Challenges: Effort to get a youth natural resources to the National Level. All agencies and bureaus need to coordinate in the vision. It is about the importance of working lands where our food comes from, conservation, education. Youth in Natural Resources program. Where does it stand?

A lot of money spent on buying land, and when we take it out of a working landscape, but there is no money dedicated to maintenance, restroom facilities. In Colorado we love our land to death. Need help with the maintenance.

Challenges: People in government are not getting the Leasing Reform message. Leasing Reform not translated to the State Direct the FO's. Training. Onshore reforms don't appear to be translating to the Field. It appears that career Federal employees continue doing their own thing regardless of new policies, etc.

Hearing about projects getting hung up. The federal employees are not getting the message on new policy. What are you planning about setting the working action groups about dealing with the new policy. Mentoring, have a forum. What would you like us to do? Reiterated the failure of agencies to move on new directives, and wants to know what is being planned to breakthrough such barriers.

Challenges: How important it is to have the dollars for landscapes - farm and landscape protection. LWCF is important. Tapping into the energy of land trusts. Relationships between the Federal, Local and State Governments. More Flexibility with the Federal Government to have roles that are more coherent. Federal programs that aid preserving landscaping are vital. Ways to tap into the energy of land trust and private citizens, goes a long way. Overlap – more flexibility on the Federal government working to have rules that work across such overlaps. That the Federal government recognize there may be a legitimate need for more protective rules in metro areas than are necessary in rural areas and not trying to have a one size fits all mentality.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Challenges: Diverse country, give local autonomy so we can manage our resources to the local priorities. That there be recognition that works in one part of the country may not work as effectively in another. Federal government should recognize this and help to overcome such issues.

Don't forget Family farm and where our food comes from. [\*THESE REMARKS CAME AFTER WILL SHAFROTH GAVE PEOPLE AN OPPORTUNITY TO SHARE ANYTHING THEY'D LIKE TO SAY.]

Small parks need to be improved. If the places are run down and lack equipment, no one goes there.

Lack of funding stems from lack of interest. As a whole, society is not interested and that is why there is lack of funding. People don't support the initiatives. Need to reengage society as a whole. Without re-engaging youth, less and less interest results in voters and tax payers, have to re-engage.

I second that, LWCF, and we haven't put enough common effort into urban parks, in communities where kids don't have access to parks where they are. Our charitable group has a goal for a safe outdoor place to play 10 mins walk for every child in the country. Another challenge if "landscape view", how to integrate city with mountains, and federal coordination.

One challenge is not being able to fund of the LWCF.

Colorado's treasures are the land and animals. A challenge is policy, with regard to animals, a lot of money is going to the charismatic species, but we need support for the whole spectrum of life. Once we conserve land it's not over, we have to monitor and pay attention to weeds, threats, and misuse of the land to maintain our natural heritage.

we have two dedicated education facilities, our obstacle, is transpiration. Fees for buses and trips are too high for some school. We're working with schools to overcome that obstacle but it is a growing concern. Testing and other obligations take up a lot of time.

Too many programs with different priorities and different rules bring a project forward and a number of federal groups and youth coordinated for that project.

Our challenge is, we own a wildlife refuge, funding is a challenge and being able to serve the communities while taking care of what we want to. We would like to serve more rural communities but funding requires we do Lowry and Stapleton (Denver communities).

One challenge is getting youth interested in the outdoors. Science academics in elementary is being sacrificed for the standards like reading, writing, math. Love for the outdoors comes through science class. Don't take science out of the classrooms.

one challenge is the technology issue, more interest in tech in their world and lack of interest in the environment, need promotion of what the environment has to offer.

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

not many people know about the opportunities, need someone to show them.

Biggest obstacle is funding to acquire open space. Opportunities to partner with Federal Government have been good, would love to see additional funding for LWCF, would like to see it fully funded. There are also some obstacles around coordination between local and Fed Gov on land swaps that make sense. BLM, Forest Service, could swap and increase preservation of open space, it is difficult to do that and would like to make that better.

Spending time thinking about kinds of outcomes want to promote, putting notions out there as challenges with certain characteristics (highly leveraged, encourage youth, have educational component), create competition and let best ideas percolate to top. Foster rich competition of ideas. Roadless rule for national parks in Colorado, frequent mention of impacts of beetle kill but more forest health problems, won't be effectively addressed unless true collaboration. Need dollars in Colorado to address that issue. Think Colorado is candidate for another national park. Have landscapes that need protection. Encourage continued review and evaluation of a range of possibilities – grasslands are underrepresented portion of national acreage among national protected landscape. Private lands conservation programs through USDA need to be continued, well-coordinated, needs to be an optimization or rationalization of federal funding sources so as user-friendly as possible. Whether pursued by private land owner or NGO, need to be presented and leveraged effectively. Federal government can be somewhat unwieldy deliverer of results.

Bring people to areas of water, especially where don't have oceans, it's central to have clean water to do that. Restore Clean Water Act. Connect experiences from childhood to places, really stick.

issues that come w/ playing in water/liability - legal issues.

non-vehicular access i.e. Clear Creek fm Loveland Pass to the flat; has a lot of bike path. Pedestrian path and funding needed for natl grid for bicycles to get off road due to vehicles - keeping it safe. Create a segregated pass for bicyclists.

big barrier is funding - for kids. Competitive resources. Get funding to reconnect families for Conservation. Technological experience to complete grants -

Conflict btwn public support for species. Issue with Govt allowing wolves to be shot.

w/in conservation often exclusive due to access, program may not be relevant to specific issue.

Funding - wildlife grants. Creativity - place to work

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Mom 2 & 4yrs age - programs for kids to participate in. Guidelines written as rules. Be inclusive and cut the red tape.

Public Land Management - for camping overcrowded. Indians Peak Wilderness too crowded, natl campsites are over booked. Managing it for private ranchers not good always.

More exposure for groups; more volunteers that love what they do; more planning/funding/dedication.

Encourage Land Trusts that r wkng on private lands/ farms; Collaborating with agencies but also private lands so we get educated in ranching/farming

Promote Public Transportation - get kids bus passes; teach kids to take other alternatives rtd, etc.. vice driving.

Agencies are under staffed - put \$\$ for positions for staffing. Educate kids and get them outdoors but need funding fm hunting and fishing licenses. Currently no money available.

Funding mechanisms - sales taxes over Jefferson Cty; pretty cool that CO has to offer

Youth core Program - get kids connected to the outdoors. More funding for Americore to help out low income families .

Co is blessed; partnership base. Need all user groups at the table/wkng together.

Funding for Land & Water - 703B contribution to outdoor. Praise federal agencies due to advertising on outdoor activities.

Solar panels & flat roofs? Something needs to be done.

Energy competitive with wind mills - wells; if the tool that govt puts out to educate - on amt energy savings. Looking for people to put in 10% but need to push 100%. US Govt has no goals to set high goals.

As far as fed govt to be a conduit in conservation - the connection btwn the great outdoors and home is critical to our job. When you think of nature people think scary, far away places. How can we market the Great outdoors?

Under the guise of what works, with motorized recreation, the money is allocated formally, but partnerships with land management agencies - they don't have the capabilities to deal with us and our monies

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

Also really disappointed we didn't show the 7.5 minute video - but it is wonderful and can see online. However, motorized recreation is not included anywhere in the video, though

Has a 14 year old daughter - Am concerned with a "youth need" for us to direct and talk to children about the opportunity and future of land, air, and other important ecological and social issues. It is important to me and my daughter to reflect to: 1.: The Winter Park (northcentral Colorado) issue need to get out. We need educational projects in Winter Park to get kids outdoors in the summertime, and other times. Less fortunate kids should have opportunity. We need to find ways to partner, for education, and to get kids outside.

We need to get kids out with the ski industry, and also year round. Ski areas would be very supportive for camp situations in summer - lodges, parking spots, and other amenities are in place. We have also provided such summer activities for decades, but now there's a bill in congress trying to formalize this. Use of ski areas to shift kids to outdoor recreation year-round.

I have lots of ski experience and outdoor experience. Our Denver area Founders understood the relationship between front range and mountain uses. Winter Park endeavors to get kids out. We approached Denver, but this outreach is stalled. No growth in getting kids to ski areas. Cost of winter sports has created minimal participation efforts. We need to look at President Obama's own upbringing and fostering of value to him for parks and the outdoors. Need to work with families to help them understand these values. Funding is finite, so you need to motivate families and kids. Work with emerging populations to get them to feel more welcome and getting outdoor use. Legacy of public lands is needed.

Vignettes of education are needed. We need to mentor young people in the outdoors.

With horses and back country horsemen, volunteers develop a sense of outdoor ownership. How to do this within budget and without volunteers is impossible. Used to be trail groups. Need to set money aside for trails that doesn't get siphoned off. Enviro studies for trails takes too long. Volunteers need quicker action. Hard to keep momentum if enviro studies stretched out too long. 4-H groups get people outdoors. Helps in urban entities supporting 4-H. National problems (Forest Service has budget issues).

Now there's the bark beetle damage, and most Denver kids don't get west of Weat Ridge. We've done a terrible job in getting kids out.

Families need to understand fundamental value of getting outdoors.

Recently, Colorado was awarded for their outdoor rec. plan. This needs to be recognized across the country! We work as 65 people who meet downtown at the REI store monthly, and this successful grassroots volunteer work can be replicated nationally. Available is Water Land and "Conservation funding for staffing, with initiatives, to continue partnering with many non-profits. We have a successful Landscape approach with our recreation issues (Gave out handout).



## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

I work with over 10,000 kids annually on public lands. Initiatives from Washington DC are not understood and they don't understand how very many grassroots orgs are working with kids. Many hand-to-mouth kids groups have too much competition already for scarce dollars. There are complex urban demographics of this country, and we are losing what knowledge there is about public lands and that is available out there. We need more public message spots on radio and tv saying over and over again this is what we do, and these lands are out there for you.

I come from a 4th generation San Luis family interested in conservation and waterways. Waterways are the arteries and veins of the system to take care of the land. We need to educate our children and get them involved outdoors. A good segment of the urban population has no interest in this. "We need to get people to recreate and enjoy. Then they will spend money, time, and interest in supporting these outdoor efforts. Urbanites may not give a toot about consumption of resources."

We need healthy watersheds and sharing knowledge of lands. Finding how to connect the dots, win, win, win, win. Sustainable funding - GOCO is successful. We need to find out how to create this for rivers and lands throughout thenation. We have an economist working on this for throughout the west and the world. Higher power revenues are the Key to success.

RTP - Recreation Trails Program is out of the Department of Transportation. RTP is on life support now. Like the Federal budget, they keep upping it, but still a number of people benefit from this and work with youth corps. This funding needs to be re-upped or RTP is underutilized. Need to do like GOCO - recdirect lottery and take income stream to create an amazing program. The Snow Mobile ruling was the first funded by GOCO.

At the end of the day, we need constituency willing to support our efforts, or this outdoors issue is moot.

I've raised two kids in school systems - public and private. Unfortunately, neither have any more physical education nor outdoor programs. We need to bring these back in our schools to get kids outside.

There is no need for more 5th graders program to ski for free at resorts. We are at capacity now at ski resorts in teaching kids how to ski. Check numbers on this for accuracy. Kids are now turned away due to full rosters at ski school. Ski areas expose millions of kids to the National Forest. We are a portal to bring kids to the National Forest.

Disagree that many kids do not have the funding to go skiing.

How to get the money out to outdoor programs? Need to play significant roles in applying, etc. Urge Administration to see who they are getting the money to and if they are accomplishing the goal.

transoportation, potential visitor don't have a way to get out to rec sites

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

funding to provide opportunities for kids, even nonprofits need funding to operate

focal point need to also be on adults not just youth, parent base is also important, too much funding just for youth, when introduce "parents" get kicked out of the funding mix, shooting, one of the most interesting activities to those participating, has very few facilities close to be used for their program and their most interesting activities to their participants, shooting sports brings many into the program

getting agencies to work together in a landscape way

outdoor education integrated with sports in school, hiking, mtn climbing, etc, not as competitive as team sports and some respond better to individual sports, and learn about the environment as part of the sport

LWCF is very successful and needs to be fully funded, but focused on "wilderness", funding should include programs "in the city" to reduce the transportation cost, focus on local city parks

Historic education is part of our heritage and important to our education and environment, many of these sites are local and easy to get to, historic properties are in the grasp of many of us, encourage us to think and promote History, need full funding, all are in the outdoors and

Ranchers are indeed incredible stewards of land, endangered species important in S Co yet they have to fight the take over of land by the Fed Govt', (DOD) Need to keep small family farmers on the land to continue the protection of those important lands

BLM needs legal authorities to establish WSAs

How do we get the kids and parents out on the public lands yet protect those lands with today's funding. Mining Law of 1872 needs to be repealed. One of the biggest problems, we are losing money because of this law. Money used because of this law could be used for other needs.

Mentoring a great idea but US Dept of Education needs to be involved sooner than later

Since most of us live in urban environments, the government should focus improving city projects.

encourage the federal government to get young people to work on the land, and invest in existing programs instead of creating new programs.

We need more cost-effective ways to introduce people to the outdoors

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

My parents are from Mexico, so they are very uninformed about what to bring when camping or fishing. Kids like me need programs to help get us informed.

There should be full-funding for the Land and Water Conservation fund. We think there is a need for projects that concern the big picture, and will be beneficial for years to come. The CCC effort in the depression has been a great help for many people. Let's get more young adults involved in helping children get outdoors by creating jobs for these 20-30 year olds.

Reduce barriers (fiscal) to partnership, and increase funding for organizations that get people outdoors. Consider youth as assets that improve public lands and solve problems.

To improve the lands, we need more funding. It is important for all organizations to work together, with the same goal.

They need to address water issues more aggressively. Initiatives protect land.

Only has set amount of time to spend outdoors and it would be nice if maps were made public.

REI has a booth of information available.

Non-Motorized trails are available online; [www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)

Challenge Corp of Engineers to fix problem they created with South Platte. There should be a new way of looking at restoration.

Us vs. Them (motorized vs. other users) all come to table to find solutions, we can all coexist. Every group wants something good and healthy for the trails

She loves the mountains. Agrees with \_\_\_\_\_ that trails are so lengthy and hard for children and disabled, handicap area does not get them where they used to go

Believes it would help to have leaders on handicapped trails.

Would like to see everyone in Govt actually doing something and listening to the public and being accountable.. need to see that the public is taken care of ... doesn't see decisions being implemented. Work for the public, not do what they want

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

One thing that is a common theme is a funding problem... one thing that hinders me from enjoying outdoors is not being able to support my family.. Carbon footprint tax should be implemented on goods that are imported and put a tax on exported jobs... we need to reduce the amount of jobs we export

40 acres, landblocked by the USFS, abuses and lies from USFS to cut trail in his land. Respect for private and public property. No permission to create trails

River issue, water resources.. having access to water. Dolores River and Pewter.. access issue with Forrest Service.. keep gates locked until July 1. Would like gate opened a month earlier.. local district office wants to follow proper channels ; Dolores, managing spills issue with FS, looking for new alternatives for the way the reservoir is managed... impacts are down-sizing.. losing usable water days

must outline these basic principles: respecting property rights, budget allowing to be good stewards, trail management issues, trash – empowers local govt

Conservation- Wise use, not just protection; conservation is key, conservation is the new protection, good responsible wise use of land. Getting more ppl outdoors, when you develop a partnership, all voices are at the table ( voices from one end of spectrum to the other). Opposing ideas get pushed to side, must work best for everybody. Forest Health Issues, giant fences around our land may mean less protection, President to reach out to broad community.

Stuck in a perpetual state of dynamic tension when there is unlimited demand with limited funding... particularly with so many different interests. Only patchwork things being done.. need revolutionary changes like funding wildlife management.. need adequate funding. Have too many priorities that are not being fully addressed.

All agencies are competing for the same dollar, choose priorities.. do all half way or chose the ones important to us and do them fully

rafting issue bill generated more public participation than any other.. packed supreme court with thousands of people... this is something that creates a lot of passion

Nice lie!

Water quality, what can be accomplished with legislation

we need to focus on partnerships to get kids outdoors. Funding opportunities for counties who do not have the resources to get the youth involved. It is important to market and promote projects, and mobile marketing is the way to go!

## Discussion Question 2

**Golden, CO**

**(cont.)**

We need improved access to lands, and provide competent and diverse teachers, and raise the standards for teaching about outdoor recreation. We need public lands that can also be used as classrooms for the youth. We also need to do away with the public attitude of fear towards accessing difficult places.

it doesn't work for young adults to volunteer their time. We need to create jobs for young people, in which they do good work for outdoor awareness.

There are many problems with the forest, other than the bark pine beetle, that need to be addressed. I think Colorado is a candidate for another national park! The landscapes here need more protection.

In Colorado, we don't have access to large bodies of water. It is important to protect our clean water sources.

It costs too much money to get into a national park, which excludes a large group of people. Transportation has become so expensive to bring inner-city youth outside, that it has become too hard to afford it. Getting people in to schools is not beneficial, because it is still not getting kids outside! Another problem has to do with the permits that national forest service's charge for admission. Why can't the forests get together, and charge 1 annual fee for people to enjoy ALL the forests, instead of having to pay for use each time people would like to get out.

If there was money, more children would be able to take part in the activities. Funnel the money through the non-profits!

There is a link with getting outside + preventative health care! Our insurance companies are facing obesity and mental stresses (war trauma), so they should also get together with the government

There is a lack of awareness about the benefits of getting outside. The government should provide answers to questions: What is there to do? Where will I find it? And how do I do it?

problem solving for trails, shes found there is not enough room to go around eachother; some areas with a diversion

## Discussion Question 2

### *Grand Island, NE*

We're partnering with several folks. Nebraska Nature and Visitor Center which has been reopened with Game and Parks and Hasting College. They are doing a day camp today. Use funding from state and federal to fund this, to get kids involved in the nature center more year round instead of just when the cranes are here. In terms of access issues, the program has been charged with acquiring 10,000 acres over past 13 years. Have gotten about 6,000. Have received many requests from the public on how do we open lands to hunters while still preserving habitat for the birds. We are working on that. We have examples where people have gone out and used TVs for target practice. How do we get responsible hunters.

Tri-Basin NRD and Phelps County Weed Control Association, works. CCPI Nebraska being one of the few states where the cooperative landowner owns the land up to the rivers edge. Nebraska was been hit with influx of invasive vegetation. CCPI put into last farm bill and funds were set aside to encourage landowners to utilize those funds to cost share management of this vegetation..Concerns about CCPI program because it is not continually funded because we know even though Nebraska was granted \$4.5 million, it may not continue to come. We need to see that because there is a learning curve, that landowners don't jump into things until they see what their neighbor does. We need to see this continue because we know that those that don't sign up now will sign-up in a couple of years. They put in money of their own. There is over \$86,000 committed to CCPI. Landowners do understand it and it helps control these invasive plants. This is somewhat limited in Nebraska because it is only for fully appropriated land areas. Over half of state doesn't fall into this area. We need latitude to get it used in other areas in the state in the next farm bill.

Something we talk about as outdoor education . Once they're educated they need access. They need opportunity. When alone they won't have access. They need local opportunities. One thing to help with this stems federal government land and water conservation fund. There is movement to get this to full funding \$9.5 million. One key element left out now is that most money will wind up going to federal programs and parks. We need at least half to go to smaller towns so they can provide to local families. Lots of families won't have opportunity to get to national parks. Needs to go to smaller or any town in Nebraska so once the kids are educated they can get access to do. What kids learn in school, if there is not an opportunity to do it, it is gone.

Answer. Right now for whole state is about \$300,000. That doesn't go very far. In order to raise level, opportunity is here and administration can see what success stories have happened thru this program. Now those things are aged and there's no money to repair it or create new. Now Land and water conservation fund is opportunity.

One of challenge we've faced is balance between ground water and water resources. One of State's AWEPS in central state has worked very well with money from EQIP, Conservation and urban development program? In case of Platte Basin Habitat this is a challenge .

Every year around budget time local offices spend time and energy trying to defend their existence/budget. What isn't working: STOP trying to remove funding from RC&D's.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Funding for RC&D needs to be funded. It works. You don't get something for nothing. I've been in this a long time. We are in red zone for level of funding for NRCS technicians. As talk about incentives and education, you're right. Have to have both. Who does education with landowners? The local technicians that work with NRCS. Dollars and workload and amount of time and then still be accountable to taxpayers. Absolute foolishness. Cannot keep increasing the work load and expect the techs to continue the work load. Something has to give somewhere. We are clearly in the red zone. Yet will put more cost share dollars and land into programs but cuts the technicians. We are at the point. We are doing disservice to all other tax payer dollars that has been spent and invested. Because they're not getting done. The point has to be underlined that we can't continue to rob from the local technicians there and still get the job done. Made enormous progress in conservation. Need both – adequate staff and adequate incentives. This is an investment and it's part of protecting water and soil resources for future generations. I'm sure Steve Chick will take me to task for that.

National Park Organization. We have quite a few partnerships. Everything we do is partnership based with funding. Weed awareness group of partners, landowners to get rid of invasive species. Niobrara. Valley Outdoor Education based -- all volunteers get together to talk about Naturefest for 5th graders. Niobrara Council has day camps for local kids kindergarten thru high school We always have a waiting list. Talking about a senior citizen outing day. They would take individuals for sack lunch photo tour New existing program is a camp program for young parents and kids out camping. Families that don't have camping background. If you've never camped you'll be first to get in. Biggest challenge is funding. We spend \$2,500 to \$3,000 for all of those kids because it is volunteer base.

Land owners and owner operators, you know how fiercely independent those people are. You won't get anything done until you get those people on board – conservative conservation minded people. We burn 4-5000 acres of cedar invested acres every year. Until you get the farmer/rancher on board with same agenda you have, you won't get what anything done. You're not talking to the right people.

Perfect example of stepping on each other's toes

not working. Impossible to get. NRCS involved in many. Building road structure, 30-40,000 to develop site and in 5 years may not qualify. What we're looking at doing is purchasing mitigated ground in middle of Lincoln to get something done in rural Ne. How does that work? Trying to do fast track but. Landowners dealing with recreational development but getting comments from EPA. Why is EPA trying to regulate my cattle's gas? As a result set on hands and don't do anything. You can't develop on your own land for your family, grandkids. The tremendous cost to mitigate is too high.

We've talked about a generation in getting them back into the outdoors. None of the people that were outdoors got it from school. They got it from hands-on mentoring.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Reconnecting people to the outdoors. Most of the time we think about urban citizens needing to be connected. Sometimes we need to connect farmer to outdoors in terms of habitat. American Great Outdoors habitat programs have actually disconnected the two; farmers to wildlife habitat. In the past wild life habitat programs are either ag land or habitat. We need to have them in both. Grazing and wetland is good for wetland and provides ag use for farmers. The set aside concept needs to go away. Example: Water bank program is no longer a program but the mentality still exists. Under the program the farmer was forbidden by program rules from doing anything to a wetland. As a result wetlands became choked with trees because the farmer couldn't remove the trees. Needs mosaic of wetland habitat. Over grazed pasture may not reflect proper pasture use, but great for shore birds. Government should not be so risk adverse because of under use not overuse. Poor wetlands because of little activity, not too much.

How to connect people to outdoors. No offense but no one in this group is young enough to appreciate the social networking available. Conservation community needs to recognize that they need to advertise this kind of information in Twitter, Facebook, etc. Show the kids a good time and it will be all over the network.

I was on team of people to resurrect this nature center. It went under and lost all of its money. There were lot of federal agencies that talked about getting kids feet into the water. But when I went to them they did not commit to following thru to get the kids into the wilderness. A lot of lip service. Each raised the flag about the issue but they didn't walk the talk. If you have these portals that have a mission to get this done then fund them. If you cut a tree down in Nebraska in the name of conservation you about get lynched. You have to cut trees down in wetlands or you don't have a wetland. Planting trees is conservation but only in the right place. The Arbor Day Foundation might have a public education campaign about "get your feet in the wilderness". The Arbor Day Foundation campaign is very effective.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act is in shambles. Mostly administrative problems with State Department of Roads and also on federal side. Program has been halted. This program needs to be streamlined. The state says the engineering firm that designs the trails can't be the same inspectors as the firm that inspects the trails. Now we have to hire two firms.

Flood control project part of master plan for watershed development. Held up for 2 years. Requirements for Section 404 (Clean Water Act) are so intense. As soon as you get that accomplished they throw something else at you. They've lost the value of the human resource that we're trying to accomplish and over-weigh the environmental project. We have a letter in the file from EPA that said all dams are bad and no dams should be constructed. The lake was about 65 acre lake. Ridiculous regulations trying to get structured created. In two years costs have gone up but not able to move forward. Heard Washington is going to change definition so the ditch I have would be wetland and I won't be able to do anything with it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Challenge—land and water conservation. Offshore drilling royalties. We have developed golf courses, pools, and parks, using land/water conservation funds. Most are matched 75-25. There used to be tremendous monies allocated across the country. Now I feel guilty for even applying for some of those funds as a larger community because smaller communities struggle to get the funds. This has been a huge process that matched dollars that is no longer available that allowed us to do a lot of these projects. The recent history with different highway bills, the trails programs have become 80/20 matching and are very popular. This year the state is not accepting any applications for trails because there has been a free-for-all between federal highway and Department of Roads when it comes to administering these programs. Struggling and making Nebraska jump thru hoops with charges to apply for these grants. Someone's feet got stepped on at national level that have caused a responsible charge. Need to have an engineering background. Must pass many tests, many hours of study. As Parks and Recreation Director, I can no longer manage this program because, for example, of a program that struck a chord with local people. Senator Nelson has been contacted to try and get past the roadblock. More of state/federal issue in Nebraska.

There is a set aside program in Nebraska. There is a guide to allow walk-ons but still need permission. If you see a pheasant in Nebraska you want to name it because there aren't many left. Through the parks and recreation department, if we don't have everything organized to a tee then parents are reluctant to let kids participate. Nature/outdoors is unknown. A lot of parents are afraid to let their kids go out because they read somewhere about West Nile, bird flu, marsh critters etc. We need to get parents to allow participation in non-scripted activities. Our biggest challenge is to get people to not be afraid.

I got certified then was decertified. We had \$250,000 sitting but they put a hold on it. We finally got a local guy to get it done. We only wanted to get safe routes to school program completed. Process has become very cumbersome. Senators Nelson's been contacted to try and get past roadblock. But to be successful we need to not be fighting each other.

Reconnecting all Americans with the outdoors. When I grew up my parents were together and we went out and did everything together. Today is a completely different family lifestyle. We are asking our schools, organizations, government. Somehow we need to have things that involve the parents/foster parent. If we are going to reach all Americans, what programs are out there and can we do this very basic that these kids can go out and do? Used to walk to school. Kids don't walk to school. How to get every kid everywhere to experience this. Pick 1 2 or 3 programs that we can support and put our whole heart into it. Remember the "Got Milk" campaign? What happened to the "Keep America Beautiful" campaign? Everyone identified with that. What is one slogan that we can all identify with?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

We have the largest reservoir in Nebraska. Lake McConaughy in Keith County, series of 29 lakes and reservoir. Stated purpose is irrigation and hydro-electric generation. The problem I have in working with the farmers and it needs to be stated here on a base level. Ag is Nebraska's base economy. If farmer's get more efficient there is more water for the river, and wetlands. They need to be more efficient at moving from pipe irrigation to center pivots and subsurface irrigation. In a large way they are priced out of the market. Pivots have gone from \$25,000 to \$50,000 in over 10 years. Need NRCS cost share. About 60 percent gated pipe in our system. Would like to be 100% for pivots or subsurface. Ag Water Enhancement Program (AWEP) proposal where we can group our producers together and affect the entire system. Fully funded in 2009 and partially funded in 2010. We would like to see that put in Farm Bill and be fully funded and increased so that we have some water to work with in Nebraska. I appreciated \_\_\_\_\_'s comments earlier about large water bodies. If we have large water body, people will come. We have visitor days where people will come. What I hear that you don't know we would love to have school kids and instructors come to our lakes. Anything we can do to provide free public access, probably need a park permit. Anything is possible at the big lakes. Would love to partner with anyone that has a bunch of kids come with an instructor. Maybe that's something that might work for all of us.

50 years ago could drive across road and see pheasants cross road. Was fun to hunt. Can go to Kansas and get 50 or more and enjoy hunting. Not fun to hunt in Nebraska. Go out, get permission, see 6 birds. In Kansas you can go down there get a booklet see areas, then go to area, find signed areas and go hunting. Don't have to ask landowner. This would be good addition for Nebraska to do this program. I would rather spend my money here.

Piece of property that got 3 acres covered with water. Wanted to dig a pit last spring. All my ground is wetland. Wanted to make pit to catch water, concentrate to keep it off my land. I had to go thru 5 organizations to get permission. Road structure. Taking out Road

I went to coffee shop and mentioned what I was doing. Someone said "You know you're creating a wetland and after two years you won't be able to do anything with it in 2 years."

Neighbor put pivot on ground. Neighbor owns all drainage ditch. Fella wanted to put in pivot irrigation but couldn't cover ditch because it's a wetland.

Has to get permission like he's doing a dam in Lincoln Nebraska when the project is in Nemaha.

The funding availability to do education whether it is to build a web page or to put techs on the ground is just not out there. I know money is tight everywhere but I have personally been surprised to find out how few dollars are out there. This has to start with the next generation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Access issue that was raised .Game and parks does have a long standing program of paying farmers for access but that funding has plummeted and that has suffered. We're more immigrants and more urban dwellers now so fewer and fewer people in state have ties to land. #2 in the country for lowest public lands.. Huge lack of public lands for people to get onto the land. Needs to reinvigorate programs to get public lands for access for people. Need to address fundamental issue.

School systems because of budget crunches are deprived of shop classes and FFA type activities. As a result life time activities are being cut. We have a problem in our education system too.

When created was allowed off-shore money but wasn't demanded. That money has now gone elsewhere. A lot of parks setup with that money but now that it's dried up we're not keeping up. Lincoln Pools shutting down at end of year. Now potential bond issue. Federal money always dries up and then local has to pick it up or it goes away. Lincoln not picking up the funding so they'll close a pool.

In teaching for a long time. It's easy to get a youngster excited about something, but when that kid runs home and sits down at the dinner table and tells mom or dad and they squash the idea. If there's a program that will get kids enthused at age 20-40 that will help too.

As a parent, I know a lot of parents of young children. We keep our kids so busy so they'll stay out of trouble mainly. Between home work, athletics, playing with friends. Only time to get into nature are those close to home. Let's take care of green spaces in neighborhood. Come up with an 8 week long nature type thing or something for kids to do something beside soccer, tee ball.

His dissertation was on outdoor learning theory. Kids learn if they walk in the ruts made by our ancestors more than being inside. No child left behind has put too much importance on tests. My plea is for private ranchers and farmers to reach out to the schools, especially the principals. Don't wait for them to come to you. If you can convince the principal you will find teachers who will bring their classes to your ranch or farm. We are having trouble funding outside activities. Find grants or private citizens who will fund these type of activities for the kids. We have to get the kids out there.

College students are doing far more volunteer service then they used to because there is not enough money. How can we organize college students, high school students, and senior citizens to volunteer?

Liability is an issue. People have said to him for years you cannot do this or that or you will be sued. He did not listen but took people out on the trails, etc.

My family has been here 140 years. We are involved with center pivots. We have water running out of our ears. We cannot put down another well. The government needs to leave us alone. The farmer is the dog that keeps getting whipped.

His farm was established in 1862. A farmer does not have time for mentoring.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

How about taking kids who need a job and pairing them up with farmers? Someone else mentioned there are regulations on this, so be careful.

He sold vegetable at a farmers market. Everyone likes the corn, tomatoes, melons, but people did not know what to do with the more unusual vegetables.

Has a city not a rural mentality. Some of the audience at this meeting have a stronger tie to the land. Conservation is important and critical. To get an urban kid from a large metro area to the country would be asking too much. We need to get them or their parent's interested in outdoor recreation if for no other reason then to enjoy it. We need to think of recreation as a critical piece.

How do we reach the parents? Do they care? Can we get the parents to take their kids outdoors? Buses generally do not go to the nature spots. Sometimes the kids need to experience it themselves, and then get their parents involved.

We have to go out and experience the outdoors. The streets of Omaha are not like streets of Dallas. What experiences do the kids today have of their parents telling them to go out and play and don't come back until dinner is ready? We probably had older siblings who watched out for our mischief.

A water park may be their connection to nature. Families need to do things together. We are competing against other activities. We need to get stuff in the urban areas to compete.

It is important that we get the kids back to nature. There is research to support this fact that children with ADD are helped with spending time in the great outdoors. Being outdoors seems to quiet the soul (watching an ant hill, looking at the stars, etc.)and teaches children that these behaviors are not odd. We need to get the kids who are locked inside outdoors. Kids who never get the chance are missing out.

She had an organic farm for a while. Need to create pathways between the different points of view.

We need nature areas for people to develop as human beings. Many of her students did not know what a seed pod was. They had no idea where food came from. We are losing farms like crazy and kids growing up on the farms.

We need to get NRCS out in the field instead of shuffling paper. People have gotten away from getting into the field. They are filling the reports out to get money to farmers.

Stated that kids right in Lincoln have never "roasted a hotdog or toasted a marshmallow over an open fire, don't like bugs, etc. Need to introduce concepts to Youth with assistance of federal organizations. Need to partner with Cooperative Extension, 4H and put more emphasis on environmental youth education.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Private landowners becoming threatened. Reduce budget deficit. Balance between government and non-government up for grabs. Approaching tipping point – Feels his private land can go away. Need a group to link private and public – LEGACY Project. Build trust. One area is endangered species - how does that fit in to the greater scheme of things; canary in the land mine. Legacy Project is worthwhile. He is working with them. They learn from each other respect each other. Research done on his land but he didn't know it till it was published 10 years later. Gets technical assistance from FSA & NRCS. Turned down some items because of the small print. How to build relationship with private landowners. Don't need to get confrontational

Working with people with Ag backgrounds has its limitations. Ag-based board has to be more open-minded. Has consequences.

Have to get kids outside.....Everyone is very busy; must find time to get outside.

Educate people on how to get on Platte River and other areas without trespassing . Need to let people know we have a great Platte River. Let people know.

Already have the positions in place now. Cooperative extension can do more with environmental education. Cannot add more programs to the schools. Needs to be done outside of class time.

Need to work with landowners to have more revenue streams. The fears of the landowner need to be addressed. Need to do more work with landowner to allow them to make money. Opportunities to work together. Show them there are opportunities as well as risks.

Kids have a basic fear of being outdoors. Biggest challenge is exposing them to the outdoors. Need to work with schools on getting environmental education in the schools.

Send pictures to friends on what work they did on the project. Geo cache. Have to be really smart. We unplug. It is a challenge - we may need to schedule time to go outside. Connecting kids at school is hard. May want to teach about guns but not allowed in school because of Columbine. Try to listen to what people want and need.

Relevancy – need to find out what we have in common; show why conservation has relevance. Show value. Find commonality. Listen to communities engaged in outdoors. Need to market the opportunity.

Agrees with everything said thus far. Ground water is a hidden resource. Hard to get people interested in something they can't see. Parents fear letting their children go out and play - abductions, bugs, critters. Nine times out of 10 we already get parents/children that are predisposed to learning. Need to figure out how to get others to the table. We are preaching to the choir.

The challenge is getting people interested and establishing a single network.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

Nebraska Game and Parks Commission: Funds needed for operations/management. Push activities that bring in money. Excise tax needed to fund operation and maintenance of recreation areas. Not self-sufficient. Can't make money on trails. Feds great help to get things started. Need help to keep things going. Texas has a good system for taxing recreation. Park permit, camping, cabins/lodging are the three top money makers. Public information - educate.

Stated by: park admissions, cabin rentals, camping, fishing & hunting licenses.

Need to create access for kids. Not much success in getting into schools. After school programs good. Not much success in the school (during class time). Creative teaching not allowed - everything is about testing due to Federal Regulations.

Younger generation has non-traditional ways to get information - internet, face book, twitter. Need to tap those resources.

Funds needed at a number of levels. Socioeconomics – families with resources are more likely to spend time outside. Different levels of accessibility. Money is the number one thing. Private lands have non-profit groups to work with, NE lucky to have that. Socio economics is an important aspect. Challenge to reach everybody. Stroller and wheel chairs can get on a trail. Need to try to include aspects for everyone.

Make relevant. Broader environmental challenge. Inform of the benefits. If people were to get out, passion might be greater.

Very important to get youth involved. Need education and adequate staff to provide education.

Generation Y is missing opportunities. Need to change the way we reach people. If she didn't work for NRD she wouldn't know what is going on, what programs are available.

Connect communities to outdoors. Recreation and conservation are attached to fixed bodies of water. Not interested in hunting but swimming and water sports, canoeing and boating. Corridors.

12 of our easements are working lands easements..they're agricultural easements. In terms of property taxes, they're agricultural taxes.

15 years ago, NRCS, Department of Ag, and the Natural Resources Commission (to name a few) worked together and came out with a three book set telling people how to incorporate environmental education into every school and distributed this information to every school in the state. Now nobody followed up on it and the program died.

Follow-up question: Where is the leadership? Are there any local partners, State, FWS, or any other cookie cutter formulas out there to get your mission accomplished?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

How many private landowners are here (9): How many people have all the answers? None

I'd like to let people come on my land. We can't make enough grazing and renting that land to pay our taxes. I don't know if an easement is an issue or not. There's a whole dilemma of how do you make the money to maintain it as a private person. If we do a whole bunch of prescribed burns, then we have a problem with leaving a carbon footprint. We have let school children on our land but there are issues of litigation to deal with and you have to have restrooms.

In some counties, tax valuations on WRP are sometimes going up because of recreational uses.

It interests me that we're talking about taxes when it's very important to show the value of conservation easements as a tool for helping people to understand the multiplicity of uses.

It is probably beyond most farmers and out of reach.

It's not only with grants, but with budgets for the federal government. There is a functional part of this that has been broken. The responsibility lies at the feet of the administration and the feet of congress.

Kids aren't getting education about their own back yards.

Landowners can't tie up their lands in conservation. The tax code can be used to apply incentives for land conservation. Creative things need to be done to the tax code.

NO, we don't have enough people to get kids outside. If you have students engaged in env. Ed., they will stick around hometowns, leading to economic development and a sense of pride in the local community.

Sometimes we overlook what small, locally organized groups can do and they may not even be small. They include private landowners. It has to enable local groups to get the resources they need to get the job done. There is always a need for leadership and funding sources.

Teach teachers about their own back yard and they will teach students.

That doesn't take care of the issue of having to make money on it.

The No Child Left Behind Act is a good place for government to get involved if change is to take place in the schools.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

The pre-service teachers and the whole generation of parents teach not to let kids get dirty or touch things because you are going to get sick.

The schools will not have time to carve out environmental education with No Child Left Behind. After school programs may be a better angle to teach environmental education.

There is a big public access problem, as what \_\_\_ referred to (Nebraska is 97% privately owned), and we need more people to be educated and have a buy-in. We need to find a way to educate people about why to protect these areas and how to get funds. With Ag and ecotourism, we're talking about teaching parents where their food comes from and Agritourism is an answer to that.

There is a budgetary shortfall. State mandates to counties help avert shortfalls and come up with the money. With tightened budgets at the county, federal and state level...how do we take land out of production and off the tax rolls?

There is not enough environmental education that has been going on. Teachers have been taking the initiative by looking for information on the internet, but in so many classrooms today, the way the laws are written they focus so much attention on math and English that the Department of Education needs to look at this from a different perspective. We need to focus on holistic learning, teaching kids how to solve problems. I work with pre-service teachers...they are the computer generation. And they have a different style of teachers. This generation is so driven with technology they don't know what to do with kids outside. On the ground conservation works, but we will end up redoing these conservation projects if we don't teach people why we're doing them in the first place. We need to provide more environmental education in the schools and with the land.

We have funding, but it's not consistent funding. EPA has funding available but it's not consistent and the short turnaround time is difficult to plan for.

We have many natural resources, which aren't apparent to kids growing up. Nebraska has two things to offer, that is energy and agricultural. Let's get back to our roots.

We need money to do these things for teacher trainings, busing, and substitute teachers so teachers can get to trainings. We need money for a full-time mentoring person.

We need to teach people how to be comfortable and be engaged in nature.

We own a hiking trail. The trail could not be supported because it is privately owned. In order to qualify for funding, it needed to have an agency own it.

We talked about youth conservation programs such as FFA and 4H. Are those organizations enough to keep the movement going (youth and conservation).



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Island, NE***

***(cont.)***

What they're looking for...the bottom line is paying the taxes, food, and the same thing that everyone else worries about...we're looking for diversification and not monocultures in our farms. We need to diversify our portfolios.

When we look at the state of Nebraska, only 10% of that is accessible. There are things we can do. Our state school lands, USDA MARC, we own these things as taxpayers but they are not accessible. Things like the farm bill access programs will be good. Access is increasingly frustrating for people, a place where we can get outdoors and enjoy nature.

When we started our SOAR program, a kids day camp program, we did not get any local support from our foundations. One of our school board members, eventually becoming a state senator, was sure that we were going to infiltrate environmental education into our kids. Without funding from the FWS, 19 years of this program may have gone unrealized. How do we stimulate a change in cultural attitude? here is a culture shift taking place. We want a culture that sees the land, sees it all, and appreciates it all (land, water, air). That has to come from within. The answer is us, not the government. When we do have an idea, a little seed money can help. What we need in our own county is this discussion and that's not happening. We sit around and talk about our kids but we don't talk about strategies to show us how to get things done. We do not sit around in our development process and understand each other; we don't strategize based on this discussion. It's just not happening and the government can't help that. If we get to the discussion we can get to the strategy.

Whose responsibility is it or where can the schools and teachers help find resources? If you had extra resources, where would they be spent?

Will I still be inclined to get the property purchased based on an easement or by working the land. Is there a difference in the incentive for purchase? ...is the incentive higher or a disincentive...

With an organization like the Nebraska Land Trust, you have a lot of people you know that lead the effort. If a farmer were going to use an easement on his/her own, how difficult would it have been?

With WRP, agricultural rights are essentially set aside. Through compatible uses, some working lands are in place.

Without experiencing nature, there is no ownership of nature.

Without the Nebraska Environmental Trust, would you be able to do the work you do?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

Biggest challenge – sometimes watersheds are protected so much we can't use the water  
Federal permitting process – have fed agencies working together to solve problem – streamline the NEPA process to help water users get through it.

Lack of funding - not necessarily for carrying out specific projects but for support required to do so. Liability insurance is also a major challenge.

motorized recreation not shown as part of the picture

narrow acceptance of motorized recreation - we work for public land access for all people, motorized access is secondary; would like to not be viewed as opposition by people who use trails that we maintain

liability is a major challenge

lots of opportunity to get kids outdoors but can't get them there - transportation and liability are a challenge

lack of flexibility in public lands management process

need transportation to get kids outdoors, more partnerships

1. challenges - always money - GOCO encourages people to collaborate using lottery money as a carrot 2. environmentalists/public should stop blocking the USFS, etc from doing their jobs to maintain healthy forests

lack of funding is a major challenge. Fiscal partnership tools can be too complicated to figure out - simplify. Use agreements rather than contracts between partners.

Education - biggest obstacle - people do not understand value of large, intact ecosystems. Focus should be on value of intact ecosystems.

education - huge urban population with no contact with public lands

balancing act relative to multiple uses is a huge challenge, funding is a big challenge, balancing short term desire to use/access lands vs. long-term impacts which present conservation. Conservation ethic held by federal employees is great but challenge

pollution from O&G industry (5.2 million gallons of oil spilled last yr in CO), want kids to be able to connect to rivers and lands without getting sick. Do not want to see oil shale developed

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Funding issues biggest challenge

Education

Working together to do a project to see who benefits

Economic benefit of recreation if huge – more restrictions – where is money going

Her students – gives kids opportunity to raise endangered fish - her challenge her kids are raised in the area and some have not seen CO River or Monument – need more than just one field trip to get kids invested.

Funding education

challenge - keep people from encroaching on wild areas - prevent sprawl

Most people don't know why we have public lands in the first place, lack of local control is an obstacle

challenge - funding

Wilderness designation works to protect value of intact chunks of federal land

Federal government's willingness to reverse bad decisions

different programs historically let people know exactly where the money was being spent (CCC, etc)

Partnered with USFS to help maintain roads, trails , etc to maintain access to reservoirs

concerned about the lack of coordination between federal agencies. Cited example of the McInnis Canyons National Conservation Area and the Colorado National Monument where the agencies have failed to coordinate and provide unified "public lands" informat

would like to see legislation that strengthens watershed protection. Cited an example of local zoning decisions along the Colorado River as mismanagement of watersheds

teachers are too focused on teaching to test scores. Schools lack funds to pay for buses for field trips. No time in the school day for additional programming. Kids time is consumed with teaching to the test and sports

emphasized two obstacles to involving schools: lack the funds for transportation for field trips and lack of time because of testing standards

fee programs and privatization of public lands are antithetical to the goals of the AGO initiative.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Regulations, requirements, and the strings attached to working with the federal government remain an impediment to many local efforts

Having an accessible walking path and riverfront is the only thing that allows her school to conduct any field trips at all

described his public/private partnership and their efforts to create a continuous greenway along the Colorado River. Has had significant funding from Great Outdoors Colorado but needs more local funding sources. Environmental centers and nature education

Wildlife is not here. We need to be an advocate for wildlife. We need to get beyond ourselves and promote. Need to address illegal roads and trails. Promote National Parks and Wilderness. They help local economy. Ranchers can use Wilderness Areas. Need

Before fed govt drills for oil and gas, use leases already leased instead of providing new ones. Grand Valley becomes dependent on industry and then they leave. This area (Grand Junction) has been devastated by oil and gas drilling.

Challenge - reservoirs on public lands are great for wildlife, recreationists, etc. but rancher is responsible for maintaining reservoir with own private money. Need mechanism to help maintain reservoirs and have access.

We are ranchers. When ranchers retire, they need compensation or they sell to developers. Tax incentives work for rich people but not most ranchers. We have Gunnison Sagegrouse and lands have been opened up to provide more habitat and browse. If wilder

II. It is great that there are lots of organizations with good relationships with the fed agencies in CO. In other places local organizations are less supportive of public agencies and local governments have too much control over fed land management and

I. Challenges. Land use planning. Feds and local government need to work together to get something in place to help keep the city in the city - stop urban sprawl. IV. In tight budget, spending a little money on recruiting volunteers could provide lar

I. frustration - focus is always on human use of lands- even for wilderness. Need a focus on non-use. Less invasive - wildlife have space requirements.

II. Ecoregional perspective is helpful for BLM and publics to have basis for conservation dialogue. Traditional uses are very important - as important as newer recreation interests. Only by incorporating those interests do we get long term stewardship.

I. Either/or mentality - protection or economic development. II. Great collaborative effort now in Mesa County - bringing more kids to outdoors. Fund to help transportation - to get kids outdoors has been great. IV. Must continue to have dialogue a

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

I. a. management, not the label of the land, is what is important. How do we write the management for the next generation - so that the label is not what dictates management? b. Some agencies or agency personnel consider Ag bad for wildlife etc. This

IV. Responding to Acquafresca - people are very busy and can't go to every land use meeting - maybe could have 1 each year so public can attend. I. Decisions about natural resources are often financially and political based - needs to change. We need

III. BLM office in GJ needs more employees to help coordinate volunteer activities (need a dedicated volunteer coordinator). Plenty of groups interested in volunteering, but need coordination.

I. Roads and trails being closed. When you focus all the use on the remaining open roads you are not distributing use - straining the remaining system and lands that are open.

I. Challenge is gaining acceptance and consensus on conservation. People used to be willing to compromise - less likely now. II. Got past that for D&E designation III. Federal role working with private landowners to allow them to make a living on pr

How do we keep trails open for low impact users? 30 years of hiking in Crested Butte area, watched trails deteriorate to the point of disappearing in backcountry, 5 day trip recently tried but now impossible due to amount of blowdown and unmaintained trail

Off road people would say it is ok to get their only by horse and foot. Challenge that people want trails. See poor planning of trails and overuse such as 9 illegal splits -- federal government has no idea of condition of trails. Connecting people to outd

66 years old can't mountain bike, OHV view, collaboration needed between motorized and quiet uses, NEPA - use of NEPA to prevent motorized use, abuse of power to prevent motorized recreation with \*\*\* Sees demonization of motorized use getting worse. Used

We have a goal to achieve "restoration of water to protect fishing", having problems on Roan Platu and Kimble Creek (Oil and gas issues); all leases set aside for \$10k for restoratin work but spills are an issues with frac liquid in creek if truck overtu

Challenges for use - 1) timeframe to build new trails (have expertise available but booged down by buracracy) -- funding and budget (EA as an example - willing to pay archeologist to do evaluation), one most obvious being free lunch (5 years before constr

Been arround a long time, cabins, all over the country, handle on what goes on. Answer people about wilderness issue (designate and leave along - no chain saws). Wilderness camper. Would say what we need is less development, less money, just need a place

Keep closing all these lands to OHV, pick up a lot of trash, I pay to have trash given back to people. Gateway is absolutely marvelous good with monitors -- sick of being blocked off. Enjoy the outdoors a lot around the country and sick of being told can

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Over the last year asked constituents what they need -- 1) Education of youth about the outdoors, having them have access to lands, understanding ecosystems regardless of how they want to use 2) EPA, BLM, USFS requirements to seek grants some many differe

Conserved about 164 transaction, help leverage local and federal dollars, example on Pinion Mesa Conservation Easement -- utilized USFWS grant thru CDOW and great outdoors stamp money to make easement happen. Abuts FS and BLM land on other side and protec

From Utah, create a place where people can go, Utah wilderness bill sponsored by Senator Bennett, Government can help to renew this effort. Government can help by listening to conservation strategies (ex. Global warning), government listening to wrong si

We help with partnerships on larger projects, get people involved, needs to be resources to help with volunteer projects. \*\*\* You need to get out and do it, but the govt needs to be a parter, especially on larger projects. It works really well in GJ, but

Make incremental progress, take the long view of what your interested in, work with BLM and be involved, engage the government to improve policy, expose young people to outdoors \*\*\* Private side of public-private partnership that is beginning to work pret

Get kids involved \*\*\* BLM should get more funding to get kids and parents outdoors. Not all volunteer work is difficult - kids can do a lot of it.

Give and take situation, many uses in public lands, examples of oil field chemicals into atmosphere -- get together and get something done -- given hand out. \*\*\* We have a give and take situation. Evaporating pond in Cisco isn't really an evaporating pond

City get to collect fees government collects to keep in community, collaboration continue to work with local communities initially affected first because 80% of land is public, please talk to people who work in government for future development, effective

Connection to rivers, work in all 17 western states, role is to give land managers and eduction and tools to improve riparian lands, work with federal agencies and governments, youth corps -- would say that one of our biggest obsticales getting everyone t

Recently moved to G.J. and grappling how federal government manages public lands, confused initiall why private industry (Extractive industries) allowed on public lands, believe wilderness has inherent values, extractive industies do have significant impa

All the work done after the depression (movie we watched), limited federal budget but achieving in need jobs \*\*\* Watched PBS program on CCC... we need jobs now, why not employ them to work on conservation and recreation.

Fund land and water conservation fund need, for conservation easements the ability of the land owner to transfer the tax credit (can sell it), Government needs to think conservation and large enough scale to make a difference, big picture needs to be keep

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Concern in how leases in Roan Plateau is devastating in contrast with piecemeal, know we can save a lot of land and resources fish,wildlife,recreation) look at \*\*\* Understands BLM has a mission - oil and gas, but he's concerned with how its done. Leasing

Chevron had monitoring in Gulf oil spill detectors did not work, more government regulation , leaks not detected in Utah, energy leases that the BLM had 14 positions for monitoring but 9 positions were vacant \*\*\* Need for more regulation in preventing oil

Need to strike a balance between competing interests

Piceance (54 billion barrels of contaminated water) - concerned about contamination in Groundwater System, come up with better methods to manage waste water from oil/gas development \*\*\* 54 billion barrels of contaminated oil in piceance basin. Water use

Finding some ways to get youth and show them the outdoors, local area we could find ways to organize youth on a outdoor trip and show them, engage youth \*\*\* Spend time in the woods with his father. Need to find ways to show our youth what we like. Don't

Support of oil companies, need jobs, I lost my job, because oil companies pulled out, need to replace ways to power our vehicles, help oil companies let them know what we think and where we stand, realistic that we need oil and gas, another approach to en

Road public transit/mass transit in Europe, a positive to move toward to help preserve the environment, invest federal funds in mass transit, intervention in wars on international scale pulling funds away \*\*\* Just returned from europe and used their mass

Foreign oil -- suck it up and save the US oil (tongue in cheek), Oil companies investment, 2 year limit on legislators, no-one does anything about the future, moratorium, the long pull we have to do something about gasoline \*\*\* Suck up all the oil from fo

Price of gas has changed dramatically --- regulate energy price swings for more uniform to what we are doing regarding energy development \*\*\* Oil and gas has created out boom and bust situation here. Price is the biggest factor in this. Conservation did

BLM book and provide meeting space as needed, Pull together website that lists various groups that could be contacted or interested in a issue. Research group developed to better prepared for clean up oil spills - frac fluids also. \*\*\* Friends of Northern

Schedule at other times to people can participate \*\*\* Scheduling these things at a different time so people in the workforce could participate.

Not enforcing regulations that are not in place

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Beaches on east coast beach belong to condominium, most people travel outside local areas \*\*\* In the latest SUWA magazine, there is an article about Ken Salazar talking about local business. Most people have to travel for their recreation. I think this

Possibility of ruining our water supplies (Energy Industry), making information publically aware \*\*\* Concerns about ruining of watershed by oil and gas companies. This is something that needs to be made publically aware. No one wants our water to be ruined

What I see in USFS is the commercialization of recreation --- charging for access is not a good thing, privatization of campgrounds not good \*\*\* Concerns about the commercialization of recreation. Trailhead fees, I hate to see us going down that road. G

Enough wilderness areas -- don't need anymore, like snowmobiling, people need to volunteer for their country \*\*\* I think we have enough wilderness we don't need to be creating more. We just need to use more resources and use education. I do like to snow

Appreciate the great outdoors, 7-8 week tour as a youngster of the west (great memories), tools and how to foster greater stewardship --- need to encourage parents that they need to get the kids out into the nature world and how we affect nature through

My dad was with dept of ag, then university system, teran, other countries -- I differentiate between outdoors and recreating. I have a problem with people going into wilderness places just for exercised that they could do in gym. \*\*\* Family was in land ma

Agriculture has a very powerful influence in government -- ruining our natural forest (cattle grazing), power of cattleman is an issue towards conservations, impact mustanges, BLM lead agency to address this issue \*\*\* There are a lot of cattle out in plac

Biggest challenge is having enough funding to even bring students to outdoor field sites, especially the Nudubon Nature Center.

I have an education specialist that covers the whole Western Slope. I need more staff, more money and time to support education and outreach.

Motorized closures not based on science, rather on whatever a manager thinks will help what ever site, or closing an area will benefit a species. NEPA requires the use of science. If areas are restricted to foot travel, only the most fit will be able to

Disturbance and fragmentation of public land is the biggest challenge. Even the best reclaimed lands are not as good as undisturbed areas, from an ecological standpoint. These disturbances including erosion, are a result of recreation user groups.

Funding is the biggest challenge in getting outdoor education to youth. Board of Education does not take outdoor education seriously as suitable education.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Sustainability is the biggest challenge. Audubon Nature Center would serve more kids in the Grand Valley, Colorado River is the greatest resource in this area. Work for long-term future. Sustainability should be the guideline for planning. If public la

Use the resources of the Western CO Congress. She volunteers for many things. Volunteers cost nothing, are valuable, provide camaraderie, learn things, service is worthwhile. Need more volunteers, making things better for everyone. Hard to recruit and tra

Land management is fundamentally broken. Conservation is in the eye of the beholder. We cannot afford to waste resources.

Every time our administration changes, our public land managers change directions.

Engaging our children who are watching TV and playing with computers. Outdoor experiences of kids today are virtual. Kids are becoming obese, need to get them out into natural areas. Make areas wild for independent play. What do we do if youth don't

Education about water is needed. Youth are not aware of how water developments work (dams, diversions). Non-consumptive needs given equal priority with other beneficial uses. There is an agency trust issue. There is no trust in government, regaining p

Wishes there was a standardization of the type of education youth should receive from agencies or guidance on what the Youth Corps should be teaching, as part of their program.

Overlooked Native Americans, their culture and history, and how they used the land and survived. Text books should be rewritten.

Lots of good things are happening due to the efforts of good people. Wants to hear more about what problems exist and what caused them. What can be done to provide assistance? What authorities exist or are needed for agencies to get kids to outdoor site

The biggest challenge is expanding motorized use. Areas have been damaged from motorized use. The farthest distance from a road in Colorado is 8 miles. Roads cause erosion and fragmentation. Road building in roadless areas needs to be dealt with. Leav

The biggest problem are the names (NLCS) and national system of public lands. The names don't provide an obvious tie to the public lands and resources. Compare NPS park names with BLM names.

Too many agencies use cookie cutter climbing management plans. They implement plans without input from local user groups. We don't have access to areas. Need to spread more information with user groups. Help to prevent limited access to public climbing

Communication and misunderstanding are problems. Agencies' values are miscommunicated and are misunderstood by user groups.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Grand Junction, CO***

***(cont.)***

Senior passes allow inexpensive access to seniors. What about passes for younger people to make it more affordable for families on fixed incomes? Consider more affordable fees for younger people, which will encourage young families to get outside.

Conservation should be more focused on the public sector. Agencies have limits on staff and funding. Focus on land trust and easements. Industry needs to stop looking at environmental groups as enemies. Closure of areas precludes use by the elderly and

Appeal 1876 mining law, remove the exemption of Oil & Gas from NEPA.

Pay attention to historic fire regimes, historic stream flow regimes and weed issues. Cheat grass, other weeds are such a nightmare

## Discussion Question 2

### *Helena, MT*

Awareness and funding. Making the future generation aware of what needs to happen to preserve our lands and how to be "stewards" of our beautiful outdoors.

Opportunity for recreational diversity- We're making enemies out of 4-wheelers, motorists, snowmobilers, ranchers, horsemen, bicyclists, etc. by closing off access. They all need a place or they'll have no reason to fight for any kind of conservation. Consider National Recreation Areas (like in OR, CA and elsewhere) to satisfy some of those.

It was great who was there. However please notify who is not there. Where are the voice of the stock, rewers, the farmers, ranchers, mayors, commissioners, mechanics, snowmobiles, ect. The working man cant make a 9:00 am meeting!! The federal government needs to go to them they are the target they need to be included. Also please beware the "evidence of the extreme" This is the scenario where one bad producer or recreationalist is used as evidence to shut down a whole industry, or at least regulate it out of existence. Please resist judging "all of us" by the "worst of us".

Missed opportunities for fed, state, and local government agencies to work together across boundaries to create comprehensive heritage and recreation areas. Further support and promotion of NPS- National Heritage Areas.

1) Growth in human population 2) Increased demand to use public land/assets.

Marginally function public custodians and underfunded agencies who do not have a union for healthy public lands. Politics has demanded and undermined function and historic landscapes. Careful management to avoid damaged to public lands must be re-energized: look at livestock grazing. Excessive networks contribute to sedimentation; water quality problems.

Move as swiftly as possible away from oil and coal use, encourage thoughtful development of renewable energy. Encourage individuals home use do solar and or wind energy. Avoid transporting electricity long distances- use and generate it locally. Focus on healthy wildlife population and distributions- "A healthy environment for man is a a livable environment for wildlife" Keep as much wild land WILD as possible- even reclaim areas back to wild state (good wildlife, habitats) truly road less areas don't contribute to water quality problems or habitat fragmentation, or attribute wildlife species or noxious spray. Apply presidential executive orders to maintain and protect soils and vegetation set up to the plate and apply protective measures to assure that we have functional and healthy ecosystems- they must not be compromised for the sake of pushing people into the outdoors. Introducing people to the outdoors must be orderly and educational so the landscape we are introducing people to are not ultimately sacrificed though our use or abuse. Stop "out" sourcing efforts that should be taken cared by dedicating knowledge, federal scientist/ employees. Take pride in the agencies, encourage them to take action to restore watershed and landscapes. Listen to people and communities but when even more importantly, please listen to the earth and its needs.

## Discussion Question 2

***Helena, MT***

***(cont.)***

Energy! Energy! Energy! Dirty and dangerous oil, coal, and nuclear profiting greatly and destroying our environment

Apathy due to lack of education to lack of exposure to the outdoors. People are not passionate about conservation because they don't understand how they are impacting the environment and/or the outdoors is not an integral part of their lives.

Lack of education and accessibility. The younger population, which is rapidly growing is growing even more quickly away from outdoor experiences available. (sic) Support authorization and full appropriation of the Public Lands Service Corps Act and Youth Corps Act of 2010. Increase and sustain funding for programs that help connect people and the outdoors.

1) Money! Disproportionate funding from federal government to other areas (security, health care) that may provide immediate benefit and results, but are no more important than environment/conservation issues that threaten our future. 2) Awareness and education -- this listening session is like preaching to the choir; there are hundreds of millions of people that are totally in the dark on environmental and conservation issues. They need to become aware/addressed.

Use the good will, motivation and concern for the environment and our public lands on the part of American citizens, especially youth/ children, to overcome some of the work that they long to do and that needs to be done to protect these resources. National Parks Forest Rangers can help facilitate this by partnering with local, non-profit and other groups to get Americans out in the land. Imagine that you could go to a National Park or forest or state park and on any given day find a program, sanctioned by the park, where you and your family could help preserve the park (e.g. paint a picnic shelter, pick up trash, pull weeds, build a trail, etc). Our parks are underfunded and in need of repair. If we can budget the money to get the work done then ask citizens to help. This will get people involved, give them a sense of ownership and accomplishment and ensure that future generations grow up learning how to care for our national treasures.

Rural subdivision is negatively impacting agriculture and wildlife habitat.

Global warming is threatening America's great public natural places. We need to stop regarding these as places that private corporations can exploit for their own profit. Instead, we need to protect their natural character and keep motorized vehicles and industrial activities out of our public lands.

1) Pollution and polluters -- we must hold responsible parties responsible 2) Climate Change

time. Development pressure both from urban sprawl, and energy. Specifically the ill considered new transmission lines to Nevada. Why would we squander MT to support more neon lights in Las Vegas?

## Discussion Question 2

***Helena, MT***

***(cont.)***

Think long term.

Energy development, unbridled motorized travel, lack of information and education, lack of funding for land management agencies, apathy

Rapidly expanding pressure on ecosystems from global climate change.

1) Passing climate/energy legislation and putting a price on carbon. 2) more presidential leadership 3) building on the increases in renewable energy research.

1) Multi-use of natural resources. 2) When areas are closed to motorized or wheeled vehicles, most of the public is shut out. 3) Conserving ranching use conserves outdoor space.

Government take over, wilderness land, road closures, bureaucrats

1) Fund the National parks -- especially science and education 2) Fully fund LWCF 3) Loss of wildlife habitats and critical migration corridors

Big demand, insufficient funding. On the Rocky Mountain front and in the Blackfoot Valley, there is 150,000 acres of "easement demand". Investments in easements on ranches contributes to local agriculture/ rural economics, secures America's beef/food supplies, and keeps wildlife habitat intact.

balancing short-term and long-term costs and benefits. Sometimes, short-term benefits do not justify long-term costs. Note: \$ is not the only cost/benefit!!! Education-there are many misunderstandings and misconceptions regarding the environment. One example-global warming (it is happening-saying it is not happening is detrimental)

Marginally functional regulators and custodians they have been fiscally reduced and politically compromised

Fragmentation, sprawl, and agricultural abuse of our lands.

one- finding sustainable energy sources- fossil fuels and finite!! Two- increasing demands and decreasing supply of clear water three- education real facts for real people and communication.

All areas have different conservation challenges but funding manpower is the largest issue.

## Discussion Question 2

**Helena, MT**

**(cont.)**

Limited resources to get projects/ improvements on the ground. Not enough people on the ground. Government boundaries should be reduced/ teamwork better.

Privatization/Development of lands providing connectivity to adjacent public lands. Loss of a viable/sustainable timber market. Loss of habitat diversity due to both development and emerging insect/disease issues. Younger generations detachment from the outdoors.

People and water: loss of watersheds; loss of wetlands; overuse of water in agriculture; overuse of water for lawn, fountains, pools, landscaped artificial waterfalls in urban settings

Yes, we need to get children and youth back in touch with nature. Along with getting them in the woods, we need to revive the old philosophy of respect for the environment—regard for the plants and animals whose habitat we are sharing. Use of public lands is creating two philosophical camps; public land for extreme high impact recreation and public land for quiet traditional recreation with low impact. This all gets down to a lack of educating experiences and guidance from one generation to the next. Currently, there is a gap in teaching traditional values in how to be a low impact recreationist. Motorized use of access roads brings the hunters and quiet user in contact with the thrill seeker on a dirt bike, orv, or in a loud pickup. A fellow I met last fall during hunting season lost his shot at an elk when a teen on a dirt bike blasted through between him and his quarry. In another instance, two riders leading a pack horse were suddenly set upon by four orv's speeding pell mell up the trail behind them. The riders spooked the pack animals and pursued them laughing and yelling through the woods! The two philosophical camps come onto public trails with objectives that are 180 degrees apart. At my cabin in the Helena National Forest I have seen dirt bikers and orv riders at least twice a week. They come with a supply of "adult beverages" and their firearms and ammunition. They come for rough play. They like risks, speed, flying dirt and mud. They pit their machines and themselves against nature. The trail becomes an obstacle course, a ruckus track, where they can test themselves. For the most part they are males testing their manhood—teenage boys. The latest game is to shoot repeatedly at a tree along the trail 4-6" in diameter until it falls. Another game is to spray insulating foam or spray paint willy nilly on signs, gates, stumps, trees, rocks. I obtained a copy of the June '09 AGO report (GAO-09-509) that suggests "OHV recreation is not sustainable unless we have adequate financial resources and personnel to deal with it." The popularity of OHV use on public lands has grown by leaps and bounds and the Forest Service, National Park Service, and Bureau of Land Management cannot keep up with monitoring. A real problem is the increased use of access roads for dumping and drug "grow camps". A letter from Region One Forest Service Transportation Planning engineer to me, dated Jan 7, 09 states that at that time \$10 million was budgeted for road maintenance with 4 billion deferred road maintenance. Road patrol worked out at 765,000 acres per officer. Clearly some changes in number of roads must be made.

Gated roads, keeping the roads open would allow for "clean up" of forest, helping deter wildfires and keep folks warm.

Greed. Big corporations destroying the land and water. Corporations such as oil, mining, CAFO, nuclear power, and logging.

## Discussion Question 2

**Helena, MT**

**(cont.)**

Obstacles as a citizen: funding, insurance, gaining access, programs to get families and kids to outdoors, parents need to step up, become involved, reconnect with land, if were more users with empathy with what is happening there will be a greater voice for now and generations to come, dual income and single families. •Create programs for state parks for reconnecting to outdoors, funding is the huge component for insurance and getting access, remember the little passionate people in policy making

Reinstate the tax legislation which benefits use of conservation easements, expired 6 years ago. •Fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), it allows for MT working ranches to be compensated, keeps open space, USDA should change restrictions on Rocky Mountain Front, not all private owners want to partner with the feds (USFWS) so make changes where conservation easement holders could be non-governmental [private land trusts]

Wetland conservation, for various reasons \$10million of wetland reserve funding was returned to federal government, need flexibility

Don't overlook Eastern Montana, extensive wetlands and grasslands; 8000 year old prairie that is dying a death from a thousand cuts (sodbusting). •Minimal funding to protect prairies and grasslands, not enough money for easements. •Lost funds (\$10 million in conservation funding was turned back last year), lack of personnel to do grassland easements where needed

Funding source is threatened for making multipurpose transportation corridors (SAFETEALU- The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) provided funding, legislation expired, renewed on an annual basis. •We need trails in communities for mental, emotional, social, and psychological benefits. •Multi-modal transportation corridors – bikes, walking, etc. : it is about moving people (not vehicles), gaining access, conservation and recreation, health benefits. •Fund the transportation bill

We have a lot of intellectual capital... need a survey of intellectual capital in natural resources work, how decisions were made previously, McKinsey and Co., lost expertise due to retirements and layoffs, need federal money to design a survey. •No academic program in MT for historic preservation matters... has to go out of state for academic training in this field – expand natural resources studies to include historic preservation matters

More is not better, manage what you have. Local control is good. •NPS management is pitiful...overgrazed, weed infested... not enough managers on the ground locally in FS and NPS

Work with grassroots, work with ranchers, he teamed up with MT Fish Wildlife and Parks (FWP) examples were Devil's Kitchen, Block management, fishing access. •Maintain working ranches thus wildlife. •Ranchers can't always get away to participate. •Have flexibility

## Discussion Question 2

### *Helena, MT*

*(cont.)*

WETA represents 21 associations including the oil and gas industry, Dave Gall of the Montana Petroleum Association had to be out-of-town. •35 years of working with state, federal, and organizations, it never gets easier; requires cooperation, respect, find common ground, thinks it is worthwhile to do that, concern for Washington DC is for give and take on all sides. •Difficulties: BLM withdrew Oil and Gas leasing, oil and gas is a bright spot in MT economy; environmental groups and industry - work together to have balance to have the economy to develop resources in a responsible way. •He also has grandchildren, is concerned for the future, work together to reach balance

Challenges: bigger isn't necessarily better, taking lands out of local tax base affects revenues to city and county, services tied to dwindling income, noble to preserve landscapes and wild lands for children, with \$13 trillion dollar federal budget why cannot we better manage what we have now; paying on the interest rate our grandkids and beyond; what we have is beautiful - better manage, then expand after these economic times

Connect young people to the land, that is what is MT is all about. •Each person is a teacher and a partner with youth

Video represented recreation but not those that work in the great outdoors. •Listen to the local people making a living on the land, private landowners. •Public land isn't sacred, take care of what we have state and national parks, do not add more acres. •Help farmers and ranchers protect property for their children

Wants to draw attention to eastern Montana where we have extensive wetlands and grasslands....has 8000-year old prairie that is dying death from a thousand cuts (sodbusting)....right now there is minimal funding to protect prairies and grasslands....not enough money for easements \$10 million in conservation funding was turned back last year because MT did not have the conservation programs personnel in place to deliver the conservation dollar purchasing power to where they were needed

Need sanctioned programs in National Parks where on any given day you could stop in and help with a conservation project...trail building, or other conservation activities....this would be especially good for kids to do and feel they have left a helpful effect in some national park.....national parks are getting too expensive ....\$200/night for national parks hotels...if you can't camp

Has raised 6 million dollars to help purchase 3500 acres of prairie land to give to NPS to keep unwanted development away from Custer Battlefield....but cannot donate land to NPS...takes an Act of Congress to extend boundaries of National Parks Wants help in getting the property they have purchased into the Custer National Battlefield near Harding, Montana



## Discussion Question 2

***Helena, MT***

***(cont.)***

The funding source is threatened for making multipurpose transportation corridors (SAFETEALU) we need multimodal transportation corridors....bikes, walking, etc. The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A legacy For Users – provided funding for multimodal transportation corridors – this legislation has expired though it is being renewed on a year by year basis.

Has big problem with having more public lands....is mad about a new powerline corridor in her area....said it will break up ranches....why not put these on public lands....wants the powerlines buried

National Forest is too overgrazed and the protection program personnel are too few....need more staff to enforce resource management protections NEPA is too cumbersome

More is not better...need to manage what we have now, what is good is because of local control...NPS management is pitiful...overgrazed, weed infested...not enough managers on the ground locally in FS and park Service

## Discussion Question 2

### *Hyde Park, NY*

Where I live in Albany, it's a lack of transportation and influence. I see young kids doing the same thing everyday. They go to school, come home, do homework. If they had the influence to go outdoors.

Number one obstacle would be technology. I can listen to my ipod or I could play with this tree.

I do agree with technology. People have facebook, computers, sidekicks, the Wii. I feel that there are not enough parks, not enough green space, not enough gardens. I think a lot of teenagers are focused on what they wear and who has the new technology. People are not thinking about 'let's go to Central Park'. People are focused on what they have. Teenagers are not aware of it. They don't get information about it. And how critical what our earth is going through, they're not going to care. Teenagers need more awareness about our earth, rather than the media and Hollywood and what is in. Let's love our earth.

Our society has gotten used to things coming to us, rather than us going to things. We have a computer that can bring us any information in the world. We've gotten lazier as a people. People are used to getting waited on; buying food instead of growing. As opposed to us going out there and being the change. A lot of people have gotten into a rut. It's not easy to bring people out of that pattern.

We find that kids love the social networking, ipods, etc. But once we get kids outside, once they get outdoors to a farm or hiking or fishing or doing a nature study. Once they've experienced that they walk away with a positive outlook on nature and the environment. We need to work all together to make kids feel comfortable outside.

I think sometimes it's just the kids themselves. They don't want to go outside – in the summer it's too hot, in the winter it's too cold. They all have sports, but most of it is pretty competitive. There is nothing to it, but what they are doing right there. They don't open up. Like my mom says to think out of the box. When they are on the computer, I think they feel pretty content with themselves.

How much technology is used in schools is frustrating. In half of my classes I'm watching a video and homework is on the computer.

I think the biggest problem is transportation and access. There are kids that don't have the computers and tech, but they aren't being exposed to the programs. The problem is being able to bring those programs that allow access into the schools to recruit the kids. Maybe talking to city council and saying this is what we want – we want our kids to have access. If there are enough young people who say make it happen. Kids don't go outside sometimes they are afraid.

Things that take place outside in the world are things that really exist and things that take place inside the classroom, exist in a textbook. We need to be able to connect, especially in science classes that what we're learning about actually exists. Being outside is a real experience as opposed to textbooks in classrooms

## Discussion Question 2

### *Hyde Park, NY*

*(cont.)*

information isn't getting out there. Violence makes kids afraid to come out.

I go out to schools on LI and educate kids about what's in the outdoors. We go into the classroom and talk to kids. The biggest obstacle is funding. We don't get to go out to as many schools, the schools budgets have been cut so they can't do as many field trips. It's all about funding.

We need a philosophical change of what the great outdoors is. We don't need to go out west or to some far away place. It can be a little stream, out your door, even if it's in the city. It exists where we exist.

Another thing is that the people that have the money to give us buses don't know that we want it. Where I live, they put a bike lane because they saw people riding bikes on the street. They put the bike lane on a part of the street that nobody rides on. People of color aren't saying what they want.

It is about disproportionate funding for the youth .We don't have the community center anymore. That comes down to a lack of resources, a lack of money. We don't see each other in the same way anymore, we don't have the same access. We have a partnership with Clearwater. Our biggest challenge is access. Fresh Air Fund can't take all the kids that apply. What about kids that don't have access to be able to leave the city? There are community gardens in the city, but they aren't provided access. Government and private industry pushing on opposite sides. It doesn't always come out to benefit the people in the middle who lose the garden because it becomes a parking lot or a 7-11.

I think as myself who lives in the city, we all know that organic food is good for us, but it's too expensive. The majority of NYC schools have cut down money and stuff. It's hard for my family when we go to the supermarket, we're going to buy what's cheap. We need more access to healthier food that's cheaper. I think we need more camps. Going to camp with Fresh Air Fund was a great experience for me. It is true that there is a limit on how many kids come there, but there is not enough things for getting young people outdoors. We have a lack of resources and I think it's sad to see. We are the next generation and there's not enough things for us. There are too many restaurants in NYC, everything has been industrialized. Central Park is not enough. We need more places in the Bronx and Queens. I'm Hispanic. I know that blacks and Hispanics are the highest poverty rates. We need cheaper places for teenagers to go. If I wasn't at the Fresh Air Fund, I would be doing nothing. My family can't afford camp.

I think that in the school, our curriculum, science is not as global as history. It's not a big priority. In the school they are not pushing us and telling us to go out and study this tree or this piece of grass and asking us how we can make the soil more fertile. We have a science test once every four years. On a day to day basis, it starts at the school. What kids learn at school, they take home. You take people from Fresh Air Fund and you bring people into the school. Science needs to be taken more seriously in the schools and kids tested more often. I think it would help motivate the kids more.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Hyde Park, NY*

*(cont.)*

What are you doing to prevent hydrofracking in NYS because of the potential for it to do equal damage as the oil spill? Answer: There's a jurisdictional issue with hydrofracking. The federal role is unclear here. There's a potential EPA role with drinking water but it doesn't feel very satisfying. We're trying to figure out what we can do. Because there's some hydrofracking on public lands out west they may be able to lead the way in how to do this properly. I was just discussing this issue at White House. I worry about it.

The LWCF is important, but there are other funding sources we depend on – recreational trail grants from DOT for example. Are you looking at this at a broad enough scope that includes other departments? Answer: Sometimes it feels like the other departments have a lot more money. DOE is an example – they are interested in these issues. Funding for trails is very helpful. Major initiative in DC along Anacostia River. Takes enormous amounts of funding, but there are examples of agencies and funding sources working together. We're working on a trail system. Thanks for your for comments.

At travel shows she attends, NPS promotes big parks out west. How much are you promoting parks here in East? We have a lot of great sites and great railroads. There's a lack of transportation to these sites. There are millions of international visitors in NYC, but not many coming to the Hudson Valley. It would be great for NPS to come to the table with additional marketing and promotion; remember parks in the east; look at partnerships (cross market with state parks and national parks); and make it interesting and interactive for youth. Answer: This is where we need you – for marketing and advertising. Our funding has been challenged. We have to put every dollar we can into operations and maintenance and it's a real struggle. NPS has done a great job at being a brand. A lot of what parks rely on is partnerships with local communities and business partners. Congress doesn't like to see us advertise. Transportation – same category. It's been a struggle to get funding for special transportation in parks themselves let alone transportation to the parks. How can we help bring people to the park? If they're not accessible to youth, then they won't come. NPS is trying to put resources into bus systems in a number of urban areas to get people to parks – need partnerships and need to get creative and get outside our comfort zones.

Comments concern green jobs and sustainable economic development. With all the attention on green jobs in the energy sector there's a whole other area of green conservation and landscape conservation. We need to see how this provides business opportunities. Are there any efforts from the feds on this kind of job training? Parks could potentially be a laboratory for training and pilot projects. We have to change from doing things the old fashioned way. Answer: We don't do a lot of that at Dept of Interior, but we should partner with Dept of Labor. Green jobs has been a focus of the Administration, but it's been more green/renewable energy. But this is important point. Climate change is the elephant in the room in many issues. Conservation is complicated greatly by climate change – all being affected by cc. One important lesson of cc is that natural landscapes have a hugely important role in cc. Land resources are critically important carbon sinks. At DOI we are close to having a scientific approach to calculating carbon storage. Some day we'll have a cap on carbon and an economic value to that.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Hyde Park, NY*

*(cont.)*

In the Hudson Valley we work in partnerships and we do this with the heritage area and greenway. We need to promote heritage resources for tourism – heritage areas help do this. Funding for national heritage areas was zeroed out in the President's budget for FY 2011 and nine NHAs will go away in 2011 after their authorizations run out. What do you think the long term outcomes are for NHAs? Answer: That's a tough one. Everyone agrees that the national heritage area program and Rivers and Trails program and others like it are centrally important to the mix of activities here. The challenge is the budget situation. The president has said we'll freeze domestic spending for the next 3 years. There's a lot of concern about federal spending. So we are not going to be seeing increases. And we are forced to make choices. Some agencies have lots of grant money. EPA has a lot of grant funding – easier for them to deal with budget cuts by not issuing grants. We face tougher choices at DOI. My advice is to continue to build a constituency for these programs. You need to keep at it. Can't assume that funding will continue. You have champions inside the Department and on the Hill. It's so important that the LWCF is mandatory fully funded.

Something about railroads and that in 2016 it will be possible to get on a train...with no transfers. She's fighting to not tear down railroad stations – destroying history and heritage. She wants a welcome center at this train station to let people rent cars (in Suffern, NY?). Would also like a museum dedicated to WPA. She's fighting the development of a condo complex. She also wants an outdoor amphitheatre. Answer: So important to hear these kinds of things.

You spoke earlier about the national heritage areas in the context of grant programs, but the national heritage areas is not a grant program and in fact the NPS Second Century Commission called for national heritage areas to be the expansion of the National Park System, to be integrated into the system and not just a grant program. What do you think? Answer: Great. It's important to talk about NHAs as an integral part of the NPS. The heritage areas represent the historic and cultural side of what we do – there's a huge constituency for this. It's not just the iconic parks out west. Very interested in the Centennial of the Park System.

teaches in South Bronx at a high school for troubled teens: For almost 20 years I've been trying to get kids into the outdoors. Toyota provided funding to get kids outdoors to meet with scientists and environmentalists. These kids didn't want to go to school, but now they are looking forward to it - because of this outdoor experience. How can we create a new narrative in our educational policy – partner education with a love of the natural environment? She talks to other teachers who say they cannot take their kids outside or on field trips because of the demands of state testing. If we want to engage youth and diverse audiences, they need to be part of this discussion. There's no diversity in this room because we haven't reached out to them. We need something big like the 60's to look at this in a whole new outlook. Answer: I think this will be front and center around the country. If we can tackle this it is the most important thing we can do. We need more teachers like you. Everyone needs to make this a personal issue.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Hyde Park, NY***

***(cont.)***

We've been very successful at protecting rural landscapes, but we realized we weren't serving urban communities so we established community gardens and they needed funding. We had to cobble together funding from many partners and grants and state agencies and many stepped up to fund this. It was encouraging how many people supported this, but this process could be streamlined. We shouldn't have had to reinvent the wheel finding funding sources for this kind of project. At the federal level could there be ways to streamline this? Answer: Department of Agriculture would be a logical source. It's a great idea. Land Trust is great example of how to share resources and partner.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Kissimmee, FL***

Segmentation, fragmentation of environment

can't get anywhere without driving...sees two separate societies, the computer or sit at home group and the play/go outdoors group

the great outdoors is very American, not much connection to outdoors in Europe....see it as no urban areas touching, very rural.

tourist, greater population....bring noise and pollution

schools are missing opportunities to expose youth to the outdoors...we used to have time made for us, now we must make time to be outside

loss of parks and open space, development

accessibility, lack of school programs

construction/development....loss of habitat

finding/making time....less parks, less organized sports

loss of habitat

work, time, safety especially after hours

pesticides/herbicides....hormones in animals....loss of habitat

school....the fact that many homework assignments must be done on a computer

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Biggest challenge for achieving conservation goals is trying to balance the built environment with conservation. State buys lands for conservation and as the economy tanked, there became a huge opportunity for governments to buy lands. But what happened was that Florida cut out the Florida Forever land buying program to balance the state budget. Obstacle is making state legislators understand that conservation is important and now is the time to buy land. Second obstacle is when we buy conservation land and human recreation is the first thing that is allowed on the refuge/park. Before allowing recreation, need to study carrying capacity for animals, etc, before deciding to open to recreation. Need to do scientific study to determine if the animals will be impacted by the human use, especially consumptive use of wildlife/fish resources. Not getting answers from the agencies about impacts. Let flora and fauna survive first, and then consider if recreation is compatible. Need to keep ORV and Jeeps out of conservation land. There are Jeep people that stay on trail, but once someone goes off, then you have everyone else follows. When managing conservation lands, government needs to consider recreation vs protection.

Osceola County set aside money to buy conservation lands. She is an appointed member of the advisory committee for the conservation lands. Even with the special money, there is not enough money to buy the land that needs protection.

Some people just don't care about the lands.

Highlands county they have undisturbed (natural) areas in county. If undisturbed than the county does not consider it worth anything. The land must be in the middle of something to be worthwhile. Areas that need protection are left alone. Bluehead Ranch is going to be developed into 50,000 homes. The planned development surrounds the WRP easement that has just been bought. Bluehead Ranch needs to be protected

The same thing (zoning for huge developments in natural areas) is happening in Osceola County. 68,000 homes have already been approved, but not built. Dept of Community Affairs stated that 103 years worth of housing has been permitted for construction in Osceola County. The county wants to expand the urban use boundary so that wealthy landowners can benefit from it before the referendum passes in Nov (Florida Hometown Democracy Amendment). Kariena represents an organization that works to balance buildings and conservation. Our system is slanted toward the developer. Five county commissioners have been working on this development plan...general public doesn't know about it and are blind-sided. State of Florida designated this as a priority A land acquisition project but owner of land didn't want to sell. The obstacle is lack of transparency of government planning/zoning. Lack of public engagement from the beginning zoning and land-use planning process.

Data submitted from developers does not get questioned by county planners. Public hearing is the first time the project is presented. By then its too late



## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Mottled Ducks depend upon many of these wetlands (including the Everglades) more than we thought. If we didn't study these species, we'd have no idea what area is important. DU works in partnership with refuges and other groups to restore wetlands. Power to vote is important to protecting resources. Freshwater areas serve as nurseries for much of the seafood we eat.

A lot of countries do not have a lot of fresh water. We need to protect what we have.

When government employees can't speak out due to fear of losing jobs, need outsiders to come in and speak for them. Also need to give the environment jurisprudence.

The FL Fish and Wildlife Commission manages 5 million acres of Wildlife Management Areas (WMA) in Florida. The state is out of money. Need to work together to save what is left. Next generation needs to be educated about our environment if we are to have it in the future. Recreation is managed very carefully on our areas. Florida Natural Area Inventory (FNAI) inventories each WMA and creates maps of critical areas before roads or firebreaks are built. Need to have people out on the land to learn to love the land and have voices to speak for the land. She invited the YMCA participants in the group to come out to Three Lakes WMA.

Suing county commissioners and hiring attorneys to attend meetings (but expensive). Mercenary training center planned in Highlands county. The county had backed the plan and the public didn't know anything about it until a public meeting was held. The planned development was going to go through until the opposition hired a lawyer.

If they hadn't hired a lawyer they wouldn't have squashed the plan to build a huge military training center on Fisheating Creek

You have to sign petitions and send emails to stay involved. She wants to learn how to preserve the wildlife, land, and volunteer for conservation.

Every state has its special places. It needs these places

We have an economic model in Florida where construction fuels our economy. Need to change this model or else we will over develop the state. Highest foreclosure rate in the US, yet we are still proposing to build ten of thousands of unneeded houses. We need more aggressive oversight from Federals for land use planning in the earliest stages of planning at the local level.

Heartland Expressway is proposed with all the ranchers impacted supporting this massive project through the central part of the state. Federal government gave these ranchers 93 million dollars to protect 26,000 acres (WRP), yet the Heartland Expressway is proposed in the same area. Ranchers are planning to make money from development and make money from the conservation easements

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

But development will still occur in this area where the WRP easements (26,000 acres) are going. Ten individuals (large private landowners) will make a decision for millions of people (with regard to developing a large undeveloped and environmentally sensitive area). Government biologists from Dept of Environmental Protection and FL Fish and Wildlife Commission are forced to back down on decisions by their bosses. Federal govt needs to come in with outside, objective view and take a look at all sides of the issue, and then make a decision. We can't fight it ourselves all the time. No way for private people to easily conserve their land. Need a government to come in and offer economic reason to conserve land through easements for private property. This will protect it into the future

One problem is consultants like (name deleted) that tie us up. Need some resource to understand the data used to justify developments.

Need a simpler, easier way to comment on Dept of Community Affairs (DCA) reports on Developments of Regional Importance (DRI). We want DCA to stay in place and be well funded, because they are the only mechanism in place in Florida that oversees the balance of conservation and development. They also need more teeth. They decide if the plan is legal. 88% of land use changes are approved by variances. DCA needs more teeth.

We've got Audubon, FNPS, and other groups working for the environment. These groups are so fragmented that they not are as effective as they could be. Need environmental groups to coordinate and leverage their resources to protect the environment.

Do not need additional development in areas where there is a high level of approved/permitted development already on the books. Federal government needs to lead this mandate to develop a new economic model where construction and development do not fuel the economy. This is one of the most important ideas to get to the president.

knowledge and education key obstacles- too many kids are afraid of the outdoors. Fear of the unknown – makes trips to the outdoors uncomfortable.

Funding, funding, funding. Need more funding for LWCF, grants, trails, allocation

We think that social media is a barrier to natural resources. We have a component on the environment for everything we do – we are now using social media to benefit . Virtual canoeing. If we have to do this to expose them to the headwaters of the Everglades, then we need to do it! Then, we can get them to the reality. Social media will not go away, so let's figure out how to use it.

Kids today think that adults do not appreciate what they have to do now, timewise, compared to past generations.

is it more satisfying to see the virtual environment? No, said kids. Would go if money was no object.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Palm Beach County – 40,000 acres that is not accessible for recreation. Burn and leave natural habitat for wildlife. Multi-purpose recreation needed.

we have environmental schools – magnet schools – they do a lot of field trips. Use Everglades Youth Camp – now run by FAU and Pine Jog Center. Afraid to come out for overnights. Younger kids – elementary? Transportation hard to line up

quick comment on these kinds of initiatives. Great to do this, but if nothing hits the ground, it's a loss. IF Fed. Gov. is serious on hardline stance, American people need to see this. Pres. Obama has very little time, or he loses face. Gotta walk the talk. People are interested to come to this, but got to do it.

The Florida Trail partners with the agencies. IF there were resources so we could more effectively partner, those are the types of opportunities that the Federal agencies could get involved in overseeing the funding at some level. Federal agencies are not in delivery system. Local agencies are in the delivery system. Fund what works. Way too few Federal agencies to get it done.

USDA Forest Service program Kids in the Woods – did not get enough \$ out.

Race to the Top – standardized testing is an obstacle– if you had the kind of curriculum that met testing protocols, maybe that would work.

How can we wean kids from electronic devices? So much out there vying for time and attention of kids.

I hear a lot of teachers are saying that the way curriculums are structured is an obstacle to field trips. May need to address issue in education. Maybe President's recommendations will have positive impact. Scouts have been mentioned – Rotary, etc., - doctors, established organizations – so, if there is a way to build on existing structures, YCC, stuff your agencies do, with civic groups – to expose young people to environment.

identify common goals and objectives.

Manley Fuller – several years ago, Gov. Crist established “Serve to Preserve” and the idea was to link retired people with volunteer opportunities outdoors. Not sure where this is today. Texas similar program. Look and see what different states have done, what would be compatible for this activity.

Not a lot of opportunity for horseback riding; need more warning about upcoming events on public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

Lack of knowledge -Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts – do they know about this program? They would definitely get involved.

used to take kids to mud bog to study. Now, liability is out there. Safer to take kids to large amusement areas. Schools don't want to take that on.

biggest concern is development patterns of the past. Need stronger infill of urban areas and encouraging open space in developments.

maybe parents and teachers don't understand wonders that can be created in your own backyard – bugs, foundations of life. Work on educating on where accessible and that will help lead them.

expensive to get kids to outdoor areas.

they have developed educational materials and websites to download these materials for free. Videos, posters, interactive materials – very good for kids all the way through the university level. <http://usgs.gov>. Work a lot with counties, cities, WMDs.

I grew up in northeast FL. Don't schools have field trips anymore? When I grew up, we went on field trips to the springs. Boy Scouts took me camping every month. Isn't the school curriculum allowing for this? Why are they going to Disney World? Why not the National Forests?

there are some teachers that do want to take kids out, but no funding. Or Principal tells them to focus on FCAT.

education works. Need to get to Moms engaged– they need to feel comfortable getting kids outdoors. Parents don't want to sign kids up because they are concerned about threats outdoors. Kids often come back 2 or 3 times to summer camp, once they are exposed. They will not be eaten by alligators. Access not issue. We have parks right behind the house – no one knows about them. Educate folks to get out.

Currently working with NRC, USFWS, and USFS. Every agency doing their own thing and has their own rules and programs and need to coordinate better and come up with a few things that work and then all strive towards that.

There needs to be a discussion about economics and how it is in the governments best interest to keep the ranches in business, but not their responsibility. If you let us keep doing what we are doing that is conservation.

It is important to have money through Florida Forever and other conservation funds. Need to have people being the scenes advocating and need full funding for all programs. These funds have been cut back and need that back to help the future and seeking funds now.

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

State taxes are a major burden.

Hard to find cattle rancher who does not have to sell a portion of their land to stay in business. Biggest obstacle is the inheritance tax and is majorly hurting us.

Need some regionalization. There are too many local, state, and feds who don't look on a regional basis and only focus on their own little portion or piece of land. Hard to manage and accomplish conservation without large scale. Maps can hurt what you are trying to accomplish especially corridors and boundaries that are drawn on a map but don't make sense on the ground.

Keep family together and stay in cattle business and do what they do and these items will mesh with food supply, air quality, and water supply and I see no reason we can't all work together.

Challenges with land acquisitions and easements, makes more sense to provide incentives. The USDA already has incentives, and USFWS is considering easements. It is all about timing, there is opportunity today and encourage you to take advantage of opportunities now. Such as Fish Eating Creek, three landowners came together which rarely happens. The state when they had money would tailor easements to landowners needs. Every agency has their own bias, bias is a well intentioned bias which does not include ranches, or trying to them how to manage such as running more cows. USDA doing a good job and all easements should be negotiated to work out terms accepted by all. Show me the money.

Reconnect youth by getting them on the properties and seeing it, food growers tend to get slighted by wildlife conservation agencies. Food growers need outreach activities too.

There is a lack of communication between agencies, all have their own agenda and their own thing they protect such as wetlands or panthers. Agencies need to overcome biases.

Get more people access through litigation reform because of lawsuits tours have stopped on the ranch. Educating our youth is critical and we need to teach our kids about conservation.

Programs attain less than fee, so what options do you have for land if not making it in agriculture? When an agency purchases some of the land, perhaps negotiate sell all if needed. Less than fee programs that could accomplish the same thing and be less than perpetual, maybe something shorter term such as 20 or 40 year to allow the next generation to decide what is best for them.

The property value is high, conservation category that should be high, the evaluations are not good. These lands have been acquired over generations and now just trying to pay the taxes, not getting true value now. Hard to sell your land when undervalued. These lands are way more valuable than others targeted for development.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Different programs and funding mechanisms do help get goals achieved. To preserve land from development and trying to foresee what next generations will need such as estate planning. Will development make land less viable than conservation land. Only big land works, small pieces compromise conservation objectives. Need combination of short infusions of capital, need some conservation easements, need estate tax relief and let the next generation make the decision. Need those three funding mechanisms. Safe harbor programs could be an effective tool. Although is still hard to trust government and that is why I did not do the wetland program. It is a definite challenge that government needs to overcome. Partnership implies trust.

I feel as if when the government comes around I immediately thing what do they want to do with my land now? These listening sessions and coordination and reporting are good and I hope something useful comes out of this. What happens after this session?

The Air Force is a partner have an interest in maintaining rural lands around them and are conservation agencies. Use tools like cattle grazing, and have lots of partnerships and with cattle ranches. Possible funding could be available to do partnerships and easements.

On coastal trails, paddlers need access to launch boats and primitive campsites. Some in good condition, some are not.

People have such little knowledge about nature- need into curriculum. Need trained naturalist into schools.

There is a disconnect between providers and users. The young generation is missed being asked for input, but they are future parents.

Single parent families need to have vehicle to get families involved in nature. Too much money, they need transportation to activities. Resources dollars, more trained volunteers, to teach life skills. Need transportation to get more young people involved.

Ranchers own 2/3 of FL in private owners. Needs to more flexilbity for landowners. Hard to plan long term for them.

Need money for preventable medicine. Get kids to love the outdoors. Get kids outdoors to have healthier kids generations

The City Apoka has 200 acre complex ballfields. Need walking area get people out need to offer multiple things to do.

Tallahatchee skate park struggle to get in but kids in listened to kids to get differe recreational activities.

Sports are important, but not sustainable recreation. Stop breaking up groups and become one group outdoor recreation group – it can work

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Need Conservation easements ranchers don't have retirement plans. But need to be feasible. Safe harbor agreements programs work good

Conservation easements work. Connect public lands. Onsite interp to new to oriented helpful. Historical sites interpreters has huge lasting impression on youth.

Get kids out when young, they want to learn more and be safe. Need to handle animas and get knowledge. Start young.

local conservation groups work, vol to schools and take groups out on public lands. Teach them about nature. Find out what youth connect to – find conservation issue for the to preserve them. Start in elem. Read Last child in Woods...

getting people to places to do it... give it the area and not out in all area doing

Lack of awareness, people go on vacation and don't see the opportunities in the less known recreation areas, they are actually cheap, but people should have access to off road activities and passive recreation we can't compete with the advertised cruise l

Lack of public access and too many restrictions, more so on water but some land restrictions. 22 year ago the state worked with state to 137,000 acres in Collier County, NPS area is still not open. GMP was supposed to open up the area in two years. Contig

Passive recreation, preserving natural Florida land management and exotic species, youth not experiencing passive Florida not being promoted in schools, experiencing natural Florida, transportation is an issue, the expense need to provide access to natura

Referencing the disconnect with children in outdoors and also with adults, the economy, disturbed land and water quality, we don't want to do anything that costs money as long as it is not in my back yard, referenced article in The News-Pres dated August

Water quality impairs recreational actives, they won't be used if filled with algae, people need to get over apathy for educating people and yes it takes money for ordinances to protect water.

Access issue has to do with liability, example of law suits mentioned that went on for five years. Safety concerns may not match reality due to heighten media attention. Dealing with the multitude of governing agencies working with land owners is a challe

Education isn't what it should be barrier like most have stated. Florida does not have an even output standard that they teach to everybody we are teaching to the test, if it isn't on the test, it isn't being taught. Teachers are paying for extracurricula

Should not be so easy to raid trust funds when they are set up for specific purposes

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

One piece of the problem is the alphabet soup i.e. all of the entities involved. The second is that you need a PHD to run a business with all of the layering of easement issues. Regulatory régimes at the federal level conflict with each other. Void of th

Understanding what trumps what, water quality vs. endangered species act.

Inability to identify environment regulatory planning council, regulator council lost authority to regulate; planning council uses them for political cover.

many programs for children, youth conservation camps, holding us up is \$50,000 for engineering/financial assistance.

Challenge to get kids out there. Building in transportation. Can't use school buses-not enough time. Schools can't afford field trip/transportation

Marketing parks with media effective if not no one hears about it

Dollars are lacking. All money won't solve the problem that we are a different society-no longer agrarian society. US Dept of education to every school district or money will be withheld refined sugar, candy machines out of school you won't get federal money. This traps children indoors, keeps them from being outdoors, hard to recruit kids that aren't obese for the military. Benefit will be long term, save health care.

Everglades only has so much space. Kids need to experience Everglades in the capacity-not enough staffing to provide this service, show kids the outdoors.

Don't really know the answer...People here don't need to be told to go outside. Most people here we like outside

How do you fund this over the long term as a private citizen. Our conservancy founded over 20 years ago. Started pushing eco tourism in Florida, educated tour guides, low impact, horseback rides. Developing a zip line worked. Pulls in people for one thing and then they see everything else and get interested in other Has to be adventurous that grabs your attention and gets you out there. Summer camp with children very successful. things. Turned ranching operation into a heritage project in terms of cattle and horses Spanish brought over in 1500s.

In high school had Ag programs. Funding not available for it. Children who get into FFA is where conservation starts, learning how to care for their land. Gets the kids thinking. Doesn't wipe out economic value of a township or city with conservation. Needs to be a balance. Sometimes this turns people off.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

Florida farming federal nutrient loading standards-could stop our state's historical industry citrus, winter vegetables, to address nitrogen. If drive very best stewards of our lands out who will know how to grow food-be getting our food from somewhere else. Preverse logic in not having a cattleranch versus a shopping mall.

We deregulated so we can't compete with another market but we will buy it from someone else that we don't know where it comes from

10th generation cattleman. Nutrient load is a huge problem which is destroying the Everglades-needs to be addressed. Competition relates to the cost of labor-can't hire people changed to mechanization. Takes away people working in agriculture. Brining a lot more money in besides just farming.

nutrient loading issue is a problem. Get into freshwater ecosystem and into marine environment (dead zones). Best management practices on the land to reduce runoff in terms of nutrient loading.

need to address real issue-not that many farms. Real problem is us-the number of people-fertilizing golf courses, yards, driving cars-how are we going to educate people in schools about these issues. State mandate no more fertilizer

lot of rivers in Florida were phosphate mines. Creating problems by getting into phosphate banks. In tropical climate either bites you or eats your plant. Can't afford to put chemicals that are safe are so expensive that we can't use

Florida Forever program was working great and now there is no money. Now that land prices are less wish we could have bought more

Louisiana produces fish, etc. more so than Florida. Federal government should connect Red River to basin in southwest LA that would restore it to wetlands and redirect river to wetlands. Value would be much greater than the cost. Salt water intrusion killed rice crop continues to leech because of what we did to wetlands

Alligator alley-additional costs to putting fly overs would be less expensive than cutting off sheet flow has caused. DOT should look at wildlife travel issues and sheet flow and if warrented by science so we don't have Alligator alley.

lot of communities respect their trees-wish we would respect our trees more. Valuable in many ways. In terms of development.

Connected to the water through surfing. A lot of development, lot of beach is private and can't access it. Less and less great outdoors.

Exotic and invasive species. Can't release animals. When things take out the natives there is nothing there to protect

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

Runoff from agriculture effecting freshwater

Agriculture is a problem to some degree. Some people are cautious of the environment while others do not have a lot of thoughts. Need incentives to protect the environment.

Community park being trashed. Lake and water trashed. If building in residential areas maintain the areas.

Kids are twice as busy with school, extra-circular, jobs

If I didn't have extra circular activities I wouldn't know about the outdoors. I would be indoors. Need to encourage more activities that get kids outdoors.

Don't know where the great outdoors is?

fear of snakes, alligators. Educated about certain fears alligators. Helps to have your parents educated.

lots of parents work. Not a lot of opportunity to get up and go.

Don't like the virtual experience. It is not real. Makes me want to go there.

love for the outdoors can happen later

Balancing recreational use and the environment, as well as with cultural resource sites. Important that use of the outdoors does not destroy precious cultural resource sites.

Some of the waterways adversely impacted downstream of Lake Okeechobee are due to the dumping of water from the lake into those bodies of water.

Some people don't know how to behave in parks and refuges. A certain amount of education is needed so the sites are not damaged.

The users of outdoor recreation are severely underrepresented when it comes to how designated areas are designed and used. Parents must be involved with youth in order for kids to participate in outdoor activities.....focus on family activities.

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

We do a poor job of properly designing public lands.

The cultural view that parks are dangerous and contain bugs and snakes.

Many of Florida's waters have become impaired due to excessive nutrients. Outdoor activities that are on polluted water bodies lead to a poor experience.

Massive cutbacks in parks to maintain infrastructure...ability to collect garbage, provide decent restrooms, etc.

Huge inventory of lands and a golden opportunity to acquire additional easements, but limited public funding.

Public agencies charged with maintaining public lands have received more lands, more responsibility with decreased staff and funding. Finding additional volunteers can be difficult. Not offering enough of a variety of activities for different age groups and interests.

Many public agencies buy lands, but little is set aside for maintenance.

Many organizations depend greatly on volunteers. It is difficult to find enough people.

There are already enough federal programs for us to take advantage of to keep us solvent. All the agencies have different programs and they should try to coordinate with each other. Each agency has all these different programs. You have enough. What doesn't work for us in the long run is the estate tax. We need some relief to enable us to hang on to what we have

Welcome, I am happy to have federal, state, and good cattlemen here. I hear nothing that is in conflict with keeping ranches and family together. Our interest is in water conservation, environment, and family and I see no reason why we can't work with these agencies to make this happen.

We have to figure out how to help land owners. We need to talk about economics as well as conservation. We need to talk about how we can help ranchers, etc., stay in business.

What's important is having the money thru Florida Forever and the LWCF so we can have people advocating for the funds and asking for full funding of LWCF. There used to be more funds for environmental education which was used to allow children to come out to ranches to learn and it is not happening now. We need to get back out there.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

If I had to choose one obstacle to overcome that could help keep us on our ranches and help our family hold onto the property we've had for generations is relief of the Inheritance taxes. It is getting harder and harder, ranchers have to sell off a portion of their premises to pay for inheritance taxes, lawyers, insurance. We are land rich, but financially poor. Ranchers can't afford to expand. We not only need ways to keep helping our environment but to give landowners a break.

We talked about regionalization of our efforts and this is good, but part of the problem is that the state and counties do not always think that way, with their building codes etc. There are problems with some of the maps being produced that show corridors and once your land is on a map it makes it hard for owners to work within those boundaries. We can't do preservation with whatever else you have left.

I have represented several land owners in their challenges for 20 years. We have to have the funds if we want to preserve property, timing is crucial, tomorrow we may not be able to do this. Just get it done, provide incentives, the State has 6 or so easement programs, the feds are considering more. The time is right, in two years there may not be as many chances. At Fish eating Creek, 3 land owners came to same place at same time and the state had the money, they bought conservation easements and tailored them to the land owner's needs. Every agency comes with its own bias, usually against working lands. Somebody at DEP says we don't want pasture lands, but want the woods around them. Some agencies want a plan to regulate cattle, but ranchers will not run too many cows on their lands. Sometimes agencies forget the fact that they are dealing with working land. As we develop easements, we must consider what the land owner believes makes sense. I realize that is difficult though, it much more challenging. As Jerry Maguire said "Show me the money", and you will all have lots of opportunities for easements.

Reconnecting America's Youth to outdoors is a well meaning program with younger kids, but by acquiring lands and getting kids on the property, food suppliers take a hit. The slant is made that animals are more important than the land owner and food suppliers.

In order for them to give more public access to their lands is litigation reform. The used to do a lot more tours but were sued. After 5 years of litigation, they no longer do tours unless people sign their lives away. If you don't teach them when they are kids they will grow up and listen to everything under the sun, and they don't learn anything. A lot of the things the kids learn are negative against ranchers.

Deseret Ranches of A lot of government programs offer less than fee, but what options do owners have once they sell off their development rights? Can you commit to owner that you would buy the remainder if the rancher needs to do that, if the rancher can't be successful in running the ranch. Florida

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

In my mind, in order to make this work, the valuation of the land needs to be realistic. The true value is higher than ranch land. There should be a conservation category that is the highest use. Some of the state appraisals that were way low. Families acquired their lands over many, many years. They paid their taxes and tried to make ends meet. If program does not give true value it is very bitter pill to swallow. These lands are more valuable than lands just to be used for development.

Another tool would be safe harbors. Sometimes because you stay in agriculture you may be penalized if some near you has not. You may have so many gopher tortoises, you should not have to worry about dealing with more penalties of having more if your neighbor left ranching and developed. nation

: I am appreciative. This has been refreshing. Now once you have listened, coordinated, and reported, what happens next? Answer: We make report to President and with recommendations, and he makes decisions regarding the youth programs, conservation, etc. There will be a long list and a budgetary section, based on feedback. We want to change how we use budget beyond 2012, which might be things like fully funding of LWCF, things we want the president to get behind. But Congress has to do it.

Rails to Trails program is working really well, state parks didn't want any part of the trails going through their parks to connect to the county parks. They overcame problems with state and now have it. They've worked with folks on the State Cabinet and had to basically force DEP to agree to it. The bike trails are not going to be harmful to the bears or other critters. The point was to connect state, county, linear parks. You have to connect recreational opportunities for people.

Again, they can fully fund LWCF and state can fund Florida Forever. They need to stop holding back funds needed for maintenance because if the land is not maintained it becomes less hospitable for people to use.

Grant access, access, access at places like Big Cypress and other federal lands. I've been working on a hunting management plan for more than 20 years and nothing has happened. Fed's need to stop doing all these road closures, those of us on ground aren't allowed to make suggestions, they need to listen. Local forestry people feel that their hands are tied and can't work with the public.

A lot can be done at a federal level to get businesses to help by using tax incentives. Businesses don't know what to do. They have to work for the long haul. Can't solve big problems when you don't know what will happen. Are there ways government can take a longer view so things can be solved? There needs to be long term consistency of tax programs, etc., so business can plan accordingly. If it is so chopped up by different administrations it will never work.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

We are constantly battling with the Corps of Engineers (who permit destruction of Florida), if society is so ok with paving over everything, what is that message telling our children. An organization like the Sierra Club then needs to duke it out with them in court. The Corps need to explain how things work, rather than using avoidance use mitigations. The Corp needs to design around wetlands so we could have better communities. There used to be a lot more woods for people to play in.

There has never been a stop put on development. Developers should have more criteria to keep things more natural, should be more greenways and natural plantings.

Everyone needs to educate the legislative folks.

If you donate 500 hours of volunteer time, you can get a free national lands pass, but some places are not honoring. Not consistent with all nation lands.

Conservation must go back into schools.

People need to learn about special places nearby, every community has some kind of park or refuge and kids need to go there and learn about it. Expand refuges in the state and country (especially at the Florida Panther refuge)

Children are not learning about these places. It is not taught in schools

Schools could promote Youth Camping. Kids in Florida don't even know the kinds of wildlife that are in Florida. People don't know why they need to protect things. Let them know what is out there.

Just a question, are their plans for any additional national parks? There is a greater need than anticipated. Want ANWAR made into a park

For school field trips, getting kids outdoors is main obstacle. Our biggest challenge is the school system. Our education department needs to encourage and fund trip. Our kids are at the mercy of school bus, once the kids get to where they're going and start to learn what we are teaching, it's time for them to get back on the bus because the buses need to pick someone up else. In poor areas, the kids don't have enough money to even bring bottled water with them so Around the Bend provides water for kids. There is a disconnect between educators and teaching kids. A lot of principals won't let even let kids get feet wet. Things with the environment are not encouraged.

We need to fully fund LWCF and we need to get the funds to the refuges to get people out on the refuges. The only way to get to the Tampa area refuges is by private boat or tour boats. We need to find ways that are inexpensive for families, maybe school kids could go free.ay Refuge

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

I've noticed that so many children can't even go into the wilderness because they could get stung by bees or amoebas in the water.

That is typical with people, if you say there are rattle snakes on a property, parents are afraid and then the children get afraid. People are just afraid to go outside.

If we try to publicize a boardwalk all of a sudden it's not so outdoorsy because the people are a step away from nature. It's a little more sterile.

The sporting industry can't go along with all the new restrictions regarding lead gunshot and taking away ammunition, that is a big obstacle, and if I don't say this, many other groups will be upset. By doing these new regulations, the feds will basically be putting a ban on traditional hunting. EPA is trying to input these regulations by November.

FWC does pretty hard core work with its volunteers. An issue that we come up with is incomplete acquisitions with property still in private ownership. It makes it very difficult to manage the property and the bigger problem is they can't do prescribed burns. Agencies and non profits need to complete their acquisition projects. When you're out there working, you can't tell what is publically owned and what's not

It's important to get kids outdoors for longer periods of time. She has shown pictures to kids and there are three deer in the picture. Only those kids who have been hunting can find all the deer in the pictures.

Access to public lands is the biggest hurdle. Have to be able to get there. Accessibility to private land included.

Awareness. Websites are not user friendly. Look at improving websites.

Intergovernmental regulations on manatees. Local USFWS staff make their own regulations and create inconsistencies. There needs to be an understanding of realities of microenvironment vs government making broad regulations.

Promise to fully fund Land and Water Conservation Fund. Help landowners and farmers by funding existing conservation programs through the Farm Bill. Adequately fund refuges and parks to be able to maintain them.

There's no landowner incentives to keep land in conservation.

Fund the landowner to manage the lands for exotic species and water conservation so they can stay intact. Everybody wants the open landscapes and we need to work with the landowners to protect them.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Kissimmee, FL*

*(cont.)*

How do you make the land valuable when you have a global economy of food production?...for example, we import exotic apples from China.

Everyone wants a piece of FL and everyone wants a piece of nature in FL, but landowners want a lot of money.

This is a problem, especially in Orlando, with so many tourists, you see a lot of trash on the ground and in the lakes. They don't know where to recycle. General lack of places to recycle things outside your home.

kids and adults are more interested in animals and plants – kids have pets. Learn how to care for other living things. Lack of interest in the natural world.

People have to pay to go into park, pay for parking. Just driving there is a hassle. Would like to be able to walk to open space. School indoors, homework in doors. No free time to be outside.

I agree with the whole money thing - \$ to cross into Sanibel and you go fishing and you have to pay to get into refuge. 40 minute drive. It's hot outside. I don't mind in the winter.

There is a lack of interest in local animal and plants. I could go see lions at Animal Kingdom and most people seem to like that instead of the local.

Locals don't grasp that they have amazing animals right there. Lack of knowledge. Lot of wildlife close at hand.

As a parent, I am going to say "fear." I did not have fear as a child. Fear of other people, not wildlife. Remoteness of it.

on crew team so we are on the lake everyday, rowing on lakes and rivers. Being in Orlando, not much open space, which is kind of sad. We like to be outside – I have 4 little brothers.

part of that is I could go out and I had woods around me – now I know I was trespassing – but it was just the outdoors for me. We would make paths, trails and we would get home eventually. We would go clamming and scalloping, mullet fishing – swamp buggy in Big Cypress. Dad would run the boat or build a camp. Outdoors = outside. Going places with families.

pet peeve – lack of people recycling – very few people put out bins – behavior problem.

I think it's lack of education. I've grown up in a different country and seen different sides. Everyone was educated in the importance – Germany – didn't happen overnight. If you go to any public place, will be different bins to sort trash. Teach the kids and why it's important. Would hit you in the pocket to get folks interested. Resources in Europe are more expensive, so recycling and conserving more important.



## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

HOMEWORK

HOMEWORK

TECHNOLOGY, HOMEWORK

TRANSPORTATION

TRASH, LITTER, RECYCLE

WORRIES ABOUT STORM RUNOFF

WORRIES ABOUT WATER POLLUTION

Kids play so many video games at such a young age

Studying takes up time but try to study outside.

Schools don't put emphasis on outdoors play.

Degradation of habitat, trees being taking down, worries about eagles, worries about aquifer.

The sea turtles, trawlers are dangerous, TED's not effective enough.

The way that society evolves, it's busy.

Oil Spill

Acquifer; all air pollution seen and not seen; pesticide in environment and septic/water tank pollution of water

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

can and bottle litter in water; lack of recycle

rampant development; air pollution by car; evasive plant; bottle water drinking is excessive

climate change; boating hazardous to manatee; strip mining

soil erosion

cool video games xbox

too much tv; technology keeps kids indoor

traffic pollution/gases; no physical education in school

cost to enter park/recreation not able to bring in items; no access to nature or the beaches

Air Conditioning (turn 'em off)

Safety

more encouragement from family and adults

lack of access to public lands

water management district establish recreation groups; water quality and water compliance which are not compatible to each other; too many regulatory agencies making decision;

lack of access; no money; boundaries limits property not within a specific boundary to add federal government

people not knowing they are part of nature – people think nature belongs to them urbanization people are being disconnected from nature

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

lack of understanding of how to conserve habitat land; better collaboration with private land owner; land and conservation fund should be fully funded every year; access is a problem;

conservation government does not work with the Education government

biggest issue is access; no respect for the land; exotic plants and animal is a huge problem in the State of Florida; better management of federal lands; not enough funding for public accessible lands; no hunting and archery in schools; water levels keepi

emerging the Boiler MACT “Maxima Achievement Conceivable Technology” from EPA no internal consistence within the government with changing of regulations; the government EPA cherry picking of data.

works with the lake advisor board here in Florida – pollution is a huge issue; local government restrictions (limiting access)

Beach erosion and trash, the oil spill.

Over development, over populated areas, habitat fragmentation, water quality concerns.

Human ignorance, pride and carelessness.

Sprawl, habitat destruction and fragmentation, general disconnect with anything natural.

Trash and litter, pollution.

Urban sprawl, fragmentation, general disregard for natural areas, people take natural areas for granted.

Classroom time and activities, busy schedules.

The economy, cost of driving to remote locations, cost of gear and equipment.

High cost of equipment, perception that you need to have a certain level of equipment to be “outdoors”, perception that being outdoors is not entertaining.

## Discussion Question 2

***Kissimmee, FL***

***(cont.)***

Since youth don't spend much time outdoors, there is a lack of understanding of the outdoors and associated safety concerns; many other interests that don't involve the outdoors.

Any free time is spent at home or in neighborhoods due to lack of transportation.

Indoor entertainment options were not available several years ago. Years ago, the entertainment was being outside and doing things outdoors.

All students can be exposed to some outdoor activities. Walk out the door and see what is there.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Lawrence, KS***

Sustainability and sustainable living - learning to live outside of houses and off of the grid with fewer resources.

Protecting sacred sites and return trust lands to the Native people for them to manage on their own. Return sacred lands to native people so they can manage them and educate others on how to live off the land.

Education- environmental and resource education outside instead of in the classrooms and talk about health concerns- all three can work together.

Eliminate trash. Clean up day once a week and get groups in different locations to clean trains, roads, highways, etc.

Enforce laws, educate people about not littering and instead recycling

Changing laws- making it free or more convenient to recycle and charge for trash bags

Require businesses and corporations to recycle

Need to make businesses and business people more responsible for their actions- not recycling, not conserving water, not having good environmental practices

Has to start at home by mentoring kids and getting them out- outside classrooms should be one time a week (depending on weather) and mandatory. Otherwise it will never happen because there are too many other distractions

Recognize that indigenous people already live outdoors- Provide more educational ways to bring these people back to their culture and give them an attachment back to their communities

Media needs to promote respect for land (a lot of land is trashed and media should portray nice lands)

Funding- on tribal lands that goes towards gardening for younger aged youth so it can become a way of life for them and fund programs that teach kids about where their food comes from

Mentorship for younger generations and get parents involved in children's' life and provide education and healthy eating, gardening and healthy activity outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

***Lawrence, KS***

***(cont.)***

haskell campus has buildings that are run down, food systems where we don't know where the food is coming from, water systems where we don't know where the water is coming from, and waste issues so there is the potential to use Haskell as a symbol of using better practices to improve the community- like having a windmill that creates energy and gives it back to the community

Overconsumption of resources/too many trees being taken down

New regulations are taking land/resources

Forest fires decrease air quality

Health issues due to fires & pollution, certain commodities adding to obesity

Dangerous atmosphere/sunburn

Too much development (businesses, roads, buildings etc.)

Large degree of litter in National Parks

Pressure or making money, job competition. Rise in offic jobs

Videogames/TV

Too dangerous to go outside, scared for safety in unknown places

Too many convenience items (air conditioning, technology, cars)

Preservation

Sustainability

## Discussion Question 2

***Lawrence, KS***

***(cont.)***

Solar energy

Teach more outside activities and benefits, use our resources to get people outside, currently not many programs are available

Teach youth how to hunt/fish

Increased education of outdoors will lead to better understanding and appreciation

Develop programs to teach cultural ways and practices/work with tribes/nations to develop programming

Incorporate native traditions and culture into schools

Give more funding to local schools and organizations for education

Utilize technology better/develop a videogames

Increased diversity of teachers

Better outreach to tribes

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

Outdoor recreation must include off highway recreation. My family and I recreate off-road in the deserts of Southern CA. My 3 sons are 3rd generation desert motorcycle riders/racers; much of what they have learned as life lessons. There are currently 4 open areas where we are allowed to hold competitive events, Johnson Valley, @ 189,000 acres is the largest area and is being targeted for takeover by 29 Palms Marine Base. We must have an equal amount of open area provided to replace this lost acreage. 1,000,000 OHV's operate in California. 500,000 in Southern California if we lose areas to operate OHV there will be OHV operation in illegal areas, doing damage to sensitive areas.

We need a national resourced Area designated to include the San Gabriel Mountains URBAN River Corridors. To achieve this, I strongly believe that the Emerald Necklace will be able to transform the densely gray and urbanized San Gabriel Valley Region into a vibrant green landscape. The Interconnectivity of parks and trails have the ability to improve communities and will give residents greater accessibility to local and regional resources. Here are the many benefits the Emerald Necklace can bring to the San Gabriel Valley: it will bring green infrastructure jobs to local communities (water resource protection, urban forestry, sustainable landscaping careers) Emerald Necklace can be a valuable public asset it serves as a public park space and many youth adolescents in the San Gabriel Valley, It will help expand and preserve natural habitats and wildlife, It will also establish a more efficient transportation corridor for humans and native animals. Connecting with the San Gabriel Mtns. to the beach via natural and urbanized waterways. We have the following support: 25 cities, 3 HOAs, 3 school districts, 1 environmental group, 1 trail group, 1 state conservancy group and 1 county board of supervisors

Bicycles: Green transportation: Benefits of cycling are enormous. Healthy, less consumption of oil. Reallocate space for bikes in LA. Not taking away but sharing roads with Bikes. Increase 3% for Transportation bill to extend bike trails. Provisions to include bikes, give space, National complete Street Policy.

Most parks and Recreation areas do not have knowledge of the Insect Biota. Plants and Animals depend on insects this influences the habitat. The Habitat influences land use. A greater understanding of insects is imperative. Invasive Plant removal and control is important in maintaining habitats overuse of land destroys habitat and carrying capacity needs to be monitored resulting in promotion of more land to use. In other words if land is overused you need more land.

Allow the USACE to use credit and funding from different funding sources to be used on the same projects e.g. Flood control vs. ecosystem restoration. The USACE prioritizes projects in part on a \$ per acre criteria. Due to the cost of urban development this puts urban projects at a disadvantage compared to projects in areas where land is less available. The USACE typically requires a 35% total match which does not allow the match to be met from another federal funding source. This local match requirement should be modified to facilitate collaboration between federal agencies. Funding for land acquisition should be available. Increase funding for the Land Water Conservation Fund for urban projects.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Challenges: Getting all of every groups ideas and efforts coordinated (shen possible) and eomminicated well. The sharing of information is a key! If we can work with toher groups that we didn't know about before, we may help each other solve some of our own challenges. Get the kids outside!!! if they are in school all day, they think (are taught) that it is normal existance. What works? Get kids outside!!! Not only will they enjoy it but they will want to retun outside. Getting thme out and involved also will create a new generation of concerned activie citizens. 3) Federal Government Role: Require cooperations that have land leases on public land, to give bakk in a way that benefits the public (in the long term). Repair the damage caused, not take us out for a Latte! 4) Tools: Funding of course!! But getting the funding to each groups pet project isn't feasible so get into the schools to get the kids involved, have them go on field trips and camp outs and "day projects" to work on some of these grass roots organizations. They want to get their hands dirty.

Scale of Parks: Redefine Park system. Fund Non Point Source for Urban Park system. Developers should incorporate Parks, maintenance of parks is an issue. Maintanance for parks.

Landscape Architect: JPA-Joint Power Authority, we have in CA. A way to facilitate Government. JPA can't access funding, compromise the mission. Don put transportation in the open bill spaces- Empowerment zone % of land used for kind of open space. Need to expand, bike pads, bike paths, usage of combining trails not a good idea.

How can the Feds help??? In CA a landmark environmental legislation, AB 32 & SB375 are in jeapordy of being appeald in November 2010. The senior leadership here today should be more visible in CA and signal to candidates the Administrator support of these initiatives. Support Federal incentives to induce in basin/Urban Solar development to offset out of basin development such as solar feed. Visit website: [www.solarfitylad.com](http://www.solarfitylad.com) to learn about the LA Business Council's campaign to induce urban and in basin solar generation.

Share Wilderness Areas with EVERYONE!! Off-rode, Horses, Bicycles. We have enough Wilderness. No More

Engage the individual: sustainalbe landscape@home/local activities neighborhood parks 2) Redirect current funding away from "old" thinking projects like expanding mass transit, rail systems. Will work to alleviate port traffic our of the LA urban area. Rail the cargo-expand the metro rail for commuters. Look to other urban areas for creative solutions to urban sprawl and pubic transportation.

Preserve more natural areas, please, within urban environments. Arroyo Seco\* area in the Southern Pasadena and La Canada. Please allow for the natural to remain as it is for a refuge for so many. Parks manicured into aonther category. We need more natural areas to the be preserved desperately. \*It does have defined areas set aside for specific type of recreation- golfing, etc, but it has a large swath of natural area that is faily well connected as well. The Arroyo also has a water filtration system that was a good example of intergration of varied use, conservation and preservation.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

I truly hope we can recognize wild life not only in open spaces out in the wilderness but in the inner city too. Many disasters happened and the last thing that is inventoried or paid attention to is wild life and/or domestic animals. Please look at the grassroots level. I used to be a Director of a beautiful inner City Part that was a dumping ground for illegal sports such as dogfighting and cockfighting. These are issues overlooked. I could name many, but another one is the fact that many cities and our state do tree trimmings at the worst time of the year for the tree and utilities the state and fish and game codes 3503, 3513 and The Migratory Bird Act have all you have to do, because a mother to leave the nest and you have violated the act. Please look at assisting domestic pets-spay/renter's initiative, adopt, educate about animals at shelters. The link between animal abuse and human violence, etc. These are needs to be addressed because it is all connected.

Increase and fund urban park programs in the National Park Service. Funding should prioritize low-income urban areas.

Challenges: Inter Office/Agency/National/State fighting each other over land (Competition driven), BLM Land used for drilling (Redrocks, UT), Urban sprawl, the deciding factors over conservation 2) Getting kids involved, use of transportation, used of school programs 3) Take some ideas at TED.COM/Federal Government Role: Stop being a corporate sponsor, Local land trusts and non profits we live here, we will watch over the land/Solar, wind power, No more OIL and GAS Fossil Fuels

Challenge: Retain consistent funding in LWCF and UPAR. Retain a State side funding level with 60% federal and 40% State side. Funding level of \$2B for LWC and \$300M for UPARR

"No Child Left Behind" in taking away opportunities for children to learn in their classrooms about environmental issues. There needs to be a federal mandate that would require students to have environment/conservation training including hands on, field trips, community service, to visit wild spaces, mountains, beaches, deserts, parks. Environmental Science camps should be a regular part of curriculum, once in elementary once in middle school, once in high school. Working on an environmental project and reporting on it should be requirement for graduation. Children need to be educated because they are going to carry on our passion. 2) Federal Government needs to fully fund the land and water conservation fund. Have a common sense, methodical plan for renewable energy that involves a variety of stakeholders. Plan renewable energy closer to urban centers where it is needed most. Get developers to NOT BUILD or develop - give them incentives to develop urban areas already built-rehab houses empty or up for rent. Fund community gardens, school gardens-kids need to know where their food comes from. More collaboration between grass roots agencies to work together-user friendly websites, kids' sites, that they will want to go to learn about environmental issues. More youth involvement.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

NPS Service: Fund Urban Park Program, Prioritize low-income areas, land water conservation fund and increase funding for urban projects, school gardens and community gardens. NEPA/CEQA are required allow CEQA to suffice for 2 reports, as CEQA is the more stringent and includes NEPA requirements. Interagency Strategy Coordinate EPA, HUD, USDA, Task Force in LA

Restoration of water ways, forest damaged by fire and human damage. In restoration concerned of the wildlife is important. Ex. Keeping or providing, corridors for the wildlife. Educating the children and adults to the importance and enjoy the great outdoors. State Parks have been closing due to lack of funds work with States to keep these parks open. Work with organizations such as local conservation groups, to build projects. Develop a cops similar to the CCC that can help resotre and maintain our parks and forests plus provide jobs. Build our solar panels and wind turbines closer to where the energy is used. Help local governments in the development of capture of water run-off

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act-It was wonderful to har about the Federal Government's commitment to protect our rivers in today's presentation and look froward to seeing more WSRs designated her in the Eastern San Gabriel Mtns, So Cal, Cal and the rest of the US! It's a great tool and we need more designations! Thank you!

Environmental Educator less and less Environmental literacy, no transportation for the kids and Nature works-Help get kids out to parks.

Gulf of Mexico? BP Oil Spill? Where is Salazar? That is one of our American Great Outdoors? Clean it Up!

Wilderness back country not being maintained for Families

Clean up? Where can I go to volunteer, I want to help?

Why has it been excluded off AGO Video? OHV activities? Don't exclude OHV include all recreational groups. Windmills took over our Valley (City of LaVerne) they took our beautiful areas for what? Energy Source? Is that Green?

Include all recreationa users in this agenda. Wilderness designations don't do this. They exclude many uses. Windmill farm destroyed wonderland, D.C. More damage in a year then what OHV could do in a lifetime. This Farm was for theuse of the City of LaVerne.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

As secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar mentioned early this afternoon, "Historic Preservation" is part of telling America's story and getting people into the great outdoors". We need to embrace our national as well as our historic and cultural resources as part of this initiative. A big challenge to conserving our historic and cultural resources is the lack of full funding of the national historic preservation fund, which is the sister fund to the land and water conservation fund this gentleman in the audience just mentioned. The Federal govt can more effective by fully funding the historic preservation fund and increasing the capacity of local agencies to preserve and protect our historic sties through technical assistance and federal incentives

Work with NGOs, Land Water Conservation Plan we are very interested in what Mr. Salazar is proposing on funding programs. How do we improve effectiveness of fund program. How do we increase ceiling of program fund. Message to Fed Reps: Failure to look at local success stories, Humbolt County resident, phone call to BLM-CA Office to know about successful stories OHV Community, Road decommissioning-not exclude OHV Community.

Challenge: Involving DOT and local transit agencies in increasingly the amount of bikeways and their safety in urban areas. The Federal Government could be ore effective by changing some of their procurement processes to allow organizations to work with the Federal Government to implement programs (rather than implementing it themselves)

Challenges-support for responsive renewable energy development in the CA desert. It needs to happen on private disturbed lands closer to urban load centers, NOT in the treasured, pristine, untouched public lands in the core of the Mojave Desert. 2) The Federal Gov't needs to take the pressure off the BLM public lands in the CA Desert for renewable energy development by looking at ways to make it easy for cities and counties to have slolar/wind development on private disturbed lands&solar panels on commercial buildings. 3) Fully fund LWCF and AB811 program funding 4) Whats working: Private, local, non-profit land trusts. We are able to purchase & protect & then manage large landscape level chunks of land that the federal gov't doesn't have the tools/resources to save. We (TWC) through private donations and grants are able to save critical habitat "islands" between already protected lands National Parks to protect ecological corridors so we dont end with islands of biodiversity and unhealthy ecosystems. Help us to get funding so we can continue our jobs & mission. (ie: UCF stakeholders in federal process,

In the LA Region, Water is among the most critical issues-Both Water supply and water quality. A century of misguided Development decisions exacerbate floodking and water pollution while conveying a precious supply to the ocean unused. What has been working in the LA Area is the slow but steady move toward multi-bnefit capital improvement projects taht capture water (both rainfall and dry weather rainoff) close to the site whre it falls and either allow it to be absord into the ground to replenish local aquifers, or stored in cisterns or rain barrels for later use. These projects are best conducted through public-private partnerships between Government Agencies and local entities including NGOs and business. there are excellent exmaples of these projects in LA, including LA's newest green street-Elmer Avenue in Sun Valley. In order to make such projects status NGO we need Federal funding and mandates for mult-benefit projects.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Global Action Research-Pro: Huge grant awarded to address water pollution to UCSD. We must look at watersheds. I am coordinating a bike ride from Vancouver, Canada to Tijuana to promote sustainability ideas and connections. Watershed Urban Research! Go with it!

High Desert multiple use-Drove to be part of this licensing session process. Others have not forgotten, should not be forgotten -OHV/Wilderness/Equestrian users. Motorized sports, local astronomy club need access. Land Management-over 25 years. Now they want a Solar Plant for Ridge Crest? Don't Want It!!! Will use too much water to provide energy for LA! When does it stop!!

Solar Desert issue: Build Coalition, wilderness, recreational groups-S2921 provides to stake holders. Heritage of story telling, use websites to disburse.

To throw a wrench into the ideas of open space is that Endangered Species in fact. Wild Birds/mammals/reptiles/are more likely to be found /live/seed/feed in areas where people are not allowed the Forest Service Support a paper finding that more wild species live where people can not go

In order to ensure that the connections we help people make to the outdoors are lifelong and life-changing education must be a core component of how we make that connection. Getting youth out to our National Parks as part of residential environmental education programs, such as nature bridge field science programs will build a generation of environmental stewards who will make responsible decisions and take actions to protect and preserve our environment. The connections to nature young people make through residential environmental education programs such as NatureBridge Field Science Programs often light a spark in students that turn into a lasting love of the outdoors and lifelong stewardship. The Federal Government should work to spur growth of NatureBridge and similar programs to increase the scale of these programs and number of youth that they reach. Invest dollars and resources. The Federal Govt: could be more effective partner by having more flexibility in the kinds of partners it works with and should work to remove obstacles to partnership or growth or partnership for nonprofit organizations. Provide resources to nonprofit partners to allow them to house and educate students in national parks.

1) Stop closing land to people who wish to use the trails and roads 2) Less Federal involvement 3) Cutting the Fed. Gov't 4) Tools-Chain Gangs use to work Fed trails and lands.

Need assistance from federal gov't integrating curriculum and physical education standards so teachers can justify getting children outdoors in parks and exposed to nature. Need outdoor education programs

Children are being denied opportunities to connect with nature the way they should. Physical education is not required by many districts. Students are overweight. They score better on tests if they do physical activity outdoors. Students need a connection to the natural world.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Her organization works collaboratively to build gardens and parks. It is difficult for non-profit organizations to get federal funding. Look at mechanisms to make it easier for NGOs to access funding – they can help accomplish federal goals.

Took kids on field trips last year from El Centro. Each busload of kids was \$1000. The program involves science in motion. Part of problem is that there is no money to pay for buses. It cost \$18,000 to take 400 kids on a field trip. Busing kids is a huge problem that doesn't have the visibility of other problems. It would be nice to get some funding from foundations. USFS has good student oriented programs, but it is difficult to get students to them. Once her program got funding from the local water district.

Speaking as an educator, he thinks what works is not having pressure to pass standards. It is important for kids and adults to have fun so they get a "Huck Finn" type experience. Then they are interested in field guides, etc. Students and adults need immersion experiences e.g. getting dirty, hands-on. There is a need to connect people's hearts through direct exposure to the outdoors. Don't get too hung up on meeting curriculum standards. Experiences are the seed to passion for the outdoors. Challenges include too much administrative paperwork.

People are interested in recreation. Laws focus more on conservation. Regulatory focus should include motorized vehicle access. People need off pavement access – fishermen, off road vehicle enthusiasts. These type of people are often stigmatized. Many are willing to volunteer. These folks are a large untapped resource. They feel that some gov't employees are hostile. The federal gov't should allow more back country access to unpaved road systems and existing systems should be allowed to continue. Such roads can also be used by bicyclists and pedestrians.

Trash in public areas is horrendous. Hopes teachers and others taking children outdoors will teach them not to leave trash. Fires – wants to know who is responsible for fires. How many millions of dollars does the USFS spend on predator control? Feels that predator control only benefits ranchers. The money could be better used, especially when we are talking about getting children outdoors.

He welcomes renewable energy. But there are tremendous costs associated with it. Not much public land left for energy developers. They have to mitigate for endangered species. Tax base is being diminished by land being put into wilderness areas and public areas. For example a huge number of acres were lost by San Bernardino County. Even if everyone negotiates around the table, lawsuits are a big problem.

Lots of funding is locked up, especially in CA. She wants to see enhanced funding for land acquisition. No local land trusts are in San Gabriel Mojave area. Should focus on existing infrastructure rather than destroying habitat.

The Station Fire consumed forest and funds. Parts of the forest are closed for an indefinite time. They have an office in lower Azusa. Their office helps guide visitors – more than a million per year. The forest is severely underfunded. More visitors per year than Yosemite.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Worried that working to get kids/people to visit public lands might become an inappropriate advertising venue

A component of education not discussed is the influx of people into remote areas. There is an increase in rescues of people who go into remote areas without sufficient water or survival gear. Also noticed graffiti in remote areas. Yes, we need to get more people out, but we need to give proper education.

LA has the largest equestrian population in the country. People purchase burros and horses from the BLM. Very few wild horses remain. Roundups are inhumane. Methods for roundups need to change. Consider birth control for wild animals.

Works with LA Mayor's million tree program. Link kids to nature by turning concrete in front of their homes into trees. She talked about urban forests. She related a story about a young man who didn't conform to neighborhood mores. Neighbors worked together to plant trees. They included the nonconforming young man who became part of neighborhood. The experience changed the dynamic of the neighborhood. Tree planting helps connect and reconnect people. It is good for kids that can't get to parks. They need money for the maintenance of trees. Could employ kids if there is money – from federal gov't? Urban forestry is too expendable in public budgets.

Get to something local not just places where you need buses. Create local parks that are close.

Countywide master plan for more green space for recreation to help with ADT with kids. Need is to create a thin ribbon for parks and how do you get people in there and maintain.

Education needed for what we currently have. Challenge is to get people to the mountains. What access could be provided? How do we get urban core to mountains via "access." Shouldn't have to drive to get to mountains. Need Better access via bikes and mass transit.

Create free youth bus to mountains and parks.

National scenic trails but missing urban trails. Urban trails exist the issue is how do you spread word about (challenges by county) Trail developed but need to create map.

Lack of support from parents. Public schools should enforce greater volunteerism with their kids to the outdoors. Challenge public schools do not provide field trips to parks but they attend indoor activities.

Challenges to National Park (Glacier) its disappearing animals and plants. Need help with Climate Change. Work on solar and wind not nuclear, could not have oil spill with nuclear.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

People have opportunity to connect with ecology. Use art to help create balance /envision and connectivity.

Need buses that are close to (free for those under 18) where people do not walk a few blocks to catch. Use students to help maintain plants.

Problems viewed from multi-use not silo. ACOE only view flood control not recreation. Need watersheds Councils as they work at viewing multiple facets.

Whittier Narrows would keep kids out of gangs and the education there works.

Develop cultural systems at Whittier narrows based on the Tribal Nation who owned land before. First mission was build by the Tribal nation and they would like to be recognized by having a place for them to meet and be buried. (Need federal government support).

Community school parks are needed at local schools. LA has worst percentage of neighborhood parks based on population. Parks Save kids lives.

Need more connection between mental health and parks this does not exist in LA.

Lengthen school days to incorporate outdoor activities for kids.

Colleges provided greater example of kids to outdoors and we need to start this at a younger age.

Tremendous leverage opportunity with high speed rail. Underground rail/collaborate with putting culverts in the tunnels. • How to integrate the rails into part of the outdoors? Need Joint line items for agencies and more collaboration: E.g. ACOE does not do clean up of toxicity and can be cost prohibitive for local gov. ACOE cannot spend other federal money for cost share. Only their own and local funds. EPA provides money for clean up.

From limited number of studies—scaffold’s experience to get folks out to the rural park areas. Staffing will be a large issue for the parks. Parks should be able to add wildlife habitat to urban areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Lack of integration in agencies for offstream amenities. Risk management vs. recreation needs. Recreation and access opportunities are not recognized by federal partners as a mission because of risk issues. Need to provide a method to allow for outdoor experience and accept risk at the same time. ACOE does not have money to provide for recreation near the flood control projects. Federal agencies need to look at watershed management approaches. ACOE does not have granting authority or the authority to enter into agreements with local jurisdictions for maintenance agreements/joint powers of agreement to allow their projects to provide access and recreation beyond flood control.

Whitewater Preserve/Palm Springs Public cannot access lower portion of the Whitewater River ½ of the year because of fire closure. • Federal Role: No staffing is available by the BLM, so no public access. Upper part is staffed by the Wildlands Conservancy. Lower part should be staffed by BLM. • Challenge: Spent > \$40M to partner with Feds to purchase 650K acres in the Mojave and gave it back to the Feds for preservation. The same land is now under threat of development. CA Desert Protection Act is supported by the WC. We need to protect lands first before we can restore them. • Tools: Push for solar energy in the desert. Legislation brought different stakeholders together for protecting the Mojave Desert. CDPA 2010.

Challenge: Our efforts often feel like “drops in the bucket” compared to the needs of educating our youth about nature.

Challenge: The environmental issues that her clients deal with are in a negative context because of fines etc.

What has not worked: BLM said they were going to monitor, but they have not.

Greatest Challenge is identify federal \$\$ to fulfill requirements in unique LA situations where land acquisition is expensive! Non-pristine lands.

Linking green areas together is a challenge too.

Challenge: We do not always have control of land, so we cannot qualify for certain grants to develop the parks. For example, one brownfield, could not be improved because of owner’s liability. Owner did not want to take the risk. Also, LA cannot compete with pristine lands for grant monies.

How do we get resources for multiple agencies to work on joint projects?

Lived next open space with irresponsible OHV use. Challenge: how to figure out how to allow access and appreciate natural resources simultaneously. Companies that build OHVs should pay for places for people to go to for offroading, so pristine areas do not get destroyed. Need a method contain the bad actors of OHV use.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Los Angeles, CA*

*(cont.)*

Part of partnership for all National Historic or Scenic trails. National Trails system. There are 11 national Historic trails—5,343 miles. Only 1/30 of these trails is fully open--The Appalachian.

Need funding for these trails as well as parks.

Working in collaboration is a difficult challenge. Need a strong focal point, such as the San Gabriel Mountains National Recreation area. Would require the NPS and USFS to work together. USFS could provide technical support to the effort.

We build new parks, but we have nobody to maintain them, and they become taken over by gangs. Once people see the LA river as a river and not a drain, it is amazing how they change their perception.

Sometimes thresholds for grants are too high to meet the funding requirements for our projects.

SAFETY

time/work

transportation

field trips = exposure

Reach out to schools

transportation

school programs (clubs, popularity, engagement)

motivation (GET OUT!)

better safety standards and regulation

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

make EE part of the curriculum

advertise parks and make them accessible (media)

Exposure and awareness of the outdoors

safety in the outdoors and a way to get there (safety and accessibility)

use technology to reach out to young people

Trash

air pollution in Pasadena

South Central needs more trees

Oxvard construction is cutting down environment/outdoor spaces

Community Gardens

make something of your land and own it

South Central has empty lots with trash and waste in it

West Couria is tagged with graffiti as well as South Central

Greater accessibility for public transit to park spaces

Green jobs

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

Greater security at parks - utilize more park rangers, especially in inner city parks

Transportation

Crime

Busy schedules with work, school, family obligations, etc.

Technology - we have become a faceless society - we spend a lot of time online especially on social networking sites

Drugs

No vacation time

Lack of education about these wonderful park spaces - many do not know that they even exist

Litter

Smog

Pollution

Not enough trees

- Trash-So Central-need more trees
- Pasadena-air pollution
- Oxvard-construction is cutting down environment

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

- So Central-empty lots, plant more trees, do community gardens, make something of it

- Angeles National Park-lots of horse poop with flies

- West Couria-fight graffiti

- Fight graffiti by doing a mural instead

- There is so much graffiti-we don't even see it anymore in So Central

establish programs and continue to fund

open opportunities for more open spaces

Too many factories/buildings, presence of civilization in the "outdoors"

dirty streets and bathrooms, minimal maintenance

we need to start taking ownership of the land - promote programs on public lands

start community service programs

campus clean ups

teach each other to help out and don't add to the problem

conserve water

more trash cans and recycle cans on public lands

## Discussion Question 2

***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

more tree planting

availability

technology is a distraction

Not enough education about where to go

Laziness

Lack of encouragement from families

Provide transportation to parks and forests

Trash

Graffiti

Lack of understanding of how actions impact environment

Limited space and crowding

Not enough parks

Dry terrain

Not enough money to clean, maintain, and keep parks open

Peer pressure by the "wrong crowd"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

Safety

Transportation

Technology -- video games isolate us from society

Procrastination

Lack of nonprofits to take kids outdoors

Forest fires

Rose Bowl

More camping

Wish we knew more of what was available

My parents didn't even know what opportunities

Lack of info. Restoration needs to be looked at from all angles before any work is done.  
Transportation systems need to be beefed up in restoration process.

More public info on National parks

San Gabriel Mountains

We just worked with what we had.

Air pollution

## Discussion Question 2

***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

Trash

Safety

Need trash cans

Recycling bins

Over use

Homeless people

Pet waste

Transportation

Gangs hang out at park

Need more funding for field trips

Not enough organizations (e.g. outward bound) to outreach to community

School education doesn't promote outdoors

Not enough exposure to opportunities

Need more buses and public transportation shuttles

Distance too far



## Discussion Question 2

***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

1st time in mountains was with work

Lack of advertising of what is available e.g. Santa Monica Mountains Recreational Area

Shuttles should go to schools, shuttles shut down due to lack of use

6/14 group members have camped

10 minutes

Around the block

30 minutes

15 minutes but closed down, no park

Only 3 members can bring whole family outdoors

7 cant access

Not enough transportation

Takes too much time

Working / Tired

Provide outdoor jobs (e.g. internship for F.S.)

More programs (outward bound)

## Discussion Question 2

***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

Funding for organizations to get more programs and outreach

Restore parks, improve aesthetics

Make parks bigger

More accountability for funds that are available, see that money is put into action

Maintenance of parks

Money for school outings

Construction at parks should focus on greenery and grass and trees, not half completed buildings

Handicap accessibility

Clean bathrooms

Sport field only available for organized sports, should make open for all

Swimming pool, water features

More info and outreach

School gardens, community gardens, botanical gardens

Funding and accounting

Jobs

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

Maintenance – keep it clean

Trash – big problems

BLM Open Space works. Concern with closing some sites.

Historic treatment of cultural resources is in question; adding the LA River is challenged; and federal funding is needed.

fragmentation of land is a challenge.

series of connections, environmental health, empathy lacking, kids education, challenge to integrate oceans, geology, and habitats.

General attitude "what's in it for me"; and charging to access lands is a big challenge for some.

Stated permitting process is a challenge, gave Yosemite as an example.

information on local recreation areas is lacking.

connections to people's own backyards can be a challenge.

Halliburton loophole; fracturing for groundwater mining is a challenge; and so are trans-boundary water issues. The Delta is broke.

Four national forests within the LA area and not appreciated

communicating the zone, the history of off-road vehicle use is challenged.

land use not fundamentally used or understood. Keep open spaces open is a challenge for the future.

applying science and applications to lands can be a challenge.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Los Angeles, CA***

***(cont.)***

territorial challenges exist. No communications, no collaboration, and no resource sharing.

recreation on public lands is phased out. The forest service has no explanation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

Pollutants (“bad stuff”) in the Mississippi killing the fish

Mercury and iron in the river

Litter and graffiti in our neighborhoods and local parks

Invasive species – it’s overtaking the green space, seeds spread quickly

Picking up trash, and trash on the bike trails

Stray animals are common and dangerous

People are ignoring the problems

There is a lack of knowledge because issues aren’t consistently in the news media and people aren’t outside that often.

People don’t have the knowledge or resources to respond to issues

Kids don’t realize how easy it is to get outside; they don’t have to take an extreme trip

School and social time takes up so much time that there isn’t free time for them to spend outside, and schools have stopped taking them outside for coursework.

Bugs and outdoor allergies are excuses people use

It’s dangerous and so parents don’t want their kids outside when there is criminal activity or gangs

Clean water – Having the experience to be able to take a dip of water to drink, swimming, tip the canoe, knowing it is OK to eat the fish

Wilderness areas

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

Pollution, example given of a glass bottle that someone broke along the Mississippi

Garbage/trash

People throw it out of the cars

In taking care of plant planters near a fast food chain in St. Paul, they are always filled with trash

The environment looks worse with trash/garbage

It does damage to ecosystems

Difference in countries – some have very little trash compared to other countries

Polluting Water

Effects on wildlife

Consciousness of people that litter – how do we get them to stop

Disposable products – example that McDonalds wraps food items even when people are eating indoors

Chemical in the environment, need to educate the public more

Service learning: Addresses a lot of issues both indoors and outdoors, provides the opportunity to learn about chemicals, connect with other classes, and affect mindsets

This is an overwhelming question

Legislative policy issues

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

Opportunities such as the National Youth Leadership Council and Minnesota Alliance with Youth

National Parks Conservation Society - Advocates for parks in Washington, the Regional office is in Chicago

Reduce consumption and packaging

Evaluate personal lifestyle choice

Learn more about what is going on so you know what to do/not do

Talk to family members

Too many class projects/school work

Picking up trash, and trash on the bike trails

It feels overwhelming because you are just one person

Safety and the perception of safety is a big concern for both kids and parents.

Adult leaders are needed who can be mentors, examples, address the safety issue.

Need for gear to camp and do other outdoor activity

Organized sports takes too much time and makes kids associate all outdoor time with sports activity. Need to allow unorganized activity as well.

Need culturally appropriate programming. Not just a language issue but a connection to older traditions with the outdoors found in some cultures.

Transportation to remote locations is a big issue. Even transportation to local resources can be an issue because of cost and safety concerns.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

Self-definition of some kids as “City Kids” who don’t do the outdoors keeps many kids from trying things they might like. There is a need for programs that help “City Kids” get past their fears and identity issues to get to the experiences themselves.

Need more fun things to do in winter as it is cold here for much of the year. Outdoors can’t just be in summer.

Funding is an enduring issue, but especially important in the context of state and local budgets going into crises. Federal programs that are trying to leverage a local match may have a challenge in finding it from shrinking local program budgets.

Understand the scale of the audience need and build programs to meet the need. This will take bigger budgets, but these should be seen as investments that payback with an educated and healthy population that cares about the state of the natural world.

Without getting hysterical about it, move to develop programs that help young people to understand that we are dealing with global systems under great stress and that we have a crises at hand. Don’t just approach interacting with nature as something tha

In my neighborhood, a Somalian community, there is too much pollution in the air around the University of MN, Children have asthma. South Minneapolis: people looking for a cheaper place to live but have to suffer from the pollution. The history of the area was a dump for trash need more funding to clean and regulate the pollution in this area.

Getting kids transportation to parks and outdoors

I come from East Africa and it’s tough to live in Minnesota! The snow, you don’t know how to walk, how to dress, it is a very tough environment in MN. We should work together as a community to support and encourage each other. We should work together and help each other we could achieve great things.

I don’t think my parents would be able to pay for my whole family to go out its too expensive to take my whole family

I think there is a desire to go outdoors, but there is a lack of priority for it when people are so busy. In their time off they don’t want to spend so much time to make the commitment to go outside. We are all so busy that we don’t have time to get out anymore

Now that there is more and more technology available, parents have even more challenges to get their kids outdoors. They need to take responsibility and take their kids outdoors.

There is a lack of knowledge about where our National Parks are and where our State parks are especially in an urban environment. We need more advertising to tell people where places are and how they can get there.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

When we were kids we didn't have iPod Touch or PS3. Now it is even harder than before to get kids to go outdoors and be active.

Algal blooms

Coal companies, standards on pollution and regulations with what happens with the stuff after it gets burned

Could kind of have to do with treaties and how the land should not be trespassed on, the importance to the Park Service is that the land is worth a lot of money but they need treaties to protect it.

In our Native American community of about 1,000 people, poverty prevents them from going to the city all they have is a muddy basketball court so they turn to video games to entertain them. Need money to get the youth outdoors, they're open to going outdoors but don't have the money to do it.

It is also very important that television and computer waste is properly recycled. That is a secondary issue from technology. There is always something new and better coming out so we have all this waste. If old electronics are not recycled, it becomes another source of waste for the environment

It's hard to know how to stop it. People want their green lawns; a viable alternative is necessary, maybe like rain gardens.

Lack of funding for this kind of care.

Lack of funds, funding goes to large corporations and doesn't make it to the Native American communities

Need help from the government to lower prices on local food

Now we see such a great difference everyone is on their cell phones, hanging out peering around their MySpace, around urban areas you lose your identity because of technology

On our land things are taken out of the ground, toxins in the land and water causing cancer in young people lately

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

On the Reservation as a child on open plains, after technology and electronic entertainment hit, it didn't matter. There was no cell phone reception when I was a kid, we had more time to play outdoors and get in touch with nature, and we created memories and stories. Now that we live in the city it's a lot worse, no one has the money to go anywhere and everyone wants to be online and playing video games.

Steam boat tours but the steam boat burned down

Still stuff being dumped into the Mississippi, like garbage or other wastes.

Water milfoil problems

Why is technology preventing kids from getting outdoors? They need to be more in touch with their roots and their environment; everyone is disconnected from their ancestry. People that are in touch with their ancestry are more easily connected to their environment and their outdoor spaces.

Litter in parks or in the water, lakes, Mississippi

Air pollution because he has asthma.

Are there other ways one can engage with environmental concerns?

Plant more trees. Removed for buildings and important for oxygen in yards or parks.

Leave no Trace, leave places better than you found them. Includes parks or city street. Pick up trash. Leave a smaller imprint.

Have more education so there is less to deal with in the first place.

Easier when schools teach about invasive plants and other related subjects.

Family restrictions due to safety, gangs and fighting

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

Trail building is hard to do on your own and friends who are interested work a lot

No car to get to some places

To many other things in the way, jobs, school

Are you okay going by yourself or do you not want to do it alone?

Some people don't want to go because friends are busy, watching TV is more important

Some things like canoeing or tennis take more than one person, a lot more fun with someone else.

Some things are team sports, soccer, football

Equipment is an issue, if you don't have a canoe or boat

Are facilities an issue?

Transportation again. Most state parks take a car to get to.

Are fees an issue?

Licenses are expensive and time consuming to get.

Need to build more parks and playgrounds close to peoples houses, especially for small children.

Larger equipment for taller, larger kids at playgrounds. (teenagers)Shute's and ladders park is great but 40 min drive.

A place where larger, older kids can play with younger siblings

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

How far are you willing to go for park or trailhead?

10-15 miles biking

feels a little out of reach (out of touch) because in a classroom too much

need to engage the parents since parents influence young people,  
find a way to instill personal responsibility - some of her family members say it's too trashy to go to a park and they wouldn't want to go there and they want something to be done about it but it's not necessary for them to necessarily do it  
create more nice place where people could come and enjoy without all the trash  
getting the younger people to see what the outdoors actually means (not just forests and stuff) but what's around them here  
More youth programs (kids love to play outside) love parks and the outdoors; try to get them to see what they have around them and how to protect/save it or restore it

invasive species - trefoil  
not enough planting native species that have roots grow deeper and are more sustainable  
learn places other than yours is hard to do, it would be nice to be able to get out more for school trips

not enough small steps to help the environment recover  
one of the biggest issues is lawns – over-watering and the use of pesticides, if every lawn could cut down on those two things could make a big impact

invasive species  
pollution and biodiversity (micro-organisms) even though they didn't find anything to be a huge problem when testing the river for school  
ponds are really gross (filled with garbage)  
not enough regulation on big businesses like Monsanto,  
too many special interest groups getting what they want from people on the EPA board  
lack of a bigger (more aggressive) and faster steps to a better energy policy  
a need to cut down on big business – put more restrictions on them

invasive species  
ponds have trash near where she lives  
not enough native plants - birds using the native plants they've planted after removing invasive, bald eagles that they see when they are out working that they didn't see before  
a company along the Mississippi River pollutes the river but they pay for the Green Team to clean up the environment, conflict of interest, they shouldn't be allowed to pollute in the first place

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

invasive species like thistles

sweeping up grass clippings before they end up in the surface water, it's a small step that an individual can do  
education is a huge aspect - everyone here has an environmental background – we need to share that knowledge with others

access, it doesn't seem like a lot of places that are accessible without a 45 minute drive - to get away from concrete or maybe I just don't know about the areas close to me

The ad culture and image obsession as a by-product of capitalism. It needs to be combat by making kids care early about what's really important by engaging them in hands on activities, especially outdoor activities.

never taken a bus to swim anywhere  
would like to be able to swim in a lake closer to where she lives

access is right around where she lives so that's not a problem but the space is trashy  
lack of responsibility in helping clean up, she jogs in a regional park and there was a dead animal washed up and she wanted to clean it up but was afraid of disease, she was very sad about the environment, we polluted, that may have caused the animal to die

Litter, even when trash cans are readily available

Litter along roadway medians and shoulders

Litter in rivers, lakes, and farmland

In Madison, WI there is coal dust and ash everywhere. It dirties clothes, hair and all things outside. A once swimmable lake can no longer be used due to coal ash pollution

The Mississippi River is unswimable due to water pollution.

Oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico

TV, video games, computer, cell phones

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Minneapolis, MN***

***(cont.)***

Facebook, social media

Safety concerns: nearby parks, such as Hollow Park, are not safe a night. There are no lights and people are scared to go there. I will not go there alone.

Lazy people

Traffic is too dangerous to allow kids outside. There is no park close enough.

The world is not safe enough to let children play outside, they might be kidnapped

Hazardous waste and pollution concerns: Will not let children near places such as Harriet Island and old printing facilities for fear of toxic barrels and radiation in the area. Parents err on the side of caution and do not allow kids to play pell-mell an

People will model other's behavior. NPS Ranger explained the Mississippi River is safe for swimming and felt if some kids started swimming in it, other kids would join in. Same for other activities, there is a multiplying effect once an activity is initia

I recently relocated to the area and do not know anyone to play with.

My aging mother cannot take me to parks.

Through the Audubon Chapter of Minneapolis, I recently worked with Audubon Adventures in an urban charter school of 5th and 6th grade girls in Minneapolis. To augment their classroom lesson, a few chapter members offered a field trip to a local Minneapolis park. The students and their teachers walked the mile to the park only because there was no money to pay for the bus. There were complaints about this, even though it was a warm spring day. After eating their lunch, the girls were reluctant to throw away the remains in the trash recepticle for fear of what might be in it. Was it a monster, bugs or some undescrivable creature hiding in the depths of the trash can? They screamed with relief as they slammed the can's small lid and ran away from any trouble. Clearly, these girls were less interested in bird identification or the binoculars we offered and more in need of basic outdoor experiences. None of them had ever visited the park, yet it was near their homes. We need opportunities to bring young people outside.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

We need land management -- don't close off the forests -- they won't be here for future generations -- they will die out. There needs to be a balance -- all things in moderation. Thanks!

Beetle kill in our forests. Allow logging and cleanup. Keep jobs available for Montana workers.

Manage the land: don't just forget them. Make use of local resources and small groups available in each community.

1) I believe the Federal governments (sic) need to consider local, rural Americans before developing National Monuments. These individuals are some of the most connected to the landscape and are already working to manage the land. Instead of supporting programs that would take control away from these individuals, promote programs that provide incentives to them for conservation. In my experience, locals are conservation minded but also need to provide for themselves and their community. 2) Expand programs such as NRCS's Conservation Innovation Grants program and make them more accessible to ranchers and landowners.

I think the most critical conservation challenge is simply moving people outside, encouraging with a full on local media (to tailor to that areas need) to get their hands dirty to build a sense of pride. Throwing money or votes, or just a warning will die without active hands.

The service-learning model that is currently being incorporated into public ed in many of our nations' schools systems will be a valuable asset in providing youth with outdoor experiences and personal investment in conservation. Service-learning should emphasize public lands and/or private local farms, nurseries, and other outdoor usages in order to create a culture that is not driven by technology alone. It is a necessity to have this type of individual engagement with the lands/outdoors/natural environments in order to harbor a community that will contribute to their conservation in the future.

Enact legislation that holds those who challenge industry in court to pay their own legal fees and to pay all costs when they lose in court. Loser, pay.

I am elated with the "know your farmer, know your food" -- type initiatives springing up all over the nation. I would like to see programs as well that promote local natural resources. I am active with a group called "Local Wood is Good" which is trying to promote use of locally harvested and processed wood products. It would be neat if we could replicate efforts like this, modeled after Know Your Farmer Know Your Food, around the country.

Conservation requires secure funding. Aittmaro(sp?)-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson is an excise tax on sporting equipment (sic) that has worked very well. Need to expand approach to include other species through a mechanism like the teaming with wildlife initiative of the 1990s -- try again!

1) Protection of public lands from motorized abuses 2) Protection and restoration of intact ecosystems including fragmentation 3) Noxious weed invasions 4) Protection of water quality

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

The scientific fact of global warming means that we don't know today what we will be conserving for tomorrow. Our habitats are changing so quickly that fighting to save a piece of land today doesn't guarantee that it will be protected. Saving land may be an obsolete idea.

Support for local products to sustain rural communities and providing opportunities to keep folks on the landscape being working (sic), active and good land stewards on their lands. Make good choices economically feasible.

There is a need to balance conservation and people being able to make a living. Timber Industry, mining and farming and ranching must be a consideration. Thank you for listening.

getting families out camping -- free recreation use on our forest lands. Supporting education for youth of all ages about the outdoors and the environment

Slow down and stop the global warming. Change the priority from resource exploitation to resource sustainability.

Availability for people in more urban areas. Outdoor experiences are not within reasonable distances and those that are are not communicated. Unless individuals have the means to travel, they can't be experienced. Partnering with regional programs/parks to give people incentives to participate in parks/outdoors.

Get support to local level, \$, agency authority, tax incentives. Allow latitude to agencies to make local decisions.

1) Getting youth into wilderness, I think my generation is not as connected with the land as previous generations. 2) Keep working farmlands available for farming and not development.

Conversion of agricultural lands. Unplanned (sic) growth eating up important conservation resources such as wildlife habitat, scenic open space, clean water, cultural treasures, family farms and ranches.

Loss of agricultural land, specifically sustainable family farming operations, this includes loss of soil to intensive industrial agriculture. The changing climate and the loss of snowpacks in headwater areas of Montana. Loss of habitat and farmland to unplanned development and sprawl, which is supported in part by automobile centric transportation infrastructure.

Water! Montana Trout Unlimited applauds NFS for their efforts on Reserve Water Rights in Montana. However, three of BOR's Montana facilities seemed to be managed at odds with fish management on three Blue Ribbon fisheries in Montana. Specifically, Yellowtail Dam on the Bighorn River, Clark Canyon on the Beaverhead and Canyon Ferry on the Missouri River.

Keeping open land intact. Maintaining family farms and ranches. Ensuring water rights are adjudicated on federal and tribal lands and water in streams and rivers is seen as a beneficial use. Rehabilitation of forests and grasslands.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Climate change

Stop promoting oil use -- start promoting clean power. Stop subsidizing oil use -- start subsidizing renewable. Stop using oil! -- Start using renewable. Simple eh?

Water quality is critical for healthy landscapes. Water quality is compromised by the 30,000+ miles of USFS roads in MT, about 1/3 of which are unmaintained, unneeded (sic), and unwanted. The legacy road and trails initiative has been funded by Congress at 40, 50 and \$90 million in the past 3 years. Yet over \$10 billion in uSFS road work is needed. Continue to fund the legacy road and trail initiative and increase annual funding to \$100 million.

The fundamental issue is to get people to interact in a sustainable way so we have open spaces for future generations. This means long-term educational programs in the formal and non-formal setting that provide awareness, understanding, problem-solving skills and participation (action) and connections with their local place.

Preserving our open-spaces. Connecting people with place.

What strategies work: dam removal, administrative land management and travel plans, land purchases/acquisition, project partnerships with early collaboration, restoration efforts. What are obstacles: adequate federal funding of agencies, difficulty of removing inappropriate uses such as motorized vehicles, fossil fuel development. the agencies should use the NEPA appeal process more seriously to avoid litigation. Ability to hold polluters accountable.

The emphasis put on youth, society at large, on materialism over experience and sustainability -- i.e. the tendency of profit driven enterprises to demolish wilderness resources for financial gains, when the essential value of these wild places is the transformation of individuals that takes place in the presence of unbridled and unmarred nature.

Understanding of the scope and impacts of not protecting and preserving our lands and waters. Incentives to preserve. Opportunities and access for children and low income, particularly in cities.

It is fine to hold listening sessions, but where and how will this information be utilized to encourage a grassroots movement to encourage and motivate the public and agencies to focus on the "Great Outdoors"?

Public schools need to enforce a conservation ethic. More school trips should be to state parks, instead of cities. Both are important but there needs to be a connection between the nations youth and their natural environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Bug killed standing timber is not able to be harvested and used as a resource (see smallwood) for buildings and bridges construction due to the fact that liberal based "conservation" groups appeal timber sales for these resources tying these sales up in court until the resources are no longer usable because of decay and "blueing" in the case of lodge pole pine, one of the main species susceptible to bug kill. A solution is to use these standing dead trees for biomass for energy and building materials rather than letting it burn, which is what is happening now.

1) Open the debate and scientific study independent of politics and liberal (or conservative) agenda!

US population needs to get in touch with natural ecosystems

1) climate change, 2) growing disconnect between today's youth and the outdoors

pollution and diminishing of our biotic factors (soil, water, air) upon which our plants & animals depend; stewardship (appreciation for, connection to) the great outdoors is not a priority at the personal, state, regional levels; obstacles to effective conservation or connecting people to the outdoors: value system putting money, shopping malls, computer games, prestige/power, "getting ahead", etc. in front

1) Allow fed agencies to coop & work with state & local groups easier, 2) Developers cutting apart lands for \$

Balancing increased use of public resources with a largely accepted public conservation ethic

climate change; sprawling development; lack of collaboration between Fed, state and local agencies; lack of awareness & action on part of citizens regarding conservation

lack of individual responsibility & concern

The American idea of entitlement to land, resources, & access without responsibility to others & the conservation/sustainability of our society

Politicians running natural resource activities

Establishing conservation stewardship across socio-economic spectrum; Citizen involvement for on the ground conservation efforts; Incentive based conservation strategies are often not sustainable for the long term if we see increased conflict or conservation needs

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

How do we manage our public lands? -(I know, big & eternal question); Loss of working, family owned forests; Loss of environmental education in urban areas & how it applies to their lives, i.e. natural resources used in living - houses, etc.

1. Early-on education/interaction with outdoors & wilderness to develop social responsibility; 2. Hiking & biking trails to easily connect with outdoors; 3. Volunteer programs to assist educ. & preservation - activate seniors (lots of educated baby boomers need something positive in life); 4. Awareness - promote, publicize, subsidize - zoning, etc. & wilderness mgmt; 5. Public & Private organizations working together

We as a population have a huge appetite for natural resources, yet no leadership of how to meet our demand.

1. Lack of youth knowledge about conservation issues; 2. Park pollution

Building individual responsibility for conservation by introducing youngsters to outdoor activity. Solve it--don't lock it don't close it.

Need healthy landscapes, managed lands including forests. End lawsuits that block active work; Must maintain access & improve where limited; Declining hunters

I'm concerned about keeping our wilderness pristine. The fissile fuel industry has had a profound impact on our wilderness and urban environments. From water pollution and air pollution to contribution global warming, we need to keep the toxic and risky fossil fuel industry out of our public land!

A generation of young people growing up without a personal connection to the natural landscapes/ environment. Kids today spend a great deal of time indoors and have lost interest in playing, exploring, hunting and fishing outdoors. Conservationist land stewards generally base their passion of working for the environment on a personal connection- typically established in their youth

This is not from the bottom-up. This is Agenda 21 UN from top-down. Loss of land rights by way of environmental land use law which circumvent the public process. ie= SB131 = The tools to shut down the economy from y to y.

Lack of connection between children and the outdoors

More education and access. In schools, trails and parks funding for internships and outdoor programs in the wilderness

The quality and amount of water in the future. Saving the lands from development.

## Discussion Question 2

***Missoula, MT***

***(cont.)***

Americans don't know enough about their public lands and the different management strategies for them.

The next generation seems oblivious to the necessity of wilderness

Kids in the Woods! Water! Energy!

Climate change. We need pass good climate change legislation or there won't be any conservation left to protect. Also we need to focus on K-12 outdoor education. Let our youth outdoors.

Preservation of productive, privately owned agriculture and forest lands. Maintenance & expansion of national, state, & local park systems

Education - we need to provide more opportunity through our public schools for children to access public lands and learn and develop a connection and responsibility for them

Loss of future stewards of the land.

growth of government land grabs

Preserving working agriculture lands and connecting people with the farms of their food. The land and the people the agricultural heritage.

Engaging families in Outdoor Recreation. Maintaining Rural character in the west.

Lack of public land

we need to make it as easy for people to get outdoors as it is to turn on the TV. Access and communication is an obstacle. There are several non-profits out there organizing and doing great things, but they have limited funds for adverting or new media communication to get volunteers involved or youth active we need a told for communication and funds to get our message out. Partnerships with the state, local and federal governments could help communication efforts. also partnering with private sectors would be beneficial. How do we connect parents as well? we cant rely on education to do it all.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Interested in tying into issue of child obesity and getting kids outdoors, also Michelle Obama's efforts. Would like to see more effort in getting kids interested in cultural resource efforts and opportunities in MT and getting volunteers involved. Difficulties in getting resources (e.g. state park funding – need basic maintenance)

Need a strategy where conservation & connecting people come together through restoration. There is an opportunity for restoration work to provide multiple benefits, such as connecting people w/ land, engaging people in caring for the land. Need a heavy investment from the Administration in restoration (e.g. Clark Fork restoration work, Mill Town Dam removal). Lots of opportunities: abandoned mines; timber road restoration; forest health issues; bank erosion & water supply. Rewards will be measured in jobs, connection, and care for places we love.

Working to get local food into school cafeterias. Teach kids where food comes from by having hands on activities; working w/school gardens, class room activities. Getting school kids to see chain from garden to final product

Addressing all questions; restoration where it's at. Trout conservancy working w/ many landowners and partners at long term restoration; applying science (how streams work). We have plenty of biologists, need people that can put it to use on the ground. Knowledge has increased, but problems are same – collapse of habitat and land relationships. Best strategy is volunteer work – planting native plants, hands on projects; satisfaction of long term benefits; Obstacles – Restoration is where it's at. List of work goes on and on – mines, roads maintenance, culvert replacement, roads put to bed; agricultural impacts. People want to know what they can do to help – need projects & money to be ready (e.g. Clark Fork project). Need more of these types of projects. Interest will wain w/o restoration activities. Need more than one-shot stimulus – need longer term commitment of resources. Make sure environment will be there through stewardship.

Working on oil and gas issues. Friend has son that was affected by air pollution. Their group has had conversations with over 7500 people across the country. Oil drilling affecting many parks in the NPS; public needs to know this, and we need to pass strong legislation to protect these areas.

Resources for action – there are many foundations and grant sources for available to the community for projects at local to national level. Also at federal level – need more incentives: how to give tax benefits to landowners for supporting this work; also land use planning (e.g. setbacks) important to coordinate federal & State land use management.

Need parents and families to be involved – They have a pilot program reconnecting children w/ nature (Park Service) to get adults comfortable in nature. Federal govt can be involved in getting parents connected and over their fear of the outdoors, and enabling them to pass on to children.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Montanans usually think conservation. The Montana Conservation Corp. is alive and well and put hundreds of high school age youth out in the field: performing trail construction, trail maintenance; fuel reduction, other construction projects. Employ high school students throughout the state. Develop and implement education curriculum. Foster stewardship and support for leave no trace ethics. Feedback after term of service term ends: can't retain; no jobs available to go from seasonal to year round employment; chasm from seasonal conservation corps program to permanent employment; no bridge. MCC is committed to young people in outdoor field ranks but no way to get them into system.

Agree with Ken – Landowners need to make a living. There's 1 million acres in the Lee Metcalf Wilderness and much of our time is spent outdoors. I've also spent much time in Libby. The Timber Industry is almost gone. Unemployment is 17% - the highest in MT. Something must be done. In Libby, 60% of the school aged children are on free or reduced-cost lunches. They're trying to get a mine started. It's been permitted by the state, but the USFS is holding back. For every person working there are 3 more out of work. We need ways to put Montanans back to work. All need to have the chance to work.

I have concerns about catastrophic fires. We've gone overboard not taking care of forests properly. We need to put people to work; help forests and help animals by creating jobs. Husband and she went to public and FS to do something about catastrophic fires in Montana. Thought was to do sensible thinning – not clear cutting – if trying to clean up air then consider that air quality after forest fire is hundred times worst – we have gone overboard as far as not taking care of forest properly with woods that have over abundance of small trees. Need to put folks back to work to help forest, animals, create jobs.

Accessibility is important. What has worked in childhood - family camped all summer long. Want to promote free camping. In 50 and 60's there were station wagons, coolers, camping tents, and access to camp sites all over. As a citizen in MT – hunting and fishing accessibility was based on an ethic – ethic started with family camping with group of folks that know how to do it right – also had camp fire and girls scouts that re-enforced concept on how to behave – finding a way to bring an ethic training is crucial – maybe no one told them when they were young not to throw trash. Need to educate – this is key. She was lucky to have ecology teachers. We don't have these now because we are teaching to standards and are losing concepts of outdoor field trips and outdoor education. Want to see promotion of education and need to prioritize to educate on the outdoors. Field trips when young and youth conservation core – these put her life on outdoor trajectory. At 15-18 yrs.old, youth were paid you to work in outdoors – plant trees – build trail – and it included environmental education. We should re-instate these nationwide. Need training in classroom and outside classroom. In Missoula, MT flagship outdoor program is funded through mental health program. Want to facility flagship to educate on outdoors – use programs like this in place – e.g. like afterschool programs. Maybe also support teachers in environmental education training. Need to build ethic that grows through youth. Help them be comfortable teaching outdoor education. What Works – rural assistant committee and FS partnered so school can be accessing an outdoor sport – FS folks came into school – they facilitated field trips to the space with the school. Need to fund gas in tank to get them outside.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

I'm a rancher – landowner and a neighbor of a forest. I appreciate the USFS. We have the same issues. The MT legislature is working with us. I think they understand the need for a win-win scenario. Family forest owners are all about the outdoors. We promote family forests for a win-win. We work to sustain the forests. There needs to be wood products thinning around communities. We need to keep the timber in America for made in America products. This will sustain wood locally instead of it being shipped elsewhere and overseas. The Montana legislature has a really good policy. In 2007, their proactive approach was needed.

Insurance on private land to access for education programs is expensive – eg. Class room group coming on land – but need to get insured – super high cost – so fear of liability keeps them from granting access.

I also see the need for and support for environmental education (EE) in classrooms to get kids reconnected. Most houses around here are timber frame. The EE help kids know where wood products/houses come from. People react to 15,000 board feet for a timber frame; it's not that much, but it sounds like a lot. I'm a Resource Conservation graduate from UofM. Projects are made to sound like they are clear cutting the entire forest. Not true. Kids don't know what it takes to build things. Wood can be sustainable. We've got to manage the land. For whatever reason, we've got to do a smarter job or we're going to lose it. I support EE in classrooms and the public investment in conservation and restoration. We need legacy projects to have working management plans on public and private forests. Regardless of size, all forests contribute to the whole system. Programs out there can use existing infrastructure. The State of Montana does a great job of managing forests.

My focus is on the North Flathead River Basin/catchment. I Want to point out: water quality so important, should support local efforts to manage. Densely populated areas should work to support those efforts. Concern about wilderness – Montana is one of two states that have not completed its roadless areas review process. Headwaters are in those areas. Montana needs to finish that process. Need sidebar riparian areas in general. Much benefit to all when protect riparian bull trout and other sensitive species. Feds need to think big. Work on Crown of Continent ecosystem level. In order to capture watershed issues, must look at that large, ecosystem scale. Education is crucial. In my work in water, it's complicated the way little things make such a big difference. Once changes occur and resources are altered, it's harder to go back. Montana is blessed with high quality and we need to preserve that quality. We should have the foresight to protect water quality.

Echo more energetic approach is needed to get forests back into sync with fire regimens; current imbalance due to lack of thinning.

Have concerns about access for people who can't get into pick up; can't walk up stairs; can't get on horse; can't get wheel chair under gates.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Agree need to manage forest – we have lots of developed lands with roads and support continued timber management in areas where we have roads – But remaining roadless lands were roadless for a reason. Condone continued protection of roadless areas – these are not good timber lands – that’s why they were not developed – controversy now is not timber management of these roadless areas but motorized recreation. Uncontrolled motorize is one of threats Chief Bosworths. Now have unregulated motorized use. We want use to look back at the 1970 designation of these areas. Off road enforcement of unauthorized use is not working. Outlaws are rewarded they - have control on wildlands. They have impacts to water/wildlife and displace other folks who want to have quiet experience away from motorized. So, motorized folks are rewarded by having that use exclusively because folks avoid them. Need better communication between judicial branches and admin to have better enforcement. (Aside- what works well – Teddy Roosevelt – courage he and partners had in establishing national forest. This was highly controversial at time and not a collaborative effort. It was visionary. We need courage when designating special areas. Special area designation has been controversial - but is has been celebrated afterwards. We urge administration to be courageous despite the controversy.)

Avoid wonky language. Provide a forum to allow dialogue. Should be no threats for sharing opinions. Collaborate on local levels. Be careful about how. I care about Big Bend just as much as I care about Glacier National park. Public lands are for all. Obstacles: must be more agency funding. Firefighting must be separate – it’s draining agencies. Agencies a hindrance or not helping because they don’t have resources. More hiking trails, trailheads are needed. Need stronger enforced travel plans.

Need more hiking trails and tools. Need stronger and enforceable travel plans. So two things government needs 1) more funding 2) protection of watershed for quantity and quality of water – no matter what we do and want, it won’t matter unless we have clean water.

Avoid wonky language. Provide a forum to allow dialogue. Should be no threats for sharing opinions. Collaborate on local levels. Be careful about how. I care about Big Bend just as much as I care about Glacier National park. Public lands are for all. Obstacles: must be more agency funding. Firefighting must be separate – it’s draining agencies. Agencies a hindrance or not helping because they don’t have resources. More hiking trails, trailheads are needed. Need stronger enforced travel plans.

Need more monitoring (fund it) of backcountry rangers and enforcement on ground. Need science based data not political

Obstacle to consider - need more agency funding – fire firefighter money needs to be separate. Agencies need funding to help reconnect with wild areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

On topic of how federal government can be better partners – one of things is to use appeals process more effectively. Don't let the process go until we force them to go to court. Instead force stake holders to come together before go to court. Other idea – FS needs to create forums that feel safe for public discourse – lots of polarity on issue. In this polarizing climate it's intimidating for average citizen to come in and speak. So atmosphere needs to be better controlled so everyone feels comfortable to come to microphone. People should not feel intimidated in democratic setting. As to strategies for conservation that worked and enhances conservation and makes feel connected, road and dam removal is working. Some of collaborative models work well – but encourage to be cautious because collaboration is at local level – but lands are owned by all folks across nation not just local folks – people care as much about Big Bend NP as Glacier NP even though he or others don't live there – so caution to local collaboration.

There is legislation pending to help air quality and help employees. We need the means to keep slash piles from rotting or burning. Sen. Tester has introduced a bill to build refuse burner around areas of Montana. Example: Seeley Lake last trash burner. If a furnace were available to remove refuse safely, could generate power...more power than all windmills on Rocky Mt Front. Eureka's burner is out of business, but if they'd had had a way to remove the slash, they could have been kept in business. Need generator to turn turbine and make electricity.

Seeley Lake has 1,000 miles of trails, but the Bob Marshall doesn't have one mile for ATV use. Lots of USFS roads, but at the same time many want roads closed off. This situation has eliminated any form of getting back there. I could get back into the forests when I was 20. Now that I'm 70, I can't get back there. I think all USFS roads /trails should be opened unless they are closed for grizzly protection, etc. ATVs are not that noisy; could start one here in this room and folks wouldn't clear the room. Enforce laws. Arrest the violators.

Why having meeting for younger folks – as older person he feels that he is one of the group too – feels not include when have a youth listening session and not include older folks- - young people idealistic – things are not perfect – so young session will be jaded.

I can't believe that the USFS can't allow access. I say, turn the land over to the state to manage. The State of Montana will provide jobs, access, and other opportunities.

Connect youth with landscape and increase scientific literacy. Environmental education opportunities are critical. Give boilerplate training to local employees and teachers so they can make connections for and with students. Providing training and resources for local educators is critical. Training is essential to connect with land managers and how they can understand and be a part of it. Recommend – encourage relation between FS and other land management agencies and schools and private land owners. Folks in urban areas need to have better connection – need science background to make informed decisions. Also give land managers training, time, and resources to provide those connections and local teachers need that time and training too – need to inspire kids for active role.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Connect youth with landscape and increase scientific literacy.

Focus on specifics in realm of federal authority. Agree with \_\_\_\_\_. Focus needs to be more than just federal lands.

Given climate change need to focus on conservation. Not just on sportsmen but on the resources, too.

One of things attempted a decade half ago was Teaming with Wildlife Program – excise tax on backpack and other camping/recreation equip (backpacks, binoculars, birdseed, etc.) – money funneled back to states – instead of pitman robinson tax – the teaming with wildlife tax would be for states for use on nongame programs and other programs that are inadequately funded – there was opposition to that but admin at the time supported it – but has been replaced by state wildlife action plans – but these action plans come with annual congressional appropriations of that money and they decide where money goes. Instead the Teaming with Wildlife would focus on species and wildlife that are currently not addressed. Wildlife draws people to outdoors – not all use on big game – shouldn't put all burdens on hunters and fisherman. The administration supported the legislation, but it met with opposition. Now, programs are not guaranteed. Annual appropriations & allocations are so limited, there needs to be a different way to fund these needs.

I want to mention something that was attempted decade ago. It involved teaming agencies with wildlife. Back taxes were funnel back to states. Like the Pimman-Rokeson Act (?) that directed an excise tax on backpacks, binoculars, bird seed, etc. and would have funneled funds back to the states. It would be directed to non-game other programs which are sorely inadequate and underfunded. The administration supported the legislation, but it met with opposition.

Need ways to make it easier to volunteer without liability for organizers

If ideas run too far afield, there's always the nuclear family option. There are local, good programs – make it kinetic/physical and it sinks in. Volunteers for preservation. Work, hit liability wall. If ways for Gov't to make easier, would help. Excite them. Parents not much different than kids. Own experience and stories. Best way to convince. Bring down to local level.

Obstacle to consider 1) catastrophic fires. Small diameter timber and beetle kill, need to act – but cant because of litigation – need to slow down ability of env from stopping forest service – 2) how to get rid of small diameter timber; fund gasification process for fuel at local level. Can bring private funds to help with this – but need to stop litigation – put good science in place – not talking about clear cutting – but using new methods. Create forest where that fire is healthy.

With regard to biomass initiatives on private lands; not sure what is currently going on. Need to look into how/whether private lands included in biomass bills? There are numerous climate bills in this session. During the last congressional session private lands were included and public lands were not.

## Discussion Question 2

***Missoula, MT***

***(cont.)***

Need to get a handle on noxious weeds. Need to have statewide program.

Very cautious in our approach to conservation because people need a place to live. Need to have homes and places to raise kids. Need to give communities a place a grow – don't have places to grow because of conservation easements– need to be thoughtful that we don't have a negative impact.

people on the ground need to be empowered, if agency personnel are not empowered you run into roadblocks. Agency people need to be supported. Farm and Ranchland Protection Program is an excellent example of a tool that works. Represents the interest on the ground; garners public support.

important to not just focus on youth but on all segments of the public. A significant portion of the population go out and trash the outdoors and shoot the signs. Education needs to be more broadly based.

We are working in a changing landscape. At one time people thought that plum creek land was public – didn't know it was private. As changes in ownership occur – access is changing. He manages over 1000 miles of motorized trails. That infrastructure is greater than a private landowner can support. Liability is very scary – really worried that trees will fall on people or people will get hurt. Important for folks to understand these issues. There are children in Seeley Lake who don't go hiking, fishing, don't go outdoors. His wife created an adventure club and taught them how to go outdoors, ethically, safely, at no cost. It doesn't take a pile of money to get kids outdoors.

gets over 1000 kids a year outside in nature. Liability question – originally it was forbidding but there are a number of insurance agencies. In Missoula – there are a lot of kids who get out in the landscape – this is a great place where people actualize what they want to happen. 1) If you want to get more kids out we could use help at state level in the mandated curriculum – need a mandated outdoor curriculum. The states that have this mandated have great programs. Federal encouragement outdoor education would be helpful. 2) Funding: EPA Environmental Education grant program – a great program but woefully underfunded. Can't be used to sustain programs – his group can get it once but can't use it to sustain the program. 3) Making national organizations more aware of what's going on the ground. Nationals have lots of workforce and funding – nationals come in with a great idea to do the same thing that the locals are already doing.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Regarding his involvement with 4H - it doesn't always take DC to get money – important to realize that the local timber companies have been very generous. As we lose these industries we lose so much money and support. Regarding access: He is a backpacker but when he wants to take out his 90 year old grandparents to hear wolves he used to drive – but now the roads are closed. He heats his house with firewood. Used to go up roads with family to cut firewood– it is a family activity and gets kids outdoors. But now people can't get out as a family to collect firewood. Also lots of families camp in non-designated areas – when the roads are closed they can't do that.

He's 29 and he finds it weird to be called a youth. Since not a govt agency can move quickly and give youth opportunity to make decision and be empowered. They can make decisions that make a difference on the landscape. Changes lives a lot – getting emotional. Give young people an opportunity a chance to have responsibility. Young folks dug a trail on Mt Sentinel and every day they can look up there and say – wow I did that – and everyone uses it and likes it.

Success – Travelers Rest State Park. Mt Conservation Fund initiated the beginning of the park. Needed someone to take on ownership of the park to use the Conservation Funds. They formed a non-profit organization to run a State park and the non-profit manages the park. Have grown from 15 to 50 acres. Challenges – needed to acquire additional parcels. Were able to use the stateside LCF funds but they have run out. The Non-profit is continuously challenged with getting operational money – how to continually fund the site. Have successfully used stimulus money but they don't know how they will manage with the stimulus funds go away.

\_\_\_\_\_ works in the Blackfoot, partners with BLM, counties. Sometimes partnerships are cumbersome because of different legal mandates with different agencies. To streamline: fortunate in the Blackfoot because the BLM has been flexible and has the latitude to deviate to accomplish things on the ground.

Important to maintain successes like BFC but important that the big projects don't overshadow the smaller projects. Important to remember that the most successful projects start small so want them to be able to compete. Many rural communities are not able to compete for rural development funds. Scope and scale are important. Funds for schools projects are great but again a scale issue because those projects work best for larger campuses – k-12 but there are smaller schools who would like to take advantage of this.

Important to recognize the workers on the landscape and how important they are. Stewardship Contracting Authority is about to expire – Under the federal contracting system the contracts are getting bigger and there is a need to right-size contracts to fit the local workforce so the locals can keep working.

For them – liability issues aren't a big issue.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

The cost of being a partner with the Feds is becoming increasingly expensive. National Park Service are putting them into contracting instead of Grants and Agreements. They have to build an infrastructure to be able to do what the Feds can't do. Then they have to compete – are not being treated as partners. (PERSONAL ASIDE FROM THE NOTE TAKER: we have had numerous partners complain about the difficulty of working with the grants.gov system. Some of them have stated that it makes working with the BLM more difficult.)

regarding Biomass: the State and Private Forestry money for schools for fuels is going away. Regarding an experienced workforce: people think about recreating on the forested lands so it is important to keep an experienced workforce so we have the ability to manage the land such that people want to recreate on it. Regarding Bonds: whenever work occurs on NFS lands the operator needs to have a bond – but there are only 2 or 3 companies nation-wide that will cover the bonds – a huge barrier.

some success is top down but some are bottom up. How we deal with our public lands is also important. Don't want oil and gas wells on the Rocky MT Front.

Rode his ATV – trespassed on a lot of Federal land and he had a very good time but there's no way he could walk to the M – because he's beyond that. Need open roads for people to be able to enjoy the outdoors.

not associated with a conservation group – born and raised in MT – his parents were homesteaders – issues not being addressed in this session – There is a move in DC to designate lands in MT as national monument. His Dad couldn't walk but he had a jeep and he could drive all of the FS roads to hunt. Are moving towards roadless areas and access by foot only and that takes a lot of people out of the ability to recreate. Need to make the land better and one of the ways of making it better is to make it accessible. In past FS treated land as a renewable source of energy and products. Letting trees grow old and die is not using them wisely. Also observed that local agencies and local people do a better job of keeping things in perspective than the folks in DC. The bureaucracy of Fed govt keeps things from happening. Things really happen from local knowledge and local funding. The further DC stays out of MT the better.

Boyscouts of America: totally led and funded by local people – no government funding or supported. Boys and Girls club are also funded locally. He wants to put a plug in that there are young people and organizations that go into woods and don't need federal govt to tell people how to do it. He understands why plum creek closes the roads but it didn't use to be that way. Now private and public all close roads. Now if don't backpack 20 miles you can't see the roads. NO MORE roadless areas. Let's log the forests and keep the roads as trails.

Land use patterns that are disparate impact agriculture & recreation. Suburban development. Agricultural lands are changing to suburban. They are working on a collaborative effort to address. Open discourse is important. Communal solutions. Parks & trails plan: have to have a larger view but local tools to be effective. Lack of funding. Lack of political consistency in support. Would like more commissioners to take this topic as a #1 priority. It is hard to implement good ideas on a governmental level

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Most of the young people in the Montana Conservation Corp (MCC) are not from Montana. It provides an opportunity for people to come here and cultivate an outdoor ethic. Montana Conservation Corp incorporates work and conservation education components to draw people into an outdoor experience.

Conservation easements. Go back to existing easement & lessen restrictions that are not productive. Wetlands & watershed restoration, for example. Make these old conservation easements work better—better science.

One of our greatest challenges is partisan politics, changes in administration. We had an initiative when Bush was president, now we have this one. The administrations keep changing. What will be the lasting legacy here? Ex. Roosevelt or Aldo Leopold era. How do we as a local community and a nation get past the partisan politics where things change so fast. Budgets are tied to military and disasters. How do we as the conservation community make a conservation connection to jobs, the economy?

She feels like most of us are preaching to the choir. There are so many Conservation Corps members here; we need to take what we think and bring it to an urban setting. It would open the floor to more ideas.

Many Montana Conservation Corps members are here and SCA as well. The fact that we're here says something. The reason there is a big group is due to ARRA money. That money may or may not be there next year or the year after. If we need more seats at the table then it needs to be funded. These kids become advocates. Darren coming from Massachusetts goes back home and becomes an advocate.

I have a thought on how the federal government can help. We need some kind of censorship on advertisement. The aesthetics of location: there is almost nothing uglier than a highway billboard. They go against every notion of nature. Nature provides beauty at every single angle. People are inspired by nature – the trees are just right, the clouds are just so. Once they discover a sentiment for nature, they don't regress; it's probably a lifelong sentiment. He is big on aesthetics

Groups working to protect NLCS. Bringing kids at risk out to natural areas. BLM Restoration projects. Contributing thousands of hours. Because NLCS is so new; inconsistencies in partnerships. NLCS has not been solidified. Salazar needs to better define what NLCS is & build in accountability with the managers of NLCS units.

Challenge Cost Share program should be reinstated. Important to partners- gets people on the land.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Message from farmers & ranchers- we need to get the schools back to agriculture in the schools. Educate kids where their food comes from. She takes kids out on her farm/forest. Her interest stems from 4-H. Conservation is a big part of what farmers do. Farmers get a bad rap on what they do. We need to educate young people about what happens on the farm/ where our food resources come from. Education to the children. Farm Fair- touches lives 5 & 6th graders. Explains farm conservation & stewardship

Ag college-need to keep funding in this. Federal government introduces programs – conservation programs- government officials look over ranch- these programs are so restrictive- not efficient guidelines/ rules. Would have to hire another employee to carry out all the stipulations of these programs. Have to have leeway that is efficient and works for the rancher. Flexibility to make the programs work.

Multiple Use has taken a back seat to development, this concept has been lost.

Madison elk working group; diverse group addressing elk population. Key is to open groups to all people. Forest Jobs & Rec effort was hand-picked & doomed to failure. Groups must include those from the bottom up & not be hand picked.

National Trust- Problem is shortage of funding in the government. Make the best investments possible. Goal-keep our rural population in place in the sites. The National Trust Main Street program & Preserve America program helps small communities to create livable communities/ preserve heritage. These programs bring in a 50:50 match & produce jobs. This is a good long term investment in communities.

Mountain biking is growing in numbers nationally. A gateway sport for kids-encourages them to get outside - 494 miles have been closed to mountain bikes, potential to close 2000 more miles; single track trails that have been in place for decades. At the federal level, bikes are considered" mechanized"... Defined- powered by non-human source. Mountain bikes should NOT be considered mechanized. At the national level, would be good to consider mountain bikes as non-mechanized. There should be distinction between bicycles and motorized bikes.

Northern Rockies has huge ecosystems/ large parks & wildlands surrounded by working landscapes. Agencies should look at the landscape level for climate change- Antiquities Act/ collaboration work. Agencies should set sideboards & guidelines for outcomes. Implement this quickly. Forest collaboration work has been successful, but sometimes then sits on the shelf. Collaboration projects should be prioritized & move forward to implement

These organizations & vo ed are often cut when funding is cut. Agricultural funding goes down when environmental funding goes up. Young farmers and ranchers groups help kids get started in ranching. Ranching is interrelated to conservation/hunting. FFA has helped finding jobs & speaking skill.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Agenda has been more & more federal control. Makes it harder to make a living. Ranches have been sold in western Montana. People forced to move to Eastern Montana. Estate Tax is important. CRP program- if you cut out government subsidies & give ranchers authority back. CRP program is inefficient. Let ranchers do their job without government regulation. Government should put more funding towards education in schools. MSU Ag. Department took a hit.

In addition to bike paths why don't we design communities so cars weren't the only option? We are thinking about this in Missoula County but not as much at the State level in general.

Thinks it's a wonderful idea to develop lands (for public gardens, etc. Anthony Rivers talked about earlier) for better usage. Would it involve planning boards working to get the community involved and gardens approved or should we use another method? We need public education to get support for gardens

We're a small group in attendance; how do we promote the interest in what's going on today instead of having people sitting there and waiting until something happens and then complaining about how it was shoved down their throats

We don't have agility to get money to support and back conservation efforts. When an opportunity is there, we need to know that our backs are going to be covered. Need agility in funding. Sometimes it takes years to find a funding source. We have lots of opportunities right now, such as connecting Yellowstone to Glacier and this is an amazing place to get huge protected landscapes. Need federal support to accomplish this. We have an opportunity now to protect some lands, we have some breathing room from development because of the economy. We need to have agility to be able to backfill other conservation efforts. Let's dive in and protect lots of land now. We could connect many public lands. Montana is a great place to get huge amounts of conservation done. We can do it here.

We need to connect people (to the land). We need a good education program and after school programs so we can get youth outdoors and tell them more about our environment; it's a good way to connect people

In elementary school I received a good education in this but in high school they dropped the ball. We need to do more outside in high school

I agree with what \_\_\_\_\_ said; our agency is not aligned. We need to reinvent ourselves. I'm a District Ranger in Idaho and my staff gets this works accomplished. Community involvement isn't a priority – we don't walk the talk. Employees put in too much of their own time – due to their passion for the job. The biggest benefits are at the grass roots level. Bring in diverse interests. It doesn't filter down from the top

I have a boring, non-visionary suggestion: AVUE. It's your introduction to the Forest Service and it's a nightmare, it's gridlocked. Last year I got hired to work for the Forest Service and it took 5 weeks before I was offered the job. AVUE doesn't seem to work for anyone.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Preservation of Historic Landmarks is important. Should balance natural and historic resources & funding. Preserve important landmarks. Save America's Treasures grant is important.

Getting the voice of youth is really important since we are inheritors of the generation before. It's up to our generation to break the cycle. It's not just an idea we hold in our heads but to get the youth voice is to empower the organizations that already exist. But have it be the Voice of America – not the Youth Voice of America. Empower organizations that already exist. Give that respect the voice deserves; give it more credence. Not 'what do they know?' but really respecting it.

I'm not from Montana. The National Forest I live near is close to town but there's no connection to town. There are no announcements of activities going on – 'town' and 'out of town' are completely separated. We need to build bridges between the two and get people out from town. I know there's a Forest Service office in town but they don't seem involved. We need more outreaches from that office to the community

Winter. Public Land management focuses too much on the summer months and not on the winter. 6 months winter 6 weeks of hiking. More strategies to address winter

I think we should look at the public schools, younger kids. We need to make more of an effort to get kids out to field trips, local areas. Some place they can grow and love and feel safe in. Outside experiences when kids are young are really important. Agencies should use no child left inside and connect to kids through public schools and get them out, even to local places. Maybe then they would take the step to work outdoors.

Key to making all of this work is top down leadership/ effective policy/ . Huge development pressure/ increased population. Need strategic planning to knit all of this together. Would like to see Administration develop a National Strategic Plan for Development and Conservation. Need to address what we are actually intending to do with development so we can make decisions. Resurrect old 701 Planning Grant for councils of government. The greatest challenge we face. Federal Gov't used to have a program for planning for area wide systems in the 1970's. Then there was grant money. We should go back to the Federal Government encouraging joint planning

Local working groups are the future-the model for the future. The Federal Government needs to get behind this & provide federal funds to support. Help preserve & sustain what we have now. Genuine working landscapes- sustain these-buffers & supports rural working communities. Conservation stewardship program –NRCS- voluntary incentives needs to be expanded. Term easements need to be considered ( versus perpetual). These may be more palatable than perpetual. Sustaining genuine working landscapes- need tax relief. Administration needs to get behind this

More efforts toward youth, especially city oriented youth. Target high school. Be careful with large organizations like PPL that take resources away from the public

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Missoula, MT***

***(cont.)***

Not from area. He didn't grow up with parks. We are being taught to appreciate the arts- should also be taught to appreciate the outdoors. Many groups here in Montana to promote the environment.

Connecting people to the outdoors. Working with people with ALL abilities to connect them to the outdoors.

When the first open space bond passed, people were not aware of the public access issues that went along with it. But five years later we passed the second bond on open space. People want to protect open space on private land whether there's access or not. He personally allows hunting and fishing on his land but he doesn't think we need to dictate to landowners that they must allow public access

Agencies have the authority to work with students to bring them into employment and if they come to work for the NPS the agency can provide relief to college debt, we need to use it!

What are the kids' reactions once they come here and participate in the MCC? Is there anything we can do to facilitate more of that? How can we bring more kids?

Agencies were structured around military models and moving people every 3-5 years. It is not working for local communities and probably not serving federal employees well either.

DOI-regulations make it difficult for private philanthropy to do good things in the parks. Grand Teton VC required all money up front before they could begin. Park said all funds had to be up-front. Ended up paying an additional \$3 million. These regulations need to be update to encourage private philanthropy.

Trails are a great way to address global warming/ childhood obesity/ & getting kids outside. Trails are difficult to build after the fact. Need policies that treat trails as traditional infrastructure. Easier to address ahead in planning, instead of trying to retrofit.

I was an NPS brat and grew up in Yellowstone. I am a Landscape Architect in Missoula. I have counted at least 10 federal agencies involved in recreation, conservation/preservation. Need to have one agency with oversight or better coordination between them. Need to address local land conservation on a national basis and create the culture to do that. I am involved in a project on Kootenai reservoir which was built by the Corp and now managed by Forest Service. There was an article in the Missoulian today that discussed it. Missoula has environmental awareness because people came to University of Montana , liked the environment and stayed.

I think in Montana the lack of zoning is an issue; it affects our ability to have open spaces. There are social and environmental problems related to zoning. Maybe state level laws would work by being stricter on development. There could be incentives for proper development.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

There is a role for Federal government to plan in Environmental Education. Her kids are not interested in Yellowstone/ visitation is dropping. Need to connect kids. MOSS- gets kids outside. Government can play a role in the schools in E Ed. National Park should promote technology/ learning/ merge new technology

He likes what he's hearing today. I think one of the hardest parts of getting youth to the outdoors is to provide a reason to go there. The Education Award is a good thing. He participated in a Career Fair where they got to talk to kids face to face and the kids got excited seeing all the tools they brought with them. Developing leadership skills is important; youth can then carry it on further into their lives. You need to probe what motivates those kids: is it cranking out 10 miles of trail? Or being better speakers? or more engaged in community? Find out what motivates youth. Youth will motivate youth. It's like a baseball team – someone tells a friend, who tells a friend, etc.; the ripple effect. The YCC focuses on leadership – but the Forest Service doesn't do this. It's so important to your community.

This speaks to the future – the 21st Century in Conservation, Kids in the Outdoors, etc.: Federal agencies were organized and located 50–100 years ago under a different paradigm. Look at how agencies are organized now. We need to change from “doers” to “conveners “. We aren't funded that way. We are organized under a different paradigm that needs change

Large scale conservation planning. 2/3 of Montana is made up of plains vs mountains. The plains provide food & fiber & possibly domestic energy production. Asks that Fed Gov't take a large scale view...we need renewable energy...but we have much biodiversity in this landscape. Don't direct new energy resources to where we need to do conservation. Rural communities in the plains are suffering. Loss of population/ schools closing. We need to look for new opportunities.

Northern Great Plains. We have overlooked the grasslands, as evidence by decline in grassland birds & species. We are focusing on North Central area of Montana. CCPI program with farm bill is effective; working with ranchers on conservation measures to protect grassland birds. Need regional NRCS people to deliver these programs on the ground. Meet with ranchers and discuss opportunities. Science based organization that works with BLM/ FWP on research related to grassland birds. Leveraging of public/private dollars is effective. CMR-largest grassland reservation. Better integration between DOI agencies needs to occur. CMR managing for ferret. Not effective. BLM trying to find incentives for landowners to allow ferrets. DOI agencies need to do better at working multi-jurisdictionally.

Administration priorities on funding- Invest in the United States & the programs NPS/ Americor- look at local food systems and recreational opportunities. Learn from the Roosevelt administration and prioritize spending here at home. Funding is not being spent in the best way. DOI & NPS advocate for funding....LWCF. Americor, Parks

Wilderness management: we need more of it at less cost

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

He works with wolf conservation. What he has seen that doesn't work is incentive based compensation to ranchers. We need to look at non-incentive based strategies in the future. Concerning conservation on private land, we need to figure out some more strategies. Project Wild: it's really interactive and cool even though it's not outdoors

I am with a 4-Wheel Drive organization. We have been working with the Forest Service on Wild Bill Park near Lakeside, MT. One of our issues is the turnover rate of federal employees. We keep having to start over explaining issues, establishing relationships because federal employees get transferred and then we have to start over it is very frustrating. Then you have to start over with new people for 10 years, than another 10 years and over and over.

NOA(H?)- Coastal areas & estuaries are being left out of this effort. NOA needs to be included. Sen Tester Jobs & Rec bill is a collaborative effort.

Grizzly Bears: we have to be able to manage them. Wolves. 60 % of elk herd is diminishing. Self-sustaining. We need to overhaul Endangered Species Act. Eliminates rancher's ability to make a living. Needs to be financial restitution

We do have sprawl & no mechanisms to deal with. No land use planning mechanism in Gallatin County. Climate change will affect all public lands, until congress acts. Poor public policies from previous administration- no new wilderness- can be overturned by new administration. Don't be afraid to use Antiques Act.

So many men and women are graduating with tremendous debt which affects the kinds of jobs they feel able to pursue. There should be a program for kids who work for federal agencies that reduces or pays off their debt.

It's important to remember that just because children live near the woods they will be engaged. She grew up in Alaska, but thinks she was the only kid at school who spent the majority of her time outside because her Dad was trapper. They won't go out there on their own. At school, the Tongass National Forest was surrounding it but they weren't allowed to go outside the playground. Their teachers never took them outside the playground. It's important to not assume kids near the woods use it. On same note, she thinks her classmates were not engaged, they did art/music instead. She later had a job as an education coordinator in Alaska where she used art and poetry to connect kids to the outdoors.

Many ranches are transitioning from working ranches to private estates. Not many ranches now allow hunting & fishing. Access is a big problem in Montana. Wildlife goes to private land. Access needs to be provided. Block Management program is effective in Montana. Provide incentives for private landowners to provide hunting opportunities.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Climate Change. Administration should look at vulnerable and valuable landscapes. Native trout & the impact of climate change on these species. Gets at economic issues/ anglers bring in \$\$ to Montana. If we want to preserve this economic stream, we have to protect watershed and riverways. Admin should launch a larger, broad scale restoration initiative in relation to climate change. This area could be a pilot area to protect native fish. There is limitless restoration possibilities out there...many potential projects. This would relate to climate change- watershed restoration

Appreciates everyone protecting land. Interested in protecting water. Primary concern is with global warming. Unless we get a handle on this issue, all our efforts at land protection will be in vain; get warmer/ forests burn up/ biodiversity down the tubes...if we don't change our ways. Federal government should not do cap & trade; we need to focus on cap & dividend or carbon tax- return the profit to the public.

We need to learn the lesson of history in Montana and watch the big money. Note the situation in the Bitterroot valley. Big money and developers have been coming in while the locals have worked to determine what good land use is. There are a lot of people coming in to make money and pollute and don't like these community processes that protect land. Our state legislature is heavily influenced by big money. Local folks need to hold the line. We need to be sophisticated in our advocacy and we need to be just as tough as big developers are and mobilize people to fight for the public interest. We have the local people who can say no to big money and development. Good planning protects private property rights.

One of challenges in the National Park Service is congestion. Ex: Logan Pass in Glacier National Park. Need to institute more public transportation in National Parks. National Park Service should set up and provide huge leadership by eliminating cars all together. Glacier could be a leading example. Glacier already has bus fleet. There is already a historic connection to Glacier NP and trains. Imagine Glacier without cars. I realize there would be resistance from local business. This might have some local support.

Ranching families-senior members are retiring. The next generation is taking over, but there is always a funding problem. Full funding of LWCF would make family transitions easier; purchase easements with LWCF funds- let younger generation keep ranch together; help older generation. As these valleys begin to unravel, find funds to help next generation take over

How to pass on to kids- ranches- wildlands. Ranch settings/ wide & free/ Inheritance taxes! To pay these, often need to subdivide. Challenges with inheritance taxes if you want to preserve ranches.

Need more incentives to 4 & 5th generation ranchers to allow hunting and fishing vs incentives to out of state ranchers.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Public land should continue to be multi-use managed but energy development needs to be better scrutinized. Montana is a very energy intensive state. She doesn't want to see things similar to the Gulf spill happen or the mining deaths in West Virginia. The administration should look into what kind of energy development can be done here as well as alternative energy. We need a solid energy plan. Public lands will be looked at for solar, wind, coal, and natural gas. Look at the pros and cons of each. We need a 20-year plan along with multi-use planning.

Conservation of open lands. Society has now taken the leap to understand that development is the greatest threat to our open spaces. The forest legacy program in Montana works really well. There are a lot of issues. How do we pay for all of this? Limited funds available in federal grant programs to make open space pay for itself. Having an environmental ethic begins at a young age. I got involved with agencies as an SCA. We need to build on these programs to better connect youth and kids, like the Montana Conservation Corp. Great things could be done cheaply by employing youth. Agencies need to look at climate change more holistically. How can we manage our lands to mitigate climate change, how can we do things in our operations like shifting to a better vehicle fleet? I hope they (agencies) will look at those things as well.

Kids don't have any clue this exists. This needs to be advertised.

Provide people with information as to what is available. Provide adaptive equipment so people of all abilities have access. This is a model.

successful orgs that enable a coalition of interests to work together. Come to the table and talk about what to do with a particular place. Working together on all places, not just focus on what's important to me. Need to be willing to listen carefully, willing to give, and agree that you're not going to be able to agree on everything.

80% of the population lives in cities. Need to work with US bicycle organizations, try to build and advocate sustainable travel. Focus on taking urban walking and biking networks and connecting them with suburban landscapes. Invest in the link between the two. Bicycling reduces pollution. Promote sustainable travel thru parks. Connects nation parks, state parks and local parks

2 things that keep people from coming to the outdoors. Facade (not Disneyworld) or fear. Govt needs to provide a mentoring program to conservation groups to reach out to publics and get them interested in the outdoors. Teach them that risk is ok, and could actually be fun. Yes, there is risk in going to the outdoors, but it's worth the experience.

2 things that keep people from coming to the outdoors. Facade (not Disneyworld) or fear. Govt needs to provide a mentoring program to conservation groups to reach out to publics and get them interested in the outdoors. Teach them that risk is ok, and could actually be fun. Yes, there is risk in going to the outdoors, but it's worth the experience.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

economy important. Need to see groups working together, dovetail natural resources and cultural resources together. Tamarak festival held at the same time as the brew fest, provides several types of groups all working together to focus on natural resources and bringing community together to combine all interests. Economic value is brought to the community.

don't feel we need to focus on new programs, but need to coordinate what we've got. Need more opportunities to provide connections with the groups we have here today. Making connections and establishing coordination.

NRCS has good incentive programs for private lands. Need to work better on the outreach to those land owners.

agencies have not been able to do the work we expect them to do. They are not paying attention to the landscapes for the sake of doing business. Agencies need to be consistent with the communities and take note of how some of the projects they back are not what the communities want.

focusing on working landscapes. From a conservation standpoint, need to provide a linkage between public and private lands. There's a misconception that private lands are not important. Need to change that thought. Private lands need to be included and considered high importance. Need for incentives to private landowners to give them the backing to want to be connected. Need to get word out to those landowners, provide unbiased info, to get them to step up and be included.

Use green practices in the agency buildings, like composting waste and using solar panels. Set an example for community. If you can do it in the agency buildings, then the community can see how to do it.

I have a wish list, 1. better planning strategies across the board, 2. Incentive to save conservation areas, 3. More information and advocacy, 4. Increased collaboration between local and federal agencies. More gets done by the locals than the feds.

Regarding the energy policy: Revise entire transportation infrastructure. Buses, trains, roads, etc. That would be ok. (Big laugh from the group.)

With issue of conservation we always hear that we have to choose between economics and save the landscapes. I would like to see more working together. That's why this event is here in Montana, because we get along so well. We import of 40% of our lumber. Are we serving anything when we outsource lumber and British Columbia levels all their forest? We need to do what's good.

Youth involvement doesn't have to be through service organizations. There are other ways. For me I worked outside. That's how I learned.



## Discussion Question 2

***Missoula, MT***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness is too stringent. I love wilderness. Wilderness is unpalatable because it too stringent. That's why there are so many exceptions in the wilderness proposals. Otherwise people won't support it. We need to make new designation all together that is less stringent. A "Wilderness Light" concept. It will get more support.

I like to see more grass root things with government to set examples like sustainable living practices in building plant or use of native plants in all diff regions. Gardens or cooperatives in military and camps.

Forest Service having native grass around buildings. Where I work now, I'm told to water the lawn. It uses tons of water to water grass around buildings. There is prairie all around. If you use the right grass you don't need to water. Nobody would care that it was prairie instead. I stopped at a FS rest stop yesterday. It was so warm in bathroom and it was at night. Why are the heaters on in these facilities? Practice sustainable ways. Fund advertising use of green practices and local land. Put word out so people get interested.

Provide funds for leadership, schools and camps. More AmeriCorps. All of us will go home and tell 30 people.

Agencies should adopt things like when the health craze health started and agencies funded people to take walks at lunch to get healthy. Agencies can adopt outdoor activities so white collar can see blue collar people work like farms, trails, and farm communities.

The biggest obstacle is lack of awareness. It seems reclamation is backburner. It takes one life cycle for a vacant lot to develop an ecosystem. Drive through any town. It probably has a vacant lot. Make an incentive for the owner to donate use of the lot to the community in neighborhood fashion like community gardens. When there is a neighborhood garden you can feel the neighborhood. There is less trash, its cleaner. The people are more neighbors. In my community there is a year long waiting list for the garden. Need many, many, many, many more gardens. The gardens put the conservation effort at the forefront of daily life.

I want fixes ASAP. One idea is mandatory public service for environmental clean-up, study of natural science, or community activities that focus on betterment of neighborhoods. Fixing road shoulders, garbage cans, gardens, etc. Have mandatory public service for one or two years after high school. Stagger it so everybody isn't in it at the same time. Every time I bring it up people agree it's a good idea.

We are here because we care about mother nature. There's not debate happening here. We all agree. If I was in your seat, what I would leave with is that priority 1 is expansion. You need more of us (young people). I will spend this summer in Bob Marshall Wilderness. It will be great experience. There are only so many seats. I'm not giving up mine. We need more seats. Advertising is important, but don't forget the main point is to make it accessible. The more of us there are the better it is for everybody. Don't forget this is the main point.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

My background is in outdoor education. Connection with nature is not working. The book "Kids in the Woods" agrees that the connection is broken. Lack of outdoor experience is a problem. It is the root of a lot of situations. Kids don't get connection with woods. Many don't live near woods. Every kid who goes through school needs time outdoors. Whether it's through the teachers or take them out and have it outside the class. Not every kid is receptive to getting into nature. But give every kid a chance to experience it.

Long-term strategies so many people want to help take care of pub lands. There is not a good enough interface right now. We need conservation leadership. How do citizens contribute? The funds we are talking about are all federal. Federal part is a black box. Everything else outside of fed black box is available through citizens. We need to work through the citizens. Things can be figured out at local level and so much good will happen. Do the local piece and it will feed to the big strategy.

Attitude towards public lands. We are intent on our right to use public lands, which turned into a right to abuse public lands. These ecosystems create benefits for humans: clean air and water. These lands and creatures have right to their own existence and quality life. It is not all about use. It's about taking care of these lands. Pushing more use and people intensifies management. We lose touch with outdoors after awhile. We are not in dominion over these lands. We are part of them. Public agencies can help instill the attitude of being part of the land. It starts with bringing it into the schools at a young age. If kids have that exposure to land they are more likely to care about it. Waiting for people to start abusing and then dealing with it is a backwards approach.

There is a lot of pressure on agencies to add things to wilderness areas like cell phone tower or poison fish or kill weeds. Remember the ethic of restraint in wilderness. Wilderness is the highest designation. These lands are the barometer in climate change. Leave them alone. We will need to know how nature will react to 2 deg change. We need a base.

Trying to get community based environmental education group going. They are building a monthly passport program, with monthly events from various organizations. All the individual groups create events, but they are so isolated that they are like little strings that need to be brought together to make a rope, to make a strong event. All these great intentions and good ideas and people who want to do it. There needs to be more organization and umph. There needs to be a non-profit or government or other way to bring them together.

I get to work with all four land management agencies. There is a lack of internal communication between agencies. Facebook and you-tube are blocked from agency computers, so agency people can't communicate with young people. Need to look at that before you can reach out to young people.

The generations before us built many roads: highways and in forest. I think we should protect roadless areas. There are not many left. It is special to walk into backcountry area and not hear motors or hear ATVs. It is important to protect what's left.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Supporting local communities: Agencies can show commitment by using local resources. If you are building a building in New Mexico use adobe, in Montana use wood from Montana, rather than from another country. Be mindful of where resource comes from.

Getting people connected and kids outdoors is important. Federal agencies were created under a different paradigm. A paradigm where congress allocated funds and agency went and did work. With people being more involved there needs to be a change in the federal agency organization. We won't be the doers anymore. We need to be reinvented.

Our organization does well. It gives an opportunity to lead and gives ownership of their experience. The kids come to be outside and work and to not be at school. Participants take ownership over the direction they go. They work in projects in woods and make decisions on how to shape the environment. It creates a sense of self work creates leadership opportunity. It bonds people to woods and creates leaders. I don't want to knock the Forest Service, but some of my friends just sat through the entry training. The Forest Service entry training is horrible. The instructors have 30 years experience or more, but they can't teach how to use a chainsaw or cross cut saw. Its exciting stuff, but they make it dull. Keep the youthful energy going.

The agencies are good at inventory and monitoring on public lands. Extend inventory and monitoring onto private lands in the large scale conservation model. With that in mind we need public access. Access is based on consumptive uses. Focus on non consumptive uses. Would be more palatable to public.

about high schools. On national news, there is a high dropout rate in high schools. Some schools are letting them move on. They say it's ok if the kids leave. Revamp high school. There is a crisis in the high school. Maybe have an option or alternative for high school kids to get into the outdoors. Make them part of the solution.

Bring outdoors into the city. Many city people spend time indoors, it may be better to get them outside in the city. It can be intimidating to do an internship with SCA in the woods. It can be intimidating if you can't cook at home and then go out in woods and have to cook outside. There needs to be more bike paths so they can experience outdoors without being intimidated.

Get kids outdoors. The book "Kids in the Woods" sets up the problem well. Lewis and Clark Trail teaches kids conservation out on a trail setting. It is an important developmental step to get outdoors, not just in yards, on lawns, but in the wilderness. We are at a time right now, and people say the Lewis and Clark Trail is over. But it's wrong. It's a terrible thing to just drop the ball and not follow up with what they saw at Travelers Rest or wherever. Get them to look where we are and the history that we have here.

Growing up in Bozeman, I got to visit Berkley Pit and learn how much money is being spent to clean it up. Reckless use of the environment has effects on the community and watershed. This has had an effect on my ethic. A way to get the message out could be tied in to the superfund. The superfund could contribute to an education program or to the schools.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

How to keep people involved. I'd like to see a task force or task team that young is involved in. There are so many ideas that are all involved in. We will be the leaders. We see a need to change sooner rather than later. We want to be involved now. Create a method for us to get involved. A team or something.

RMF Heritage act is great. Roadless rule is not final answer. We need more designation besides wilderness.

Climate change— there is no greater environmental effect. Land management agencies can effect not just on ground but can influence others. DOI can have an impact on others.

Restoration is a buzz word. The governor has pushed it hard. I think you need to harp on it more at federal level. Obama said "Let's restore forests and watershed and put people back to work doing it." That's what we need to do.

I resent to be told that we (the youth) have to deal with the problems of our forefathers. The Downtown Association says "These things didn't work now it's your turn to fix them." They say this to empower youth. The enemy of the past approach doesn't work well with me. We (the youth) want to do it together rather than ask us to take over. We don't want to step on toes of someone who's been there for 30 yrs. We want to work together. Incentives don't always have to be money. Incentive may be a title or being part of a group, it doesn't have to be money. Don't write a ton of bureaucracy or policy that we will be tied to forever.

Thinking about corporations—one aspect is corporate responsibility for environmental damage is less than what it should be. The funds they have coming in could be focused differently. There could be bigger fines for violations. There could be effects on their charters. Stockholders don't feel the effects. Like BP in the gulf. The effects don't necessarily come back to the stockholders. Make it should come back to stockholders somehow. They will make better investment choices. If there were effects to the corporations, they would use their funds for the environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Getting more Children Outdoors – This is one of the biggest and most important challenges for this generation of children who have the highest rates of obesity and health problems related to being over-weight, such as diabetes. - Pass the No Child Left Inside Act (HR 2054 & S. 866) – This Act would provide funding for expanding environmental education in schools in order to get kids outdoors to learn and care about their environment and have the opportunity to be active and enjoy the outdoors. - Children in Nature – Many local, state and federal agencies are working separately and together to develop programs to get kids outdoors to connect with nature and be physically active after school or on weekends. Greater coordination and funding from the Federal govt could substantially increase these efforts. - Increase funding for the Recreational Trails Program – The majority of this funding goes to construct trails that connect city residents with parks and open space, providing more opportunities for children to be active and enjoy the outdoors. - Increase funding for Safe Routes to School – This is one of the best ways to reduce children being driven to school each day – provide a safe route so that they can walk or ride their bikes instead. - Help create more opportunities for both volunteer programs and paid work – 1000's of young folks are connected to the outdoors by volunteering for local, state and public parks, but many local govts don't have the resources to either create or expand upon volunteer programs. Assistance from NPS or the USFS could make a big difference. Also, help increase programs that assist college students with paid internships or paying back college loans in exchange for working outdoors.

Getting more Adults Outdoors - Support Social Marketing and Social Norming – This is one of the best ways to inform leaders, parents and children that getting outdoors is healthy and positive. Social marketing has changed the way we think about litter, forest fires, seatbelts, recycling and more. - Increase CTEP Funding – This is one of the major funding sources for constructing bike/ped trails that are used for commuting and recreation by adults of all ages and abilities and children. Such funding is often used to build bike/ped trails that are completely separate from roads in beautiful greenways, which encourages more adults to ride and exercise when they feel safely separated from auto traffic.

Lived by a national forest in Tennessee. The local school system didn't take advantage of the local forest. The local Forest Service office really isolated themselves and you never saw them in town. It would be great to put the local office in town and combine the town and the agency to increase education.

Website for finding jobs for the Forest Service and National Park Service is terrible. If we go to a web site that's not well put together we are turned off and we don't want to work for them. It's hard to get a job for the FS so why not put links on your site of alternative ways to work in the woods that may not be as good as pay but get us out in the woods and work experience.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

His roommates recently got a record player and you can't skip a bad song easily. When you deal with a job site – the kids are used to skipping past bad songs easily so when you're dealing with a web site need to make it so that there are not bad sites that youth will skip. Make it fast – the youth are used to operating really fast. Use of social media facebook and twitter is really important. The NYC people who aren't in the woods use FB and Twitter and that is how we can connect with them. Also remember that use of social marketing technology skips over the young folks who aren't on facebook yet. Keep in mind that when using facebook you are missing elementary and middle school kids and we need to get kids into the habit of using the outdoors.

It would have a huge impact to move the Forest Service out from under Department of Agriculture because when you view trees as a crop it makes a big difference in how they are managed. The way to set policies should be based on watershed health as the basis for all management because, for example, drinking water will be one of the primary problems of the next century.

He brought seven people here all of which can't come back because of the limits of the program. This creates problems and also brings in new ideas. He's seen Forest Service people getting comfortable in their jobs. He'd like to see the agency have rules where employees would have to move on – for example they could be a GS-4 for a number of years before you move up or move out. This would help the younger people move in and would keep the government agencies fresh.

Two issues: Sustainability in the timber industry. There is a way to use these renewable resources. There's a way to use the trees without clearcuts – use the woods at the same time as keeping them growing. Land use ethics: he moved to Kalispell thinking he was coming to a little mountain town and instead found out it had six grocery stores and two Walmarts. He'd think it would be huge if people understood the land that they're destroying by building on it.

He would like to see the FS change their stance on mining and international Forestry.

This group is not representative of youth in Montana. She is a 5th generation Montanan and there is a need to take this to more rural communities. It would be good to have smaller groups, led by youth and get in touch with more youth groups.

You asked how to reach out to the youth. The way to do that is to treat us as the new and upcoming voice – do not marginalize us – don't just see us as a group of young people who are upset and have too much time on their hands – instead see us as leaders – we are concerned about national security - we recognize that the problems going on are not just problems now but will be problems for the next 30 years and we're going to have to be the ones to deal with it. Recognize us for that.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

1. Lack of money is the critical issues. The forest needs to managed to generate money to do a lot of the recreation development and restoration work. Letting wildfires run and the money goes up in smoke. Harvesting creates roads and access for people to use, it creates jobs and can make the land healthier while generating revenue. Plum Creek Timber Co lands allow access and it creates lots of recreational use, unfortunately it also ends up with people dumping refrigerators and couches. Money is critical issue for managing the land, it needs to be generated from management not appropriated from the government.

One is going back to grad school to work on climate change another really wants to work in the forest not in an office. It takes \$10k to pay for these types of positions and experiences. The agencies often don't have the capacity to do the training of volunteers so we miss opportunities to use this labor force, the agencies don't have the NEPA completed to implement projects. The agencies don't have the organizational staff capacity to engage the way that has been expressed today.

a huge barrier is the potential for catastrophic fires with our overcrowded forests and beetle epidemics. We need to get forests thinned. Tools needed= fund biofuel energy developments – it will be cost effective and provide jobs. The private money will not be invested until lawsuits that stop thinning can be stopped. The private sector needs enough lands to be under contract so they can see their investment being amortized over time.

The government can be a better partner by stop hiding the grant opportunities – web sites to find this information. Need to have simpler application processes.

Both within FRPP - LO's get to work with 3rd party of their choice - a strong selling point for that program; when LO puts property under easement; it's \$ out of LO pocket - wants more recognition of LO contributions

Grizzly bears

Strategically think about fracture zones and linking the protected areas for interests of grizzlies, etc

Eastern Front -- protect North Fork Flathead

\$s, jobs and Mother Nature

No longer checker board land pattern

Whole thing is what's next - biomass project

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Thinks what's happened here can be exported but they need help - facilitation, etc - NGO's have helped and so have some agency folks who also love the front

130,000 acres of easements - another look ac waiting

Oil and gas

Good place to do this development and others not so much in Rocky Mountain Front

Forestry 700,000 state-owned, more land owned (next to feds) then private -logging will be able to continue into future

EAJA -lawsuits creating big \$ for radical environmental groups; some conservationist groups you can work with \$, others are just litigious.

NEPA sufficiency and hard release language is needed - costs \$m to create these documents and they're litigated like crazy - need to get rid of litigation.

When approached with the idea of purchasing A- 300k ac for~ why that incredibly complex, etc, but that they had to do it - will never be successful in conservation unless it can work for people who live and work there (\$250m is what Baucus apparently came up with); happy with full funding of LWCF.

an organ in Missoula, inch Hell's Anglers ... in 1975, a mine blew (or something) it killed river, now restored there are 500k such abandoned mines out there -. 1 ~ law -local community ~~

Abandoned mine cleanup fund (not what he called it) should be created to give

needs solar and wind as alternative to oil, but needs discussions on where best place is for these and associated transmission lines; likes full funding for LCWF

Historic preservation fund (National) created at same time as L WCF and it's not talked about so much; Government took small amount of ARRA funds and put to historic preservation. The conservation and preservation community should be tied closely together

on a per capita basis, Montana sends more folks to Iraq and Afghanistan than any other country - partly out of patriotism, partly because of jobs

FS over last 11 years has worked hard to reclaim the mines near the edge of Yellowstone -last week or so, Baucus got funding to finish it - Crown Butte Mine

## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

You don't get from part A to B overnight; serious problem - inappropriate use of seashores, marshes, coastlines, floodplains; may not have known at the time, but we can't perpetuate the mistake; disaster funds help them, but the ability to get insurance affects peoples' willingness to build there again - doesn't want taxpayer \$'s going more than 1 time to the same structure/piece of property - need to encourage development

200 Lo's on 600 projects

It's about the collaboration, but need to keep red tape \$ bureaucracy to minimum

FWS partners program - keeps L6 agreement simple

Prerequisite to using conservation easement - appraisals affected by outside folks moving to Montana for environmental amenities so the after appraisal values are very high – this doesn't make it easy for landowners

But tribes don't qualify for Pittman - Roberts funds in most cases

No 6 EAS funds

No multi state conservation grants

No state wildlife

Block mgt program needs help. Very stringent rules may discourage some landowners from participating. Some don't want become block mgrs due to regulations, program needs to be more flexible. Plum Creek gets a huge tax incentive. Motorized traffic does not apply in block mgt, overall great for hunting access, some pitfalls to blk mgt area that are constrained by FS in DC. Especially time of year motorized access, some farmers and ranchers are restricted to what they can do, today's economy the restrictions may not allow participation. Need more flexibility and incentives. A state program, MT citizens should try using bond issues to allow purchase of more private lands, example we have purchased lands for public access in the Potomac Valley.

Many community meetings in Darby to discuss FS potential road closures and travel management. The concern that 1000s of miles of logging roads that we utilize with 4wd, horses, jeeps, access by older americans, don't close our logging roads, lots of people want to close to help elk habitat, long time residents disagree with this, the elk are doing fine with public access as it is and has been for a long time.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Missoula, MT*

*(cont.)*

Big city school kid, grew up with problems of getting kids out to the wilderness. Most city kids are exposed to the goal of attaining material possessions v. wilderness values, difficult to be inner city kid and beinvolved with outdoors. He would fish around the lakes , qtr acre of public lands v. huge private land holdiungs. he bought a houseboat to av oid ownership boundaries. sieer club atv access talk they are for keeping logging roads for atv use, issue is when they jump off roads and creat new trails, damages resources, oil leaks, personal responsibility to avoid wetlands, drivers need to bemore responsiible. wants more freedom to avoid other people.

One thing nobody mentioned is CRP Conservation Reserve Progrm involves private l os and public acces, obstacles we face, diff los with adjoine pieces of property emphasize their diffs rather than common, work thru comm and concensus emphasizing the points in common

SHOULD BE A DIRECT CONNECTION TO SCHOOL CURRICUM, NEED MONEY FOR OUTDOOR ED

Movingon to obstructions, 4th gen mt, two obstructions FS is mandated by rules and regs from dc that don't fit here, FS says that it needs to be restructured and maqnaged a different way. NEPA MEPA Travel mgt program is outr of dsate, takes too long things are taking too long. things change updating need sto happen mroe quickly. people need to pressure legislators, not rocket sciens, just talk topeople. 2. the professional "terroists" anyone can walk in a file a n injunction all the programs that people wnat topo p ut together to tmake something work, for \$100 people can hold up progrezss for 5 yrs, need leg to req people to put more money down to file a complianbt, project money os goinmg to litigation

Large landscape coiord res mgt to address climate change, orgs that are successful in bringin people together to, real obstacle as simple as travel funding ands adequate staff time toand agency support to allow need to have amandate in fed govt to allow a space inthe employee workload to outreacha dn woirk with people. State needs to fund travle tio meetings to allow greatewr partiucuiopation. Local orgs Lincoln Inst and policy inst in UM coivwenine a round table with los and local govts, to allow better communcaition across larger scales.

DU has raised over \$2.5 billion over the last 73 yrs for waterfall and other wildlife habitata in US, Canada and Mexico. One of the primary goals is to protect prarie pothole region, 300,000 acs of prime breeding hab 49 % of woerlds waterfowl pop produc 1m.5 hunters hunts ducks in pothole region. main issue conserv easements, du has identifie dover 600 los in ppare ready willing to renrole private lands into fed sponsored eopncerva eas grassland/wrtland easement program DOi fws and DOA NRCS, need fundign once du gets asignal that givt i dfunding DU can faciliatet the easement

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Missoula, MT***

***(cont.)***

Vast amounts of public land matrix of mult uses, core is large protected areas, NPS tourism economy drivers, quality of life need to acknowledge the reason for success in conservation in this region because of large protected land areas. FS, NPS is not the problem, is what has allowed this occur, obstacles are the success of these areas too many people moving here, how can fed help solve this, teach residents how to live in this env to allow the success to continue, Eastern Mt there are efforts to help create large areas Prairie Foundation to help restore bison and to help create and diversify the economy, rec quality of life, hunting fishing other areas of the country

There is only one safe trail at Grand Canyon for access to and from the canyon, the Bright Angel Trail. This trail is highly unpleasant and unsafe due to the heavy use by hikers and donkeys. Trail improvements are needed as this is the only safe route into the canyon.

A controlled burn at Yosemite National Park got out of control and cost large amounts of federal dollars to contain. The federal government should pay young people to clear brush to alleviate the risk from controlled burns. Any controlled burn in tender box conditions is a mistake.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

www.walkinonranch.com concerned that these comments won't be read, doesn't like the idea, he is private business man, served in Viet Nam, has some land near Cookeville, they have a horse business, he has PTSD and doesn't like to be around people, wants to know what to do to get help and support, invited to equestrian world games as breed representative for TWH, the small grass roots people can do things, small person can make a difference, looking for help in representing the Tennessee Walking Horse, the various websites are not giving him the assistance he needs in getting help he wants, he wants to get help in representing the state of TN, small farmer and rancher can contribute but need help in figuring out how to get assistance. Don't focus all assistance just on organizations, make it easier with less red tape for individuals not just organizations. Make it easier for people on bottom end of it to contribute.

make it easier to get grants, most of these folk are volunteers with day jobs, make it easier

challenges: Conservation and greenways more \$\$:

Challenges: grants not enough \$\$ to cover grants and request for funding.

challenges: Kids connected to nature. Every Kid getting access to outdoors. Classes, greenways and parks, field trips, Teacher training no knowledge for them to get outdoors, lesson plans for teachers,

Challenges: TN # 8 in tourism. Preserving America Program: no \$\$ in budget for this program in 2011. Sustainable tourism will suffer if this stands

Challenges: DU Kids in the outdoors. Education parents. Find ways to do this. We missed a generation so the kids are suffering

challenges: Childhood Obesity, media partners telling people to stay inside during heat. Find another way to provide a healthy message

challenges: Land owners may be interested in Conserv easement. Expensive appraisals or donation of \$\$ to monitor lands. Match up people who have lands and money. Maybe set up trust funds to help facilitate this for people who have \$\$ but no land

Challenges: State Mandate for State Wildlife conservation plan, federal agency use same tools to set up consistency btw states. EX no net loss policy for wildlife conservation

challenges: Lack of fitness. Get out and walk, eat healthy, ect: To do this area must be safe and education about fitness and healthy eating

Challenges: Consistent and full funding for the USDA's Resource Conservation and D... Fund (RC&D)

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

*(cont.)*

challenges: recreation in forested areas is threatened by insects and diseases (trees) Threats to forest health on public and private lands. Land use change loss of forested lands. Work with our policy makers to make them aware of the importance of our forested areas.

Challenges: Create opportunities and demand for kids to be outside. Convince kids that it's great to be outside.

Challenges: Forest fragmentation housing and commercial developments need more local regulations to manage land use. Keep best farm land in production

Change the perception that it's not safe to be outdoors. Address it if it's real or dismiss it if it's fiction.

Challenge: Change the perception that it's not safe to be outdoors. Address it if it's real or dismiss it if it's fiction.

Challenges: Trouble for private sector to meet matches for federally funded programs. Prioritize or coordinate the funding programs.

Challenges: Get our message out to a more diverse group of people instead of the same folks. Engage every member of our population

Continue to evaluate areas of opportunities to get more kids out doors.

Success in bridging gap btwn preservation and conservation community. Preservation community is more concerned with buildings and conser. = landscapes. Need to integrate these ideas. TN Civil War Natural Heritage Area administered by University. TN farms that have been in same family for over 100 years These areas are important to many more partners.

tn organization, challenge they have release schedules , from tva they hold lots of land concern hawassi river, river turns on at 11, want recreation on the river. Wants white water rafting with more releases. Before and after labor daily

lands set aside, and we struggle to maintain what we have, maintenance and upkeep.

- help people to love something to get them outdoors. TN children we have lots of parks and trying to get children outdoors.

con easements 06 07, easement enhanced. Extended 08 + 09, 2yrs success, want perm tax code(revisions). Chattn cons farm land Farm to school program good benefits, child nutrition act hard to serve food, had more funding and buy from the local farmer.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

*(cont.)*

grant money criteria to be looked at- pking lots a waste of money requirements need to be looked at.

policy cutting into the NF, on board of tn parks and greenways, reassess the resources of TN, look and not cutting into the NF

we observe wildlife no hunting on it, raising money for land, money is hard to get. LWCF land acquisition money

we created your going to fix it ( as he tells his youth group)

Release schedules of water levels are controlled by TVA need to be aligned; engage partners and hold stakeholder meetings regardless of controversy or differing users in order to best regulate water levels.

young people reconnection minorities. Working with Dept. of Interior is a nightmare vs NOAA. NPS superintendant are too hands off, better coordination of youth programs.

Get kids outdoors- find practical ways to get kids outdoors in backyards. Basic everyday things such as raking and mowing are not done parents overworked. Fontenel Sies with. Integrate nature activity with normal living opportunities such as outdoor concert.

set lands aside and struggle to maintain and keep up lands. Dedicated funding for maintenance and upkeep of lands and use other initiatives to bring kids and people to lands.

Help people love something Every child outdoors TN bill of rights for children walk in woods possible because of partnerships subscribing to this bill. School curriculums recesses and outdoor activities are cut and field trips are limited. Challenge is outside activity is limited because of testing requirements.

challenge of conserve. Easements 2006 and 2007 enhanced tax incentives caused lots more people to enter into CE program Needs to be permanent part of tax code. Help small scale local farmers farm to school programs where schools purchase foods from local farmers Child nutrition act makes it hard to serve quality food and program specifies exact quantities and lends itself to processed large quantity. More funding for Child Nutrition Act.

Access is issue, no mass transit- how do you get urban people to open lands? Difficult to get youth out to areas because of transportation.

Schools, community groups cannot get to park because there is no bus stop.

Concerned about land not being acquired, purchased and developed for private purposes.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

*(cont.)*

No equal protection for state programs in local communities.

Dealing with what I do with my land is my business and no one else's zoning needs to be in place, to make smaller footprint and preserve more open and green space.

Money unavailable to buy inholdings because funds are committed elsewhere.

Special use permit process is dependent on whoever is in that job. When it takes one year to be heard, isn't there something wrong with process?

rethinking cutting in NF if trees store carbon maybe we should reassess if we should cut in NF. Reassess logging laws in NF and licensing. Do not harvest because of carbon and

Problems we face will not be solved by the minds that created them. DOI needs more coordination to get more young people involved.

RTCA Program. There has been tension over budget allocations between RTCA and park unit.

Wonderful to have initiatives but don't have staff/time to educate public/youth. Not enough staff for field trips. How can we get excited for educating youth if we have no funding/staff?

Land managers have been accommodating users and resolving conflicts—NOT WORKING—trying to get access to NATR for mountain biking at no cost to land managers to building mountain bike trails—has horseback trails for users but would like mountain biking trails—would not become eye sores—wants consideration for mountain biking

challenge—get all districts and all levels to realize under one regulation—realize people trying to help—Federal agencies need to listen more to legitimate ideas from local agencies

Partner with economic development to help conserve the landscapes that attract tourism. Not realistic to tell rural communities to stay rural with no development. Provide the incentives and work together. There are so many government agencies, TN department tourism works to designate byways, then TDOT puts rip rap along the road...not working together, government needs to be pulled together. Need balancing of environmental and economic. Hierarchy of gov't. Need economic purposes for recreation to make rural communities more viable.

Blue way concepts working well. It gives people access. Not a big investment that can make a difference. Misconception about BIG government taking private land. NRCS programs, there's a disconnect. Locals do the paperwork, but the process fails to get the actions/expectations to met. The small grants are not the effort, work and paperwork! Not going to waste time on a small piece of pie. Need a critical mass to make it worthwhile.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

*(cont.)*

Real estate land broker. Couldn't find anyone to tell him how to get land donated to public. Realtors are not at the table when conservation groups get together or when opportunities present themselves. Success would increase if real estate persons were at the table. Could government help identify the key lands that are needed for conservation? So when a farmer is ready to sell, conservation advocates are ready and responsive.

American Rivers. Request for funding to allocated specifically for blueways in urban areas. Focusing on local urban streams. Allow for more protection and cleaning up the rivers, i.e. Wolf River. Signs posted for no prolonged human exposure. Kids can't swim in the creek. 319 and State Revolving Loan granting programs are routinely unfunded.

There's a disconnect between people needing funding and the funding sources. People aren't applying for these funding sources.

Discovery Center Murphreesboro. I do a lot of environmental ed with inner city kids. Challenge is kids are terrified. How do we get them over the fear? We need to get their parents to say it's ok to go outside and climb a tree or get a teacher to take the students outside? How do we breakthrough to parents and teachers?

TN off-highway Association Turkey Bay, LBL, and state area above Knoxville (Royal Blue). Supply is challenging. Lack sufficient access. No public riding areas in Tennessee, but thousands of registered riders. However people don't buy OHV's because there's no place to ride on public lands. People have to travel out-of state to ride.

a farmer perfectly honest, there's a lot of mistrust with environmentalists. You can't be sustainable without a profit. Let's work together. We need strong, viable farms so the lands don't get sold and parceled out. Regulating farm dust, is this really an issue? What's worse, working lands and forests or development?

Underlying theme is finding out what the needs are in a community and funnel funds to them. Need to piggyback community needs; ie. Provide day-care with Environmental Ed. to help kids of single moms to get out outside.

\$5000 grant is not worth the effort to apply, we only apply if it's at least 80-100 K.

trying to get people outdoors SAFETY and CONNECTIVITY are the 2 biggest challenges. Culture of stranger danger keeps people indoors. Too difficult to get across the state, just as hard as it was for the pioneers! Too many obstacles in perimeters of cities. Some cities may have good connections, but that all goes away in rural areas. Perception that if someone on a bike gets hit by a car, it's the bike riders fault.

Civil war focus. Need some kind of channel or network that various groups can use to work together. We share common interests but don't work together, nor know all the interested parties involved.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Nashville, TN*

*(cont.)*

Public school access and connectivity is being lost because housing developments don't allow through traffic. Fences are going up and keeping kids out. There could be regulations that tell people to allow access and open for use. Federal government should buy key parcels to secure public access. Federal regulations on mortgages have changed in the last few years; these regs could incorporate land use to accompany better connectivity in neighborhoods (not allowing fences so kids can cut through yards). Can't use utility corridors either.

Equestrian, RTP should be constant funding and cut the red tape to get the funds to the ground.

lucky to get one Forest Legacy a year. There's a huge need for very little funding opportunities.

Need to provide better incentives and push for benefits to put farm in an easement.

Make a requirement for field trips.

I see a lack of willingness for educators to bring kids to places. Teachers tend to think it's the parents responsibility to get kids outdoors. Williamson county trend is taking less and less field trips each year. Less movies! Take kids out.

Board of land trust. Tried for 20 years to get my grandkids to my farm with limited success. Try to get the parents, grandparents outdoors too. The competition is tough with sports, video games, etc.

from Oregon and familiar with working with Forest Service. The access shut down, don't maintain roads, and charge a fee under Clinton Administration. Less access for fire suppression, higher cost of fire suppression with federal money/tax payer dollars. Less Roads = less jobs.

park enthusiast. Tremendous lack of young park employees. It's difficult to get in. Cumbersome application process. Younger generation are not veterans making it difficult to get employment. Recruitment lacking.

One constant thread is everyone is seeking funding. Got accustomed to the government providing cash for their program. Government act more like a business and not a bureaucracy. Government should look as itself as an investor, not a benefactor.



## Discussion Question 2

***Nashville, TN***

***(cont.)***

private landowner His small town has purchased in town 27.4 acres for a community park. He sent out postcards to towns people listing asking things they wanted in their park. These people wanted to go back in time. The things they wanted in the park are sledding areas, place to grill out, places to ice skate outdoors. They basically wanted to slow down and return to past recreation activities. These people just want to relax. His park has many different habitat types. They will connect their park through a hiking trail to other areas. The challenge is funding for parks. They can get matching funds, but they have problems raising that much. Grant process is 157 pages, very complex. If you really want to get to the people your really need to go to the grass roots. You also need to have a simpler process to get the money to these grass roots process. He qualifies for the grant, but they can't get it because of the arduous process.

The amount of money it takes to administer a federal grant is high. Some NGO's don't go there because it is such a hard process to deal with federal grants.

watershed NGO they connect people with the resource. They also work to connect private and public people together. The boat day is a great event to get people connected to the resource. They work to educate local governments, and education community about serving their needs but also serving the conservation needs. They work in local communities to be ready for Climate Change. They focus on forest and water conservation in climate change. They work at a local level in communities building conservation teams. The challenge around that is getting grants. She will never do a federal grant again, it was a horrible experience. The administration of the grant is a big job to do. It would be wonderful to have the government to look at foundations and help them because they can distribute the money easier. Give them general support, and expect reports, but don't overdo the administering portion. Non profits can distribute these funds so much better than the federal government.

clinical psychologist, retired Been trying to form a Tennessee Naturalist program. Worked on a grant proposal for two years, this grant with NSF was unbelievably ridiculous. They finally got the funding, but by the hardest. She will be in the first group to train with biologist. Do not limit your work to only children. She is 76 and she believes they need to develop their relationship with nature. Many older folks don't like nature. She read a story about an older group that went off into the wilderness. They were going to study how that effect their brains without electronic equipment.

NGO comberland region tomorrow works with developments of lands in constructive ways and with community development. The current policy works against land conservation. We are set for sprawl in the current policy. What the Fed. Govt can do is to connect their efforts sustainable communities partnership initiative that will help communities with better development of their communities and infrastructure. The other thing you can do is work with natural resource partnerships with state agencies and provide them with ways to partner with NGO's. Fund communities to help provide comprehensive plans for these community development.

## Discussion Question 2

***Nashville, TN***

***(cont.)***

Blueways program Challenge on access points to trails. She would like that state and federal can help in getting private landowners to give access to these trails. For them to work to help educate these private landowners in their views on this. She wanted to thank (name deleted) for his wilderness program.

There has to be an umbrella, to organize the groups to qualify for grants in partnership with other similar groups, they will qualify for more grants, grant process is difficult.

TWF (also hunting and fishing guide, member of board of several groups) - challenge because losing numbers of hunters and fisherman, need to get word out to all the organizations and public that hunters and fishermen are not the bad guys, don't want to be on a pedestal, but want to be acknowledged for their contribution to grassroots conservation efforts historically, they want to save green space, etc., they are often treated badly, groups trying to take away hunting and fishing rights, need to bring the sportsmen together in partnership with more of these organizations acknowledging common ground.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

communities have a connection to water, blue trails program – new program but challenge is making sure connection to clean water and use history to make that connection. It's a slow effort (too slow) in changing how we spend money on our infrastructure (roads, utilities, etc).

work with student conservation, bring programs into the urban areas

West has different problems, so few people and lots of acres, federal role is there is not enough of presence, staffing, and communication

advocates for diversity, Benjamin Banneker monument, staying the course is challenging because national memorials are privately funded, economy makes it difficult, and have America refocus on diversity. There are no monuments to African American on the National Mall

fighting a gaming commission on Casino development in Gettysburg, inconsistent message from federal government

challenge on helping protect the battlefield - Neither NPS nor Elected Officials will take a position to stop Casino Development proposed directly adjacent to Gettysburg National Military Park

Surrounding communities don't understand what the National Park Service does, NPS could do more to get that message out

bring underserved urban minorities into wilderness/parks. Example of Opportunity: We brought 15 young urban women on 4-day rafting/camping trip down Delaware River they took that experience back to their communities. One became a paid intern at camp. I can get no funding from federal government for rehab old building, only money for new building construction – this is antithetical to sustainability

historic preservation professions do NOT pay well (Most professionals do it out of interest and passion).

vandalism is a problem (especially in remote areas). Must make it cheaper to rehab existing lands/buildings than to build new development and encourage sprawl. Put Land Development cost premiums on development of "virgin lands" and incentivize redevelopment and reuse especially when it preserves historic fabric.

Need to have comprehensive and consistent goals at all levels of government and across initiatives –For example: Preservation is unnecessarily taking a back seat, in the name of conservation and job creation, to unthoughtful development of Solar Power Infrastructure being developed in inappropriate locations that impact cultural resources.

funding is an issue, federal role can leverage funds, matching funds from local level – example Highlands Conservation Program where federal funds have had big ripple effect and been matched in big ways with local funds.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

in Rural areas currently need vehicles to get anywhere, public transit doesn't exist, need funding for alternative transportation ideas. Prohibitively expensive to get urban population to Delaware Water Gap, for instance – Bus goes from Philadelphia to a bus depot that is many miles and a \$50 cab fare away (and, by the way, there are only 2 cabs available)

cultural landscapes, when federal government takes over historic structures there is not enough money to restore them, funding is always a critical item and administration has cut out historic preservation funding. Need to emphasize how Historic preservation = economic stimulus. NPS publications are invaluable.

Predatory development is destroying Gettysburg brand. There will be devastating impact on heritage tourism if the Gettysburg Casino goes through. Also, Jobs gained by casino will be lost in tourism.

Serious Consideration should be given to rethinking the name "America's Great Outdoors" initiative - - it does not convey the interconnectedness of Culture and Nature.

Challenge – there are bureaucratic hurdles in getting help from NPS. One is promoting our brand in our community. NPS has its own particular brand; limits its ability to play a particular role.

Graveyard at 4th & Pine (Philadelphia) ceased being a graveyard years ago; people planted trees, now we're an urban park, this is causing all sorts of problems. It costs thousands of dollars to fix heaving gravestones. Our iconic fence is ready to collapse on Pine Street.

We desperately need to raise money.

Existing federal legislation such as Section 106 must be followed by all the agencies that are affected by that legislation. Department of Energy, for example, doesn't follow.

Pinelands Commission no longer does cultural surveys although they are supposed to. Re-development is going on, following no requirements (Section 106 nor cultural surveys). They don't let anyone speak at meetings. Go back to the Comprehensive Management Plan that was done by the Commission. Enforce laws and CMP.

We should get the Pinelands geography into local curriculum but there's no room because of "No Child Left Behind." Curriculum is so structured & strict, teachers can't even teach about the local environment and heritage; so there's no passion for it [being cultivated in the children]. They're teaching to the test.

Teachers don't have time to teach this in the classrooms any more. Maybe we need to pick up the gaps. Work more with teachers to develop programs. We've had some success in Germantown (Philadelphia). Teachers are incorporating local heritage into Social Studies.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

I get a special feeling every time I go in to Independence Hall. But I think many local people know it's there & don't visit. I think it's an acquired taste. Our trading cards go like hotcakes. But people don't come for that reason. Need to develop a desire to visit in the first place.

In Germantown (section of Philadelphia) – challenges with blight & crime, getting visitors there is a challenge, so we focus internally & get community involved first. Make the green spaces of cultural sites available, this brings people in. Building affinity groups such as brewers group, jazz concert, through these you build appreciation of the cultural site, people begin to understand it's important & they come back.

In Washington, DC, challenge is finding enough \$\$ to get schools out to cultural sites. NPS & public-private partnerships. Get the money for school buses to get kids there.

we raised an endowment for that, people want to support it. But it is an obstacle, getting kids out to the sites.

East Coast – such a long-term colonization. Pinelands is exquisitely preserved. Amazing resources there. Pinelands Commission no longer requires archaeological surveys, so areas just get plowed over. Woefully underappreciated on east coast even though NJ has such a rich Indian history.

tribes – no distinction between natural & cultural environment. Would be a good model for all our parks. We have divided natural and cultural.

West Coast example -- park formed in 1860s on land occupied by Indians for thousands of years. NPS telling story of 1860s period is inadequate given timeline; there is plenty of room to strengthen the interpretation. Room to grow the story of the tribal experience in most of our parks in places like Yosemite. I seek it out but it's not easily found. We are often missing the thousands of years before park was established.

a lot of history has already been lost. NPS is trying to reconnect people but it's not the same as being able to re-visit your tribal homeland. NPS and NPCA (National Parks and Conservation Association) – we tend to think we know how to protect Indian lands better than Indians do.

32 states have historic tax credits but they're all threatened every budget cycle.

In PA, Historical & Museum Commission gutted, really a problem for historic sites like my own. Always the stepchild & first thing to be cut, even though funding is so minimal in the first place. It's always "arts & culture," not "arts, heritage & culture." Advocacy is something we don't do well as a group. We could improve.

Jewish community started in Pinelands in 1880s. Pinelands Commission trying to put sewer projects on this land. State says it can't help because it's federal. State laws don't cover national preserves. Create partnership between state and federal. There is more protection outside the Pinelands than in.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

Business sponsorship is the wave of the future, I don't know if it's good or troubling. Are we going to have "Microsoft National Park"? We have Director's Order 29. In all the categories – we need to do a better job of talking about the mechanics & the framework of historic preservation. People think that buildings preserve themselves & historic documents just appear in little plastic envelopes. How many people know how small the federal funding is? It's chump change & always threatened. Talk to residents in communities; teach that it's more economical to re-use a historic structure than build a new one. Get people to understand there are alternatives; there are programs in place. Things need to be thoughtfully preserved.

Get local, state, federal politicians interested in the passions that we all share. They seem to be off in a world of their own. We're pleading for money while other things that don't make sense to a lot of us get well funded. Political aspect is a big one. Put them under a magnifying glass. Accountability

administration is looking for new ways to make historic preservation even more successful than it has been. What is it that's too stuffy about it? What should we leave behind or re-package?

land and water conservation fund, lack of funding for program

chronic lack of funding, even to do basic survey work. Historic Preservation Fund programs in federal government have never been fully funded.

National Underground RR Network to Freedom program – really neat, still underfunded. Provides expertise & resources to people in communities to help them tell the Underground RR story. NPS was having difficulty engaging African Americans in community. Underground RR Network to Freedom – success story.

Challenges: lack of relevance of historic sites to people in communities. People didn't think historic preservation applied to their stories. Underground RR Network to Freedom has such great staff – they were able to break through that, help to engage people where other agencies cannot. Doing well but needs more resources.

Lack of Diversity is a problem in Historic Preservation professions, especially in archeology

youth were not aware of the job opportunities in these preservation and conservation fields, one thing that need to do is increase the knowledge of the job opportunities in diverse communities.

technology is a great challenge (Need to find a way to get youth off their gameboys /i-pods/computers and into real places), engage youth through iPod video and have them tour the Pine Barrens in NJ, guided tour through village.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

need a consistent message, NPS has said that historic preservation is not a core mission, inconsistency with federal governments message, actions have to follow words. Tribes want to do more historic preservation and there should be more federal money to help them.

challenge is us, we've been talking about this (Diversity)for years, change the paradigm and start taking steps to change it, very few pathways that youth ( and especially youth of color) can get into (preservation & conservation fields) professionally, we need to own it and change it

people ask what is there to do here? They expect people to interpret. People WANT to connect to the past; looking for a Williamsburg type experience. Expectation of being told stories.

web isn't all. It is the beginning. Still need signs, interpretive panels. Kiosks with educational features

Heritage areas need to have solid base of legislation at the federal level. Each Heritage Area has its own legislation. We need congress to approve an act that unites the heritage areas that forms a partnership with NPS.

Help regional tourism. Regional tourism helps develop products - develop marketing. Biggest challenge: taken severe cuts in the state. The states don't have a budget for historic preservation and have been hit hard.

funding disparity. At least in NJ, lots of community NGOs fund environmental efforts but not in historic preservation. Must bring in the foundations and boards to energize as well as state legislatures to remedy the disparity

challenge- make sure not only talking about NPs and best of the best but broaden to communities. Ex: Cumberland, MD- western terminus if C&O canal. Canal as a national park is an attraction but town revitalized through fed programs such as tax act is the context and the community is as vital as the park itself. Importance of programs to assist all levels of preservation

Another form of help that would be useful is legal help. Not sure if any legal help is available for preservation. Citizens are putting up their own money to fight against a developer that was using money from the state to fight a law case. If there is any way communities could try and get support to enforce laws that are on their own books that are undermined by backroom deals, it would be helpful.

Even when we talk about "green" buildings, don't talk about landscape outside. There are a lot of disconnects and need as diff agencies and disciplines need to come together and integrate all of these things

so many people don't know what resources are in their own backyard. Get the information out there in the local community and tell your neighbors what is here and why it is important. Challenge- educating locals about resources at their disposal

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

full funding for HPF. In historic preservation area private entities make things happen but SHPO offices set guidelines. With federal historic preservation program, SHPOs do the implementation. Last few years, 40% cut in staff but larger increase in sect 106 cases. Need to do better

engage local groups, municipalities to what is going on in their backyard. Need to have overarching effort on federal level to bring larger regions, groups together to bridge the divide. Bottom up and top down at the same time.

great losses in the 60s. how do you provide check against contemporary enthusiasm so don't later regret what was lost. build a video game where villain is destroying historic buildings

connect "no child left inside" to AGO

Youth see a benefit of having connections to their heritage. Their concerns were – they didn't know much about their heritage. There needs to be more information about where sites are and what there is to do, they can't get to the sites once they know they are there, What are your concerns about engaging young people?

Our youth are sending the message there is a strong interest in preservation as a career but there aren't many opportunities.

NPS needs money to purchase in holdings.

Lots of people want to start working for the NPS but there is no way to do it. The federal hiring system isn't ideal. Needs to be some intake program or easier way to break into the NPS. More emphasis on hiring structure.

Acknowledged the challenge of understaffing and underfunding of CR programs. Acknowledged the challenge of CR preservation mandates being viewed as secondary to environmental protection mandates.

There isn't a place in this country that nature and humans have not interacted. It is one in the same and you cannot divide it.

Cutting federal funding to heritage areas is a challenge, along with Preserve America and Save America's Treasures. Lack of funding at national level at BLM and Forest service.

Recreation in NJ: In the state every bit of open space needs to be built upon with soccer or ball fields. There needs to be a focus on green spaces and natural areas, not the suburban treatment of parks.

Two challenges : 1) lack of communication among each other 2) lack of education. Need ot get next generations of young people out.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

Battle lost against casino (sugarhouse site) had more Native American artifacts than other sites in PA are now sitting in archives. At Fed. Gov't level tools like NEPA and USACE could be deployed at these sites would be helpful. Legal structure – there is a weakness in public interest law. Casino bought out law firms and no public interest firms got involved. Citizens groups had trouble finding law firms that were not being paid off by the casino developers. Campaign finance abuse – casino developers were contributors to campaign funds of the governor.

Don't see Cultural/Heritage tourism being addressed at all levels of government.

The history has to motivate the kids – which they can relate to the history. Nobody would come if it didn't speak to them. Eastern State Penitentiary would be a great place to train students in historic preservation techniques

Need to add environmental component to historic areas. There won't be recreation if there isn't preservation of the environment. i.e. if the water is polluted, then the land around it will be polluted too. Add protecting viewsheds to areas that need more protection/energy. Viewsheds should be considered the same as watersheds. Need to put history back into historic preservation. People have disengaged from preservation. Preservationists don't have a clue as to the history of the site they are working on, they are just focused on fixing the roof.

This administration has turned its back on historic preservation. There was one reference to historic resources in the AGO film. You can't deny the relationship between land and people. We need this administration to acknowledge preservation. When you look at all the materials (AGO) there is nothing. Yet we are the only federal program to protect the historic resources of this country. Save America's Treasures is an economic engine. If SAT goes away that is the end of the federal program for the preservation of our historic resources.

It is essential to have a listening session that is more streamlined for Native Americans.

Many constituents are unsure of issues that deal with their local NPS sites. People don't realize that these sites do face pressures. Simple public outreach can get the public engaged. If the public doesn't know that parks are there and for them, parks don't have a purpose.

policies & incentive programs that perpetuate the notion that built environ is expendable but natural environment is not. In reality, bldgs are millions of tons of materials that if not saved would be put in a landfill. Demolishing & rebuilding says we have all the building materials we need when in fact lumber is coming from forests that we need. Need new paradigm the message out that built environment and natural must work together

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

In her experiences with inner city youth, she has found that it can be hard to connect these youth to historic places and the outdoors. Sometimes they don't know that they can access these sites (residents said they didn't know the places were for them to enjoy too). Historic places don't always know how to connect with the communities that they are located in. These connections require funding and it's difficult because the funding isn't permanent.

My site is within the Marcellus Shale are – our site is threatened by potential drilling. We will not be able to raise money for an interpretative center if our water and soil will be contaminated by drilling. Preserving our natural resources will save

When trail work is done for a multi-use trail, the trail designers don't understand horses and we have surfaces that are not suitable for horses. USDA published a book for multi-use trail design; we ask that it be used. We need trails to ride on and we need to do better to accommodate the horse.

Heritage Education – we need to keep in mind access and relevancy. Who is the constituency, how do we reach them, and what do they need to know? Many people are not finding their place in our history.

problem: why aren't people visiting? What kinds of experiences are we offering? Thematic like in crossroads in NJ- get excited about all resources

Sometimes partnerships are challenges. Money is a challenge – we rely on public/private partnerships, which is in jeopardy now.

challenge- get people to appreciate archeological resources. If can't see it, assume it isn't there. Arguably, greatest amt of resources are below our feet. Ex: Phila. President's house. 300K visited archeological site in 4 months. Telling visitors that there are archeol. resources elsewhere and can revitalize interp.

SHPOs and TPOs are under-funded. The Historic Preservation Fund has never been fully funded. We've never experienced our national historic preservation program in its full glory. The administration said that Save America's Treasures and Preserve America don't align with the mission of the NPS.

Neighbors don't know how to access a park. Lots of people drive through Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area but don't know how to access it. NPS should fund parks because friends groups can't run everything.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

Pennsylvania is having trouble w/ finances. PA has large number of small, municipal governments – things are important locally. SHPO has had some success going into local communities to help historic preservation. Need to take care of places that already exist. Need to make historic preservation a priority – instead of funding other projects (sewer systems, etc etc). Incentive programs work – and not having them is a problem. Re: Historic Preservation trades – difficult to get students, easy to place students. Could collaborate w/ Habitat for Humanity to rehab old buildings instead of Habitat for Humanity building new houses. Need to address people and engage people where they are – they may never get to huge park – so need them to know what the great outdoors are locally.

Delaware River is the natural resource linking many cultural sites and since those sites are oriented toward the river but the last 50 yrs have turned us away, lots of sites are abandoned or less used. Example: Fort Mifflin owned by city of Phila but run by a nonprofit. Lazzaretto south of the airport is also in need. Preserve these sites and link them together along the river. How do we have a federal role? how do you promote, fund and preserve these sites along the river across these 3 different states?

focus on recreation element: breaking notion that you have to travel to a destination to recreate. Transportation can be recreation by insuring access pts are accessible by auto, biking and are connected to nearby places where people can stay or live to allow recreation en route to destination and not just when you get there.

Federal funding, and state and local funding, is being cut. Funding to survey properties so that we know what we have. Administration's lack of support for preservation programs. Section 106 not taken seriously. Mistaken perceptions that inner-city youth don't have opportunities to use parks (they do, for example, Central Park).

Need to get people to care – people don't feel that history happens to them/affects them/is part of their lives – same for the outdoors.

We need to connect our parks and forests with our communities in a closer relationship. We shouldn't think one-dimensionally; need to look holistic at projects.

(Conserve wildlife foundation of NJ) - natural resources & biodiversity- issue we have : wildlife watching is growing. Would like o tee biodiversity afforded protection it needs and address the backlog of listing of endangered species that has been stunted over the past 8 yrs. Second, private land stewardship issues. Not land acquisition but land STEWARDship.

Obamas in Acadia visited historic sites and went hiking so they got the balance. We don't have that in NJ- great divide btw natural and cultural. Visitors will have a much richer experience if natural and cultural are unified.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

Lack of funding for programs, lack of education for local jurisdictions that don't recognize value of resources (example – Wilderness Battlefield in Virginia and Walmart), Community is not aware of historic preservation benefits/efforts, need for Superintendents of national parks to help local governments see/know how the NPS can be of value to local governments.

Youth are at risk getting to outdoor spaces. Don't have funding for transportation to get them to open spaces. Schools are a good way to get the message to kids – field trips – but it is just getting them there... programs are available, but only takes care of a limited amount of children. Also some of the grants dry up and funding disappears. Young people don't want to walk, so that creates need for bus transportation. Historical initiatives are cultural and socio-economic, and when dealing with neighborhood renewal historical sites can be destroyed to “clean up” the neighborhood. Educate and learn about community before tearing things down thinking it is being made better – can sterilize a community and make them apathetic. Need to educate people of color about historic preservation.

Land & water conserv fund –need dedicated funding fully funded. Another challenge in PA is incredible sense of parochialism. Everyone wants their own fiefdom and not willing to work regionally. Suggest better preservation effort if you look regionally, beyond your borders.

perceived divide btw natural & cultural resources- telling that the AGO sessions are called out topically rather than talking about the great outdoors holistically. Cultural & natural environment are interrelated and need to be dealt with collaboratively

Tax incentives for weatherization of housing is at odds with historic preservation/preserving historic places and houses. She does not believe that these are mutually exclusive missions.

Need for special funding (public funding is not flexible). Funding for conservation and preservation should be broadened to include marketing.

difficult to see where funding for historic preservation funding is in the AGO initiative. Distressing that funding for Save America's Treasures is no longer a fund source. It's difficult to fund historic preservation projects

So often the enthusiasm of protecting the land gets ahead of recognizing the cultural resources that exist on the land. The SHPO doesn't have the funding and staff to keep up with the inventory, which is needed. The effort by Congress to exempt a large project from Section 106 would set a bad precedent

Missing: access to local history. People have very little identity with the places in which they live. DRVPC does environmental histories that can be better used by teachers in classrooms

Industrial areas- how can the government transform lands of abandonment into land that can be used for recreation, open space?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Philadelphia, PA*

*(cont.)*

Tax credits are not working in those communities (outside of NYC) because no investors, difficult to get the word out to investors more effectively.

Places are being bulldozed, our history is being destroyed. We need politicians on a local level to stress that preservation connects us to where we came from.

People don't make the time.

Valley Forge, removal of invasive species - trying to spread awareness of the dangers of invaders like rusty crayfish and kudzu. Keeping ecosystems intact.

Someone to go with. Don't like to hike alone.

Money. Don't have money, can't go. With unlimited funds, would visit all of the historic sites.

Need to share information that the park (INDE) is free. Tickets are free, need to get the correct information out. Communications. These places exist and they are free.

From Arizona, take the outside spaces for granted. They are seen as permanent and don't make visiting a priority.

People don't know where these outdoor spaces are.

School

Too many distractions, technology is good but keeps people out of the outside world.

It takes a lot to engage kids and have them understand the importance of historic sites and what do they mean that would be better accomplished on a park by park basis since the approach is individual.

Invasive species - People are actively planting invasive species which are some of the hardest things to contend with and they are only being brought in out of ignorance, not malice.

A lot of parents just don't care. I just took a 15 year old friend who'd never been camping in her life. I have friends who have never seen snow or gone skiing. Depends on your family. If they don't care, you will never get the chance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

A main problem of getting people to go to parks is being outside is nice but can't compete with big and flashy and that is more immediately gratifying than going into a park. Harder to go outside than turning on tv. Much more accustomed to do the easy thing.

Accessability to and from site

Access - hard to get to cities and rural sites

Another issue is cost of transportation budget.

Available resources. Motivation.

Better access to information

Better access to transportation

Buses aren't part of a suburban culture, although you can take a bus to get you to a mall.

Casino near Gettysburg Park, desire just for jobs is shortsighted and conservation can also create jobs.

Comfort zone, fear of trying something new.

Communicate opportunities (internships, youth employment, volunteerism)

Coordinating among NPS sites with other cities, organizations and visitor bureaus - more maps and visibility - share things to do in the area, not just in parks

Develop youth oriented programs

Disheartened by Stimulus Bill because we didn't use the Depression era model where we improved existing places. "Shovel ready" is ridiculous way to choose projects.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

Don't want to go unless my friends are there.

Festivals, carnivals - "National History Day," reenactments, but you never know when those things are happening.

Focus on interaction with the public and put less focus on reading signage

Get the word out that has information on all of the things that are available to do in your community. Don't have one place to look for information.

Getting students out into parks and historic sites every year. Field trips with follow-ups. (Not a great idea to force everyone to do an activity because they may react against. If it is a requirement, it will get negative energy. For example, I have to do service hours but it is a requirement so I don't want to do it. Make it positive rather than negative. Give options - natural or historic park or alternate).

Hard to go; we're in a crew

Hiking for a reason like cancer research. That would appeal to some.

Historic sites are not relevant youth

I go to school in lower Manhattan and we gather in the open spaces but it is passive activity being outside but not active. It is nice to be outside but not as much benefit as if something is going on.

I have a friend whose attitude is "I'm just one person; it's not my problem; what can I do?" She doesn't understand and that makes the problem worse. Knowledge is important. Learning about the environment - make the environment a reality in daily life. We cleaned up a beach and I saw the kind of trash that washes up on shore; it made the connection real.

I lived on Lake Michigan and there are kids at my school who have never seen it.

I never see ads about National Parks or anything.

I went visiting a bunch of national parks this summer and it seemed like only one out of every five people were speaking English - it was mostly all international visitors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

If there's a Megabus for \$5 to Buffalo - then why can't you run cheap trips to parks or historic places?

If you go bike riding you will get hit by a car. I live near the beach and trails but if the only way to get there by car, who's going to take me?

If you live in one area, you need something nearby in order to learn about what people are talking about. Otherwise your attitude will always be "why should I care?" - need that exposure and experience to understand.

Importance of parents bringing kids to these amazing places.

Important to understand your own community - in LA, kids who live 10 miles from the beach have never been there.

Information - about where to go, what to do, programs, volunteer packages, funding, etc. Would be great if there were a place online that you could go find it all

Is it a big scary world? Challenge of a single female feeling safe.

Labeling system, trail or recreation directory - where is someone in a park - how do you get from point a to point b on trails. A ranking system that will gradually introduce people to outdoor activities and can contribute to awareness.

Lack of engagement and interaction by the public with the youth

Lack of information of what's there, how to get there.

Lack of recruiting from NPS. I went to a government job fair and the Department of X was there, but NPS didn't have a rep. Finding internships is hard. I went to volunteer.gov and that led me to another search engine. You really have to look. Need a clearer, easier way to get involved. Never heard of SCA group before today.

Mobility once arriving at site

Money

More people to give information (interpretation) rather than signs / wayside exhibits



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

More programs and less expensive programs. Young man hunted the internet - community serve teams for \$4,000 plus \$1,000 for stuff. \$5,000 to go volunteer?

National Parks are not the first thing I think to do. Wouldn't think to go hiking but if there wan an open field, I would play sports.

No place for kids to go sit. No gathering places.

No safe way to get to urban parks, smaller historical sites are not always in saf enighborhoods or you need to go through rough neighborhoods to get to them

Not protecting the irreplaceable we lose our identity, destroys physicality as well as who we are as Americans and how we unite.

Not youth-friendly (\$, access, etc)

Park passes are expensive. Is there a youth pass for NPS? What is "youth" cut off? Is it 18 years old adult or youth?

Parks should market less as schools / learning, more as recreation and fun, more activities, less passive visiting

Partner with schools and educators

Physical Accessibility

Programs / packages that make it easy to visit or volunteer. Alternative spring breaks - in parks, service-oriented. Hard to find programs like the one Habitat for Humanity has. Programs that include transportation would be good. Big thing is once you're there - so many other places you can go for leisure that have cheap places to stay. Connecting through schools / colleges, that stuff is already set up. But other programs, it's not all set up. Not easy. Lodging and stuff for volunteers and interns. In a place like Point Rey Park - if you don't live near the park, there's no access to lodging. Could camp - but what about cost of camping equipment! Showers? Storms?

Programs offered at parks are not fun for youth/ programs dumb down materials for youth

Provide internships and summer jobs for youth. Youth want to be in the parks, but they can't find the opportunity to contribute and stay engaged

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

Provide more opportunities for educators to use the parks as classroom

Sites are ruined by others, graffiti / defacing is unattractive

Some places in NYC - no loitering, police come kick you out. Assumptions it's about drugs or something.

Television / media - excuses not to go see the real thing

There's this mentality that the world is scary and it's a liability issue if you take kids away from school for field trips.

There's this Purell vs. dirt mentality now. Everyone worries about accidents, predators, etc.

Time and money - expensive to visit, can't afford fees, transportation, cost of programs

Time, single mothers are parenting most under-served audiences and do not have disposable time or money to provide experiences for their children

Time. I don't use my free time well enough to choose to go outside in parks, historic sites.

Transportation - cost, distance to sites, availability

Transportation for youth - Fisha and Wildlife buses kids from cities and having that be more widespread would be helpful and would facilitate awareness and experiences.

U.S. residents just don't think of going - we'll go to Mexico on spring break before we'd think of going to a National Park.

Want more flexibility, less structure with scheduling

We can't say what would interest us because we are already here. Need to get the word out to people who are not already interested. Convince your friends to go who wouldn't already. Enticements work. Like to an event like this - bribe people with free food. A niche group are interested in this and you need to expand it to a broader audience. You are preaching to the choir.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Philadelphia, PA***

***(cont.)***

Where I live, they don't like high school students to loiter; they built a sitting park, but you get chased out if you sit. They made a skateboard park and put it on the edge of town, but it's so far away, the kids can't get to it. You have to be driven there. Stuck in the suburb; can't get out. There are strip malls we can get to. After nine when everything closes, the kids would go skateboard in the parking lots, but the cops chase them away. Skateboard park is pretty, but you have to be driven there. It's pointless. Can't use what we have access to, can't access what's been provided for us.

Work to attract high schools and universities - through special student admission / student events with a well known name to attract them.

Young woman tells story of trying to go for a run in a park; the police stop her at the entrance and tell her to go home. Some negative activity there that they can't control. Single woman is not safe.

Young woman who attends Environmental Studies High School in NYC gets opportunities to go hiking and scuba, but a lot of people don't want to go out to the park - broken glass, people smoking. Too much effort that's not worth it.

Youth do not know about historical sites and recreational parks in their neighborhood/area

Youth from outside Chicago asks are there buses that go to Valley Forge or Hopewell? Youth answer, no there aren't; buses take you from one part of the city to another part of the city.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

I'm a Hudson River navigator and through American Heritage Rivers Initiative. Also works here at Marist and represents local community groups. Bringing people out are surely things promoted by the grass roots, local community. Opportunities to partner with federal government. Every local community has different needs and it could be recreation or natural resource conservation. But we need to stress connecting people through the rich sites that we have, cultural, historical and environmental. Additional resources that would help our efforts? Coming from the American Heritage Rivers Initiative – 14 rivers that work together. Tools we need from federal government is for federal government to be engaged, but not just through one agency, but inter-agency task forces. It's not once size fits all. We worked with an interagency task force. Can be such a tremendous tool, because if I go to USDA and I'm not talking about farm, it's not a part of the USDA priority of projects, if we could crossover and USDA is partnering with the American Council of Historic Preservation or NPS is involved, then they will recognize needs of local communities are not one size fits all. We need to work across agencies. We also need to re-engage what the federal government has already invested. We constantly struggle with where we belong, because the American Heritage Rivers is not part of an overarching organization. Where do we evolve? Maybe what we do is partner with some of those local initiatives to reengage them and make them part of the project. The challenges are, of course, money. We need to see the federal investment across all agencies. The role can be great. We've seen across our history much investment and it is a golden opportunity.

What works to engage people are community gardens, school gardens, theme farms, fresh air farms, things to get kids out and experience their environment and to understand the food system. Community gardens are a fabulous way to get people even in small spaces in urban environments to connect with the outdoors, to preserve that land. Tools/resources – public land trusts, protection of land rights for community gardens, assistance of soil remediation in brownfields and urban areas, sites that exist and are neglected, mini-grants, funding to get school gardens going, efforts to bring fresh food to children. Challenges – state and local regulations that are seen as barriers right now. Lack of incentives, short term goals for development that fragments the land and takes land out of production as a green space. Green spaces or community gardens being sold. Maybe if they are sold could have some percentage of the fund be put into a coffer – when public land is sold, to put some of that money into a coffer to use for other public lands, soil remediation, etc. Food modernization act is an opportunity to amend that in certain ways not to overburden small producers. Can't be one size fits all, right now it's five hundred dollar blanket fee for every farmer that participates. We need to mitigate that and make it more flexible for small farmers or a variety of farmers.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

I'm here today as an independent professional fundraiser who's worked in parks, gardens, arts related. I want to second what \_\_\_\_\_ said about interagency. Inter-agency approach is essential. When you are dealing with a park, you are dealing with a designed landscape. It can't just be seen as grass mowing. I work for two different Olmstead parks. One has challenges just to keep the trees trimmed, to keep the design intact. Needs historic preservation money and recreational tourism money. As far as activating this, I think that what works is to plot activities to connect people through various methods – slow food, future farmers, etc. Get kids out of the classroom and on to farms and in farm areas. There is no excuse for not getting kids out of the classroom more. Water is also very important and kids haven't had any experience with water and it's very important to educate them about water safety. Every year kids die because they don't know how to swim.

I work for the NY state office of parks, recreation and historic preservation under \_\_\_\_\_ as a community liaison. One thing that really does work is to link the many programs out there. Many times we are working in bubbles without connections to others. What we do in the state historic preservation office is provide an awareness and a protection of resources that lead to an incentive for preservation. Farmers have to make money. Money goes where the opportunities are and where the path is clearest. But we have an amazing amount of infrastructure that is already established in historic sites and towns and we need to reinforce what we already have. We have a federal-state program "Certified Local Government" that the federal government stepped up to the plate to provide assistance to communities to incorporate preservation. We provide grant money to those communities to do the preservation work, training, and planning. It needs to be fully funded. if we keep our infrastructure and our historic communities viable, people want to live there and we leave open space alone. Speaking under my parks hat, we have enormous number of parks, we pioneered the CCC effort here in this state. All these things that were built that need cash. Cottages, cabins, admin buildings, that important for families to get out. We are so behind in our capital investment because we can't do it anymore. I see all our historic resources and parks, we have any interesting hinge part between communities and parks that are economically important. It takes funding. It takes cash. Land and Water Conservation Fund has gotten so much attention, trying to keep attention on Historic Preservation Fund.

independent consultant in historic preservation. The good news is that the increase the state office would get from the Historic Preservation Fund would go back out to the communities. This extra money would be going for more projects. Money to do these important projects, the grass roots needs the money to do that. My concern is that the state being in this position financially, there will be short term decisions that will have long term detrimental impacts. Alternative energy for example. Wind farms, gas development. This is an industrializing area. When you have farmers that are not making money, landholders that have no viable means of earning, they are very vulnerable to practices that may not be the best, like hydrolic fracturing. In terms of developing these rural landscapes, making rural roads accessible to high volumes of truck traffic or collecting lines for the electric power grid, these things all have major impacts on our landscape and diminishes people's connection to it.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

attorney and involved in Walkway over the Hudson. Most people thought I was nuts to try to turn a railroad bridge into a walkway. It's become the 3rd biggest tourist attraction in NY State. We've had 600,000 visitors. I think it's popular because it's very simple – it's a way to get people outdoors without cars. Shared for bicycles, skaters, runners, walkers, small scooters. It takes about half hour to walk across it. Until you get out there, you can't understand the beauty of it. It's quiet, it's peaceful and people just love it. It's going to connect with 25 miles of traffic-free trails on both sides. I've been pushing for a number of years with the Dept of Transportation not just to concentrate on providing motor vehicles access, but on bikes and pedestrians. Not enough attention to sidewalks and traffic-free lanes. There's no shoulders, sidewalks, traffic free lanes. I think that's the reason for the obesity problem because there isn't a safe way to get out and walk around. We've concentrated on motor vehicles for too long. Dept of Transportation needs to take into account and consideration the impact on bicycling and pedestrian traffic. Maybe some incentives that every project they do, they take into account the impact on biking, walking, take that into consideration. Even with the project we did, we had transportation funding and it took us 3 or 4 years to use that. We had to get most of the money through other means. In the Hudson Valley in general, we are the original great outdoors. It's the most beautiful area in the world and I think the federal government should concentrate on this area by making it accessible to people not just in motor vehicles. Railroad transport—one of the problems we had, csx a new freight line, not really cooperating in helping us use old rail trails. Trying to get commercial interests to buy them, but the federal government could help. The feds could take a role in providing incentives or leaning on CSX. Senator Schumer helped with the walkway. We are working on other things. CSX owns a key piece that we need for the trails. It is all coming into fruition except for the one piece we are trying to buy from CSX. We're within close proximity of 10-15 million people in New York City. Local people can't get out West, but by protecting the Hudson Valley we helping people get outdoors in an area that's close to a concentrated population. We were overwhelmed with the success. By word of mouth we're getting people from all over the world. You just have to go talk to people to see they're coming from everywhere. We're still working on parking issues, an elevator, benches, but it's been a remarkable success. Until you get up there, you can't understand the beauty of it. With those trail connections, we could make a trail from here to NYC, but there is a lot of resistance to it. But if we could get the federal government to help us lean on the railroads.

One of the other issues with access is getting people from the city. Metro-North has been very good about promoting our region and if there is something special going on they have been very good about offering deals. They have helped support tourism in our region. I think the education system should address that as well, getting the young people from NYC up here.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

Great example about the partnerships and working together is the Walkway over the Hudson. It's our newest state park. It was also an historic preservation project as well, it's a community resource, it's sustainable because the iron was forged in the 1880s, we didn't have to mine for it. It was already constructed and we put it back to a new use. It's kept a landmark of the Hudson Valley that's already constructed and in good order and put it back to working order. One point of access to the outdoors is historic urban parks. There was a huge park movement in American city life started in 1860s, too many of those are languishing. They have mature landscapes, beautiful buildings, and the state cannot put money into them. The cities cannot afford to put the money back into the parks and provide the maintenance. So in the urban areas, there experience of nature can be pretty lousy because the parks aren't kept up or aren't safe. We have those parks all across NY State. We're called the Empire State, it's a nice name, but it'd be good if it meant something. We have these great communities, everyone needs help to keep legacy alive.

GIS Director of Highlands Institute. US. What works? The USGS and the USFS. I can't say enough about the scientific work those organizations have done, their diligence in organizing it and their increasing ability to make that publicly available. The Rockland County Water Resources spread new light on the water treatment plant, for example. Getting solid science about how the entire water cycle works allows us to be informed, will have impact on generations. In the U.S. Forest Service, Martina Barns and her colleagues, they have done studies (Forest, Water, and People Study) that analyzed several indicators of water quality so we now have the information and data. With this data set I can help individual municipalities establish targets, impairments, threats to that water and actions. What are the best water sheds, what are the challenges? The work the at the U.S. Forest Service is invaluable. In terms of natural resources, Harriman State Park has a long tradition of group camps for less advantaged children. There is a balancing issue between recreation and biodiversity. Recreation does have a significant impact on biodiversity. In Harriman state parks we have many visitors, but if something isn't done we will have no forest in 40-50 years if we do nothing. The management is the issue. Establishing of base lines and ongoing monitoring. More study and management.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Small grass roots group working in Putnam County. Being an advanced senior, I will read my comments. (Written comments were submitted.) The great swamp of eastern Putnam and Dutchess County is a different type of river system – 20 mile length encompasses two major river systems. The Housatonic and the Hudson. The East branch of the Croton River also is part of the NYC water system. The great swamp is known to supply about 20% of water to the Croton system. The great swamp is the 2nd largest fresh water wetland and the largest red maple swamp in the state. Many thousands of acres are included in this area, fresh water swamp habitat and critical resources that provide areas where children and adults can get out and engage in science in the field by tracking turtles or simply enjoying the joys of being outdoors. Hunting, fishing, kayaking and canoeing are possible. Many species live here, many species of birds, major breeding population of turtles, amphibians, reptiles, etc. Over 25 species of mammals, rare plants are numerous. Eight natural communities support rare plants. Success – the answer is a coalition of partners led by an entirely volunteer organization. Friends of the Great Swamp (FROG) that has been able to obtain Recovery Act funds, with 11 partners as well as local land owners have all come together to preserve over 600 acres in the swamp and more acres in conservation easement. Major challenge – funding. Potential for new homes and development in the great swamp watershed. Demand for open space has driven prices beyond which feds are willing to pay. We need more open space lands in the Hudson Valley. Land prices and taxes are exorbitant here. There are few other grants for open space preservation. What can the federal government do? Now is the time before it's gone to create unique and valuable open space. We support that creation of the Hudson Valley as a National Park. FROG would like to propose that the federal government acquire additional acreage in the Great swamp to create a national wildlife refuge to protect the habitat of the wildlife in the great swamp to protect habitat of waterfowl and songbirds and rare reptiles, amphibians, mammals, and butterflies. This refuge could also act as a biological research station as well as preserving water quality and provide public education. The addition of a north woods element is a thought. The northeast would then have a national refuge and a national forest similar to what is out west. People cannot connect to the wild world, if there is no wild world out there. Preserving the great swamp is an important first step. We look forward to partnering with the federal government.

zoning commission for town of Taughkonic, town is rewriting its zoning code and an area that the federal government could connect with. I'm reaching out to find resources to help the town's feel empowered and to understand the importance. We are the front line of conservancy with a 36-year old code where the word conservancy doesn't even appear. And of course there is funding. We have \$10,000 to get us through a three year process. Feds could reach out about these issues. We need funding for planners and helping organize. We are the front line to educating our townspeople and we are losing our population. We've had dairy farmers taking their own lives because they can't face the debt they are acquiring.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

The Hudson Valley is the birthplace of the modern environmental movement. We have partnerships and incredible collaboration through the government, organizations to help provide food to our incredible farm stands, tourism. Great opportunity to build on what we have here as a great resource and collaboration. One aspect of that collaboration is "Saving the Land that Matters Most" 17 land trusts are working together. 65,000 acres that we estimated cost about \$500 million dollars to implement. There are other estuaries around the country, but the idea that in 5 years we could preserve that green corridor of the Hudson Valley is within our grasp. We think it can be done through a number of exiting funding sources with a collaboration with USDA, DEC, etc. If we all work together to fight for full funding of existing initiatives is what we need. We have the Land Conservation Fund, the Highlands Conservation Act authorized for \$100 million, the National Estuary Program – full funding is essential for these. We've asked Governor Patterson and Mayor Bloomberg for funding. USDA farm and ranch protection program is miniscule amount of funding. I would love to work with the Dept of Ag to identify other funding sources because we have land trusts on the ground, working in our communities with the farmers and land owners. We need a federal partner here. Working with NRCS, USDA, land trust community to protect what is a great source of food for the valley and for NYC. Many of our farmers are trucking their food to NYC. If the land is lost at the rate, Hudson Valley agricultural sector is one of the 10 most threatened nationally. This is a time of real urgency and a great opportunity for collaboration.

Captain of the Clearwater. I believe in conservation. The sloop Clearwater is a large sailing vessel and part of the mission is protecting the waters of the Hudson. We do on the water education. Our standard sail is three hours, a field trip for students. The boat is a replica of the cargo vessels that would have been on the Hudson. So the kids are getting an all-encompassing experience on the Hudson – learning about the history and the environment. But these kids are 9-22 years old. Everything we're talking about in terms of conservation, recreation is going to happen in the future. If we short change a serious understanding of how to work the outdoors into the education system, especially for the kids in urban areas or in isolated rural areas, it might be the first time they've slept outdoors or been on a boat. It's a very intensive program to give these kids a place to put their enthusiasm and we must get them while they are young. We heard from the youth yesterday – one girl said that we don't think it's good to mandate what we have to learn. But I do think it makes a difference in the attitude that you have from the top. Value outdoor education, but not necessarily mandate it. Some resources that would be good would be to streamline the grant process. Many small organizations need help applying for funding. Giving those small organizations the opportunity to get money – it doesn't need to be millions of dollars. (Beczak in Yonkers, Rocking the Boat for example). It can be a local place that can't fill out 150-page grants but can handle smaller grants. Facilitating that grant process is important. And setting the example of early education is something that needs to be done.

The problem isn't the government it is us and the nature of the beliefs and values which determine our actions that are important

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

In effect what I am saying is that we need a transformation in values. Without a transformation of our cultural values we are not likely to be successful in achieved what is best in the long term.

My question then is do you understand how the growth in size and density of the population has transformed the beliefs and values that constitute our culture and how these beliefs and values have created the problems we have. And that it is only by transforming these values that these problems will be solved? It is not laws and regulations, nor is it money that will transform our values. It is we. It takes each of us and all of us.

I ask you, how much time do you spend with your children and what do your actions convey to them about the nature of what is right and wrong, good and bad? Do you teach them that character and virtue is of central importance? Do you take your kids out in nature so that they can experience the beauty of the nature? How much time do they spend on computers, on cell phones, and watching TV. Are your kids disconnected, bored and suffering from anomie? If this is not you, then who is this we to which you refer

We know that if we pollute our outer environment that pollution will eventually pollute our internal environment. We also need to realize that if we pollute our minds we also pollute the world. If these fundamental issues, population growth, and the change in our beliefs and values are not addressed our problems will not be solved. This is not a problem that money or technology can solve.

I attended the listening form at Marist College. It was quite apparent that the audience consisted primarily of people who worked for and/or directed various environmental organizations, historical organizations, educational organizations, or park services. And every one of them seemed to say the same thing. "The Government needs to give us more money to do our job." Clearly what is important is the "our jobs." Their appeal sounded more like an appeal to save their jobs, that to promote a public good. Now many Americans are saying that they do not want to pay more taxes (even though their taxes are the lowest of any industrialized country). So I find it difficult to see how the government can satisfy these appeals while holding taxes down. Federal taxes revenue has been relatively flat the last several years while spending has continued to increase. This cannot and will not continue, as all levels of government are going broke from doing so. But I did not hear any suggestions that would resolve this dilemma.

They problem isn't with the government it is with us with the beliefs and values we hold. We cannot blame the government for the beliefs and values we hold as it these believes and values that are internalized and determine the structure and action of our governmental institutions. We cannot expect the government to transform these beliefs and values if we are unwilling or to take steps to address them ourselves.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

The question is what factors determine the nature of our cultural beliefs and values and how do they in turn determine the nature of response with regard to the natural environment? It turns out that the primary determinant of our cultural beliefs is the size and density of the population of which we are a member. When populations were small and scattered the primary social unit was the family. As the population grew it brought us in contact with strangers and thus a way was needed to transform strangers into family.

Where family members are genetically related strangers are not and thus a new type of connection was needed. In response humans developed the ability to transfer their affects to non-family. These affective bonds were what held society together. But as the population continues to grow affective relationships are insufficient. We then learn to manage our emotions and relate rationally. In a rational society relations are routinized and secularized. We interact with others as objects and not as subjects.

The problem is this process has separated us from the natural environment, from others and ultimately from ourselves. Thus a rational society has a high incidence of mental illness, addiction, and suicide. It is what led de Tocqueville to state that in the midst of great material wealth we have a great spiritual angst. Instead of having religious freedom we end up with freedom from religion. We teach more about technology than we do about ethics and morality. We teach more about science than we do about art, more about math than about music. And our lives are less rich because of it. Things have been turned upside down. Instead of being people of the land it is not the land of the people. Instead of living in physical intimacy with the natural environment we live in privacy in separate abodes.

Secondly, there was an almost complete absence of the general community of the people we supposedly are serving! But for the most part they were not informed of or invited to the meeting. And even if they were invited attending a Friday meeting would be difficult if one is employed. And even if it were manageable I doubt many would actually attend. So what does this mean? At the least it certainly says something about how much value we give to something.

If we were to put a user fee on access to these places I suspect that use would decrease. When Stonykill Environmental Center was threatened with closure there was an outcry, but not one person stood up and said let's raise money to keep it open. We turned to the government and appealed to you to keep it open. What we want is for others to pay so that we can get it for free. (a clear example of the maximization of one's self-interest in a rational society). We want others to do what we can't or won't do ourselves. Even though it is less costly to it ourselves than to have the government do it. As the government has grown in size the administrative costs of collecting and redistributing the taxpayers money has increased significantly. And in general the wages and benefits of government far exceed the average wages and benefits of the community they serve.

## Discussion Question 2

***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

Thirdly, I feel it is ridiculous to speak out about increasing open space in the face of an increasing population. Or perhaps I don't quite get the new math. . Land is a finite resource! It cannot provide for the needs of an infinite population. Now clearly by building vertically and by clustering we can increase the amount of shared open space. But this seems to run counter to what most people's desire, which is not to increase open public space but to increase one's own private space. This is a direct consequence of the size and density of the population. We each want more space and to own mini-estate. Developers understand this and this is why suburban sprawl occurs. Developers generally build what people want and value the most. It seems that the new environmentalist is one who lives in a 4000 sq, ft home set on four acres with a neatly landscaped yard, and drives an SUV with a sticker on the bumper which says save the whales. How ironic!

We can't expect the government to change this is we are unwilling to change ourselves. Our values are screwed up. Our egocentric self-interest appears in the Nimby principle. We also believe that freedom rights are more important than restraint and responsibility. We are strongly individualistic and minimally communitarians. Today socialism, the joint action of the community as a whole, has a negative valuation attached. But freedom without responsibility leads to anarchy just as responsibility without freedom leads to slavery. Freedom must always be accompanied by responsibility and accountability.

We cannot increase the good without accountability for the bad or adverse consequences. In fact one of the major responsibilities of government and the justice system should be to hold people, corporations, and government officials fully accountable. We don't hold developers accountable for the full costs of additional services that need to be provided. They make 30% profit while costs are transferred to the tax payer. It is not just a problem in defining the good, it is also a problem is how that good is distributed. We should all ask if the distribution favors a few over the many or the many over the few. Kids learn from us that they should hold others accountable but others should not hold them accountable.

If we give money but do not hold others accountable for how this money is used there will be a problem. This lack of restrictions on the use of money can be seen in the money government gave and loaned to make education affordable. But the universities did not use this money to lower tuition but rather used it to build and become larger which then resulted in an increase in tuition such that today even with loans the cost of education exceeds any benefits that individual will receive after they graduate. The money was distributed in such a way that it benefits the university and not the students. How can a child of a lower middle class succeed if they must borrow \$60,000 to pay for education when after graduation they either cannot get a job or when they can it pays only \$20,000 the loan payment would be greater than half of their salary.

## Discussion Question 2

***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

I would also say that it is just about money its also about time. How we use our time. I made the decision that spending time with my children was more important than all the material things I might give them if I worked longer and harder. If we had the time we wouldn't need the money. If we wonder why our children don't get out in the environment, it is because their parents don't get out in the environment because they don't have the time. Because many of them work long hours and commute greater distance they don't have the time. But we fail to realize that the choice is ours.

The Reason people work so hard is do to our Calvinist heritage and do to the fact that as social groups grow in size hierarchy increases and thus we must work harder to stay in the same place. The real wages of blue collar workers has fallen over the years. This needs to be corrected. A country where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer is headed for civil war and destruction. The middle class is being destroyed and the country is being split into the haves and the have nots.

Growing up on a farm my kids learned that cooperation was just as important as competition and that altruism was as important as self-interest. I also taught them that spiritual growth (development of character and virtue), was more important than acquiring lots of material things. But today I find that people are frequently willing to trade virtue for value, including individuals, experts, corporations, and government officials. Should we all become prostitutes? Is this what we wish to teach our kids? Why do we imprison those who act out of a moral conscious and not those who do not?

Certification serves to protect corporate producers even when their produce is significantly inferior. Should we continue to reward quantity over quality? For the life of me I can't figure out why anyone with any sense of morality would want to do this. Well if we can't control the population growth perhaps that is what we need to do. But there is a cost for doing so and it is incurred by those who have had a child get an E. Coli, Salmonella, are antibiotic resistant strep infection severe enough that it may result in their death.

We need to understand how the size and density of the population determines the beliefs and values we hold.

And we need to understand how these beliefs determine our response to nature.

We need to understand that all short term good is ALWAYS accompanied by adverse consequences which over time if left unaddressed with eventually overwhelm the good that was produces. The man made environment has produced good but it is associated with adverse effects which we see in climate warming.

We need to act to improve the good of the many and not just of the few.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

We need to teach our children that spiritual growth (virtue) is as important as acquiring material wealth (value).

We must teach them that the end does not justify the means

We need to teach them that altruism is as important as self-interest.

We need to teach them that it is cheaper to do something yourself than higher someone to

We need to teach them that cooperation is as important as competition

We need to teach them that freedom is always accompanied by responsibility

We need for them to understand that an actual lived-felt experience of the world is better than a cognitive distant and disaffected view of the world Nature isn't something you can experience on the nature channel but something you must enter in to fully experience But we have substitutes a virtual reality for reality.

We need to teach our children that what is outdoors is as interesting as what is indoor

We need to teach them to value time for this is the most precious resource we have and thus how we spend this time is of the utmost importance.

But if we don't have the time who will?

I used to live in the city. Moved from city to suburbs . The city environment is limiting people from seeing nature. Parks are not being kept up. No use if not kept up

Upkeep of environment. If it is dirty you would rather stay inside. If you are from city you are not used to being out in nature the first experiences are not good experiences because it is new.

Technology is a big reason people don't go out. They are worried about getting the best technology like the newest I Phone.

One obstacle is that people don't know where things (good outdoor spaces) are. People in city are often far from places.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Culture is not helping. Parents are afraid to have kids outside. They think and are told it is not safe. Everyone needs to be so connected all the time and youth is looking to this. We are not bringing people to nature.

Lack of education. Adults and children don't know there are areas you can go to be in nature. Common Ground Farm at Stoneykill was almost shut down. Kids and Families can go out and run in fields ,etc.

Education structure prevented me from being outdoors. Get up go to school, sports, etc. No time for outdoors. There is no extra time for outdoors except night, and going outside at night is not as much fun.

Parents raised me hiking biking etc. Others don't do this. It is a cycle. If you are raised in touch with the environment it is easier to pass on. Parenting and exposure are important

You yourself are the biggest obstacle. If you leave your society for 3 days you would collapse. Kids kick and scream for what they want but they don't so this to go outside.

Parenting and education at same time keep people from environment. You have to look out for yourself to get out. A lot of kids don't know about compost in inner city. If parents and kids don't know it will not be passed on.

Communication is big obstacle (I am from Harlem) my mom won't leave me outside. Don't have the community base. Moved up to this area but still don't have that community. Neighbors don't talk. People would feel more comfortable in environment if communication was better.

I am a Local Farmer in Dutchess County. I just wanted to be able to bring to your attention some of my concerns as a livestock farmer in New York.I currently operate under a USDA exemption with a USDA inspected plant.

This limits me to 20,000 birds per year.I think that our numbers should be doubled. The reason being -

these numbers were arbitrarily established decades ago. All farming expenses have more then doubled since these regulation were first implemented.Even with the doubling of numbers to 40,000 it would still just be a part-time operation. You couldn't successfully operate a slaughterhouse 5days a week with 4 employees and justify paying a full-time inspector.

The most significant concern is to be allowed to transfer our working farm to future generations " WITHOUT ANY TAXES".

But there are many challenges. (Paper) We are all aware of the pressures on the municipalities to develop these historic properties – for taxes, and ratables. Developers are no doubt looking at this small, but significant property for housing or storage- a tempting though. But I think, just as Poughkeepsie has before – we can come up with more creative uses of this public property to keep our historic sites and park and make it sustainable for the 21st Century.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Our heritage shouldn't be something we leave behind. It should become part of a sustainable Hudson for the 21st century. Thank you.

It is my goal that this newsletter will be the first of many forms of communication between this historian and others interested in beginning an allied effort to establish a Dutchess County historical community. A unified group communication ideas, support, and research in accomplishing historic preservation and providing education on the history of our communities.

Prior to becoming Poughkeepsie City Historian I was engaged in collecting artifacts, researching Dutchess County's industrial history, and presenting historical displays at the Dutchess County Fair. In 2001, I wrote a book entitled Poughkeepsie Potters and the Plague. While in 2005, I wrote a research article for the scholarly journal *Ceramics in America* entitled "A pot of Butter for the victims." Over the last two years my focus has been on Poughkeepsie and the Quadricentennial; researching, presenting historical displays, writing short articles, designing historical promotional material, and utilizing state grant funds to educate and promote tourism of our historic community. Along the way I discovered significant information on the history of Poughkeepsie and Dutchess County that had been overlooked, inadequately researched, and virtually forgotten. Let us begin a communication network that can benefit our individual communities through an allied effort to recognize Dutchess County's history as our mutual historical link.

Hoffman House stands today paying homage to the industrial advancements it witnessed, paying respect to the people it housed and protected during their live times of vision for the future of Poughkeepsie, Dutchess County, and the Mid-Hudson Valley. Please join me and the citizens of Poughkeepsie in support of historic preservation, promoting an educational museum for all of the Hudson River Valley community, and a vehicle for learning for future generations at the foot of our "Walk Way Over the Hudson."

Investment in New Technologies: Creating the Smart Park – In this era of rapid environmental change, solutions to ecological problems rest on people understanding how the state of the Earth's land, air, and water is linked to their everyday lives, health, and well-being. Parks, nature preserves, and other protected green spaces offer opportunities to capture data on the Earth's systems and then to "translate" it into information that helps people connect with nature, strengthens and supports scientific research, and informs policies to improve environmental conditions, but need assistance to take full advantage of green technologies that will make this information more accessible to researchers, scientists, students and citizens.

Shifting Demographics – The Hudson River Valley is a National Heritage Area with a population of 2.2 million. Ulster County, in which the Mohonk Preserve is located, has a population of 180,000 and an over-65 population expected to grow 62% by 2030. Currently 150,000 persons come to Mohonk Preserve each year. This number is expected to grow as the 22 million residents of the NY-NJ-CT-PA area spend leisure time closer to home due to economic realities and a trend toward "staycations". The Preserve must be prepared for increases in the numbers and changes in the needs of the visitors it serves in order to properly steward the land and maintain the organizational capacity to meet new financial and operational challenges.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

Full Cost Accounting (FCA) and Triple Bottom Line (TBL) – FCA is the process of collecting and presenting costs as well as advantages for each proposed alternative when a decision is necessary including both direct costs and an allocation of indirect costs. TBL captures an expanded spectrum of values and criteria for measuring organizational and societal success: economic, ecological and social. These approaches should be implemented more widely in both the public and private sectors.

Finding people to do the work or creating the jobs where the people who want to help can work or make a living doing these things

FEDs should put more money into these organizations that fun institutions but the turn around a patent research that sustain life. (Land Grant Colleges).

Funding sources pose a big hurdle.

Interoperability between the agencies that have the power to implement any of these changes required to bring about the America's Great Outdoor Initiatives, the ease in converting farm land into developments.

Train teachers to bond with student in these areas.

Getting word out about these partners or initiative out there who are doing what they are doing  
Ways of bringing all these initiatives together.

Transportation to get people from the urban population to some of these outdoor adventures (getting boats back, rebuilding docks).

Planting trees and vegetation to prevent erosion and sediment runoff works; Forest Service has work very well; Forest Service has also done a lot to quantify benefits of environmental mitigation efforts; large scale planning that would take into account t

Synergy between the agencies – how to do you connect people with these outdoor activities; where can we place these community gardens; complete streets and safe routes to schools.

FED should take a more active role with people who bring together these people.

Efforts to create more green space; improving or building more docks on the Hudson River.

Local land trust are the most effective means for protecting open spaces and watersheds, renewal of the extended federal tax incentive for conservation is critical.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Connecting people with the land by showing them how food is produce works.

As a lifetime member of Girl Scouts and someone who attributes my strongest positive qualities to my time at camp I can tell you that the outdoor experience is truly vital and irreplaceable in the lives of young people today. And yet it is one that has been consistently neglected as our culture shift toward more superficial hyperconnectedness. It is during these turbulent times when kinships are most paramount. So rare now are opportunities for youth to unplug themselves from incessant electronic stimulation that to lose the service of the land would be to comply with this trend and deny the importance of nurturing these bonds in efforts to promote healthy minds, bodies and spirits.

It is vital for us all to act as stewards of the Earth by learning about and taking part in recycling and composting, as well as coming up with other ways of reducing our impact on our planet. As part of a larger conserved landscape it is our duty to facilitate an ongoing appreciation and interest in land conservation worldwide and promote a consciousness about the Earth and our role as stewards.

While many camps and after-school programs across the United States offer intensive programs with organized sports and activities, there should be more programming that gives children, families, communities and other groups the opportunity of free play and exploration in the outdoors and the freedom to create a self-determined experience within a familiar and comfortable routine. This self-direction encourages creativity, builds decision-making skills and helps people take responsibility for their development; in addition, it offers a chance to explore and build respect for nature.

I urge you to step-up federal commitment to our estuaries as important habitats, recreational areas, and working waters, by including national estuaries in the next big conservation initiative, America's Great Outdoors.

Based upon our more than two decades of working with grassroots groups and all levels of government, we wish to present some challenges we have recognized along with some ideas that may help the public reconnect with the outdoors through the use of our country's magnificent parks and trails.

Challenge: Persuading people who are not comfortable with the outdoors and not attuned to the benefits of physical activity to view the outdoors as non-threatening, enjoyable, and convenient.

Challenge: Parks and trails must be acknowledged as an essential and mainstream element of local community infrastructure, much as utility lines and sidewalks are thought of today, in order to ensure that all citizens can safely and conveniently access a park or trail within minutes of their home or work, especially in the historically underserved areas - rural communities and urban neighborhoods

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Challenge: The usage and economic importance of our local parks and trails is largely unknown and generally not regarded as significant making it difficult to obtain funding and galvanize public support when resources are scarce. Concerns with safety and property value impacts also often derail proposed park and trail projects.

Challenge: Grassroots constituencies make a significant contributions to park and trail development and maintenance, can be effective advocates for legislation and funding affecting parks and trails, and are best suited to motivating their neighbors to reconnect to the outdoors but these groups often lack the tools to expand their reach, leverage resources, and adequately get their message out.

Yet, while much has been accomplished, the need is still very great. As an example, in the last six years we have received more than 100 applications from communities seeking assistance with trail development through our Healthy Trails, Healthy People program that could only select less than a third of the applicants.

In the enclosed package we have offered you brief descriptions of what is happening here in the Hudson Valley followed by proposals for action by the federal government that can boost our efforts to new heights. Here in the Hudson Valley, we have created inventories of the top priority lands that must be preserved, and we have a cadre of 17 land trusts working together with limited private and state funds to save them during this period of low real estate prices. We have an action agenda for restoring the health of our Hudson River National Estuary and connecting people with the river, reflecting broad consensus among key governmental and NGO stakeholders. To be blunt, the missing ingredient in most cases is money. We would urge you to work within existing authorizations and programs to bring funds to bear to implement these conservation initiatives.

Hudson Valley farms are the primary source of fresh produce for New York City, representing 80 percent of the vendors at its GreenMarkets. They contribute \$530 million in direct economic benefit while supporting a \$4.7-billion tourism economy. Land trusts are leading efforts to ensure permanent protection of the valley's agricultural lands - 20 percent of the region's overall landscape. Farms protect our forests, wetlands, and watersheds; they also provide scenic backdrops for many cultural and historic treasures. Despite this, the American Farmland Trust has designated the valley one of the country's 10 most threatened agricultural regions. The state loses 10 times more farmland to development than it protects annually. State support for purchasing development rights has been slashed to \$5 million a year - 16 percent of 2009's level - despite a \$70-million backlog of approved transactions. Federal funding for New York through the Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP) averages \$2 million to \$4 million per year, just 3.2 percent of funding over the program's history.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

The Hudson Valley has one of America's largest National Historic Districts and myriad breathtaking parks, all located in a state-designated scenic region that attracts international tourists and provides residents with outstanding quality of life. Land trusts and stewards of historic sites have jointly protected buildings and surrounding lands, but they face a formidable challenge: suburban sprawl that undermines the valley's scenic and historic character. Scenic Hudson's Saving the Land That Matters Most campaign has united 17 land trusts and state agencies to conserve the vital scenic, ecological, recreational and agricultural lands in the Hudson River corridor. This collaboration is hampered by the state's fiscal crisis; its commitment to land conservation has dwindled to 30 percent of 2009 levels.

The Hudson Valley ecosystem faces unprecedented challenges. Loss of farmland and forests to sprawling development is fast diminishing valley habitats; roads and subdivisions are separating wetlands and rivers from upland habitats. Climate change will exert tremendous pressure on productive tidal wetlands and signature Hudson Highlands forests. While damaging everywhere, these trends are especially destructive in the Hudson Valley, where species are concentrated in a narrowing arc between the edge of the Highlands and their natural range limits south of Albany.

While strong collaboration and effective programs exist, the region is changing. Population is rising, with much of the growth focused in the urban centers where young people do not have the same opportunities to experience the great outdoors. Many academics note a growing disconnect between youth and the natural world that sustains them.

On May 15, 2009, the historic, long-awaited cleanup of PCB's in the Upper Hudson began. But this battle is far from over. After the first phase of the dredging of PCBs was completed this past spring, General Electric has been trying to backpedal on its commitment to clean up the Hudson, raising concerns over dredging impacts and proposing to leave more PCBs in place rather than removed from the river.

Oxygen levels in the Hudson River are decreasing because of increases in temperature and other nonnatural causes such as sewage overflows caused by outmoded combined sewer and stormwater systems. As wet weather events are the primary trigger behind pathogenic overflows into our waterways, environmental regulators and planners must focus on reducing stormwater flows before they reach the sewer system in the first place. Implementing "Green Infrastructure" designs such as green roofs, permeable pavement and rain barrels can dramatically reduce stormwater pollution and "green" urban areas, providing a double benefit of reducing pollution and improving city dwellers' quality of life.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Energy and water management are two of the country's most pressing problems, especially in urban areas. These problems have been exacerbated by the growth of suburbs and the decay of our inner cities over the past several decades. However, uncertainties in energy prices and concerns about the environment are now causing many to question the merits of living in the suburbs, which could lead to re-growth of inner cities as desirable places to live and work. This provides an exciting opportunity for the design of buildings in inner city neighborhoods, where clusters of buildings in close proximity can achieve radical improvements in efficiency of operation through shared services. This project will develop a framework for the design of urban buildings that accounts for ecosystem services and greatly reduces the environmental footprint of neighborhoods. Consideration of buildings and infrastructure as components of a sustainable urban ecosystem, located within a watershed, will result in a transformative change in the way buildings are designed and positioned in inner cities. There are three objectives: 1) to characterize the built and natural environments in blighted urban neighborhoods to benchmark existing conditions, 2) to develop alternative methods of achieving significant reductions in energy use and improvements in water management in buildings and clusters of buildings in these neighborhoods, based on creative renovation and new construction, and 3) to rank order the methods of achieving the reductions in energy use and improvements in water management, based on an integrated assessment model that incorporates building and ecosystem data, economics, and the preferences of neighborhood residents. We will achieve these objectives in two test cases: the Near West Side section of Syracuse, NY, and the Borough of Wilkesburg, PA, adjacent to Pittsburgh. The new framework will be applicable to clusters of buildings in any U.S. urban area, and will provide a vehicle for collaborative efforts in other cities as community leaders and government officials develop plans to transform their neighborhoods. Examples of activities to be conducted include collection of data on existing buildings from local agencies and field measurements, collection of ecological field data, organizing and facilitating community visioning sessions with residents of the neighborhood, and developing integrated assessment software to account for the multiplicity of factors influencing community decisions for change .

There are several themes common among older industrial cities in the Northeast and Midwest. First, the majority of these manufacturing belt cities grew very rapidly during the industrial boom of the late 19th and early 20th century. Unfortunately as these cities developed, a healthy tree canopy and greenspace was rarely incorporated into the urban expanse. As scores of forests were cut down and huge swaths of land were leveled for neighborhoods, factories, roads, and rail lines, little, if any, consideration was given to replacing trees or preserving natural landscapes. During the rapid construction of these communities, the most notable sectors devoid of trees and greenspace were the dense, quickly constructed neighborhoods of the working class—neighborhoods that were within walking distance of the soot-covered brick, steel and concrete industrial sectors of the city .

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Today, with our nation's severe, half-century long decline in domestic manufacturing, the social and economic landscape of older industrial cities has changed dramatically, but the treeless physical landscape has seen little change. Even after more than a century, trees are rarely seen in low or moderate income neighborhoods and the crumbling structures of idle industrial and commercial sites are surrounded with acres of treeless, barren parking lots and roads. As jobs left the region, the population of older Northeast and Midwest industrial cities has decreased an average of 30 percent over the past four decades. Even though the exodus of people has resulted in countless tracts of vacant land, generally speaking, very little has been done to plant trees and create esthetically pleasing park space. In many cases, zoning trends that were popular 30 to 40 years ago actually made agricultural practices illegal within residential neighborhoods. Cities like Baltimore are only just now overhauling such zoning regulations and officially legalizing urban farms .

As the cities' populations grew, new drinking and waste water systems were constructed to accommodate the new citizens. Major water infrastructure systems last roughly 50 to 70 years. Not surprising, most of these cities began to see the shuttering of industrial facilities and sharp population declines as the water systems were approaching the end of their lifespan. Decreasing populations and reduced productivity rapidly eroded the urban tax base and the cities have been left without the financial means to replace archaic water infrastructure systems .

Third, another example of mutual concern amongst older industrial cities is low property values. Again related to a lack of traditional employment opportunities and decline in population, older industrial cities have relatively weak property values when compared to the rest of the country. An overstock of housing and relatively low wages created market conditions that led to high foreclosure rates and excessive urban blight long before the rest of America witnessed the deleterious impact of the recession and housing crisis of 2008–09. Low property values also attract low-income residents, a demographic often without the means to easily access fresh, healthy foods—a problem compounded by the fact that low value neighborhoods are rarely served by major grocery stores or fresh food retailers .

Strategic greening projects and urban gardens cannot solve all of the problems of older industrial communities, but healthy greenspace and well planned green infrastructure can certainly help offset many common struggles. With the factors stated above in mind (and for multiple other reasons not yet discussed) the Northeast-Midwest Institute proposes to develop an initiative aimed at improving the green infrastructure of older industrial cities

Collaborative land conservation efforts between NGO's, Local, State and Federal entities

The need for Navigational Dredging for commercial vessel use and heritage tourism ( the lack of a navigable channel is stifling economic development in the upper Hudson River Valley water front)

Contribution of agricultural land holdings in; drinking water protection, wildlife transportation corridors, cultural landscape conservation, national security relating to grow food in this country, local food production and agratourism

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Make Rev War battlefield sites eligible for LWCF funds (as Civil War Battlefields are)

Improve the amount of funding and federal cost share portion of the Farmland and Ranchland Protection program (USDA NRCS- Cost-share is currently 50% and no transaction costs are covered) As the fastest growing county in NYS with the largest industrial de

Make federal grants for transaction costs and for building stewardship endowments to provide ongoing stewardship of conservation lands and easements

Make LWCF funds a dedicated fund and make them available to nonprofit land trusts, who do the local community's conservation work.

Make the enhanced income tax incentive for property owners who conserve their land PERMANENT.

I invite you to stay the weekend here in the Hudson Valley, and experience I-87 anytime after 3:00 on a Sunday afternoon. Traffic crawls to a snail's pace and, clearly, too many people are accessing the Great Outdoors using their car. If you want to drive to Minnewaska State Park on a weekend- and you're going to have to drive, because I don't think there are any public transportation options- you better get there before 10 am, because the parking lots will be full.

The answer is not to build a bigger parking lot, as Minnewaska will soon be doing. With 80% of our population now living in urban or suburban areas, and less than 50% of the residents of New York City owning cars, Tri-State Transportation Campaign asks that the Administration consider public and sustainable transportation options as key to this initiative.

There is ample evidence that cars and roads are contributing to climate change, water pollution, and landscape fragmentation- issues that are serious challenges to our natural resources. It is therefore incumbent upon our leaders to assure that our attempts to connect don't destroy the very thing we are trying to connect to.

Currently, the Secretary of the US Department of Transportation is not listed as a leader in this initiative. While it is clear that there will be interagency coordination, we'd like to emphasize the vital role that national, state and local DOT's must fill.

Transportation is an equity issue. Many people can't afford cars, and there is evidence that younger Americans are choosing not to own a car. The challenge that the Administration must consider is how to do we get all people connected, literally, to the Great Outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

A major goal of the Canal Corporation is to provide landside access to the NYS Canal System through completion of a continuous multi-use trail adjacent to the Erie, Champlain, Cayuga-Seneca and Oswego Canals. The 365-mile Erie Canalway Trail is now 75% complete. Limited funding opportunities exist to develop additional trail segments. The Canal corporation has completed engineering plans to construct four Erie Canalway Trail projects that would add over 20 miles of new trail to the existing 272 miles, but lacks the funds for construction. Additional Erie Canalway Trail segments are, feasible, but require funds for design and construction.

Restrictions on the use of funding sources, including those that require a property interest for actions on publicly owned right of way.

PCB contamination in the Hudson River hinders access to the River and prevents the full use of its resources. The current EPA-GE cleanup will not fully restore the river's resources and PCB contaminated sediments will remain in the ecosystem for generations. In addition, PCB-contaminated sediments in the navigational channel of that prevent the NYS Canal Corporation from dredging the River. Consequently, navigation of the River will continue to be impeded. A 2006 report by NOAA, USFWS, and NVSDEC addresses this very issue and asserts that the navigational resources of the Hudson River have been adversely impacted by PCBs.

You have asked us today, as a part of this process, to tell you what works and what can be improved. One answer, to these questions, is accountability for Federal capital grants. This past spring, in the midst of a budget crisis here in New York State, state parks were placed on the chopping block. Over 50 state parks, including Schodack Island State Park, were slated to close. Many of these parks contain facilities: buildings, roads, boat launches, swimming pools, and other capital improvements that were paid for, in part, with Federal funding. There was, as you have likely heard, an outcry. Never before, even in the depths of the Great Depression, had a New York State Park been closed.

**AmeriCorps (U.S. Corporation for National and Community Service)**

For the past four decades, conservation and service corps have demonstrated that young adults engaged in stewardship projects make significant contributions to their local communities and develop crucial skills and attitudes needed to become productive citizens. As pressures on our nation's land and natural resources grows and youth unemployment soars, an enhanced AmeriCorps program provides a holistic approach to addressing challenges faced by communities, natural resource agencies and families alike. Expanded funding of the AmeriCorps program will not only ensure completion of a backlog of needed conservation projects; it will help train and support the next generation of environmental leaders.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

AmeriCorps support has also been provided for crews to complete much needed stewardship projects at DEC environmental education centers and on state lands. Western New York AmeriCorps crews removed invasive species and made trail safety improvements at Reinstein Woods Nature Preserve near Buffalo. The Headwaters Youth Conservation Corps provides trail maintenance and habitat improvement services to Rogers Environmental Education Center and state forests in central New York.

The state's fiscal situation has eliminated funding for these two important partners recently; federal waivers for reduction or elimination of partner matches would help restore these important stewardship collaborations on state lands.

Wastewater infrastructure investment and green infrastructure incentives

New York's wastewater infrastructure is in decline and needs at least \$36.2 billion in funding over the next 20 years to address the needs of aging, failing and new facilities. [See DEC's report: "A Gathering Storm" <http://www.dec.ny.gov/chemical/42383.html>] An enhanced, consistent commitment of federal funding is absolutely essential to protect this vast and essential infrastructure whose failure will result in irreparable harm to our waters, imperil the health of our citizens and ecosystems and cause havoc to our economy. And as we work to upgrade these critical facilities, we also need to think of new approaches to protect our waters. New York has been working closely with the EPA to (1) make our state revolving fund (i.e. Clean Water SRF and/or Drinking Water SRF) more sustainable by examining how it could better support smart growth, energy efficiency, and asset management, and (2) support better wet weather controls and the need to adapt to a changing climate by encouraging the wider use of so-called "green infrastructure" projects to protect natural resources.

On the first point, DEC and the state's water financing Environmental Facilities Corporation have been working to ensure that projects funded through the SRF do not promote sprawling, unsustainable growth, setting priorities instead on repairs and enhancements of existing infrastructure and support for downtowns and historic town centers. The SRF can be an effective tool for promoting wise local land use planning, and to the extent feasible, finance projects that are consistent with existing land use plans. It also can and should promote wastewater treatment facilities that maximize energy efficiency.

New York State has encouraged the wider use of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund provide financial support to local governments to implement comprehensive green infrastructure programs. NYSDEC's vision of an enhanced green infrastructure program includes assistance to local governments and NGO's to identify and incorporate green approaches into plans to address water infrastructure needs and to develop local programs to protect resources through landowner incentive programs, sensible land use regulations, conservation easements and best management practices. The requirement in ARRA and Federal Fiscal Year 2010 appropriation that 20% of the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund appropriations be used for the green project should become the norm in future SRF funding determinations.

Funding and coordination of complex, coordinated, big picture effort.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Our major challenge has been limited funding. The potential for new homes and commercial development in the Great Swamp Watershed...a bare 60 miles from Times Square. The demand for open space has driven land prices beyond what federal agencies like Fish and Wildlife with NAWCA funds are willing to pay--they prefer to purchase lands in the west where it is less expensive for large acreage's and there is already a Federal presence in the form of National Forests and National Parks. In the Hudson River Valley we need open space lands near where people live in the large metropolitan Tri-state area. Land prices and taxes are exorbitant here. There are few other grants for open space acquisition. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is rarely fully funded unlike this year! Congratulations.

35000 acres of Parkland n NYC. It is the backyard to many children. Urban areas need to be included. Problem in urban areas is alienation of parkland. It is too easy for land uses to change and it is not preserved as open space. Urban areas have natural areas too. Our cities and council people are selling our historic and natural areas. Oldest part of Poughkeepsie settled by the Dutch. As mayor I acquired the property to access walkway over the Hudson. Can't make these types of areas inaccessible to people. Friends of the Upper Landing with partners hope to build a bridge (taken from Dutch technology) and help restore old buildings. Need to pursue global projects to boost tourism.

Part of organization to bring back the night sky. Full cutoff lighting promotes tax savings and gives view of night sky. Incorrect lighting changes life cycles of some animals in sound. They move to the Town lights rather than to the moon light. Web site: [www.darksky.org](http://www.darksky.org)

Many grass roots agencies already work together. Need feds to join. We will have a US travel office thanks to the President. We need Federal partner help with having tourists come up river from city to see the Hudson Valley. We just got a grant but the pre-approval application alone was 115 pages. No public transportation to get from train station to farms and parks and trails. Tourism in HV is \$4.7 billion dollar business.

Have seen good and bad of conservation actions over years. NY has over 14000 public/private recreation areas. Each State has unique goals. Local needs are different than out west. National goals not only goals. They may not fit every state. Need to look at needs over the country. NE has more open space than bi areas out west. Needs across NY are all similar. Groups need to communicate across the state and the country. A lot of innovative ideas are out there. Don't re-invent the wheel.

Making first whisky in NY since prohibition. We are a farm. The biggest disconnect between people and farms is that they don't get there. Tourism helps bring some people to the farms, but we need an education program to get more people to the farm. Farming in NY is a difficult and dangerous job. Feds need to help the state understand the importance of connection.

The City of Yonkers has only 50 yards of access to the Hudson River. 4th largest city in the state. We see over 15,000 kids a year and they never see or get to the water. Education is an important component. Don't forget the kids that need to touch the water. Stop Hydro-fracking from happening.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Purpose is to connect people to natural resources and history and culture. Please include Americas Byways as equal partners with the park service and others in this initiative. Make sure funding programs are not for just bricks and mortar. Have some for grass root organizations that bring people together. Volunteering is an American activity. These people in these groups can spend funds wisely.

374 acre learning center for arts and nature. Connecting kids to nature by bringing underserved kids into the environment to give them hands on learning. We get kids there for 3-5 days. It is enlightening for them. Kids learn about history and importance of conservation and perform better on testing when outdoors. Need a stronger educational component.

Put emphasis on hands on learning rather than tests. We can't pay for a bus to get 5 miles to get kids outside in nature. Kids in rural areas don't get out either. We need to build a passion for outdoors.

Working on statewide agenda. Pass not child left inside. Make sure every kid gets outdoor education for every year they are in school. I work with little kids and see the benefit. Test scores go up, illnesses go down. Teachers aren't trained to take kids out. Transportation is a huge issue. Encourage outdoor jobs for youth.

Signs off for environmental education aid for state. Disconnect for administrators at schools. They need to be educated on value of outside hands on training. New teachers are trained on pass tests. The teachers who are retiring are the ones that had the hands on experience.

We discovered a revolutionary war monument. Had kids who had gotten in trouble with the law restore it and they didn't go away. They kept coming back. Convenience is needed to get people out. As a physician we need to get people out. This is a public health emergency. 40% of sophomore girls were overweight who were going out for sports 5 years ago. We need to work on this.

Land grants are recommending the wrong type of feed/chemical for cows.

Have an idea. Raise your hand if you believe that anything is possible. We always hear we need more funding. What if what we do is profitable? All the groups that are here. Small gardens in the Bronx can't produce enough. But if all the groups work together we can produce enough to sell and make our own money. For example Rockin the boat builds boats. They are not for profit but they don't need money. They are making their own. The Carpenter School in Maine only gets a little bit of funding. They sell what the kids make. Think Profit.

Parkways, protect plants that are growing. Education important.

70 acres of historical property was going to be developed near a soldiers grave yard. His project would hopefully protect the value of a battlefield. The Hudson Valley grassroots effort is made. funding is needed

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

Trails, bridges need to be connected. Transportation needs fundng. Highway design should incorporate walking, biking trails for Cities and Parks. A better way to transport.

Beacon - make transportation an important part. The Hudson River is America's River. Funding needed for transportation costs and being connected to the River.

1. Elevating our national estuaries to the same status as national rivers in this program. Here in New York they include the Hudson River, Long Island Sound, the New York/New Jersey Harbor and the Peconic Bays.

2. Maintaining the Northern Forest as a designated Treasured Landscape.

Preserving and restoring nationally important habitats in our estuaries and their watershed lands and the 30 million-acre Northern Forest which stretches across new England;

Recommendation 1: Elevating our national estuaries to the same status as national rivers to protect New York's waters and connect people with nature. Waterways in urban and suburban areas are treasured by millions of residents and tourist who use our clean and healthy estuaries. Here in New York they are the Hudson River. Long Island Sound, Peconic Bays, and New York/New Jersey Harbor. These estuaries are used for boating, swimming, fishing, shellfishing, and wildlife viewing. Their economic contribution to our state is significant, Yet, protection and restoration plans are not being implemented due to lack of funding. We urge you to give New York's contiguous national estuaries- the Long Island Sound, Peconic Bay, New York/New Jersey Harbor- the Treasured Landscape status they deserve.

We also recommed you use the AGO initiative to improve existing federal programs to prioritize national estuaries. AGO presents an opportunity to develop a cross-cutting federal initiative to leverage greater protection of recognized national priorities- estuaries of national significance- by focusing and funding existing federal programs.

Maximizing existing federal LWCF program: Expand federal-side LWCF's eligible project areas to include the watersheds of nationally recognized estuaries, such as those designated by the National Estuary Program and National Estarine Research Reserves. This would give National Estuaries the same status as National Rivers, and enable accessing federal-sidw LWFC.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Recommendation 2: Northern Forest Treasured Landscape to protect local jobs and critical habitat. Stretching 400 miles, from the shores of Lake Ontario, across New York, Vermont, New Hampshire and into Maine and Beyond, the 30 million acres of the Northern Forest make up the largest intact forest ecosystem east of the Mississippi. The breath-taking and rugged landscape is shaped by lakes, rolling hills and wetlands and includes all of the tallest mountains, and the headwaters of all the major rivers, in the northeastern United States. Ecological resources such as wild forest and critical habitat are only one part of what makes up the Northern Forest, as the culture and economy generated by the region's two million inhabitants are also among the oldest and most vital in the U.S. Per capita, the 237 Northern Forest communities enjoy the lowest crime rate, the most cultural institutions, the most historical societies and the most independent businesses in the nation.

Recommendation 3: Investing in public and private efforts to create jobs and connect young people with nature. In today's increasingly urban and digital world, many young people are growing up disconnected from nature. This trend poses a serious threat to the future of conservation, the environmental sciences and environment-based jobs. The more disconnected today's youth are from natural areas, the less likely they are to care about nature later in life. If left unchecked, these trends could rob the conservation movement of its future leaders, and rob our future generations of experiences of our natural world.

Unlike remote parklands in the country's interior, our national estuaries--the Long Island Sound, Peconic Bay, NY/NJ Harbor--Have thriving cities and suburbs of millions of people, along their shores and in their watersheds. Protecting and restoring the health of these estuaries directly benefits millions of Americans. Yet, significant federal funding has too often passed by these places for less expensive and more expansive places!

In the enclosed package we have offered you brief descriptions of what already is happening here in the Hudson Valley followed by proposals for action by the federal government that can boost our efforts to new heights. Here in the Hudson Valley, we have created inventories of the top priority lands that must be preserved, and we have a cadre of 17 land trusts working together with limited private and state funds to save them during this period of low real estate prices. We have an action agenda for restoring the health of our Hudson River national Estuary and connecting people with the river, reflecting broad consensus amount key governmental and NGO stakeholders. To be blunt, the missing ingredient in most cases is money. We would urge you to work within existing authorizations and programs to bring funds to bear to implement these conservation initiatives.

However, we still haven't achieved the act's goal of a "fishable, swimmable" Hudson River, where water quality is regularly tested and reported and the public can safely recreate in a Hudson that is free of sewage from outdated storm water and wastewater infrastructure; where Hudson Valley residents can once again eat local fish without health concerns, and sustainable commercial fisheries can thrive.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Sewage pollution from aging infrastructure, toxic PCBs that General Electric dumped into the river in the 1970s and declining fish stocks due to overfishing and power plant intakes remain as our most persistent environmental challenges.

Up and down the banks of the Hudson River, power plants dot the landscape, many of them continuing to use outdated technology known as once-through cooling. These plants withdraw billions of gallons of Hudson River water each day to produce electricity. While generating record profits, they are extracting an even larger cost on our river's aquatic life. This enormous water use needlessly kills billions of fish, eggs and larvae each year, an impact that could be almost entirely eliminated through the use of closed-cycle cooling systems.

On May 15, 2009, this historic, long-awaited cleanup of PCBs in the Upper Hudson began. But this battle is far from over. After the first phase of the dredging of PCBs was completed this past spring, General Electric has been trying to backpedal on its commitment to clean up the Hudson, raising concerns over dredging impacts and proposing to leave more PCBs in place rather than removed from the river.

Oxygen levels in the Hudson River are decreasing because of increases in temperature and other nonnatural causes such as sewage overflows caused by outmoded combined sewer and stormwater systems. As wet weather events are the primary trigger behind pathogenic overflows into our waterways, environmental regulators and planners must focus on reducing stormwater flows before they reach the sewer system in the first place. Implementing "Green Infrastructure" designs such as green roofs, permeable pavement and rain barrels can dramatically reduce stormwater pollution and "green" urban areas, providing a double benefit of reducing pollution and improving city dwellers' quality of life.

What's working well is land trusts working with landowners to get farmland back in production. But people coming to valley are new farmers, don't have experience, want to do a good job, need mentoring, want to take advantage of markets – dollars from USDA to do training at the community level between experienced and new farmers. Then can keep them on the land. New farmers come, take 1-2 yrs, fail and then leave. Training and mentoring new farmers so they stay, such as through an "incubator farm" to train new farmers. USDA to take more progressive role in assisting.

Looking at processing infrastructure – value added processing team that is doing work from 5 different states to create interstate dialogue to find commonalities, best practices and how to communicate to others. There is also an initiative in Vermont that leveraged ARRA funds in state legislature to create 10 yr strategic plan for farms to market ag products – Farm to Plate Initiative. Involved in agricultural innovation center – investing USDA funds that congressional delegations pulled in to support value-added production and incentivize organizations to partner and seek innovation. Big opportunity to identify organizations, such as Fair Food in Philadelphia that bring production to urban areas. Glynnwood Center has great model for educating community. CAVE doing value-added for processors.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Great partnership between NRCS and SWCD to bring conservation programs to local level – but when rules are written, regional equity doesn't come to play making it hard for farmers to participate in programs – please consider this for next Farm Bill. Tools available, such as EQIP, WRP, CRP, etc are working for farmers, but finding lack of technical assistance (TA) and NRCS is strapped to help. To get programs on ground, need more technical assistance to farming community. Challenge is that tools are not available to entire ag community. Moving from large farms to smaller operations with vegetables and fruits that are more specialized– don't have tools to help new diversified farming. Small Farms (5 to 100 acres) aren't having stewardship on land like larger operations are. New farmers don't have understanding of land and water to be able to do it. To provide TA to these new farms is something we need to look at and some of the practices need to be adjusted to fit these small farms as well as on large farms.

Urban farming creates social awareness, creates better community because creates sense of connection to land. Need more funding in this area to land trusts and support for community gardens because current funding from CDC is gone.

I am a new farmer and in favor of more training and TA but biggest challenge is not being able to rent land; need more long term access to land. I have a contract for 5 yrs, but this is not enough time to make long term investments in soil, etc. Conservation easements is great, but still can't afford land in his town (sells \$20,000 per acre). How are we going to get young people on permanent farmland? There are tools on smaller scale in Vermont and California that prevent sprawl and protect farmland and open space where there is option to purchase farmland if farmer is working. But there are restrictions because farmer must be producing and must sell land at ag value to another working farmer. Make sure there are working farms available to next generation.

Barriers to access for young farmers is big deal – large proliferation of CSAs in the valley – small farms connecting people to communities and works. Have seen huge increase in people applying for apprenticeship programs for new farmers. Many interested in farming for their community. For example, 3 yrs ago they had 5 applicants and this year 70 applicants for mentor program. Need more mentoring and business training. But what happens after they leave their program is that they still have real barriers to access to land. Easements mostly help existing farmers; young people can't get there. Here land is \$20,000 per acre with no ability to seek financing if they're a new farmer. Having no income and collateral plus being a young farmer is hard. Need some kind of loans. With aging farm population, young farmers coming in are providing public service. There are loan forgiveness programs for doctors that work in rural areas, why not for young farmers? 90% of intern/apprentice applicants are college educated.

Change ag census to better reflect farming in Hudson Valley. So when they go on census they wind up in "other" category because they don't fit in category for type of ag in this area. It's hard to tell the story if there's no data. Need to have accurate numbers to provide necessary funds and programs to farmers.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Isolation is an issue for small farms; providing services and repairs are difficult for companies because of long distances to travel to small acreage farms. Also friction with municipalities - farmers finding themselves surrounded by suburbia that did not exist before and municipalities don't understand and don't support farmlands. SWCD's formed the Resource Conservation & Development Council (RC&D) that is doing a barge project to get Hudson Valley products to NYC. These farmers don't have employees to transport products, but will have access points to get products on barge.

Big threat from energy development and transmission lines targeted to be put on preserved lands. If EPA could talk to DOE and target renewable energy project sites for Brownfields and old mining sites, old malls (many in NJ) – why use “greenfields” for renewables after we have worked hard to protect these lands and pay taxes on them. (applause from group)

Real challenge to make small farming more viable. What is needed is aggressive regional supply chain development. In NYC there is a severe disconnect between city and rural areas. Reorient programs and resources. USDA could partner with organizations. Need for aggregation and warehousing, severe lack of processing and distribution for farms in regions. In NYC, the Dept of Education buys \$300,000 of lettuce from Maryland each year because there is no place in NY to process these products. Wholesale farmers market in the city is dying. Not lots of fed interest in that.

Difficult battle to maintain critical mass of farmland in populous parts of the country. Need to leverage money as intelligently and as soon as possible to get to hands of farmers. Distinguish that protecting farmlands isn't always protecting farmers, but sometimes does do both. In county have been able to get funds to landowners who then invest in their business and an example is where an orchard could build cold storage facility.

A challenge is that climate change will change face of ag and climates. We are not ready at local or fed level to start to address these issues now. We need to have tools in place to address this. Haven't seen changes in NRCS field office tech guide (FOTG) to upgrade conservation practices. Not costly for feds to start this. Through Long Island RC&D and NRCS should soon be putting in field mobile pelletizer program to assist farmers and homeowners to get away from fossil fuels. These types of projects need to be looked at to get project on ground and provides new means of income to farmers.

There is a great beauty and diversity of the State and it's very different from other areas. In federal programming, must understand it's not just about population size because standards might not match needs of community. Allow communities to identify their own needs - like HUD program does- require the fed agencies acknowledge great diversity of communities they serve.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

Local people know what they need and difficulty of funneling the funds down. It shouldn't be as hard for a small farmer to access money as it is to run their farm; but it is. We can't function without the local land conservancies. The fact is that the land conservancies, whose goals are a little divergent, have allowed us to establish the partnership. They have the connection with communities and individuals. The feds need to trust the people are going to spend the funds. If there were a way to streamline programs so funds aren't taken out for agency staffing and instead go to the local areas. It's a complicated business to spend federal funds, but to give some of the money to land trusts is good- they are nimble and have staff. They also have information. Money needs to get to the people who need it.

In Hudson Valley with advent of small scale farmers, there's interest in doing sustainable forests. NY is over 60% forested, and 80% of that is privately owned. Most folks with forested land have no idea of the stewardship role they play or resources available to them. Not a lot of info on how to manage that land sustainably. Ag and everyone depends on water that comes from uplands. Folks need to understand this issue. Resurgence of valuing local produce, but not local forests. We can't put everything in easements.

Lots of funds need to be targeted to young farmers. It's totally different mindset for these - they are conscious of sustainability issues, etc.

The Hudson River watershed is a community with many different local governments. What doesn't work is a lot of different parks that charge their own admission and you can get one pass for all the non-state parks for each park in different towns. This discourages recreation. There are great parks, but they Bay way is identifying wonderful spots to kayak and routes. Resources are not available or known to people. Wants a pass that is good for lots of parks.

\_\_\_\_\_ agrees with other commentators, especially regarding the lack of funding for DEC. She is concerned with the impact of untreated sewage on streams (combined sewer overflows). There needs to be more funding for infrastructure. NYS has within its jurisdiction ways for fine money to go back into the community and that should be done. Municipalities need to be fined if there is water quality violations and have that money go back into the community.

\_\_\_\_\_ grew up in the Bronx 30 years ago and had lots of outdoor recreational opportunities. Indian Point used to be a park. There are less areas for recreation in cities currently. We have to change the political discourse so that the public language has to be more inclusive. Everyone needs to pull together with people working together regardless of political affiliation. Sea level rise is a national security issue. He would like to see an increase in EPA and NOAA budgets.

Need more real time monitoring (Beacon Institution is doing some of that). Would like to see a model of what is happening on the river. More funding is needed for real time monitoring. Science education is needed and training for teachers on how to teach kids to learn science hands on.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Poughkeepsie, NY*

*(cont.)*

\_\_\_ wants to commend the federal groups for holding this session. Kids need to know how to swim. 69% of African American teens can't swim. 42% of white teens can't swim. We need to do a lot more to teach young people to swim. The CCC provided infrastructure in the 1930s that is still used today. NYS closed parks and the Feds stepped in requiring state to keep open fed. funded parks. Please build in accountability in federal grants. Write in assurance that parks using fed money require that they remain open. Build in enforcement that money is spent in compliance.

Lack of funding for DEC prevents DEC from investigating violations. Local planning boards don't take into consideration cumulative impacts which affects the Hudson River. SEQRA has no enforcement arm.

AGO is also in our back yards and ecosystem services should be a top priority. Funding and research on new education initiatives, and infrastructure.

\_\_\_\_\_ wants view shed protection for the Hudson Valley. When federal and state parks are involved there should be a way to protect viewsheds. Things that are done on a local level affects people in a region.

All river and estuary programs-make all of them one program and give them elevated status. Combine federal designations to work better together. Make them all eligible for federal money. Better coordination and resources among federal agencies. If you want to connect people with nature put nature where people are. It has to be accessible to people in urban population centers. Federal money needs to go to urban center parks. Concentrate and prioritize on national estuaries.

Allen is NPS hydrologist. There are national parks in New York, but few people know of them. We need to get NPS information out.

Reconnect people with landscapes and connect landscapes with each other from headwaters and tributies to main stem. Provide additional funding to remove dams. Support legislation to increase F&W service programs. Find ways to provide federal incentives so farmers don't have to sign natural gas drilling leases.

The Hudson River estuarine research reserve is part of a little known partnership program. They have something to contribute. Use science based management practices. Get people to connect with the resources from youth to policy makers and how to plug for the program. Please fund and connect to other initiatives. We have to keep climate change and sea level rise front and center. Relates to public access, wonderful array of public access site, a lot of those will be under water with sea level rise. Keen interest in seeing energy conservation.

## Discussion Question 2

***Poughkeepsie, NY***

***(cont.)***

It is important to understand it is the kids that are going to carry this work on, kids need to be involved in river activities and kids love to be on the river. The more they are on the more vested they get. Kids like being on the river with their friends. They are more invested if they are with their friends for longer periods of time. Just need a strip of beach with nothing else on it. Kids don't know you can't be on the river after a hard rain because of CSOs. River keeper is working hard on this issue. There isn't timely knowledge of bacterial levels in the river.

Would like people to have access to water quality information. Infrastructure investment is desperately needed. We need a water quality (sewage system) infrastructure! Needs enforcement of laws. EPA has a role. Waste-water treatment budget has plummeted in EPA. Need to have a robust presence so permits are more strict. Wants fed government to invest in infrastructure and enforcement. Hydrofracing what is EPA's jurisdiction? Leaves drinking water supplies contaminated. EPA needs to get involved otherwise the states will have conflict. EPA needs to make sure NYDEP works on infrastructure investment and economic opportunity. Send more EPA staff to more public meetings.

It is worth reminding ourselves that we have globally rare freshwater wetlands in the Hudson Valley, we need to conserve the ecosystem, need big picture plan of attack (this is work here-Greenway program). This would be a great test case. We have the resources, plan and people. We are all invested in this plan and would love a federal partner. Expand NY & NJ harbor Estuary program should expand up the river. \$52 million dollars requested to President to expand funding for EPA. Combine 2 programs to combine the harbor program with the DEC program. Sea level rise will travel up the Hudson. A green ribbon of protected space along rivers is a great idea. Federal government needs to provide more science on sea level rise and more interpretation and outreach about that data.

I remember playing with my son and the water was terrible. Children need to have clean water where they are playing. Concerned about too many services because taxes go up.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Prior Lake, MN***

Thanks for coming to listen. "Long over do." When Washington policies affect his tribe he listens. Sacred teachings are important. The wish for president's initiative on the Great Outdoors is a blessing. We are losing our sacred things. We are losing our wild rice. What the heck are Asian Carp? We need to protect our natural resources. We need to do this as a group. (A 30 million \$\$ fish farming project failed due to (regulation delay), took 5 years to do and they are still waiting for return on investment.) We are the sacrificial goat. We need input on development and policy. He sees this in WI and on fed level. Need consultation with Indian tribes. Tribally driven policies versus Washington developed. Natural Resources shouldn't be regulated in DC. Lack of input from tribes is a concern. Tribes need to step up and do something in addition.

She talked about reservation boundary issues. By act of congress they were given tribal boundaries. Need long term planning. Projects don't work. They don't have infrastructure to implement. She highlighted the issue of identifying cultural resources and then the difficulty in protecting that same information. Working on IRMP, Integrated Resource Management Planning, identifying resources and defining cultural/historical resources. Need to beef up management and get business/management plan, get water resources, trying to give back to the youth. There is a concern of losing cultural and language. The goal is to start with the young, teach the language and then they gain connection to natural resources. There are water issues with the (use) (of the Aquifer) and (River) water rights. Why do they need the water, except for irrigation? They are working on zoning. Don't want their resources just taken. There is a need to identify important resources to be preserved. They have issues regarding agricultural/range leases. We need to improve our management plans with NRCS for land use.

In regards to resources, he was an electrician and was forced to leave the reservation. He knows the problems on the reservation. We all have the same problems. Talked about BP oil spill, needles washing up on shore /international dumping in our waters, preserving our Cultural Resources, and losing the language. He mentioned smog at the Grand Canyon. He highlighted that a white guy is teaching their language at UNL. Lincoln. The language is his mission. He also mentioned a museum that is in the works and that the Smithsonian is (holding some of their cultural heritage/sacred pole.)

What works? They have a New Director in Natural Resources that is working, a Green Thumb program, elders beautifying the community and they are stocking lakes with fish, they are acquiring GSA surplus equipment and work cooperatively with State and Fish and Game. They are a small reservation with a small land base. They have buildings on dumping grounds. (A Middle school and a former housing unit that was torn down 18 months ago, which is not cleaned up yet.) Since it is not cleaned up people are getting hurt, there is vandalism, and it poses a hazard to the members. There is not enough law enforcement on these sites. They must protect the aquifer on their land. They also have Chippewa Tribal Industries, which is performing home inspections and energy audits. They have Community gardens. Another challenge is they are losing the willows for basket making. Would like to see more tribal, state, governmental teamwork on these issues.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Prior Lake, MN***

***(cont.)***

What works? What fits this is CCC. Civilian Conservation Core with youth doing natural resources. (Rails to Trails program, projects such as trails from WI to MI., campsites and deer surveys) This got the young into the outdoors. This all ended when (name deleted) became Governor. They only receive funds to build, not to operate & maintain these parks, ball fields and trails. Doesn't want other programs to be fleeced in the process. Wants them to be 638 so tribes run the program. (MI mine to be destroyed) Get young away from crime and into traditional sites/values. Doesn't want sites open to the public. (Mention of Monuments /site where they collect pipestone where there was graffiti. He wants no graffiti on rocks.) He cited GLIFWC as an example of off reservation cooperation to protect resources. Can we purchase off reservation and close it to the public?

Thanks to Obama for this initiative. Our economy and culture was destroyed by this government. The agencies have helped. We, as tribes, do not have the infrastructure to help with funding. He had an issue with OSHA winning administrative jurisdiction on the reservation. Issue with Unions. Many tribes are poor to begin with. Pow Wow winning are now on the 1099. The IRS and taxation/1099 take too much. IRS is a disservice to the tribes. Tribes win little money. Land into trust. Menominee feels they were ripped off. Connection to congress resulted in MIT ripped of (Legend lake) acres. Legend Lake landowners have a covenant to stop land into trust. The youth is in crisis. New law enforcement (funding) will help. Drug problems are a big issue. We need to utilize the resources available to us and the Agencies. Need assistance with infrastructure so that they can utilize the funds that they receive.

The youth focus of America's Great outdoors is great! Our assets are our children. The greatest gift is a world where they can sustain themselves. We are losing our moose population, seeing raccoons and wood ticks, which they have not seen before. Their ceded territory saw their first Turkey hunting season last year. No one knows how to hunt turkeys. Concern: Treaty rights as they relate to subsistence which is important to the tribe. Mining is a big issue for them. Asian Carp & VHS (fish disease) is big problem for them too. Don't do enough implementing; instead they do too much studying. We did the same thing with the lamprey. Now they are managing them. We need quicker action on invasives. Partnerships are important; both sides must have total honesty. Need every one to come to the table with no hidden issues/agenda. We need more direct tribal contracts. Hopes this initiative doesn't stop.

Thank you. How do (we) keep tribes input happening? He directed everyone to the web site for continuing to make the issues known. <http://www.doi.gov/americasgreatoutdoors/> He asked, what does the forest of the future look like? Should we be looking to new ways? Liked the second generation forest mentioned by the Stockbridge Munsee tribe. The CCP program and youth can become the new natural resources care giver. Community gardens and USDA can be of help. The Forest Service has learned how to manage forests from studying Native American practices. They are struggling on how to manage forests to anticipate climate change.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Prior Lake, MN***

***(cont.)***

You need to listen to the children and Indian country. Appreciates the effort in them being here. He stated that they must spend a day or two here, not just a few hours. Tribe's resources are "they need the money". Tribes expect the government to live up to treaty rights, funds, and provide technical support. He noted that the president said that Indian Country has always been underfunded. We/tribes need to maintain what we have and find other financial resources. The treaties don't say "subject to budgets".

## Discussion Question 2

### *Salt Lake City, UT*

Getting word out to the people. Letters to the editor and newspaper stories.

Assisted and low cost programs so people can learn to fish and camp. \$10 for campground to participate in activity.

Working model is education thru YouTube online. Educating parents on how to get their kids outdoors.

Success in marketing, state travel agency and agencies. Work w/organizations from Fed. Funding for promotional efforts.

Boy Scout base. 30 years later they remember where they visited.

Partnering w/other agencies and organizations. Lots of stakeholders are brought in. Conservation needs to be science based.

Sometimes resources of Fed Gov't are not available timely. Easier to do cooperative agreement w/local gov't.

Works w/Wildlife Resources and gets more accomplished. More interest from general public.

Quarterly meetings w/DWR.

Fully endorses youth groups - involving them works.

Nothing has worked except Bill Barrett.

Gov't can facilitate groups getting together. Outfitters, environmentalists, etc., presented to NPS and got adopted.

Bringing interns in. Going out to the community and asking their concerns. Learn the local issues. Getting all of the points of view.

Why should we reinvent the wheel. We have conservation groups and Boy Scouts that have been around for years. Here let us help you expand.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Salt Lake City, UT***

***(cont.)***

This is great event. You can walk away with the hope that something will happen even after a couple years. Same hope with San Juan Co. May not ever happen because of politics. Fed Gov't can bring groups together like in Washington Co. and with the attitude

Best item that works is education- education in terms of maps, trail info. Kiosks, partnerships with all, school education too. Instead of teaching not to do something.. Teach them how. The 80/20 rule (80% follow rules and 20 do not) - enforcement is critical

He agrees in his work as a BLM ranger education and enforcement needs to be combined for it to work. Need to explain to people why the law is there why need to obey and if needed use cuffs.

When BLM dealt with OHV designation plan some of the OHV users were very upset much controversy. Retaliation occurred, etc. They funded one person for enforcement but really this person worked on education and hit the areas with crates of maps and information

Another approach that works is good signs.

Dialogue takes time, but there is a public lands council that works. Gather as much input as possible and then make the best decision possible.

Collaborative work....the Tuschar Mountains collaborative for grazing allotments was wonderful. Lowered AUMs thru science. Public range lands need to be resilient due to Climate Change....we need science thru monitoring. Direction from on high - oil and gas p

Folks that are making a living from the land are bringing more and more people out to the "lands" to help with fencing and riparian efforts...they can be the teachers. Treasured Landscapes are not necessary because the farmers are already connected to the land

Generations of tradition in Blanding of looting the lands - academic archeologists paid rural folks to dig up pots. Something that may be working - after the antiquities bust - the boy scouts - who in the past had gone out on private lands to dig and get

Partnerships are the key to get energetic youth moving..AmeriCorps and other Conservation Corps....funding from a National Level is the key to continuing this educational experience. Public Lands Service Act is a bill in Congress right now. Connects young

Get together with curriculum experts and develop a spiral curriculum. Work with themes at the grade school level and come out with a program. There would be federal grants to provide the materials and internships to train kids at an early age to move forward

Bureaucratic organizations need to understand ranching and farming in order to understand the land and economics. Feds should be talking to the states so that resources are shared...get rid of the "lines".

Take what is local and add to the curriculum to build it up.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Salt Lake City, UT***

***(cont.)***

Road closure - worked with Tooele and Utah Magnesium, UDNR & others - built interpretive display to educate the students that live in Tooele county regarding the closure of Stansbury island. Plan to teach teachers how to teach students. Partnerships is th

All about the children and future. What works for education for kids - quality of life now and in future - overall respect for the land - energy, oil gas, coal extraction to devastation of land for future of children, state and country. Need to look at ou

Greatest thing that has worked was during FDR in the great depression. Trails in Yellowstone built by youth. Need youth core programs.

Youth cores area working.

Volunteer groups to help with education and monitoring. Need to make them aware of what is appropriate in the outdoors. Back country horse patrols can help along with the bikers.

Education and enforcement is needed. An online map somewhere does me no good when I'm on the ground - need signs and kiosks with maps. USFS did well in Am. Fk canyon in signing trails. Forest Lake is a problem since it is empty half the year and people wi

AM Fk: Pleasant Grove Ranger District - have different management styles even in the same Forest Unit. We tried working with the SL ranger district and they had no interest in the specific trails program. Some are engaging community in promoting stewardsh

Education works, starting at an early level.

Provide a community created map of the issues on forest lands to local and regional management units (e.g. USFS) so the someone beyond the overworked forest units can receive this information and get engaged in the dialogue.

Get programs with telescopes at supermarkets and other high visibility areas.

Enforcement. Different than rules of road in driving. Want to be able to go to website on map to see what lands can be grazed or not. Where motorized vehicle is allowed.

Education. Get more people into the outdoors--need to educate for proper use. People need to know what the rules are--signing, etc.

CD for OHV trails is coming out. There are those that will go where they want regardless. Most people want to be legal and obey the laws of the back ground if it were mapped out, signed, etc. If trails are signed and on maps then there is not a lot of abu

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Salt Lake City, UT***

***(cont.)***

We make signs for appropriate use. Putting people to work, works. We can pound posts and put up fences. Let us do work that is meaningful. A lot of our public infrastructure projects - putting people to work works. We put up signs. Give us meaningful work

It has to be signage. There has to be social marketing to make it work. Need to do background research. Understand why people care and why they do something. Signage and info is important but background research needs to be done- marketing. Find out the w

Economic advantages, recreation advantages. Threats to national parks--air quality, off-road vehicle uses, etc. Higher levels of cooperation between land managers and landowners--need to see more of this coordination and cooperation. What are apparent are

3.4 million acres of land in Utah granted to support public schools. Showed map. Recreation impacts all of the school lands. Every school gets discretionary money from lands. How are you going to preserve recreation without funding. WE want to have these

Good science, peer review works. Modern technology is good. Cannot mine water--we conserve it. Study drain systems in Utah to meet agriculture and recreation needs. Get people out on the land and sea and experience it. Suggest BLM have open house to show

Division of natural resources has a program where you can call on people poaching. Something similar should be set up for off road use. Brought kids together that have never seen a deer from inner city and local farm kids. More money for youth national co

## Discussion Question 2

### *Seattle, WA*

Walkability and access to green spaces is a problem in Seattle neighborhoods; have plans but they are not funded/built; have a very good re: with MBSNF, supportive of our work in bringing diverse youth to the forest; ie, provide funding for Eagle Watcher program and have a community partner who has been very helpful in helping us access all of the resources that are available.

parents tend to push kids to their interests; people don't do what doesn't apply to them (not interested, not available); important to show kids that Hollywood doesn't depict the facts; need to take kids out to places like NW trek – the don't do things they don't know about – if you're taking your kid to the park, offer to take a neighbor kid; if parents don't know about opportunities, hard for kids to know about them (e.g. 4H programs); also won't be funding if no one shows up – need to make it relevant to kids

Trails in WA are in very poor shape, keeps people from coming out. Disappointed with low funding to public lands, particularly Forest Service near populated areas. Not sure how money is appropriated to specific needs. Seems that forest service trails near less populated areas are in better shape than those near urban areas. Understands recent weather is contributing to problem, but thinks this is and has been a problem for many years. Also many trails further from urban areas receive a lot of ORV use which takes these trails out of circulation for other trail users.

overuse of local trails, lacking resources, equalize based upon use rather than political power

More emphasis needed on local schools and parks, participation at the local level

Public agency staffing is revolving door. Need sustainable funding sources for recreation.

Environmental and outdoor recreation education is needed, including ORV use.

Uncertainty of climate change. Need a synthesis in adaptation options for land mgmt. Need to create easier channels to engage youth in outdoor recreation, technology.

NPS provides structure and framework to address environmental issues. Use the NPS organization as a framework to address these issues. Also, utilize local urban parks to teach issues and provide close access to outdoor areas.

getting to the National Parks without cars – public transportation

Center for Wooden Boats. Barrier is funding for transportation to bring kids from schools to outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Cooperation/Collaboration between USFS and private user groups. Need to maintain access and quality of experience to keep people coming back. This goes a long way toward people coming back. User groups must take responsibility for care of the land. Volunteerism works.

Mountains to Sound Greenway – Kids learn more when they are actually outside. Youth programs, volunteer programs such as these help make the connection between people and the land

amounts of grants available significantly decreasing and more competitive. No money to do the things needed

Wild and Scenic Institute: Low funding levels for nonprofits providing education and outdoor recreation.

process by which land uses are determined and way decisions are made. Public rights and public are being given away. Agencies collaborate with special use committees that are heavily stacked towards local interests. EG in Montana Resource Advisory Committee represent local industry, labor, 5 are tribes, 2 seats are for environmental groups. Lawsuit at end of Bush administration – filed to stop BLM from evaluating any further BLM lands for wilderness designation. Obama administration has been discussing in order to reinstate some of these, but so far no action. Fed agency hearings are not set up to fully represent all Americans. For example they are set up outside the agency where local special interests can dominate the discussion. Environmental groups don't find out about some things until EA is out. Special hearing was held in MN which was near Boundary Waters – at Minneapolis hearing only pro-mining interests were heard. Media was not allowed in the room. Members of Congress feel free to give away our land if its in their special interest. Senator Tester (MT) Bill which would order mgmt of Beaverhood NF to put out minimum level timber cut. Discouraging that Americans who don't live adjacent to federal lands are ignored in process. Too much local and commercial influence in federal land use decisions.

existing built environment needs improved preservation and funding to restore and preserve them. Natural Heritage Areas help to get people out into the outdoors and need to be supported with funding

Mountains to Sound Greenway – Collaboration between govt, community and non-profits. Take over landscape with maps, community plans to map out landscapes, collectively obtain funding from various govt agencies. Look at history of Mt to Sound Greenway. Look at documentary on Jim Ellis. • Partnerships between non-profits and govt.s works well ie: land trusts, etc. Focus on what disparate groups agree on rather than disagree.

state of WA and OR both have CWA laws that apply to the Columbia River, but have different standards, particularly with respect to gas going over dam and impacts to salmon; states should have same standards; maybe have federal government help the states agree on a standard

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

permitting and access; company that brings people and kids outdoors, but on federal land (USFS and NPS) it's difficult to go through permitting process to bring people to locations; lots of hoops to jump through – staff admit that hoops exist because of lack of staff to process applications; with USFS there is a moratorium on issuing new permits – if you want more people outdoors, need to make it possible for non-profits and other professionals access to the land; permitting processes are too complicated (think about a single unified application, similar to what grants have done, or colleges); also there seem to be monopolies of companies with access to specific national parks; also the cost of filling out the permitting; agree that people need to be prepared, follow leave no trace, etc., but would be good to have one application apply multiple places

NPS needs to make sure it is representative of the cross section of our society. Look for opp to protect landscape that rep. who we are as a nation.

Snake River dam comment seconded. Need preservation of open space as more priority. Cascadia environmental science center. Senior High kids have less time in curric to be involved in envir studies and getting outdoors through classroom. Parents spending more time working and don't have time to get out w/ their kids. Stimulus bill should fund ESA recovery work...would provide more opportunities to get out and see these species.

one challenge is lack of cooperation between federal agencies; eg. At NOCA, want grizzly population augmented but all agencies aren't moving at the same pace – NPS wants it but the FWS not agreeing

Trans Alta owns Centralia Coal plant impacts Mount Rainier. Recommend Jon Jarvis converse with Governor on this. Other federal agencies – trying to protect resources around Bumping Lake but Bureau of Reclamation is working counter. BPA is standing in way of taking out dams. National Park Service is working to take out Elwa dams, but its been 25 years and still hasn't happened.

Underserved populations need to be engaged through multi-tiered approach. Need for accessible outdoor recreation opportunities, through partnerships, private industry.

Understanding of value of wilderness – not only for recreation, but for clean air, water, and other ecosystem services.

cost. Example – outside of Leavenworth - \$70. How many families can afford this cost?

We need to engage the populations that live in our cities. More diverse populations. Form a more collaborative culture

dual edge sword 'idea of diversity'. Myriad of interests that have to be addressed. Dichotomy of use and protect. Finding right balance is difficult. Challenge is lots of interests that need to come together for compromise solutions

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

applauds the First Lady for wanting to get kids out moving; it is a challenge in making the outdoors accessible for many people living in Seattle

access to trails & open land for equestrian use, fractures in park connections - regulations, ordinances, taxation

Access is difficult for all recreation, particularly for ORV use. Need for open-mindedness in land managers for all forms of recreation

Lack of connection for minority population to public land. Need for focus on green spaces in urban environments to lead to greater public land participation.

RTP works very well, leverages federal dollars; real, legitimate collaboration works really well – having a pre-set agenda doesn't work (in collaborative efforts); have had great participation and success with volunteer efforts to build mountain bike parks, 12,000 hours in once case; give us more access to more areas and we will do the work.

low access due to poverty, lacking resources (transportation & funding) to provide volunteer services with public lands

LWCF funds are too low

Lack of public transportation

need to use the technologies that young people are using to reach them

Earth Corps; from Kenya: some environmental issues are cross-cutting; the EC program teaches environmental skills, very good way to help young people get involved in the outdoors, and can lead to careers; also, Americorps

important to have a clear goal when you ask groups to collaborate

Kitsap Co, put out maps for m/c and ATV trails. 500 miles of ATV trails in Kitsap Co. Getting the maps distributed is key to increasing use and knowledge of these areas.

lots of money available that is not being connected. Money in Ed and Labor not getting to Youth initiative.

Competition in funding in local jurisdictions. LWCF highly competitive, and not enough to cover needs.

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

WWRP funding not available to non-profits ; RTP and NOVA funds very beneficial fund sources, but in danger of losing them....need the RTP funding coming in the next transportation bill....used for backcountry grant programs.

Act as liaison to provide environmental education and outdoor recreation to kids with special needs with physical, cultural, and financial barriers to accessing the outdoors. Would like to see more funding for smaller orgs that are trying to bring people to the outdoors and funding for transportation to do so. Need funding for the introductory level of exposure to the outdoors. Also need funding for outreach programs specifically targeting special needs groups. Trend appears that National Forests will fund service projects targeting groups doing hands-on conservation – this doesn't facilitate programming for kids who are experiencing the outdoors for the first time and we want to meet those needs and bridge that gap.

success in obtaining matching state funds for challenge cost share programs; a diverse coalition brought together as result of the statute, WA Wildlife and Recreation Program...the most successful program you have never heard of!

King County Historical Society. Encouraged to see talk of preservation and protection of historical sites. Troubled by two things with current administration. 1) Save America's Treasures and 2) Preserve America. Administration is also proposing to cut in half funds for National heritage areas. Confused by what administration is saying about encouraging use and protection of these areas while cutting funds for these programs. Propose fully fund both programs.

AmeriCorps vol work with schools and teachers to provide good educational experience for kids in the area. Funding is a problem

elected officials need to see better the value of conservation, recreation and the out of doors to place a higher priority on it.

Access and land closures. 6 million in Puget Sound Region. Only access is 200 miles east of here

Renegade trails and problem people

Lack of law enforcement. His group tries to educate but they can not keep up with everyone. We are in danger of losing very sensitive areas

Washington Trails Association: USFS staff is retiring and understaffed. Difficult to work with due to limited staffing.

Shrinking land base for ORV use. Lack of understanding in ORV use.

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Immigrants lacking an avenue to engage with policies, need ways to reach out to these communities to engage and for policy making

Difficult economic times – outdoor recreation considered discretionary spending yet this is a primary factor in quality of life

Zoning for housing along waterways and rivers has not been sufficient to protect them for riparian health and public safety. Zoning affecting construction quality, energy conservation, green building, not sufficient. Better standards are needed. Also need better protections for Orcas from Dept of Defense operations, re sonar. Need conservation related job program like CCC to employ youth, homeless, jobless

Focus on technology to engage youth. Revisit education curriculum to see how land ethics are incorporated.

Biggest short and long term challenge is climate change. Would love to see synergy with connecting youth to public lands and climate change issue. Climate change issue is opportunity to connect youth to outdoors and public lands

WTA working very well for volunteer trail work; a very good system;

Important for people/orgs/groups to come together

waterfall garden in Pioneer Sq; then to Klondike Goldrush NHP; challenge is getting kids away from the computer and out; once kids get a taste of excitement and pleasure of the outdoors, they get the spark; just a matter of getting them out on a regular basis

Transportation challenge, school participation demographics has changed with less participation by inner city schools especially due to costs of transportation.

Runs program for high adventure outdoor experiences for girls. This is first summer they have had access to National Forests. Can't get permits because fall in category of commercial users. Non-profits that pay staff are categorized as commercial users of forests and there are limits for historical use permits. Lot of historical users don't serve diverse users. End result is encouraging access to non-diverse traditional users. Has been movement to special agreements diverse youth have to do service work instead of just being able to recreate. Reason its beginning to change is due to lobbying of non-profits

People try to respect rules but without access will do illegal and



## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Challenge to have the management in place to organize volunteers to help care for forests to trim trees, maintain forests, manage multiple activities (like cross country skiing and snowmobiling). Resources and willingness by agencies to use volunteers

find out why people aren't outdoors. Kioks/info stations have info that may focus on negative. Access to these places is a barrier. Need local, closer places. Arctic NWR – short terms gains

Need more focus on health care issues and outdoor activity and that connection. Need to do more to encourage healthy, active lifestyles.

Converting to Wilderness Areas limits land use/access for various user groups

Timber Tamers (4-wheel drive association). Accessibility and diversity. Keep pushing the off-road community out of places and they all end up in one place that is over used. Same thing would happen at Green Lake if you ask everyone to go hike there on Sundays.

Pacific Forest Trust: Lack of resources for funding in permanent conservation easements.

inspiring America to take care of wilderness – funding to maintain & steward public lands – problems in all agencies (forests, parks, state, local)

one obstacle with respect to private landowners is negative incentives as opposed to positive incentives from government policies, eg. Wetlands, endangered species; conservation reserves provide positive incentives

extend excise tax on hunting and fishing equipment – a very successful program - to other recreational equipment

one of biggest challenges is quality of life for all of us; whether rural or urban; concerned with policies and the idea that more people need to live in cities that are already crowded and how to achieve that; concerned about use of eminent domain and that use becoming abuse; more development is moving to the cities; concerned about how we achieve quality of life is not compromised by policies to force people to live in certain areas

Concern about commercialization of National Parks to the point where people can't afford to visit.

on corporations to encourage volunteers to come out to work on public recreation lands.

We have done a lot of research around people not engaging in the outdoors – common factor is fear. Lack of exposure, lack of understanding of the issues

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Removal of predators from the ecosystem. Need to focus on how ecosystems evolved.

Jefferson Land Trust. Need a more predictable source of grant funding; need fund sources available to work at the local levels; teachers need more flexibility to incorporate environment into curriculum and classrooms.

Diversity in natural res workforce doesn't fully exist yet so obstacle to getting people out. LWCF Pres America, Nat Heritage program have helped to get funding on ground but have been cut. Need incentives/funds to buy people out; do the right thing. NRTP funds help create work for youth. Adequate funding for LE on public lands.

Government prevents access to recreation areas with gates and closures. Improved access needed to increase outdoor activity.

· Greatest obstacle to restore watershed is threat of invasive species, spread from private yards. Pollution another threat affecting salmon restoration in the watershed. Spread of invasives needs to be taken more seriously – ivy, blackberry, other species. Creates rodent habitat, encourages insects, needs to be addressed.

could be very effective at removing barriers

trail projects are great ways to engage people;

drive to OLYM NP thru the OLYM NF and challenge to conservation is lumber is a big economic resource; UW has a sustainable forestry program – federal interest could help expand

Parks are designed around the camping experience. Changing demographics leads to a lack of access. Lack of opportunities and locations in parks that are accessible to the American Public

Strong support to Pres for clean energy bill. Recommend breaching dams on Snake River-restoration, job creation. Subsidies for wasteful energy uses; change tax code

Already have great programs and agencies exist, but not enough funding, not enough job openings. Reinvigorate with funds to keep these going.

Priv bussiness operating on public land – interp of NEPA/enviro laws. Update 1986 ski rec act.

LWCF Pres America, Nat Heritage program have helped to get funding on ground but have been cut.

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Need Incentives/funds to by people out; do the right thing.

NRTP fund help create work for youth. Adequate funding for LE on public lands.

Barrier in higher ed model where teachers are feeling pinched to get it all done or don't have the skill to get the enviro curric/projects done.

People are too busy – program managers are working at getting the funding year to year and keeping and growing the programs are difficult. Need static, stable funding.

Limited funding. High proportion of federal budget goes to military spending; propose to devote more to environmental programs and access.

Primary funding source for environment comes from off shore oil drilling leases but it hasn't been fully funded (Land and Water Conservation Fund). Need to fund at full \$900 million per year.

· When and where will future listening sessions occur? AGO website should provide this information.

Relating wilderness to urban users. Lack of connection between urban, dense populations with reasons for environmentalism, conservation. Lack of understanding in agencies, and the use of common language among agencies.

underserved urban schools despite love of nature experiences for local youth

Education and environmental learning works. Align and integrate env education into traditional academic goals. Should be connected.

Volunteering is a valuable to forge deep sense of connection to the land.

Collaboration of NGO's. Not a lot of money around in govt. Must use these partnerships to leverage limited funding. Leave no Trace is a good example of information dissemination and adoption by Govt. NGO articulates issues.

Need to search out NGOs that can engage youth

Save America's Treasures effectively funds historic vessels in getting youth out on the water. Foothills trips for youths. Preserve America program promotes heritage and cultural site as tourist destinations. Gets people out to rural areas and to parks.

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Art – Artists on Trails – King County Trails-artists are playing music on trails, interpreting trails with new imagination and different perspective on appreciating outdoor areas

How do we reach diverse populations when dealing with outdoor recreation issues. Currently a mono-culture. How to engage other age groups and cultural groups?

This session was not publicized well. Some just found out about this this morning.

This room doesn't look like the community culturally. However, during the earlier youth session, it was more representative. Also, Eastern and Mid-Washington did not seem to be represented here.

Initial reintroduction to the environ - salmon in the classroom program; all about the money and keeping environmental education centers open; a perfect chance to catch kids – few parks that have ed centers are losing funding – a huge missed opportunity

- people at two ends of economic scale, is there a way that adults could be exposed to the outdoors so that they realize the need for their kids to be outdoors; some people can afford camps; at what way can we inspire parents to learn more so that they realize the importance for their kids (whether they are at either end of the economic spectrum); parents need to be aware of nature deficit disorder; example is teaching science to young children at the library

- general challenge is transportation to bigger open spaces; younger people are often dependent on other people to access the outdoors; e.g. HWY 2 requires a private car – no shuttle to get you out to the woods; infrastructure to get people to open space relatively inexpensively

Mom says can't be out at night

Fear

Being harmed

Too far away

Violence

Transportation

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Save Our Salmon, Lack of political will to do what is necessary to restore salmon, federal leaders need greater willingness to solve challenges

- Spending billions of dollars to subsidize fossil fuels; need to put that funding into clean energy.

People don't believe large change is possible, but a green sustainable lifestyle is possible. Small changes can be effective in conservation

Water is an obstacle and challenge

Barriers between agencies – state, local

Effectively get volunteer groups & manage them

overuse of trails, lack of access, trails closing, abuse of designated trails – volunteering more than using

Getting kids outdoors – required service hours for students – need contacts & transportation

Population shift from rural to urban – they have to create for each other, value exchange

Difficult for small farmers to transfer land to new generation due to low values, high investment in fallow

Jurisdictional issues, boundaries and working with various agencies – water quality, partnerships, working locally

Getting businesses to consider the effects of the land and consequences, less focus on money, consider long term

Varied communication from rangers on land access

Need more grant writers to get funding, more notice for grant fund availability

Educate teachers on how to incorporate experiential education into curriculums

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Same – maintenance of existing trails. Used to have so many trails, now gone. Would like effort to have more

Same – access. Boy and Girl Scouts are having difficulty with permitting

Seattle has good urban parks but transportation needed to get outside of city

Oregon State Parks – political issue. Quality of life. Recreation and conservation - marginalized importance of the qualities that add to spiritual, etc, well being. Lack of political capitol. Should have stronger allegiance with education agriculture and health care systems

Land use conflicts. Oregon faces challenges faced at parks, conflicts among users

We do not have long term sustainable funding sources

Identify disadvantaged youth unable to access the wilderness. Recruit diverse populations – gain skills and not be fearful. Fear, financial, cultural, physical, lack of time

Doing something else / something better (e.g. video games)

Information not available

Being lazy

Parks: dirty and dangerous

Parks are closed when you want to use them (not open)

No equipment/gear for recreation activities

Transportation

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Getting caught up in technology (video games/electronics)

Destruction of parks

Opposite sex

Cell phones

Feeling unwelcome

Being lazy

Safety concerns

Weather

Location/environment

Gang violence

Parties

Knowledge of the places to go/knowing the benefits

Over crowded spaces/capacity

Who you'll meet there

Maintenance of the space

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Not enough activities offered

Parking restrictions

Easy access

Busy schedules

The beach

Parks

Outside

Camping

Roadtrip

Walking around

Ride bike

Community center

Movies

Franklin, Chief Health, Cleveland (high school)

Work



## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Basketball

Baseball

Sports

Take garbage out

Don't litter

Separate recyclables

Remove invasive species

Pick-up litter

Plant trees

Don't smoke

Don't drive

Don't overuse water

Water garden

Eat natural/organic food

Unplug stuff

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Recycle

Compost

Dangerous gases in the air

Lack of safety

Health reasons/keep clean

Oil spills

Transportation

Area/location (transportation, too far away)

Not enough time

Endangered species

Permit

Construction (being closed)

Park closure because of budget

money

Transportation- Don't have outdoor space within walking distance so they cant get there

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Money- Many parks charge admission fees

neighborhood parks may not be safe for youth-homeless people, drugs, etc

Lack of activities- Nothing to do in neighborhood

Kids would rather stay inside with electronics (video games, TV) than go outside

Parks don't appeal to young people-Should have more Bike/Skate parks

Some parks restrict activities that youth want to do, like biking or skateboarding

Lack of knowledge- Some people don't know what opportunities exist

Location- too far away

minimal personal transportation options

no driver's license

limited public transportation

limited money/equipment

lack of time

competing entertainment options

cultural norms

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

safety concerns

lack of awareness and interest

pollution

conflicting priorities

need more accessibility to parks and open spaces to grow their own food for youth and their families. Need more education and information around sustainable, local food production.

Overwhelming competition for federal funding, grants, philanthropic etc. to support youth serving organizations.

- The general public may not know the differences between federal agencies. Entrance fees, permits, etc.

agency staff is not available to families at district offices. There's nobody available to explain the rules and the different regulations and passes.

Take children to public parks and they're not safe. As a child growing up in a small town, parents had no worries about where she was.

It's not safe anymore—children need constant supervision. How do we deal with these safety issues?

It's not safe anymore for kids to play and have fun.

Questions about corridors and connectivity—what does that mean? Questions about purchasing private lands. Pete Silva details what this means—connecting lands.

example of graduate students that are 18-19 year olds with no first hand knowledge of the land and forests, need for connection with land. Important working forests, fisheries, but if no knowledge – difficult to engage in communications. Plug for education in K-12 to get aht background. Need to prioritize challenges – concern with conversion of lands, need to reconsider economic values. Sustainable forestry – federal agency support for local groups' proposals, changes in law.

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Abating threat of forest fires in central Cascades. In early 2009 they helped pass an act to allow FS to work with partners on restoring land—taking landscape approach to treat a place as one landscape instead of doing things patch by patch.

Authorized at \$40 mill per year—idea was everyone would bring funding together.

FS has created collaborative program where federal funds can only be used on federal lands

Asking state to bring match—want this policy reinterpreted so funds can be co-mingled to address this issue.

FLRA's coverage and eligibility should be expanded to allow restoration on Tribal lands, State lands, and Private lands

Need to see better funding. A lot of the funding gets passed down to local communities so they can conserve.

Need more funding to preserve America's treasures. Historic landmark vessels being used for children's camps—these historic places can be used as exercise for kids (obesity crisis). Passport in time program—kids get out to excavate sites.

Heritage area is a way of using private property, esp. ag. Land, good program for heritage farms where private owners get matching grants to repair barns, keeps ag community and keeps lands in private hands and allows them allow to keep their historic building.

It'd be great to increase this funding. Where does this funding come from? Dept. of Interior (?). Use the money for the public good.

Kids don't know they can go out into the forests and parks. It is not a part of their culture.

Classrooms don't have time for guest speakers. Some parks have crime issues.

Washington Trails Assoc., we do volunteer trail work all over Washington. Infrastructure is crumbling, we need partners at the agencies who can help us help them. We need better funding at the agencies to staff positions that can help non-profits restore trail infrastructure and use resources more effectively. Fund National Recreational Trails Program.

Commissioner – salmon recovery board – federal government is biggest problem – overstocked forests – instream flow concerns in meeting goals in Okanogan Co. Forest health is an issue. Litigation can hold up actions moving forward. Concern that any group across the US can comment hold. One entity able to stall progress

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

· people back to the land – how is this reconciled with roads management, and the removal of roads. Road closure shifts users. Little connection of people to and in the agency can be a can have with users. Access issues and users.

multi agency problem – not talking. Support a multi agency oversight group. No child left behind depends on interagency support and local groups – Scouts. Scouts special use permit not renewed. Sees discrimination in resources and permit process. Barriers to getting youth to the outdoors. Need to coordinate federal agencies with local groups. 4 million members – strong advocacy group.

“Silo effect” ....barriers to govt. agencies cooperating.

Educate people on the urban opportunities, time, access and knowledge.

Unable to offer program due to permit issues-appears to be an administrative problem, same problem with boy scouts.

Reclassified as an outfitter and can no longer take kids to Forest Service Areas

Lack of a united plan connecting federal agencies with the states, focusing on schools, municipalities, etc who are trying to connect people with nature.

More and more lands being closed to public use. NOVA funds—gas taxes on people who own snowmobiles, etc.—those taxes should be delivered back to agencies.

These funds from registrations is supposed to go to a fund to maintain snow parks, but that money has been taken away and given to general fund.

These areas are now closed down with the reasoning that there’s no money to maintain them. That’s frustrating.

He’s into trailriding—no money to maintain or fix this area—forcing overuse in other areas, and they say there’s too many people using this. Public access to land and monies being dedicated are being sent elsewhere.

support public learning activities that will encourage youth to experience National Parks. People from diverse backgrounds, new citizens are not experiencing the Parks. Need to reach out to those who are not familiar with local and national parks.

Mt. – Seattle – vested interest in the PNW, first come have interests that they don’t want to give up. Water rights issues – use or loose. Concern with limited resources

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

· memorial and cultural site to help adults/youth to think about actions not happening again. Looking for federal support.

Lack of general understanding that student learning is enhanced by learning in the outdoors.

Need full funding of the Historic Preservation Fund. There is a lack of focus in classrooms on history.

Land conservation organizations work well with landowners, but state agencies often feel it is their turf. We need the right scale of conversations with large landowners.

I work a very diverse school district, because of the focus on school testing there is no time to devote to outdoor recreation opportunities.

need to keep or waterways and lands safe so that they can continue to be enjoyed. Consider the Gulf of Mexico crisis. Enforce the regulations and implement those that will protect natural resource.

Portland – superfund site. Education is a challenge for all ages. Regulations inadequate, lack of enforcement, some stakeholders feel polluters and promoters are together, and that other voices not heard. Concern with water quality in Willamette River – containments. Polluters are self-monitoring. Need EPA to step up enforcement and supportive.

equal access to the outdoors – there are barriers – fees, education, adult users taking youth.

Accessibility issues. #1 Make the outdoors more accessible. No mention of special needs. No programs mentioned for youth and adults.

Agencies working with landowner need to not be regulatory in nature.

vol. for NP – youth education – need to figure out K-12 education- get into curriculum and out in the woods – interagency cooperation and local involvement early. Concern with having Mt. St. Helens under NPS – more funding and different emphasis than USFS. How can federal government cooperate between agencies, Not enough \$, everyone will need to Do more with less.

Sessions like this are the answer to these issues. People can discuss the issues openly in the public arena. A state law holds landowners harmless for recreation use of property.

– coordination between different agencies, especially in regards to water for salmon and other uses. TFW – water quality recovery plans – 10 years too long. Jurisdictional concerns. User conflicts with limited resources

## Discussion Question 2

**Seattle, WA**

**(cont.)**

Lack of full funding for Land and Water Conservation Fund. It has been underfunded for many years. Volunteers in Forest Act is dysfunctional as organized by the Forest Service. Liability is borne by individual National Forests which makes forest managers overly cautious, and cripples ability to work in the woods.

Schools are not engaged in educating kids on land management issues because there is a lack of unified curriculum. There are some from individual agencies, but not coordinated. We should elevate Environmental Science as a core class rather than an elective.

landscape scale – challenge between conservation and recreation, parks loved to death. Need to identify point where resource uses are at odds with each other. Need for communication – interest groups at the table. Goals may be at odds with one another, and the time it takes to work with the system to get to identify the point at odds.

youth and youth of color out to the forests and parks. Access issues and making areas welcoming to families – diversity in workforce – career goals. City parks program start for youth to get out to the forests and parks

so many agencies – compartmentalize, - land being bought up – how does this effect tax base, border – homeland security, role of federal government involving the local government. Don't see details being shared.

Publicize the lack of liability for homeowners for trespasses

Motorized access for recreation continues to be restricted. This is an issue for snow machines. \_\_\_\_...don't allow funding allocated for trail activities go back to general fund

raised money through vehicle tabs (state) that was re-appropriated to the general fund. Those funds show go back to expanding motorized access to public lands. Funding is a barrier to motorized access.

Land acquisition not equal to conservation. Can end up with unintended consequences. Concern with need to include a diverse group of recreation uses and work with the diverse groups. Need to make areas usable. Need to support facilities – ex. LO maintenance – one group wants to support it, others don't. Need to work with community. Make site enjoyable – have service in the service. Adventure series per park/forest. Barrier to use – permit process – ex. Film couldn't get permit to film in forest. Money to the field – had to ask for 6 times as much from Congress. Need to streamline the processes and participate locally. Need recreation plan for Forests – too long a time frame for planning process.

Access issue with roads and counties. One of few accesses to Olympic National Park has been washed out since 2001, and that was one of very few access roads that's handicap accessible.

Grizzly bear restoration: Fear of this wildlife—is it a deterrent?



## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

RE: Private property owners: People are motivated to take good care of property and learn and understand better ways to manage property, but they are burdened with layers of regulation from federal to local levels, which impacts the usage of their land.

Thousands in permitting before they can even turn a shovel. Affects affordable housing. If people can't use their land, they eventually end up getting forced out a lot of times.

Older people whose savings are tied up in property lose this investment. Zoning issues. Puget Sound restoration: Is this going to be another layer of bureaucracy with property rights? That extends all the way to the Cascades, which makes it harder for people to use their property.

Use education to protect property rights.

In terms of adding to federal lands, in the West so much of it is already federal (1/3 of WA state, 85% of Nevada)

Big national financial crisis, and management of federal lands has suffered from inadequate funding.

Reports of billions of dollars in maintenance backlogs. If we add to those national lands, are those dollars going to get spread further and further, and not do a.

Outdoor education is hindered by high costs of food and transportation. Students are generally afraid of the outdoors. Experience is the answer.

Landscape conservation issue—ability to manage wildlife and access.

A few years ago in NW we had mass floods and it showed we have problems accessing our national parks. FS roads were wiped out.

Agencies unclear on whose responsibility it is.

There needs to be clarity about this.

Loosening about ERFO regulations to restore roads as they were previously.

Second concern is north cascades grizzly bear augmentation study. Fish and Wildlife Service dragging feet on this—what's the opposition to studying grizzly augmentation?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Seattle, WA*

*(cont.)*

PCT – volunteers out on trail – good partnerships, challenges – disconnect between National and local levels – National direction may be difficult to implement on the ground – ex. Liability – concern with injuries workmen’s comp – who pays, concern with risks and funding not there to cover. Funding availability, criteria and representations on panels.

Limiting motorized access limits many of the Baby Boom generation that is aging. “It is a disservice”. More tolerance for people with mobility issues

look at whole basin – several jurisdictions involved – one person can hold up actions, government has a large role in leadership

access fees can be an obstacle – parking at trailheads. Questions about fee use – admin and enforcement, want to see it invested back in trails. Lack of knowledge of fee, arrive at trailhead, back to facility to get pass – hassle, Need information on trail situation. Keep funding for trails.

Off road vehicle use in WA State and in country displaces hikers and equestrians from trails. People who seek peace and quiet will be driven away by people who make noise

Machines displace wildlife, impact soil and vegetation

Sedimentation into streams—these human impacts are important

Damage can last a long time

Messaging that comes from proponents of off-road vehicle proponents is a concern, Impacts should be considered

Needs to be better staffing to ensure following the law

Reiter Forest—state DNR land—off-road vehicles were damaging the forest

Maintenance of these lands takes money—this is a funding issue

Access to lands for high impact uses: There needs to be a linkage to deal with that usage in monitoring and enforcing

The land belongs to everybody—not just who happens to be on it at the moment

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

NOVA again—federal connection to what happens on federal lands is affected by state money

4x4 community recognized propensity of their own members—state commissioner reopened Reiter for motorized use

Views impacted by these vehicles, which are now allowed on gravel road: Message is that it will encourage illegal use

Has implications for other forest roads

Need to expand funding for motorized trail development as well.

Access for groups (non-profits) is limited by the regulations and permits required. Need to remove those barriers to kids back into the woods.

Water is also a key issue in this discussion. Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers needs to have their authorities reviewed and need to be encouraged to embrace conservation.

Sky Valley Recreation and Planning? The liability that private landowners incur when they allow the public to access to their lands is a barrier to recreation. Consider the Moab, UT and Hatfield/McCoy Trail system model

Federal agencies need to be at the table with local governments – coordinate at the beginning of plans

- Process can a barrier - NEPA

If we could pay less taxes, we would have more time to recreate.

To use the resources requires multiple permits from multiple agencies.

Forest Service needs to devote more money to trail maintenance so that state can use money for other resources. Need to make sure to at least budget for basic maintenance and services

Too much of the budget spent on land acquisition – this money should be spent on recreation/resource facilities. Closing campsites and other reductions in maintenance is detrimental

## Discussion Question 2

***Seattle, WA***

***(cont.)***

Insufficient cooperation between agencies, e.g. road maintenance by Parks and Forest. Need better interagency coordination

Getting to the outdoors to recreate costs more money now, e.g. gas. Could there be reduced fees or subsidized costs based on income level?

Collaboration between agencies on reaching out to youth could be improved.

Budget cuts have limited infrastructure within agencies to coordinate youth and other volunteers to do the park and trail maintenance. We have more volunteers than money.

Lack of adequate resources for observation and monitoring for conservation.

Should be working with private landowners who know more about the land/resources to set conservation goals.

Federal, State and local agencies need to do better enforcement on public and private lands.

Single source-mandated funding is too limited.

Army Corps wetlands regulations get in the way of viable agriculture.

Federal and state regulations often are not appropriate to the use of the land. Landowners know best use of land.

Land use/recreation restrictions are unexplained, e.g. ORVs. ORV users contribute more to the resource budget and provide more money for trail maintenance, but are more limited in using the land.

Engaging youth: take opportunities to partner with schools, e.g. Students helping with water testing and monitoring.

Payment in lieu of taxes program: federal government payments to locals have lapsed, negatively impacting property taxes.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Spokane, WA*

Successful stewardship of the land requires a comprehensive strategy. Ecosystems rarely align perfectly with property boundaries on a map.

Tribal Nations exercise jurisdiction over tribal trust lands at the reservation level. Tribal lands were once vast and contiguous, but were reduced and fragmented over time due to myriad federal policies.

Congress passed the General Allotment Act in 1887, which led the "checkerboard" nature of many tribal reservations that exists today.

The General Allotment Act divided tribal land into 80 and 160-acre parcels for individual tribal members. The allotments to individuals were to be held in trust for the Indian owners for no more than 25 years, after which the owner would hold fee title to the land. Many of the allotments provided to Indian owners fell out of Indian ownership through tax foreclosures. Moreover, many allotments are now subject to "fractionated" ownership as a result of the intestate succession that occurred following the death of the original allottee.

This fractionation makes it incredibly difficult for tribes to include those lands in comprehensive land-use planning.

In addition to causing problems at the tribal level, land fractionation imposes a significant burden on the Department. An independent report commissioned by the Office of Special Trustee identified 4 million individual Indian interests in allotted lands. That report estimated that the Department's administrative cost for each individual interest was \$108. The total administrative cost to the Department associated with fractionation on tribal lands was \$432 million. A separate independent report projected that the growing rate of fractionation would cost the Department \$523 million by FY 2014, and \$1 billion by FY 2024 just to maintain its current level of administration. The report estimated that a \$2 billion investment in all of Indian Country over a period of 15 years could effectively eliminate the myriad problems associated with fractionation of Indian lands.

The precise location and description of culturally significant sites is a sensitive issue for tribal nations and their citizens, making it difficult to include many such sites in a public initiative. Moreover, many of these sites may be located outside of tribal lands. Federal agencies should work in consultation and collaboration with tribal leaders to ensure tribal access to, and preservation of, these sites to the greatest extent possible.

There are many tracts of non-trust federal lands adjacent to, or near, tribal lands. These lands vary from National Parks and National Forests to surplus military property. The management of these federal lands has a direct and substantial impact on the management of nearby tribal lands, and on nearby tribal communities. This is especially true where tribes have reserved the use and enjoyment of resources under a treaty with the United States.

The primary obstacle faced by tribes in their efforts to protect cultural and natural resources is insufficient funding to meet the needs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Spokane, WA***

***(cont.)***

Tribal governments often attempt to leverage federal funding to receive grants from other agencies and private organizations, but this creates an unpredictable situation.

Indian tribes will often supplement federal funding with their own tribal government revenues; however, for many tribes with abundant natural resources --those with large land-bases and/or located in remote areas -- tribal government revenues are scarce.

This lack of funding impedes the ability of tribal governments to recruit, hire, and retain qualified staff, and limits their ability to purchase equipment necessary to manage natural resources.

Another obstacle tribes face is inconsistent, and sometimes nonexistent, consultation by federal agencies where their actions impact cultural and natural resources within and near tribal lands. Consultation is especially important where government actions may impact cultural resources, such as sacred sites. The inconsistent application of consultation pursuant to the President's Executive Memorandum often places the burden on tribes to initiate, or expand the scope of, consultation.

There are a number of instances where tribes have reserved the right to hunt, fish, gather, and conduct other activities outside of tribal lands pursuant to a treaty with the United States. Protection of off-reservation treaty resources involves a collaborative effort between tribes, states, and the United States. In some cases, state natural resource agencies rely upon tribes to manage natural resources in treaty territories, even where tribes may lack the funding and human resources necessary to do so. In other cases, state agencies are uncooperative in facilitating tribal management of federally-protected treaty resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

Work towards efficiency maximization by making all land management plans available online so that agencies, state, local, and federal governments, and private sector entities can view ongoing projects and coordinate efforts. Currently too much unnecessary

In reaching out to minority groups and youth, it is extremely important to be able to relate to their situations and experiences -- most programs that attempt to connect with youth and minorities really fail to understand those populations, which makes

Make state governments equal to federal government in planning process. Agencies have to train together if they're working on the same projects; current system has all agencies training separately, which doesn't make any sense

Consider urban environment

Wilderness society: working at the right scale/letting people see themselves -- allows buy-in of shared and different values. Connections can be seen. Too small scale can be difficult

Youth: make connecting with nature and the outdoors a priority when they're young

Get the private sector involved in these initiatives; coordinate agencies and groups on different projects to increase efficient use of time and resources

Family legacy is a key component to consider when conducting outreach; hard to talk about youth without talking about parents. The nature of environmental stewardship is a multi-generational concept so we should try to get families involved in activities;

Communities of color: veer from traditional vols., long term mentoring -- start young, grade school, recruit teens as teachers/mentors, conservation big brothers/big sisters, encourage higher education -- getting children of color into sciences, not a sho

Transportation: NPS/other agencies could provide buses, require states to create envt. Literacy campaign/curricula; nature bridge -- public/private partnership, 40,000 children/year, continuum of care to involve children in the outdoors, keep listening --

Make principals of conservation less esoteric -- connect all principals

Concerns with overgrazing (increasing elk population). Concerns regarding: buccillois to Cattle Agency with responsibility?

piggyback where collaborations are happening and bridge natural resources, rural America is losing economic battle -- they are losing jobs and not reaping the benefits of conservation, conservation is costly and they don't get the results

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Federal government has lack of real relationships -- system is hierarchical and transient, fed government is everywhere but nowhere, federal structures need to engage local groups and people more steadily

Transportation to get youth involved - major issue in urban areas

Federal grants don't reach small, non-profits

Use social media - meet young people where they are; people-to-people interaction; cultivate "real" relationships

Lack of scientific understanding of nutrient dynamics in agro and urban ecosystems on watershed and landscape scales.

Failure of a large portion of the electorate and many corporate leaders and politicians to understand the vital connection between health, landscapes and their own well-being and the Nation's well-being.

Climate change; getting kids outdoors; protecting special places; encouraging volunteerism; actively engaging all ages

Clearly there are thousands of projects ready to get young people involved directly with the outdoors. The Appalachian Mountain Club alone would have many projects up and down that could get kids to work on trails - trails that are close to home e.g. near major cities but also in more rural remote regions. Some kind of civilian conservation corps - or re-civilization would be good. But working with partners rather than creating a stand alone project so partner agencies can hold on to these young people and have them become life long advocates for the outdoors. Fully fund LWCF as a key funding source. As suggested have secretaries work across agency lines. Help support private landowners that provide access and recreation opportunities in their lands - e.g. Northern Maine where the majority of the land is privately owned.

Habitat degradation, fragmentation & loss. Need for additional dedicated funding for state fish & wildlife agencies to meet growing issues & mandates. Disconnection of the American public from the "great outdoors"

State Wildlife Action plans, national fish habitat action plan, among others, offer that analyses threat analysis and strategies to deal with habitat loss. Get the voluntary public access program up and running

The impact of recreation on the land and economic impact to local communities



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Funding for private land conservation. Estate taxes. Generational succession of landowners.

Collaboration, funding, allowing third parties to hold conservation easements from all funding sources (including LWCP). Incentives for landowners to be part of the solution.

There are many, many problems of course but to me our biggest challenge is to preserve and restore enough wilderness, open space, and other networks of protected lands to provide for the needs of plants and wildlife in the age of climate change.

Loss of forests

The kick off film says America is "80% urban." That is incorrect. The nation is 80% metropolitan. (60% suburban and 20% urban). You can't conflate those into 80% urban. Very misleading. It undermines those of us living outside the metropolitan areas, but just as importantly in a country where suburbs are resource rich, it undermines our cities and their needs.

Pine Beetle infestation in the west. Lack of Youth participation in Outdoor activities- Conservation

Funding , sprawl, habitat loss, pollution, nature deficit disorder(s), water quality, connectivity, highly stimulating entertainment (computers, media, etc.)

Lack of resources to address the urgent, now-or-never conservation opportunities now facing us.

Loss of critical wildlife habitat, migration corridors, etc. A specific example.. The native prairies. It's also a piece of Americana.

Underfunding is a persistent problem. Having the environment viewed as an impediment to economic interests must be overcome.

The lack of close to home outdoor recreation venues available to youth, especially in and/or close to urban areas

New funding-forest legacy + NAWCA have been outstanding. They should be expanded and used as models. LWCF should be fully funded using additional fees on oil + gas development. These two programs do more to leverage funded dollars than any other.

Global weather change. Polluted water. Pesticides misuse. Endangered Species-Critical habitat

Face them-all of them-vigorously with sound science-use more collective time together effectively day by day-precious time

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Improving the scientific basis for environmental decision-making is one the most critical challenges facing our nation today.

Climate change, loss of biodiversity, open space preservation, water conservation

As the Executive Director of Greening Youth Foundation, a cooperative agreement holder with National Park Service, one thing that I see that is needed is access to fellowship opportunities with the various agencies within the DOI. A fellowship program would be the next logical step for grassroots conservation organizations to connect underserved young adults to conservation careers.

Please continue to have active forums in which we can engage and collaborate with one another. We need to be a support system for each other. Please include Gullah/Leeches as "tribal leaders" and a resource for traditional knowledge. We are willing to work on interpretive pieces that will help "bring to life" the areas we are here to protect and conserve.

How do we do landscape-scale conservation that spans public, private, non-profit and tribal land to address measurable conservation objectives (biodiversity/ecosystem services/ certifiable commodity production/amenities)?

Full and dedicated funding for LWCF with an equal share of the stateside program

Too much emphasis on iconic landscapes - not enough on local or regional; such as Midwest - protect special areas and restore what's been lost - water quality, habitat, climate change. Fragmentation of landscape. Competing goals - biofuels production v. water quality v. habitat.

Young People are detached from nature. Lack of incentives for private landowners.

Conservation of private lands particularly in the eastern U.S.; Climate change

Sprawl development that impacts open space and working landscapes. Loss of wildlife habitat and overall disconnect with nature

1) culture of disconnect where families have no history with the land; and the land in the cities does not speak for itself but rather for crime, pollutions and disinvestment 2) dollars

More dollars... non traditional such as tax credits and cross funding (like ISTEAs enhancement). More coordination and interdisciplinary outreach among agencies. Before you start new programs look at what is out there and think about how to join, several, deepen and fund partnerships

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to get kids off the couch and get them outdoors. We need to protect public lands from external threats (including invasive species)

Innovative outreach-take nature & activities to kids & encourage them to get outdoors after introducing them to the outdoors. In Missouri, our WOW- Wonders Of Wildlife program has been very successful at getting families together outdoors. Our State Park youth corps will introduce a new generation to the outdoors this year.

Increasing population with its appurtenant uses. All of which affect the availability land quality of water, wildlife habitat, and land use.

As our private forests, farms, and ranches face additional challenges associated with a changing climate and a growing need for public benefits to serve an increasing population, they also face growing economic pressures as the land they manage for a combination of conservation and economic benefits becomes less economically competitive.

a lost generation of conservations, inadequate spokespersons, conservation myopia, too many people assuming that the personal experience they had that engaged them in the outdoors applies to everyone

One significant challenge is bringing together, on a local level across the nation, the diverse stakeholders, who can make a true on-the-ground difference to create a shared vision for the future. A vision that reflects and respects the local cultural history and promotes economic development while being sustainable and beneficial to future generations.

Conservation is facing a new paradigm with climate change. With a changing system we can no longer simply conserve lands and waters, but manage toward a new equilibrium that is currently only based on models.

Use this initiative to create a national crusade for conservation that provides a clear and compelling vision, that uses Bill Crown's? Language around the "conservation of shared values" that elevates conservation around the concept of commonality and community and that provides both tax incentives to individuals and financial incentives to communities to actively implement the conservation agenda.

Your leadership on these matters is critical. Thank you, I urge you to continue, to be courageous and risk failure, to embrace landscape-scale initiatives of the Great Regional level, and to know there is a great, natural thirst for re-birth of the values you are promoting-landscape scale, innovative, collaborations. Thank you very much.

Big corporate interests who profits seem to rule over the concerns, livelihoods and interests of the rest of us.

Lack of economic incentives for land protection. Need for green jobs programs

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All of the polls show that most Americans feel that we can not effectively address climate change. As well, they are pessimistic about how well Carson, the Administration, and other government institutions can address our problems.

Many strategies need to be deployed. But one central strategy is to show examples of success. Give the public hope that we can succeed. National Parks are the best places to demonstrate and communicate successful strategies to respond to climate change.

Great Lakes-Water Preservation. Open Space preservation-climate control adaptation. Leap frog development

GIV-Preserving greenways/blueways-Conservation design planning.

Need to fully fund and program urban national parks such as Gateway NRA and help fund city, county, and state efforts to get kids outdoors, learning and exercising, with federal grants for facilities and programs.

Challenge: make the American people full partners in conservation, stewardship + enjoyment of their public + private resources. Conservation= with and for the American people.

Loss of quantity and quality of habitat and natural spaces (rural and urban)

1. Landscape approach to connect communities, economy, and people to places; 2. Outdoor programming - CCC, AmeriCorps, new federal leadership, & environment. Edu.

Continued loss of working farms and natural lands. Loss of food production around urban areas

Federal Estate Tax deferral for working farms and land of conservation value. Permanent Conservation easement tax incentives for farmers

Failure to make better land use decisions, which has created a whole host of environmental, economic, and social dysfunctions. Failure to invest in natural and build infrastructure in existing communities

Land conservation incentives for private lands. Reinvestment in urban infrastructure, particularly transit and storm water. Major investment in metropolitan energy efficiency.

In our city of Pittsburgh, a rustbeet distressed municipality, taking care of the existing 175 park facilities with excellence and finding the money to do this is our biggest challenge. Our private non-profit group is 14 years old and has raised almost \$50 million.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Balancing the need to make access to our resources easier with preserving and protecting these resources. Educating parents and individuals on the benefits of outdoor activities. Parents just don't know how to inspire their kids to take advantage of these resources. I can't stress strongly enough the need to provide local outdoor opportunities within 30 minutes of every children's life and the need to reeducate parents on the benefits and "how to" of outdoor pursuits. camping, fishing, hiking, biking, etc. There is a lost generation of parents who have not been exposed to the outdoors, they cannot be expected to teach their children, what they themselves do not know. they need the tools + resources. Parents will always be the mentors for outdoor activities. We can't replace them.

We have a lot of good programs but we need a coordinated focus by all agencies on youth and educating their parents on outdoor activities "how to" "where to"

More urban parks, less dead malls. [www.redfieldstogreenfields.org](http://www.redfieldstogreenfields.org). [www.moreparks.org](http://www.moreparks.org)

Climate Change and land preservation

Reconnecting youth to America's outdoors and their hunting heritage. Providing increased access to existing public lands. Reform ESA. In its lifetime it has evolved into a tool to block too many things; i.e. states rights to manage wolves. Increased funding for LWCF.

Too many dead malls & outdated factories

"TALK, PPIC, or FDIC" like fund to help finance purchase of bad commercial real estate for new urban parks

A disconnect between Americans, especially children and communities of color, with the great outdoors. People need a sense of place/ownership to appreciate wilderness + nature to serve as future stewards. Climate change- fragmentation.

Nutrient enrichment of waters, from Ag non-point sources

The most important challenge is that most people live in cities and don't have enough opportunities for access or engagement with the outdoors. In particular, young people are missing opportunities to shape their values based on experiences outdoors and relevant to their lives. Combined with sprawling, unplanned development, this problem will only get worse unless steps are taken quickly.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Loss of wild lands and wildlife habitat decline and fragmentation, worsened by the impacts of climate change and invasive species, disease. Need assurance in thinking and attitude by Americans that wild lands are our natural wealth that should not be squandered and abused. Must develop effective and valid/respected mechanisms

Loss of wild lands and wildlife habitat decline and fragmentation, worsened by the impacts of climate change and invasive species, disease. Need assurance in thinking and attitude by Americans that wildlands are our natural wealth that should not be squandered and abused. Must develop effective and valid/respected mechanisms

To expand support we must maintain the legitimacy of already preserved landscapes. An ongoing program for the acquisition of private holdings from willing servers within designated protected areas, such as wilderness, is vital to opening legitimacy.

The forest of the Northern Appalachians, stretching from New York to Nova Scotia is one of the largest, relatively un-fragmented, temperate forests in the world. (80 million acres) protecting and connecting this Eastern wilderness should be a DOI priority.

Climate change. Lack of full appreciation of the value of wild lands.

Invasive Species are one of America's greatest threats on conserving our great outdoors.

Education is a proven method to slow the invasion. President Obama should consider an Executive Order to stop the spread on all Federal Lands

Increasing minimum impact access opportunities for children and families.

Strategies: have wilderness protection and wildlife corridors -- be part of Great Outdoors Initiative. We cannot be bullied by the radical right. The majority of Americans find their own sense of democracy tied to the land. We need to honor the vision: like Stewart Udall as a great visionary and Secretary of Interior who honored conservation as a bipartisan concern.

An over abundance of predators are causing significant declines in game herds out west. This reduces hunter opportunity, millions in conservation dollars via lost license sales and loss of jobs and rural economies. An exponential problem.

1) trust in the federal land managers 2) climate change, wildfire, water scarcity, insect and disease 3) Loss of conservation skills in Rural America 4) Increasing poverty in rural America, especially adjacent to public lands

Loss of habitat, Money, Science

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Great American Outdoors Initiative. The LCC effort to provide GIS and science and huge partnerships to leverage \$. You are on the right track. Find money.

Ask more of for-profit businesses to better work together and how we can be of better use in conservation. Our goal is to get 6 M kids into the great outdoors through multiple partnerships.

Want to thank \_\_\_\_\_ for working so hard towards conservation. Take away our gratitude.

Land and water conservation fund needs permanent funding. Better distribution of funding and flexibility to apply the funding better. When energy bills are passed, we need that profit to be reinvested into conservation programs and projects.

Drakes estero. Pastoral and wilderness zones must be protected. Oystery owner wants the permit to expire to push a commercial operation and we do not want the permit to expire.

Motorized vehicle users are unfairly victimized because people believe we detract from conservation. We use it to get our families outdoors and means of transportation for those who are disabled. Brings economic viability to forests and deserts. Gets kids outdoors.

We need a better financial investment in getting kids to the outdoors

Private lands conservation must be an important part of protecting the working landscape. Want to participate in grants.

Need better management in the delta area. The future of the delta lies in education and we want to play a role in designed future plans for the delta.

Keep permitting access to public lands and support the multiple-use concept. All public lands should be available to our citizens with no limitations.

Fishing is 3rd most popular outdoor activity in the US. Fishing licenses dropped a few years ago. Our foundation gets funding from federal govt to support increase in fishing. Anglers Legacy Program pushes everyone (parents, teachers, etc) to take kids fishing to get them interested. We want to work with federal govt and states to get more kids out fishing. Lets join forces. We need more fish in rivers and streams as well.

Need more accessibility of open space for kids. Better balance of property rights in the berryessa snow mountain range for more access to kids.

More easements needed to better protect the environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We want to encourage you to make your programs more accessible for youth on public lands projects.

Currently working on water systems in regards to Eurasian mussels. Water infestation in lake meade and lake havisu. Must address more containment on invasive species. Will help habitat by federal govt taking a more proactive role in containment.

Opposition to berryessa snow mountain designation. Fosters poaching and trespassing. It is already protected and this designation only has a negative impact.

Supports land and water conservation fund. Needs to ensure that it is fully funded. • Establish a national pool for national insurance emergency fund.

Bring oaks back into the landscape. Plant them more along roads. They will create better habitat for insect and birds.

Pay attention to grassroots efforts to protect maculany river. Sacred agricultural sites. Value to wildlife. We need to better protect it.

We need more bicycle access and safer trails. More kids and women will get out and bike if we have better infrastructure (Amtrak should allow bringing bicycles onboard to be easier) to get people to the wilderness on their bikes and ensure that the trails are safe.

Challenge to get people to know about conservation lands. No clear policy directive for BLM to manage more consistent national landscape.

Need better corridors for motorized vehicles to avoid wildlife.

We support sustainable private lands. Need more partnerships with federal govt for better private ownership landscapes. Estate tax reform needs more support.

Need to protect fisheries for bass and trout. • DC must provide encouragement to replace unnatural community lighting to enhance the night sky.

Need more environmental education to get more kids outside. Federal grant program needed to support more environmental education around the US. Need more transportation to get more kids outside – more buses.

Must employ more inner city, at risk youth. Get them out of their communities and into the outdoors. Support more paid work opportunities.

We need to better support land trust organizations. They protect ag lands, waterways, etc. You must allow land trusts to hold conservation easements.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

National wildlife refuges need to be less isolated. From the sacramento river to the coast range the refuges need to be more accessible.

3M people participate in our group. MOUs with BLM and others allow us to do projects on forest and public lands. We work to build more sustainable trails. We protect wide open spaces. We need more trail upkeep. Increase in mountain biking supports more kids getting out into the outdoors. Need more money for trail upkeep too. King Range supported by Thompson – thanks.

F-Prioritize and fund outdoor service learning opportunities in schools followed by opportunities for youth training programs after graduation that offer EQUAL scholarship opportunities similar to the military GI bill.

G-Providing local opportunities for outdoor jobs and careers (growing your own food, A community initiative to restore and renew vacant lots, use local building and construction companies, community grants etc.)

B-Campus recruiting for environmental jobs at career fairs, etc. - making jobs more accessible, desirable, and cool. Going out and engaging youth - not just being there - really working to connect

C-Funding for more accessible afterschool outdoors programs from private (like North Face) and public (education + park & recreation) partnerships.

I-Get the government out to clean up the toxic waste so we can provide safe and clean spaces for the outdoors - clean it up for the people there - environmental justice.

F-More youth should be involved, events in the morning planning it (9-12) except - not on Sunday mornings, because people have family obligations.

H-Lack of parental and school promotion of the outdoors with their kids.

L-Lack of family influence and awareness about the outdoors.

E-Electronic entertainment such as computers, videogames, television etc. Too much focus on technology why go outside" "the inside is so comfy".

D-Lack of exposure, resources, awareness, fun and adventure family and community support to get outdoors.

A-Negative ideas surrounding the outdoors as dangerous cultural impressions of the outdoors can impede recreation

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

C-Misinformed perceptions including safety hazards, access, and lack of perceived value in the outdoor experience and lack of health benefits.

I-Urban environments don't help to encourage parents to let their children outside - safety and availability.

B-Lack of information between what to do, where to go and how to be safe.

J-Lack of a perceived benefit and exposure to being outdoors.

F-The way media defines and portrays the outdoors, creates a preconceived notion of danger, separation, the dichotomy of extreme adventure and underestimating activity, and the lack of an accessible medium.

G-Lack of outdoor role models/mentors (i.e. a celebrity for role models).

F-I would like to gain new skills in outdoor recreation (pitching a tent, starting a fire, identifying plants and animals, etc.) but are not sure how.

I-People who live in urban areas care less about the environment/conservation than people living in rural areas.

A-I would recreate outdoors (bike, hike, run, swim, fish, hunt, rock climb) but there aren't any places within 3 miles of my home or apartment to do them.

Young people today are more interested in their technology and "X-Boxes" than the outdoors.

Outdoor classes a requirement in schools and make sure that after school programs are funded well enough to be accessible to all kids.

Pass legislation for environmental education (this is a current bill in congress) pass environmental literacy plans to implement environmental education nation-wide.

Have environmental education part of the curriculum at schools and make outdoor time as well as hands on outdoor classes mandatory.

Lack of parental and school promotion of the outdoors with their kids.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lack of family influence and awareness about the outdoors.

Electronic entertainment such as computers, videogames, television etc. Too much focus on technology "why go outside" "the inside is so comfy".

Bring nature back to the city - urban/nature are two separate things - perception. This creates a problem and nature becomes less accessible for all people and requires resources people don't have and can't afford.

Providing local opportunities for outdoor jobs and careers (growing your own food, A community initiative to restore and renew vacant lots, use local building and construction companies, community grants etc.)

Promote safer parks with free events and youth programs, have schools partner with the youth programs to get kids outdoors.

Create natural play areas in structured environments such as schools.

Partner with universities to provide internship credits for students who help educate, provide recreation experiences, mentor the youth on outdoor issues.

Create an outdoor ambassador internship that provides training and encourages teachers to incorporate the outdoors into the curriculum within their school.

Create and promote free family outdoor events where they can get active outdoors and obtain free local outdoor experiences.

Creating a political platform that focuses on outdoor experiential education curriculum requirements for schools.

We must create a social norm that moves away from electronic companionship and moves toward outdoor experiences that inherently fulfill youth's physical, mental, and spiritual needs.

Find and foster role-modeling relationships (mentors) that involve the outdoors in communities.

Incorporate the outdoors into standard curriculums through field trips & life skills.

Funding for more accessible afterschool outdoors programs from private (like North Face) and public (education + park & recreation) partnerships.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Advocate with dept of education & bigger organizations to get funding for Environmental and Outdoor Education programs in schools/classes and provide scholarships to get people involved in the programs. (ie: afterschool programs).

Get the government out to clean up the toxic waste so we can provide safe and clean spaces for the outdoors - clean it up for the people there - environmental justice.

Holding free and safe outdoor events at schools in communities to get neighbors outside.

Create safe, green spaces for kids and families to exercise and grow their own food within their communities by inspiring and supporting local outdoor leaders and sustaining those positions by offering internships/jobs/money/support.

Safer and easier access to parks, fitness opportunities, and outlets.

Website and cell phone initiatives. Outdoor Volunteer website paired with non profits. Phone - take cell phone pictures of areas that can use a project and send it to local agency that supports the above website

Mineralogical societies

Represent "rockhounds"

Multiple use concept

Conservation and recreation are compatible and desirable

Use is not abuse

Conservation priorities

Delta region is endangered

High unemployment rates for young adults, esp people of color

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Need opportunities to employ urban youth in outdoor settings

Natural area access open space and parks underscore public support for open space

Drake's Estero wilderness designation

Pastoral zones, wilderness zones, potential wilderness zones

Commercial oyster permit expires in 2012

Conflict between commercial operation and wilderness use

Water rights private property rights

Oppose Berryessa snow mtn designation

Negative impacts to private lands

Trespassing poaching, fire hazard

Already protected,

No additional protection needed

Local governments are concerned about designations

Before designation goes forward need support from local government

Private property owners

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Can we reestablish elk population in off-road vehicle park?

Need support from outdoors initiative

Need more fish

Increase agency funding for dam relicensing projects

Cache Creek visit

Wants to keep environment safe for future access for family

No clear policy directive for BLM management

Accessibility of open space is essential to human experience

Need federal resources to move forward with Berryessa Snow Mtn area

Need open space nearby

Motor rec unfairly vilified as detracting from conservation

Closing trails and areas to motor rec

Trails are overtaxed

Illegal dams and spring developments endanger anadromous fish populations

Native trout, small mouth bass are in the area

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Healthy ecosystem and healthy fisherman

Night sky is a resource

Encourage towns to replace modern streetlights to allow people to see night sky

Stebbins Cold Canyon

Fully fund land and water conservation funds

USFS establish national pool for volunteer liability insurance

Needed to help promote volunteerism

Growing population puts demands on resources need to limit population growth

Threatened plants in the area

NWR's need to be less isolated

Need more connectivity

How to connect Sac River via refuges to coast range to enhance value

Invasive quagga and zebra mussels

Sources of infestation are Federal jurisdiction waters

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

we must remember that, in addition to protecting our outdoors spaces for the next generation, we all must also share in the job of encouraging our young people to develop their own relationships with nature, and to inspire them to take up their own banner of protecting and preserving the land they will someday inherit.

we live in a world where too many young people often have no opportunity to experience the joys of our natural world. The unfortunate reality is that, for these young people, video games and indoor activities are common practice and there is no bond with the rhythms of nature. The result is a generation that lacks this important connection. Children and families need natural areas within easy reach of our cities. The Rio Grande Nature Center or a neighborhood park, a special place like Tingley Beach or the river or the bosque - some accessible natural environment that provides that crucial connection.

Non-point pollutants focused on quality/health environment

Engage the entire family, connect with kids at a younger age, kids with parents, don't assume you know what is best

Engage volunteers to work and adopt trail sections

Loss of public lands funding to support infrastructure - "Green Zing" (green experience online)

Opportunities for information exchange; where do you get federal funding?

In reaching out to minority groups and youth, it is extremely important to be able to relate to their situations and experiences -- most programs that attempt to connect with youth and minorities really fail to understand those populations, which makes them less likely to participate in similar events in the future

Environmental education -- people are not aware of opportunities around home -- take information to the people. If people don't understand their own environment, they likely will not care about a distance environment

Change the language that we use to talk about youth, remove artificial barriers

Landscape scape conservation - knit together landscapes

Restore large wetland complex



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

don't wait 100+ years to have this type of discussion, trickle down from event, put spotlight of partners, volunteers

Parents don't know how to camp, state program to show parents how to camp so they can take their kids

Foster conversations between wildlife, environmental, private property

Technical assistance/best management practices

Children need environmental literacy

Some degree of land restriction is positive -- there can be negative consequences to opening access to all lands

Extremely important to know the historical context and where we fit into it today

Legacy of stewardship through generations. Have to talk about parents and youth together

Kinds are overprogrammed -- need for a resume by 16 years old

No public transportation, no affordable transportation, entrance fees

Rangers bore kids to death. Need to be cooperative work -- rangers come to communities

The opportunity to connect with the outdoors is not available for many people; accessibility

Most organizations don't have enough funding to expand their activities to help facilitate the goals of AGO

Very few entry level positions in conservation related fields exist due to lack of funding; creates a barrier to the involvement of younger demographic

Lack of agricultural connection to land at family level; success --> guest ranches, wildlife training during recreation/fun

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Bankers under 35 want clean technology conservation and want to see these initiatives make money, encourage great leaders to promote these things in the economy

2008 Farm Bill -- socially disadvantaged farmers formed an alliance and made sure that conservation came back to communities with 30% advanced pay that was advanced to people/groups who could not afford to start conservation efforts on their own

Don't compete with programs that are already doing good things -- just because federal government doesn't know about it, doesn't mean it's not a good program

Conservation and stewardship hampered by partisanship - tax credits needed

Lack of research on experience changes behavior

Engage people in such a way that they understand and believe they can do something about conservation - connect via pride in the outdoors

Dedicated funding for this purpose, whether LWCF or otherwise, is critical for states to conserve land and continue connecting growing populations to the outdoors. Stateside LWCF funding has been substantially reduced over the past 5-10 years and general taxpayer funding has been reduced substantially for the Colorado Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation, which has reduced our capacities to meet needs in these areas. Conservation and recreation can be odd at times. However, outdoor recreation is the conduit by which we connect current and future generations connect to the outdoors, and quality natural settings are necessary if we are to conduct these activities. Conservation and outdoor recreation partners need to continue to work together to further shared goals. We need more coordination and collaboration between federal & state agencies, and local governments and other outdoor recreation and conservation stakeholders. Institutional barriers need to be broken down so all parties can be on the same page. Additional outdoor recreation planning expertise integrated within all levels of land use planning will also ensure that more connections to the outdoors are available for the public to enjoy and benefit from.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What We Glean from the Ag Census Data. When most people think of agriculture in New York State, they think of “upstate”, not the Hudson Valley, which long has been subjected to intense development pressure from commuters and second home owners. But in fact, according to the Census of Agriculture, in 2007 there were 848,214 acres of farmland in the Hudson Valley. That is equivalent to more than 1,300 square miles of land. This is an extraordinary resource, especially in light of its proximity to New York City. 17% of the land in the region is farmland – again an impressive figure given that the percentage for the entire state was 24. Collectively, the Valley’s farms had sales of \$510,322,000 – more than one-half billion dollars. Think of the impact of this money recirculating in the local and regional economy – and the negative impact if it were to be lost. Yet until very recently agriculture has been the “invisible economy” - overlooked in the context of economic development efforts that sought the “silver bullet” of new industrial development. Meanwhile, these farmers – critical small businesspeople – struggled to receive the support that they need and deserve from economic development and related agencies.

Now for the sobering side of this story: the average net cash income for the Valley’s farmers was \$13,624. That is only 42% of the NY State average net cash farm income of \$32,533. This reflects many things, including the high costs of doing business in a metropolitan region. Clearly this is not sustainable without a family member working off the farm or other sources of income.

The continuing loss of farmland, at a time when the importance of fresh locally produced food is becoming increasingly apparent as a matter of public health and food security, indicates the need to take action on every level to support the economic viability of the region’s farmers.

Our understanding of the importance of local community engagement was confirmed recently by a study undertaken by land use attorney Joel Russell. Over the years Mr. Russell has helped several towns in the Valley design zoning intended to encourage agriculture. Last year he undertook an assessment of which of these efforts had been effective and why. He concluded that farmland protection zoning by itself is never sufficient to preserve farmland. Instead, he found that communities with successful farmland protection programs have a distinctive culture, in which farming, farmers, and farmland are valued for their own sake, and not just for scenic value or as a way to prevent residential or commercial development.

Mr. Russell’s conclusion buttresses the results of a study Glynwood undertook in conjunction with the analysis of the 2002 Agricultural Census Data for the Valley. We found that “ ...other areas of the country that have been working to strengthen their regional food systems have found that it is important to develop a widespread, fundamental and passionate belief that agriculture must be part of the region’s future. This belief galvanizes the community and policy makers to support agriculture and gives the farmers the confidence they need to persevere.”

As explained above, the Hudson Valley is characterized by many dispersed, small and mid-size farmers. Over the past several decades, as much of the nation’s agricultural economy has shifted toward consolidation and commodity production, the network of small-scale processing and distribution infrastructure on which smaller, independent farmers depend has seriously frayed. As a result, it has become increasingly difficult for many farmers to reach markets efficiently, which discourages optimal production and reduces farm viability.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For example, the Valley grows good grass and is a good place for pasturing livestock. The market for meat from pastured animals is very strong and growing, as more consumers understand its health and environmental benefits. But it is hard for producers to reach this market because there are too few USDA licensed slaughterhouses nearby. Glynwood's farm manager must schedule appointments 9 to 12 months in advance, often for only one or two steer at a time, then travel 150 miles round trip first to deliver the animals, then to pick up the meat. This certainly contributes to the fact that high quality meat from regional farmers is much higher priced than meat from the industrial system. It also reduces the amount of regional meat that is produced. A recent study in Massachusetts, in a region quite similar to the Hudson Valley, found that nearly 60% of the farmers who responded to their survey projected increases in the number of animals they would bring for slaughter and processing with "better access to a reliable USDA-inspected facility". Between 45 and 80% of the farms who responded (depending on the species) indicated that they would expand their capacity and these increases would result in production per species for most farms more than doubling.<sup>4</sup> Our less formal survey of producers in the Hudson Valley suggested a similar pent up opportunity for increased production of pastured livestock

However, to help set the stage for these young people (or others who are transitioning into farming as a career) to be successful over the long haul, we must begin to provide a more comprehensive training and mentoring program. Glynwood and our colleagues at the Stone Barns Center for Food and Agriculture are collaborating on the development of a new farmer training curriculum that will be launched in stages beginning this winter. It will be a serious, though initially limited, response to a growing need and opportunity. We view it as an extension of the work that both organizations are currently doing to support the CRAFT (Collaborative Regional Alliance for Farmer Training) program in the region. With more resources, a more comprehensive program could – and we hope will - be developed.

Another barrier for access for new farmers is the high cost of farmland, which can range up to \$10,000 per acre. However, there are increasing numbers of people who have purchased former farmland as a second home who are now interested in having it farmed. But they don't know how to determine what their land is suited for or identify a farmer and establish a long-term relationship. Glynwood has worked with some of these owners and understands their needs. Land trusts also know many of the owners who are interested in having their land farmed. But there is no overall training program that 'graduates' new entry farmers who we know have the skills to successfully begin farming this land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Yet agriculture in the Valley is profoundly different from the type of agriculture on which the federal government has focused its attention and financial support in past decades. The “get big or get out” mantra did not suit this region and never will. The farmers of this landscape – producing environmental and economic benefits while they produce the food we need – are small and mid-size farmers, many with very diverse production. If the USDA is to be a more effective partner for them and for this region it must find ways to support and encourage this type and scale of farming. What it accomplishes in doing so can be replicated where this type of farming still exists near other major metropolitan centers as well, with profound and lasting impacts

Farmers in the Hudson Valley often feel that government agencies at all level, including the federal, do not respect their importance to the local economy or the potential they hold to strengthen the food system in the metropolitan area. Yet it is hard to make the case for their importance because the best data we have is from the Ag Census. And while it is extremely useful - as evidenced above, we use it to the fullest extent possible - it does not adequately capture detailed information about the kind of farming we have in this region: small and mid-size farmers with mixed production. So we don't have enough clarity in the data as it applies to our smaller, diversified farmers who are making a living at farming.

For example, farmers often indicate their frustration with government sponsored credit and insurance programs. While there may be funding available, the application processes are often onerous and seem overly complicated, likely reflecting the fact that the funds which are critically needed by these farmers are far less than the amounts generally sought through these programs, larger sums that may appropriately require more paperwork

the Ag Census data has some limitations. Agriculture is the “invisible economy” – the money farmers spend on locally available services and supplies can have a major impact on the local community. One informal survey that we conducted in the Hudson Valley showed that \$1.25 million of the local farmers' expenses was spent right there in that community. It was an eye-opening discovery. How about asking them where they spent it? Even a general percentage of dollars spent within the region would give us a powerful sense of the strong role that farmers play in our local economies.

The new inclusion in 2007 of farm typologies took a step in the right direction by correlating things like farm sales and the primary occupation of the farmer. It shows us how many farms are being operated by someone with another career, vs. farmers who rely on farming for their livelihood, and their general level of sales. We need to have more information related to this kind of scheme. We need to be able to filter information by typology, but also show what farmers in each typology category are producing, what they're spending, how big their farms are, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Census uses industrial classification codes to categorize farms according to their principal production. However, many of our farmers in the Hudson Valley practice diversified agriculture – meaning, a combination of things at once. This may provide a way to diversify income, spread risk and/or try to develop new products. But if a farm has sales split across a few different sectors (vegetables, poultry, and goats for example) they are classified in the catchall “Other” categories. We suggest that the USDA consider adding some greater specificity so that the Census could better illustrate the vital role of diversified agriculture.

2. Providing incentives, investments and policies to support the strategic conservation of working forest landscapes.

a. I believe the biggest thing that could be done here is to abolish the death (AKA estate) tax. Most American farms and forests are owned by private families. Due to inflation, the nominal value of the land continues to rise thus forcing owners into ever higher levels of taxation where it becomes increasingly necessary to sell off acreage in order to pay the estate taxes. This is counter productive to long term conservation of working forest landscapes.

After indicating I would come to the Grappone Conference Center in New Hampshire I now find my schedule will not allow me to do so. Hence my written comments are below. I have briefly commented on the five breakout group sessions. I trust that you have the ability to see that these comments get into the record?

1. Promoting markets for wood products etc.

a. I believe the Federal EPA has made a grave mistake in their final PSD tailoring rule which treats biogenic Co2 the same as fossil fuel Co2 emissions. This will have the negative effect of ruling out biomass as a fuel source for electrical generation or combined heat and power. Reconsideration of this rule could go a long way in incentivising more investment/jobs in the forest products sector. As it now stands the EPA ruling only hurts working forests. Better to do nothing than to do those things that hurt American working forests.

I am opposed to the idea of "working forests." I want forests to be allowed to regenerate naturally, and I don't want for them to be managed like crops.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing in regards to the "America's Great Outdoors Initiative" and the Concord, New Hampshire public listening session on "working forests."

Overpopulation of this country is a problem that our national parks, forests and wetlands should not have to endure. There are VERY few virgin timber stands left in America, we logged the American Chestnut to extinction as its numbers were not great enough that it could rebound from the blight imported to this country. As I am certain you are aware, you MUST protect this country as best as you can, I am POSITIVE that you are being met with great opposition - if your intent is to have the national forests be more accessible to visitors while protecting their splendor, I urge you to spell it out clearly. Hunters, hikers, campers, and non-motorized horse, dog sled and bikers should be welcomed into the lands, however, industry should not. The mountains in eastern KY are being destroyed at an alarming rate, these are not WORKING mountains any more, they are vanishing. BE SURE this does NOT HAPPEN TO OUR FORESTS!

Recognize that broad eco-systems are at stake and must be addressed beyond any particular state's preferences. The red rain that falls on the denver area and covers cars, houses, and my expensive photovoltaic solar panels so that the sun can no longer reach them originates in abusive "historic" land practices---read over-grazing---in the Utah desert. If "scientific management" is the guide, why is this happening? Barren drilling and mining sites likewise destroy the land and water. Have we learned nothing from the Dust Bowl of the 30s? Specifics relating to these broad recommendations abound. We now need to move forward.

Productive natural resources are vital for the well-being of the individual rancher, the local, state and national economies...society as a whole. A healthy rangeland provides for a healthy watershed and a renewable resource. Ranching sustains open spaces and aesthetic feature which contribute to recreational opportunities, food production, healthy environmental systems, and ecological sustainability. - Excerpts from the Colorado Cattlemen's Association Resource Stewardship Code of Ethics.

Currently the LWCF does not allow private land trusts or conservation organizations to utilize funding for conservation projects We would request this be removed.

Limitation on conservation tools and initiatives that landowners are requesting, such as term environmental market agreements. Regulations are still the preferred method of achieving conservation goals as opposed to voluntary incentives. Incentives have been shown to outperform, at significantly lower cost to tax payers, than regulations that have unintended and far-reaching consequences.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The 1965 Land and Water Conservation Fund Act requires the preparation of a statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plan (SCORP) in order for states to receive SWCF funds. Every five years, all 50 states and territories develop and submit a SCORP to the NPS. Each federal resource agency has its own planning legislation and regulations, promulgated by NEPA. Our federal agencies develop plans for their own jurisdiction. That is, federal agencies are not authorized or responsible for statewide comprehensive planning. The LWCF SCORP program was administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation for a decade, then shifted to the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service until HCRS was disbanded in 1981, and is administered today by 1.5 FTE within the NPW WO. The nature of administering the SCORP program has gone from a proactive, collaborative, interagency resource/support program to simply a LWCF stateside grants program (i.e., a check the box program). Along with the 30-year shift in program administration from a federal Bureau to 1.5 FTE, LWCF funding during this time has been erratic and declining. The relatively few dollars on the stateside has influenced the quality, integrity and utility of SCORPs. That is, today SCORPs are largely viewed as simply an administrative requirement necessary to secure stateside LWCF funding.

It is commonly recognized by the NPS and the National Association of Recreation Resource Planners that the number of "good" SCORP plans in the nation is few. The SCORPs recently prepared by Colorado, Wisconsin, Oregon, Georgia, and Virginia are commendable. The declining respect and utility of SCORPs over the years is recognized by others, and thus involvement and collaboration in the planning process by our federal agencies has waned. The LWCF Act provides minimal guidance for what a SCORP should contain, but does allow the Secretary of the Interior to add additional requirements as deemed appropriate, both in process and context.

By way of background, all New England today faces profound threats to its land and natural-resource base. Climate change and its impacts on the region's biodiversity and agricultural and forest economies, fragmentation of the landscape from sprawling development and generational turnover in farm and forest operations, and all-but-unlimited demand for coastal property threaten the viability of the plants, animals, and resource-based industries and communities that depend on them. These forces also threaten the human experience of our natural world. As a marker of change, tourism now eclipses forestry and farming as a source of employment in the region's rural places, even while tourism depends directly upon the very quality of the landscape and the vitality of local industry. As the nation urbanizes, efforts to re-create elsewhere what New England has long enjoyed come even as our own qualities of the landscape are in peril. Happily, growing public awareness of climate change and its impacts, the role farms and forests play as carbon sinks, the greatly increased demand for locally-grown foods and the resurgence of small-scale, community-based agriculture raise the urgency of and public receptivity to effective conservation initiatives.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What's happening: Because of a warming climate, mountain pine beetles now survive longer at higher elevations, allowing them to infest trees they do not normally infest in any significant numbers. These trees are Whitebark Pine, and they are the keystone tree species of the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem - 20 million acres of wilderness that includes Yellowstone National Park, Grand Teton National Park, the National Elk Refuge, and six national forests. Whitebarks are the equivalent of the Rockies' redwoods. They are ancient, stalwart trees, populating the wind-ranked plateaus and ridgetops of the ecosystem, and they are the Giving Tree of the GYE: their seeds (from their cones) are the most nutritious seeds in the entire system. Grizzly Bears depend on these seeds, and their loss could mean the loss of the griz from the northern Rockies. In the past decade, 95% of all white bark forests in the GYE have become infested with mountain pine beetle.

4. Contrary to what some may say, there are thousands of family farms and ranches across the West that are threatened with the possibility that the land may be lost to pay the estate tax after a death in the family. There are several proposals being suggested to address this, including one by our Congressman John Salazar. We urge you to take this point into consideration in your recommendations.

5. Finally, we urge you to make the conservation easement income tax incentive permanent. Nationally, this single incentive nearly doubled the pace of land conservation since it was instituted in 1996. In closing, we have the opportunity to protect the West's iconic working ranch landscapes, but only if we work with private agricultural landowners. Based on our success and the backlog of conservation projects waiting for funding, the landowners are ready and we have the appropriate tools to accomplish this work. We simply lack the funding to allow all of us to accomplish our conservation goals. Thank you again for coming to Colorado to listen to our vision for conservation.

Besides NAWCA, we would like to indicate our strong support for the conservation provisions of the Farm Bill, soon to be considered for reauthorization. We strongly endorse the restoration of baseline funding for Wetland Reserve Program and the inclusion of an additional working lands provisions that will allow grazing rights and encourage more and diverse agricultural participation in key waterfowl habitat areas. The "Sodsaver" provisions of the Farm Bill, weakened in 2008, must be revised if the Prairie Potholes are to remain the continent's waterfowl nursery, while the Conservation Reserve Program and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program also need to be strengthened.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To help move this effort forward, we request that you facilitate a meeting with Nancy Sutley, Chair of the Council on Environment Quality (CEQ), where we might explain this program and the critical role that CEQ could play in helping to coordinate the support of various administrative agencies in implementing the Initiative. For example, there are also excellent opportunities associated with the 2010 Farm Bill to modify existing USDA programs like the Farm and Ranch Protection Program to achieve our goals. Coordination between NOAA and the natural Resources conservation Service would be most helpful. Our SLRAI represents something that we can do now about climate change that would likely be supported by the agricultural community, the commercial and sports fishing community, conservationists and sportsmen but we need to raise awareness in the Administration and coordinate a variety of existing programs in a number of agencies. This is an appropriate role for CEQ.

In California, water supply is always an issue with respect to wetland conservation. The Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) almost two decades ago held great promise, providing water allocations for both wintering habitat and for summer irrigation that provides the waterfowl food, and mandating the construction of the needed water conveyance facilities. Yet, we have seen a declining amount of summer water and very little activity in construction of conveyance, all the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation. We need a commitment from this Administration that the Bureau will make good on its legal obligations.

Finally, given the significant role that we foresee conservation easements having in not only sea level rise adaptation, but in preserving wetlands throughout the country, we strongly recommend that the Administration supports current legislation in Congress to enhance tax incentives expired at the end of 2009. They need to be renewed and made permanent. There is support for this legislation from both major parties.

The primary obstacle to achieving goals for recreation and reconnecting people to the outdoors has to do with the "definition of what constitutes a Road". The definition normally used does not define what a "Road" is, but what "Roadless" is. Below is the accepted use: The term "road" when applied to wilderness is a specific legal term based on the clear intent of congress, as specified during discussion and passage of the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA). Accordingly, BLM uses the following road definition derived from the House Report accompanying FLPMA: The work 'roadless' refers to the absence of roads which have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use. A way maintained solely by the passage of vehicles does not constitute a road. (Report 94-1163, page 17, May 15, 1976)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Further Icarification is provided by minutes from a House Public Lands Subcommittee session, where the above report language was discussed: Rep. Steiger: "Mr. Chairman, if I may, and I would confine this to the report, but I would like to spell out, which I gather was never done in the Wilderness Act, what we are talking about when we talk about a road. I think the accepted deal in the Forest Service is that it is a graveled and graded road and that sort of thing. As far as I am concerned, I think we are talking about a road that is in any way maintained and improved, a dirt road improved by grading, or the placing of culverts, or by the making of bar ditches and that sort of thing. I don't think we mean jeep trails and that sort of thing, and there is a difference" (House Public Lands Subcommittee Markup Session of Sept. 22, 1975, pp. 329-332). The road definition in the House report was clearly intended to delineate which vehicle routes would disqualify wilderness study areas and which would not. Furthermore, it is clear that Congress intended that vehicle routes that do not meet this definition of road should not exclude an area from wilderness consideration, for protection as a wilderness study area, or for designation as wilderness.

Yet because of the predominate "conservationist" (read "preservationist") views of the majority of Public Land Management employees, they have twisted the words "of roads which have been improved and maintained by mechanical means to insure relatively regular and continuous use." to mean that "the road must have continuous and regular mechanical maintenance." By that definition, many state and county roads could be included in a designated Wilderness. Some might argue that many city streets would not merit the name "road" for lack of maintenance. By way of example, in the recently designated Dominguez Wilderness Area south of Grand Junction, Colorado, just inside the north east border is a "constructed road" proceeding through a new BLM gate that runs up the side of a mesa to and around Triangle Mesa. This "road" has been dozed deep into the side-hill as it ascends to the top of the mesa. These deep gouges into the hill side will take hundreds of years in the desert environment to become unnoticeable from across the small valley where the new Wilderness boundary lies.

For this reason, the whole "roadless study" (RARE I, RARE II, and more recent studies) required by the Wilderness Act have been faulty from the beginning. Many "roadless areas" are not "roadless". Not now nor back in the 1970s when most of these "studies" began. The proof is still there for anyone of honesty and integrity to see.

The fact that a land management agency elects to abandon or close a road or an area has absolutely nothing to do with the FACT that it is and was a road.

With the wanton closures and "designations" being perpetrated by land management and Congress on the advice of those agencies, the remaining open areas and roads are under more and more pressure due to the confinement of people attempting to recreate into smaller and smaller areas. As more and more miles of existing roads, trails, and areas are closed to motorized use, the growing numbers of users have fewer roads, trails, and areas of public land to access by their preferred method. By confining all these users in this manner, the remaining open roads, trails, and areas are seeing much faster degradation from overuse, therefore forcing land management to close more areas for "reclamation".

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

*(cont.)*

A current "policy" of the USFS and BLM is to look at all inventoried roads and trails not having a "loop" effect. The thinking goes something like this: If the road or trail comes to an end with no exit, it must be closed. What they fail to see in this policy is that when one comes to the end of one of these roads or trails, they will invariably see a whole new country on the return trip. These spur roads offer the recreating public a way of "getting off the beaten path" and finding a place with at least "semi-solitude" even with their vehicle close by. The end of a spur road invariably is what the road was built for in the first place. Historical interests are found at the end of the road. They don't "just go out there". There was a reason for stopping there. Even if it is simply an overlook now, the end of most spur roads are interesting. People with disabilities are most affected by this policy of "loop roads". How are they going to achieve solitude when all that is left open to motorized travel is a "loop road" that everyone in the entire area is using? The answer is obvious... they cannot!

Even people on a bicycle will look for a road or trail where they don't have 100-cars per hour passing them and raising dust for them to breathe. The "conservation first" way of looking at public land management has many short-comings. First, just what are we "conserving" this land for by closing it to motorized traffic? If in excess of 90% of the public wanting to utilize their "public lands" for whatever recreation they choose arrive by motor vehicle, who is the winner after a closure has been implemented? Certainly not the overwhelming majority of the recreating public! The only people winning by these closures are people with a political agenda and those looking to exert "power over the majority", often one and the same.

"The act to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the permanent good of the whole people, and for other purposes." This is the "purpose" of the Wilderness Act. One question they did not address... "when is there enough Wilderness?" When does the Wilderness "process" become "watered down" and bastardized to the degradation of the meaning of the word simply to satisfy the whims of a few willing to degrade the whole process? As for "reconnecting people to the outdoors", what message is carried to someone hearing the area is "Closed"? "You cannot drive in the area" Does that sound like the first choice most people would gravitate to? If most of the area surrounding a city is "closed to motorized use", what possible reason would anyone with an ATV, motorcycle, Jeep, or even a mountain bike in many cases have for traveling to that area?

When all of public lands are closed to motorized use, why would anyone want a new ATV? How many jobs will be lost in the manufacture, sales, and maintenance sectors of the economy?

Many of the management techniques being taught presently do not work in the "real world". If you listen to retired land management people, most will admit the policies are wrong and should be changed. Let people who have local management experience be the ones who make the policies. Not some "desk jockey" in Washington DC or some professional politician who has never even heard of the area!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is not a reasonable "one-size-fits-all" policy when it comes to Land Management. Seldom to two areas have the same physical or political issues to deal with. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior are political appointments. They normally don't have any "real" qualifications to make policy for local areas and they surly do not have knowledge of the local area issues. Again, let us have a balanced approach with a balanced panel of "very experienced" (20 years or more) LOCAL land managemnet leaders and local governments make the local policies and have them implemented by a more balanced population of personnel in each local office. It is perfectly clear that the present arrangement of management is not working for the betterment of our public lands.

Forests are being decimated by bug infestations which lead to wildfires because present policies have precluded logging and other uses of the renewable resources. Proper land management would include select logging in areas with mature trees. Newer technologies and machinery can and should be used to "manage" these resources. It can and will help make the forests more:

- Healthy
- protect them from huge wildfires and insects
- promote local economies with jobs
- promote income from resource sales to the federal government
- protect watersheds
- promote recreation opportunities

In other words, everybody wins... except the "Preservationists" who will not be satisfied no matter what you do.

2. Every user type should have an equal voice. Quit the "dismissal of motorized users" attitude... and yes, it does exist! We are a legitimate use of public lands and should not be treated like a pariah in meetings and offices. We've heard the comments made after meetings with land management personnel and do not appreciate the prevalent attitude of the majority of Public land management personnel. If we had "Our way", many of you would not be welcome in the office either.

5. find some way to minimize interference from the "DC crows" in what should be "local" issues. They have no firsthand knowledge and nothing to lose with their rules, so should just keep silent.

First, I have enrolled in several Farm Bill Conservation Programs, including the conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and have encountered some unexpected hurdles and challenges with these programs. For instance, CRP helped fund the initial establishment of longlead pine on my land but offers little assistance for the maintenance costs of this tract, including maintaining roads and controlling invaise species. Additionally, I have run into some challenges with applyingprescribed fire to the tract that borders the national forest, the USSA cost-share programs have been extremely helpful in defryaing costs of forest management including seeling release, reforestation, pre-commerical thinning, and control of pin beetle infestation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Second, I am gravely concerned about the effects of the estate tax on the ability of family forest owners to keep their land in the family. Often, the high costs due to the state tax to transfer land to the next generation result in fragmentation. MY first two tracts are in a family LLC. There are many restrictions included to protect the land from member sales and tax burdens that often causes fragmentation of our privately held land. However, this was a very expensive and burdensome legal process. Many family forest owners cannot afford to put their land in an LLC. Congress needs to find a fix to the estate tax that removes some of the tax burden of generational transfer and will encourage continued management and conservation of family forest lands. H.R. 5475, The Family Farm Estate Tax Relief Act of 2010, introduced by Rep. Mike Thompson (R-CA) is a good start to finding a solution.

New England's forest landscape is becoming increasingly parcelized. Land trust conservation projects typically are less than 100 acres with fund-raising activities undertaken one project at a time. The Harvard Forests' recently released report: *Wildlands and Woodlands -- A Vision of the New England Landscape* proposed that 70% of the forested landscape (or 30 million acres) be preserved to sustain human well-being/. Conservation by a myriad of land trusts at a one-project-at-a-time pace will not begin to achieve the Harvard Forest vision. Accordingly, a new paradigm for conservation is needed.

Engaging stewardship of the historic, natural, cultural and recreational resources is best accomplished through partnerships with existing organizations - primarily the community nonprofits. But these organizations often struggle with management and leadership issues. An out-of-date or poorly defined vision prevents them from achieving meaningful results. Although adequate funding is a challenge for everyone, a lack of leadership and vision is the limiting factor of success for anything.

The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness, we need less.

The President and Congress need to adopt and implement the recommendations of the National Parks Second Century Commission Report in preparation for the Centennial anniversary of the National Park Service in 2016.

the need for compatible use buffers at Robins Air Force Base to protect against development intruding on its boundary and jeopardizing its mission capacity.

Growing public desire for greater recreational access to the Ocmulgee through the creation of a cohesive river trail from Macon south, potentially extending to the Altamaha river. Groups such as the Georgia River Network, Georgia Canoeing Association, and others are working to improve public access and connectivity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Georgia Wildlife Federation and the National Parks conservation Association do not, in any way, seek to obstruct or hinder a boundary expansion for the Ocmulgee National Monument. We do, however, suggest and request that while a boundary determination is being made. Congress should simultaneously examine, in the form of a Special Resource Study (SRS), the potential preservation of the broader river corridor, at least as far south as Hawkinsville. The National Park Service is Empowered to undertake boundary adjustment studies for existing park units under its own initiative, without further direction from Congress. However, an SRS is much more comprehensive and inclusive in scope, and cannot be initiated by the Park Service without Congressional authorization.

Wilderness. The U.S. Forest Service in Western North Carolina has failed to identify, study, and recommend more areas for protection under the Wilderness Act of 1964. Citizens have identified approximately forty eligible areas on the Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests, alone. Yet no positive steps have been taken by the Department of Agriculture to find these areas, to study them, and to protect them, pending designation by Congress as Wilderness areas.

The need for full operational funding for the national park service.

Compared to the overall federal budget, the Park Service is very small - only one tenth of 1 percent Providing Parks the funds need to serve visitors and protect resources is a tiny investment in our national heritage, and provides economic benefits and jobs in struggling communities nationwide. A recent SPCA -commissioned report, The U.S. National Park System: An Economic Asset at Risk, found that the National Parks generate over four dollars in value to the public for every tax dollar invested by the Federal Government.

As recommended by the National Parks Second Century Commission in their final report to Congress and the Administration, NPCA is advocating for a multi-year commitment that reduces the operations shortfall by at least \$100 million per year, as well as an additional \$500 million to meet the construction and maintenance needs of our National Parks.. First and foremost, the President and Congress must support operations funding for the National Park Service, sufficient to meet its' needs.

Lack of a secure and fully funded, mandatory land and water conservation fund.

In order to preserve America's treasured landscapes and places of national significance, it is essential that the President and Congress fully fund a mandatory LWCF program. Current events in the Gulf of Mexico make keeping this promise more important than ever.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Despite the proximity to this open space, San Gabriel Valley residents have traditionally suffered from limited access to high quality recreation opportunities as well as high diabetes and obesity rates. The San Gabriel Valley has a large ethnic-minority population that is severely underserved by nearby public lands such as the Angeles National Forest, which hosts over 500,000 visitors a year along the dramatic canyons of the San Gabriel River. There is currently a dearth of basic recreation support along the river such as rest rooms, trash removal, rangers, stewardship education programs, graffiti removal and safe river access--the list goes on. San Gabriel Valley residents could also benefit from a stronger system of trails and transportation to get our constituents to their public lands.

The Conservancy itself is engaged in Park Service-approved activities to restore the historic West Bay Club property, currently under a use and occupancy estate. In addition to taking steps to maintain the relationship between people and places, federal agencies should do all they can to meet their own historic preservation duties. Unfortunately, despite the hard work and commendable effort of federal agency staff, funding is not sufficient to carry out his mission.

Assistance from nongovernmental sources is needed. To address this problem, federal agencies should seek partnerships and cooperative management agreements with community groups, non-profit friends groups, and private foundations. Such partnerships not only provide a source of private funding, but also enhance and enrich the capability of the federal partner to do its professional job more efficiently and effectively.

Unfortunately, unfounded concerns and political ideologies have prohibited range management and control of the population of prairie dogs inhabiting the grasslands. This has not only adversely affected the health of the range, but also allowed for the spread of disease in the prairie dog population of other species.

This important and sensitive eco-region is anchored by three national parks (Mount Rainier, Olympic, and North Cascades) and a number of designated wilderness areas within national forests. The watersheds that drain into the Puget Sound sustain salmon and steelhead; however, most of the runs are listed as either threatened or endangered and face real challenges for recovery. The lower elevation watersheds and working forests are mostly privately owned and are important for corridors and connectivity for fish and wildlife - particularly as we deal with climate change.

Congresswoman Chu spoke about and other speakers mentioned making the San Gabriel Mountains more accessible. They mentioned how the problem of obesity would be solved if only people could get outdoors.

Congresswoman Chu mentioned seeing "dirty diapers and trash" left along the San Gabriel River and that this was due to "no trash cans nor restrooms".



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are frequent visitors to Whittier Narrows, the San Gabriels and many other state, county and federal open space. Never do we hike without gloves and trash bags to pick up the filth left behind. It is highly doubtful that anyone trucked into the mountains will respect it any more than those already there. We find chip bags, soda and beer cans, broken bottles of beer, plastic water bottles, fast food leftovers and yes, dirty diapers! Did I mention the graffiti on every rock that has the slightest smooth surface? While we have paid our dues as responsible conservationists who cherish natural places, we are unconvinced that increased effort to bring more visitors will do anything but hasten the decline of what is left. One speaker mentioned the conflict of people and the impact on habitat and wildlife! Hooray!

Last August we were camping in the Angeles Forest at Chileo. When we arrived at our campsite, I walked around and saw a campfire still smoldering! It took lots of water to put it dead out. We told the woman who was checking to see if we had paid our camp fee. She said there is nothing to do since the forest service personnel cannot prove who left the fire! Even though someone - I assume - had paid the camping fee for the night before????? Perhaps a letter from the forest service might have caught the attention of these people. Another campsite was strewn with 3 or 4 bag loads of trash - which we picked up.

Finally: Is the supervisor of the Angeles Forest still employed? The handling of the devastating and preventable fire showed gross incompetence. The most recent article - this one in the LA Times - 7/5/10 quotes Capt. Perri Hall regarding the inability to contact and then to get action when the fire was small and able to be put out. his comments contradict the official "review". We watched tv coverage last August and September. One forest official believe it was Mike Dietrich said "we are concerned about the loss of human life and property, but we are also aware of the COST TO TAXPAYERS". What? Why is this an issue when the forest is burning? Were officials, including the Supervisor, trying to look good on expenditures instead of focusing on putting out the fire? And why was only human life an property an issue? Did no one think about the animals an other life forms being incinerated? The forest was THEIR life and property.

Lastly: on the Discovery Center at Whittier Narrows. This is an outrageous waste of money; it will destroy natural space to impose a huge building - no doubt with county and other government officials' names on it - which building is more likely to serve as a meeting place for more bureaucrats. Stop this project now! It is shameful to waste the money, time and space on this project. Lease the Whittier Narrows alone!

We face new challenges in preserving our outdoor spaces, and I share your belief that the solutions will not originate solely from Washington. It will be necessary to engage with citizens across the country in order to share knowledge, study existing community-level conservation efforts, and develop common-sense strategies which are suitable for implementation on a wider scale.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While representatives of some of our organizations have participated at some of the sessions, we have found it difficult to find out information prior to the meeting date about when and where sessions are going to be held. In some cases, we learned about proposed listening sessions from third parties who had the information well in advance of the time it was actually listed on the AGO website. In other instances, listening sessions were held that were never posted on the AGO website. This inconsistency in terms of timely notification means that many Americans are excluded from the reprocess that purports to seek public input as your agencies prepare to submit to the President a set of recommendations for the use of our public lands.

Some listening sessions feature panel discussions and we applaud this approach. We are not aware, however, of any representative of the motorized recreation community being asked to participate in any of these panel discussions. This omission is troubling to us especially since motorized recreation is recognized as a legitimate activity on public lands and frankly, provides much needed economic stimulus to many rural communities adjacent to federal lands. Therefore, we would like the opportunity to participate.

Finally, we would like to recommend that at least one listening session be devoted to the role that motorized recreation can play in connecting more Americans, young and old alike, to our public lands. We all recognize that many of our citizens spend far too much time indoors working or playing in front of a computer screen. While perhaps intellectually stimulating, it certainly does not foster physical fitness so critical to a healthy lifestyle. Responsible motorized recreation can and does connect people to the outdoors and in many cases serves as the prime motivator of connecting our young people to America's Great Outdoors.

communication technology/transportation

Maine is a boarder state. Maine's transportation infrastructure and climate impacts access; communication technology is not evenly availably (or easily) in rural areas. Maine is an aging population state. Maine's cultures of farming, hunter, and working water from some endangered waterways by big paper mill companies, clear cutting, developers; working waterfront is not limited to fishing or shipping; public access and vary from town to town along the coast. Public access is not always a standard procedure or easily found.

Rural communities are concerned with landscapes.

Urban conservation alienates ranchers who are concerned with the preservation of land and wildlife.

Equal access to Justice Act creates too many lawsuits by environmental groups. NEPA efficiency to reduce lawsuits.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

River restoration. Fish and Wildlife Partners Program. Forest Service partnership agreements. Including tribes in the process early on. Guided recreation. Conservation easements. Tribes do not qualify for federal funds. May 9-11 is a River Honoring on Tillethead(?) Indian Reservation.

Landownership contributions to conservation easements. Lewis and Clark Trail. National Historical Trails helps get kids out in the outdoors and recreate. MT Legacy Program.

Transportation: many of the sites are difficult to reach without a car - it's a long drive, maybe unfamiliar too (there should be more signs on the roads). Education: many youths do not know that the National Park Service exists; there should be something about the NPS in schools - hey, many high school students need jobs and community service.

Jamaica Bay: funding

The great outdoors in our city backyard - we need to make these estuary plans coherent to everyday citizens living on the Jamaican Bay. How can they participate and reach these resources?

More opportunity for youth

School children have few opportunities for outdoor experience beyond their local parks. Recommend expanding outdoor overnight camping in Gateway and other parks and environmental education programs.

The key to access is affordable water transportation that links all major U.S. state and city parks. We need regional management systems - one harbor, another for Hudson River Valley. The key to mgt success is enduring partnerships with civic and enviro groups.

Coordinating task force for region, too many agencies. Pay attention to developments in conservation biology, especially landscape ecology, also endangered species. Look for solutions that help people and nature, like coastal preservation.

We must be creative but also challenge our experiences that have worked elsewhere.

Discontinue hiring from the inside in order to bring new ideas to the table.

Access is important for it's own sake but also to build constituents that support a healthy and vibrant and accessible harbor. How can we get federal state and local authorities to create docks and piers to get people to the water and land and vice versa?

Each federal agency has their own restoration program. They need to work better together to combine funding for great restoration instead of the their agendas. State regulators need to get on board with restoration to make permitting easy.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The effort need an overarching authority to create a perennial high level body to break through red tape and provide continued priority and energy.

How do we bring NJ to the table? Gateway also stretches into NJ, as well as the comprehensive restoration plan. In order to succeed, we cannot ignore the other side of the harbor

Williams and National Grid are participants in the Blue Ribbon Commission and desire to play our part in improving Gateway as private partners. We find the maze of stakeholders daunting to navigate such that we can move our project to supply additional natural gas supplies forward. Any streamlining of priorities and efforts that would provide us a clear path forward to allow us to do our part in supplying gas to the region and bring a good opportunity to be corporate stewards in the region is appreciated. we would love to discuss further.

For too long we have rested on the laurels of America's greatest conservation leaders, from President Teddy Roosevelt to Secretary Udall to President Carter, who assembled the greatest collection of National Parks, Forests, Monuments, Wildlife Refuges, and Wilderness on earth. Preserving these lands required perseverance and a willingness to override local opposition to land preservation, which had stood in the way of protecting the Grand Canyon, Alaska, and other national treasures. Preserving America's greatest places also required meaningful levels of funding, particularly for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We must be willing to emulate the leadership of Roosevelt and his successors if we are to provide our constituents with the recreational and wilderness opportunities that distinguish America from all other countries.

In my district alone residents face a 19,000 acre park land deficit. We need to expand and create new National Parks and other public lands aggressively to meet the needs of a growing population, while protecting existing federal roadless areas for low impact recreation.

We also need to expand public lands in rapidly growing urban areas. Northern Virginia would benefit from substantial public land acquisition as well as more public access points to the Chesapeake Bay and her tributaries.

Just as we could not have witnessed the unspoiled glory of creation without the leadership of Roosevelt and others, so too generations 100 years from now depend upon us to protect lands and waters that will otherwise be desecrated by the relentless march of development.

As residents of the magnificent Puget Sound region, we can easily recognize the importance of the great outdoors and how critical its preservation is to both our culture and economic livelihood. I applaud the Obama Administration's search for solutions to conserving and increasing access to our public lands, improving outdoor recreational opportunities, and celebrating the role that the environment has played in our rich cultural heritage.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While most of the groups and programs that are assembled here today may be providing valuable outdoor experiences for kids they are all too expensive to seriously impact the severity of the problem we face today. We have created a forest ambivalent electorate and one need only look at the metrics; if your organization is providing expensive, all inclusive mountain and outdoor experiences and especially the ones that continue to characterize millions of kids as at-risk, - how racist is that- underserved and mostly capable of working on expensive work crews on public lands- we would like to suggest that you fold up your tent.

Expensive programming means that you will only ever be able to reach a "finite" number of children and overlooks the reality of today's economic challenges. and if those programs were so successful, why are we so non-inclusive of youth and emerging population today? Hopefully the Obama administration understands that we are seeing a crisis in America . . . not just because the average youth in this state is spending 48 1/2 hours weekly in front of media or that there has been a doubling of obesity and diabetes rates and that millions of kids are missing out on the "inspirational" value of natural world experiences (quote commerce city and kid in a trailer park anecdote) - but because "PURE" outdoor and mountain recreation experiences for kids are key to preventing a "forest ambivalent" culture!

There also needs to be a realization that the greatest threat to public lands and the environment here in Colorado and on most public lands is not global arming, bark beetle infestation, boreal toads, lynx habitat or off highway vehicle use ..... it's this pernicious lack of youth outreach and the fact that in a places like Denver, other than the 2-3 day outdoor educational experience that we provide almost 10,000 kids annually, 95 percent of Denver kids never ever get to the mountains during their youth ..... we have 1.26 million kids under 18 in Colorado and in spite of the fact that we live in a state that is defined by its mountains, most of our children (over 1 million) never enjoy them in spite of the fact that 25 of 26 of Colorado's ski areas now operate on land that belongs to all Americans ..... not just the wealthiest! This is disgraceful.

Twenty and thirty years ago, there was more youth participation in the outdoors and in mountain sports because it was viewed as "affordable" and "welcoming" to more Americans. Not so today! In fact almost all high schools and middle schools used to have mountain clubs or ski clubs and frankly more families valued and could afford to recreate in national parks and forests. We need to empower teachers to augment natural world course work and physical education with actual hands on experiences in the outdoors.

Limit cell phone use – it's an obstacle; employ strategic use of technology.

Can the federal government be more of a central resource for all different organizations and people to access and share? Coordinate management and outreach.

Push back on/counter the media-induced fear factor.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Federal agencies need to learn how to talk to each other within the multiple agencies. There is a disconnect between them. BIA (Bureau of Indian Affairs) doesn't seem to have a voice and needs to learn how to talk to other agencies.

The federal agencies should get together with the local state agencies and the school districts to talk about how to facilitate connecting people to the outdoors.

Give states and local leaders more say in what happens locally, rather than blanket policies for the entire country.

LA County Fair youtube videos showing silly LA County behaviors illustrate that urban folks don't have great outdoor connections. Or iphone apps.

Money is a barrier – people can't afford to drive, or to pay entry, or leave the city.

Sheer numbers of visitors impact the environment and other people's experiences.

People don't know how to act or what to do in the outdoors – there's a lack of education and experience.

There are complaints about the new Forest Service travel management map – it doesn't really let people see what's going on. The map is so poor. It's easy for me to get confused. Then, if enforcement is hard edged, that's a turn off for users.

Provide opportunities to a wide spectrum of users- conflicts are bound to happen. There can be a push to create duplicative trails, which is a no good.

Mineral development, like oil, gas, and uranium, creates a challenge to recreation and conservation. Extraction creates impact. Example might be Sublette County's Jonah Field, which wiped out historic antelope hunting.

Social structures that are indoors encourage young people hang out at malls or online. We need to build social structures that include the outdoors.

There's a lack of credit to land owners. The federal government has already decided to be recreation focused. But programs that help recreation have a negative impact on landowners.

Poor air or water quality issues don't encourage conservation or affinity.

More work hours in America shortens recreation time.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A lack of commitment to stewardship, or to ethics. Not getting landowner permission for hunting, for example.

A few people's lack of common sense or respect for the land can shut down access for everyone, including proper users.

Stop pushing more wilderness and closure of areas. Mountain pine beetle and other resource issues still need to be addressed and can't be with imbalance of too much wilderness. Minerals industry pays the taxes, so there needs to be a balance.

Allow enough access to let families access wild places. Too much wilderness makes it hard for people access wilderness in the time real people have. One example is the proliferation of wilderness study areas in the Red Desert that severely restrict travel.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is used nationally for federal land acquisition. Most counties in Wyoming have laws opposing net gain in federal land.

Children go outdoors less than they used to – they watch TV. My parents used to send me outside. They didn't allow me to stay inside.

There is a stigma of land managers vs. private landowners. Cultural friction.

Kids are overscheduled—other things are taking their time.

There is a perception that it's expensive and takes lots of equipment to get kids outside.

There's a diminished societal acceptance of risk. There is an aversion to risk and expensive associated litigation.

Commissioners outlawing certain types of animals in Fremont County, such as wolves and bears—politics work against much of our wildlife.

Emotions run high.

Individual organizational goals are place above those of the county.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When people whose wages come from tax dollars lecture ranch owners about Coordinated Research Management Programs, it wears on ranch owners. These are conflicting priorities. Fewer farmers or ranchers that have sizeable property, so this creates pressure on land owners. As landowners, we are only caretakers for a certain amount of time—it's not really ours. The world has more needs with the same amount of finite resources.

I'm now losing sheep to predators in broad daylight, and that hasn't happened for the 33 years I've been doing this. People need to see that things are shifting wildly.

The lack of a central clearinghouse for program access, or rules for various types of access. We need a one-stop shop for all of the information, as well as better outreach and resource sharing.

We need more time, more energy, and more money.

We need a better structure for transportation – it's hard to get kids transported to the outdoors.

The government should be more of a central resource for all different organizations and for people to access and share.

We chase federal dollars for conservation programs. But if we only receive a per capita portion of those funds, it's not enough. The conservation values in this state are more than competitive for federal dollars, and private land conservation has to be a major part of that. Use Land and Water Conservation dollars to preserve those private lands. It preserves our state's cultural identity as well.

Consider keeping viable ranches without a conservation easement. Keeping ranches working is as simple as not making everything they do feel incredibly difficult. Make it easier for those ranchers to get their jobs done. Permitting, litigation, etc., make it hard to get things done.

People not acting because they think they need to ask for the Government's help and funding. Individuals can do an incredible amount on their own. Keep the funding local to begin with.

More public conversation and media coverage of recreation to balance the focus on energy.

Seeing kids and families out on trail is great, but the negative part of that is people who ruin things and tear up the land. So balancing use with preservation.

Affordable hiker/biker campsites at state parks that are cheaper than car/RV camping sites.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

More sharing of information about economic impacts and opportunities that exist for individuals to engage with the outdoors.

Tourism doesn't stop in the summer.

We're still getting accumulation of annoying impacts. Firewooding is everywhere. Even though there are fewer people camping, we're leaving a legacy of that everywhere, and that's something we can focus on. We need more education on how to minimize impact.

Wyoming Conservation Corps has been very successful. Why not promote that on a national basis because kids involved in that can earn college credits and get a healthy stipend.

Funding. There is a lack of education about how you treat public spaces. People don't realize they're paying to fix what they just broke.

A lack of money. Money to keep trails open, keep them passable.

Money that is collected on local basis must go into the ground, not into some black hole someplace. Keep funds raised locally local.

Vandalism and destruction of public structures by public. Money does go into fixing these things, pumping outhouses.

The media portrays the idea that as soon as children walk out the door, the boogeyman is going to get them. The media has not done us any favors. Parents are paranoid and scared to let their kids be kids and have opportunity to be outside. Don't throw crimes against children in our faces every day.

Multi-use. Trying to make every group happy is impossible. Every group wants more and is willing to give less.

There is a lack of volunteerism from the users.

The lack of a clear understanding by volunteers makes them unreliable and problematic. They come and go as they please.

New additions are considered sexier than maintenance. This is a challenge.

The Good Ole Boy Attitude pervades decisions.. We did it this way and we won't change. There is a reluctance to change.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Deterioration of our infrastructures is a challenge.

Fear factor – urbanized folk are afraid of the outdoors, need a guide

The desire to find solitude is at odds with the increased crowding of outdoor places

We need to protect places from the people who enjoy them.

People don't want to work to have fun, and there needs to be a way for these people to access remote areas

Kids can't recreate on their own – educate parents

Tough economy makes expensive weekends harder to do for families

In just a generation or two, a remarkable amount has been lost. Reservation youth often haven't ever fished in their lives.

Safety and money inhibit us from taking out groups of kids.

Access to transportation limits group activities.

There is a disconnect with between people's food and where it comes from

Regulations limit what families can do together, like collecting firewood or cutting poles. Now you just buy all this at the store.

Media sensationalizing the outdoors, with extreme and crazy survival stories, making regular nature seem boring

Bad press, like bear attacks, instill fear

More bears and wolves make families more cautious

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The economy makes it harder to buy and use ATVs, limiting parents' ability to take kids out

Schools don't support taking students outdoors, which also affects access to parents

Cultural shifts deter people from outdoor experiences, these are hard to change

Kids don't like to do things outside anymore.

People are close minded; they ignore all of the issues, and they need to open their minds to get anything done

People are getting lazy, sponsored by technology

In the olden days, we just got kicked outside to go play. We weren't going on sponsored ski trips. That seems to have gone away.

From a young age parents are placing children in front of TVs, they making it a babysitter and a reward.

News from the TV only reports about death in the outdoors.

A lot of parents are holding down many jobs, they have to feed their kids then regroup for their next jobs and the solution is plop them in front the TV. I was amazed at how many children had not been up sinks canyon (8 miles from town) to go on a hike, feed the fish, etc.

Parents feel it is dangerous to go outside

Some outdoor activities are not fun when you are out of shape and over weight. Skiing is not fun when you are out of shape.

Poor nutrition and lack of activity is a deterrent. Parents aren't paying attention to this.

School food is bad, and bad for you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Some schools have no PE program. Some schools have no sports at all.

PE teachers in Wyoming should be able to run an outdoor field trip.

Teachers will cancel field trips, like a trip to Yellowstone, as a punishment.

Young children aren't going on as many field trips.

Communication between public lands folks and the public could be better, and many forms of communication should be used.

Trail crews lack knowledge and experience to do their job correctly.

When a decision is reached by a land agency regarding natural resources there is a vocal opposition. Agencies' hands are tied and nothing happens. For example, with timber management, there are acres and acres of dead trees that aren't being logged.

There is a lack of resources and support for winter outdoor activities. People don't have the training or equipment necessary for winter recreation.

As fishing and hiking are easy for us, there is a reluctance to teach too many the trade.

It's fine if people want to get out, but don't show them our favorite fishing spot. Once-secret areas are now in marketing materials, bringing people in droves.

While less people are going outside, some places are being more impacted

With folks migrating to urban settings and a flagging economy, more folks are heading outside when they take trips. We need to be doing more outdoor education within the public in the school system, but it should be slow, and not widespread.

No Child Left Behind is forcing teachers to find the most objective parts of education, and forcing them to teach to the test. Funding is tied to whether students know facts. It needs to change. Students love to learn outside.

The system has rid itself of good teachers that would take them outside. Access to our youth is biggest challenge and school systems don't provide funding.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is hard to balance our need for industrial development of these lands with my love for these lands. I drive a car. It has an impact. I have a conflict. To best address this, we need to be smart with our impact. And balance development with protecting lands.

The education system doesn't recognized the legitimacy of outdoor education. Outward Bound doesn't count for school credit.

We are so convenience based -we need things quick. There is no interest in the outdoors. There is no good draw away from technology. But technology can help fix this.

We need to focus on cultures in big cities. Amazing at the boy scout level, few scout masters knew the animals in Wyoming. Takes dedication. We can figure out ways to manage land for the best uses; we live in a small population, and there's no need to have every use on every acre of public lands.

There is a lack of access to public lands in this state.

Numerous environmental terrorists are harming the health of our forests.

Conservation easements are an effective way to protect land and provide additional public access. And we have a lot of federally protected land.

Kids are more computer-oriented. They are afraid to go outdoors.

There's not enough MONEY!

There's not enough access.

Educational priorities, i.e. curriculum and funding, are an obstacle to outdoor activities.

Time management of individuals, and the scheduling of free time. Electronic interference should be limited.

Organizations can work together to better to coordinate their efforts and to communicate. Fremont County ATV Association has to contact many different organizations to find out where they can ride.

There's not enough transparency in federal planning.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Youth are bombarded with consumer advertising, which drowns out the call to go outdoors.

Deferred maintenance projects at parks reduce their appeal.

Kids don't show up, and don't have outdoor activities as a priority. Can we create an incentive for kids to volunteer to build trails, etc.?

Youth don't even know about this stuff! Communication is insufficient.

Events don't always make it clear that kids are welcome.

Parents are afraid to let their kids play outdoors, and they over-schedule their kids' time.

Many teenagers are so involved in activities/sports (overachiever lifestyle) that they don't feel they have time to go outdoors.

If it's not scheduled, it's easier to play a video game

If there was more funding for public land agencies these three problems (money, access, time) would be alleviated

People do not lobby actively enough on an individual level for our government to address these priorities.

Our educational priorities, such as a focus on high-stakes testing, do not allow for enough field trips. We would probably produce more scientists if we connected students to the natural world.

Many communities are not structured to enhance exposure to outdoor opportunities (bikeable/walkable, signs, etc.)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Participants at the session told numerous stories of effective partnerships at a local level that utilize existing resources and organizations to connect people to the outdoors and conserve open spaces. Sadly, many stories ended with reports of partnerships dissolving due to resource scarcity. This region, like others, is blessed with incredible ingenuity, motivation and capability. Coupled with adequate funding and resources, these efforts could be sustained over time to significant long-term positive impact. Many conversations focused on building and sustaining partnerships between federal, state and local agencies and school districts, and also incorporating non-profit groups, local landowners, outdoor education institutions, and local businesses.

Inconsistency across agencies, confusing bureaucratic processes and administrative hurdles, rules and regulations that often seem punitive, are poorly explained, and change with land ownership boundaries: these are all obstacles to many people who seek to visit the outdoors. Much of this could be addressed through better communication, both between agencies and from agencies to local communities and the public. It could also be addressed by enabling and empowering local governments, organizations, and individuals who hold in depth knowledge and experience about their communities and public lands.

Money is a barrier: many people can't afford to drive, pay to enter, or acquire gear.

Lack of recreation funding for the federal agencies.

Deferred maintenance projects at parks and other public lands.

Lack of education or experience prevents people from going outdoors.

Poor tools prevent going outdoors; e.g., inadequate maps or ability to use them make it hard for people to do the right thing and enjoy themselves.

Lack of understanding that private landowners can be good land stewards. Federal agencies are too recreation focused at the expense of landowners (e.g. ranchers).

Impact of a few can have negative effect on everyone's access and experience. We need better connection between natural systems and social systems (people) in the form of education.

We lack a central clearinghouse for program access, rules for various types of access. Need a one-stop shop for all of the information; better outreach and resource sharing rather than each land agency reinventing the wheel.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Negative impact on the environment affects people's experiences. New development, urban sprawl, subdivision, energy development all have significant impacts that affect recreation and other uses.

Poor air and water quality have negative impact on recreation.

Youth lack role models and are influenced by pop culture, which is not outdoorsy.

Kids are over-scheduled.

Teachers have limited time; high cost of insurance to get kids outdoors, paperwork to develop and maintain school and extracurricular programs for kids.

Hard to get kids transported TO the outdoors—need a better structure for transportation.

Kids are bombarded with consumer advertising, which drowns out the outdoors.

Media sensationalism emphasizes the bad and scary (e.g. bear attacks).

Changes in family and social structure (e.g., increase in single parenting) make it harder for kids to connect to the outdoors.

Cultural friction between land managers and private land owners make partnerships challenging.

Diminished social acceptance of risk and fear of litigation.

Too much federal government interference in local issues.

Political polarity on sustainable use, two extremes and no middle ground, blocks sustainable management (gridlock).

Inconsistent leadership at the federal level. It is great that current administration is advocating outdoors, but there is no follow through. In two years there might be a new focus.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The bureaucracies don't understand the constraints of businesses.

The USFS often does not have the funding/personnel to support partnerships to the full extent possible (i.e. volunteers are turned away because there are not enough staff to train and assist them).

No one my age (mid high school) likes to do things outside.

Laziness sponsored by technology.

Poor nutrition and lack of activity decrease motivation to go outdoors.

School food is bad. If you eat it everyday you would gain 20 lbs.

Some schools have no PE program. Some schools have no sports at all.

Not only that, but the forests need protection from the devastation of the Ips ponderosae bark beetle that is currently ravaging Lodgepole pines, White pines, Ponderosa pines, and other pines. This beetle has almost wiped out Canada's lodgepole pines. We need to act before it ravages America's forests too.

My hometown is in Michigan, one of the most beautiful and safe states to hike in, due to the lack of larger predatory animals, poisonous snakes and insects. Home to the Great Lakes, our water shed suffers dramatically from the illegal dumping of chemicals by big money, such as Dow. While I recognize the need for companies like Dow, they use their "weight" to dismiss the damage they cause and do not accept responsibility. They must be held responsible; they owe something to the people who allowed them to prosper, while they dumped Dioxin into our rivers. Thousands of people's land is now worthless and the health problems are numerous. If you, Sir President, can tax sodas and other things considered unhealthy to the general population, then you must stand for our land and waters. It must be protected and the people who damage it, must be held accountable to the strongest extent. Thank you for your time.

They are murdering mules and donkeys on federal reserve land just because they eat there.

Most agree that recreation has been under funded for decades. This may be the result of a lack of recognition that recreation does in fact require investment. Trails especially need money to be designed well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Too little staffing and resources to take advantage of unsolicited volunteers. Some volunteers are turned away, or sent to easily accessed areas, rather than those that really need their attention.

Some agencies have a lack of "open mindedness". While less of a problem in the Jackson Hole area, other regions suffer from agencies that cannot be flexible and consider new ideas.

A culture of fear. Excessive liability concerns make getting people, especially young people outside difficult. This is a widespread societal problem with an overly litigious society, but one that schools and agencies especially struggle with.

Some public lands feel more welcoming than others. Rules and regulations that are difficult to understand can make people feel "policed" and even turn some people away. National parks and Forest Service land serve complementary purposes, with the Forest Service land often perceived to be more welcoming and less regulated.

Agency's recreation capacity is focused on commercial use. As a result, resources are taken away from working with volunteers and the general public. This is a funding and a philosophical limitation.

The limitations of time and money keep people from trying new activities and exploring new areas. Work limits recreation time and cost limits equipment purchases.

Many schools do not make an effort to connect kids to the outdoors. Instead, a longstanding focus on science and math takes precedent over any sort of outdoors education. Kids at most schools spend 8 hours a day indoors. I. On the other hand, kids have spent time inside for generations, so the difference lies in what kids are doing with those hours they are not indoors at school.

Cultural distractions. The digital realm dominates at the expense of the natural world.

The balance between introducing new people to the outdoors, while saving the remote experience.

More entry level trails - accessible.

Building political power through the people who are engaged in the outdoor community. If we don't have that, it will not change the way things are.

Making funding sources through non-motorized users a standard practice.

Watch that you don't go too far in Paying to Play. You want to be able to preserve and conserve, but you don't want to destroy the resource for what it was intended for.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Collaboration with other groups, motorized and non-motorized.

Bring it back to a lifestyle choice, finding ways to relate to people that live in urban areas.

Lack of time is an excuse-the administration can find the time to do what it wants.

Lack of vision (i.e. "I didn't know you could do that"), lack of money (e.g. artificial leg costs \$17K; mountain bikes are expensive), poor marketing.

Cultural differences and the different activities associated. o Fear/lack of familiarity. o Importance of the tribe (individualistic activities)--lack of being able to sustain activities (immersion). o Important to get diversity of cultures into outdoor recreation in Junior High and before in order to make a transition into college.

No education (no P.E., public schools don't start kids on the "outdoor" path). o Early engagement (as young as kindergarten) and early and positive access and experiences.

Poor Urban Planning--80% of Americans are in urban environments.

Elitist attitude among retailers and the desire of users to find exclusive places.

Conflict between recreation and conservation

Creating a welcoming environment for diverse cultures. o Different opportunities and inclusivity strategies to engage in the outdoors for different cultures. o Traditional outdoor recreation providers to need learn more about this.

More tools need to be utilized to get people excited about nature. o Getting outside doesn't have to mean going for a 'birding hike' or a tour of some kind, but can translate into "where you are" areas.

Too much bureaucracy in trail building, maintenance, and permitting systems within the USFS, BLM, and NPS.

In general, there is a strong disconnect between DC rhetoric and on the ground realities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Permitting system is restrictive. o Non-profits need more opportunities to implement youth-based outdoor programming. o Needs to be more support in the "reconnecting people to America" agenda.

Federal agencies need to be more coordinated and streamlined.

Recreation keeps getting pushed to the bottom of the priority list when federal land managers' priorities needs on lands during the planning processes.

Money, money, money--for equipment, access, gas, driving, recycling programs, etc.

Coalitions are fragmented and consistent unified messages get lost.

Weakening recreational use statutes (e.g. CA is pursuing strong regulations).

Wilderness v. recreation (e.g. mountain bikers)--see N.C.A.

Resistance to change. We need to change existing notions that outdoor recreation means far-from-home, expensive, and extreme opportunities. A change in the paradigm calls for more education about outdoor recreation.

Lack of education. The health and wellness benefits of outdoor recreation are not stressed enough in our country. We need to tap into technological resources in order to communicate with youth and emerging populations about where and how to recreate. Families need to know about low-cost alternatives to watching television. And universities are underutilized given their resources and missions.

Lack of transportation and connectivity. Youth and emerging populations need more, better, low-cost transportation methods to access outdoor spaces. Gateway trails throughout urban areas need to be established.

Access. There need to be more greenbelt parks in more neighborhoods. Among the urban areas, these parks must be safe. Also, competing interests on common lands poses a challenge to recreation.

Too much red tape and bureaucracy. Government rules and procedures can get in the way or dissuade public/private partnerships from occurring.

Eclectic policies. The many different rules and policies regarding public lands can be confusing and irritating. Streamlining, updating, and creating more uniformed rules and policies would encourage new users.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Funding. Funding lies at the root of most of the above, but is also needed to create more spaces to recreate and maintain those areas with good access and high use.

People's resistance to change.

Lack of funding.

Lack of education/facilitators.

Lack of connectivity/accessibility/transportation.

Too much bureaucracy, red tape, backlog.

Poor exposure and lack of awareness and guidance (esp. in Texas).

The difficulty in changing paradigms/people's negative preconceptions of the outside world.

Lack of manpower and funds to build more trails/spaces.

Getting new people to the spaces, people who would not find them on their own.

Communication, education, and readily accessible and clear information (online and inside spaces/mapping).

Need more resources and incentives for private partnerships to work.

People afraid to take the first step--need programming to encourage people to try something new.

Health and wellness of being outdoors is not stressed enough.

People need more options on how to keep kids away from the T.V.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Need to change people's perspective on what an outdoors activity is (e.g., people often fail to associate kayaking outside the realm of whitewater).

University resources are underutilized.

Education about low-cost outdoor activity--mental barrier to entry.

Transportation, especially with kids, is one of the largest problems. Need more greenbelt parks in more neighborhoods; add "gateway" trails in urban areas.

Funding for publicizing and maintenance.

Federal government has declared university groups as commercial regarding outdoor trips; need to have university permitting.

Each national park and/or forest deals with policies differently--need more uniformity.

No one encourages access--the response being that getting more people into outdoor spaces make jobs more difficult.

The process for permitting is difficult; problematic policies, no incentive to get more people in the parks.

Competing interests--increased access, more people in the spaces could create conservational/maintenance/etc. problems.

Where there is good access, there is often poor infrastructure that won't support growth.

The challenge lies in preserving the land for the public, not from the public.

Trash and litter is becoming a huge problem in the area.

Education the young generation to pick up after themselves.

Maintenance at trailheads.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lack of education and communication regarding conservation and sustainability, especially among youth (need to start young). This is a problem within and without schools.

Ongoing education versus reactive education (e.g., water conservation even when NOT in a drought).

Educating multiple cultures/creating a jingle for every culture.

Transportation - getting kids/emerging populations to recreational places.

Avenues for low-income families to access the outdoors.

Unsafe cities lead to parents afraid to letting their kids get out as much as they used to.

Accreditation versus one-time funds.

Access to outdoors for those in urban environments is limited. Access and opportunities to experience natural settings close-to-home in the urban environment does not meet current needs. In addition, transportation to outdoor places is a challenge.

Perceptions of safety and a culture of fear. The outdoors can be scary for kids particularly those who have no prior experience.

Elimination of outdoor education and physical education in schools. The focus on academics and testing has taken away from opportunities to enjoy the outdoors and physical activities. This has impacts on how the next generation connects to the outdoors as well as implications for public health.

Outreach methods are marketed to existing constituencies. In communicating opportunities on public lands, agencies typically focus on marketing to a narrow segment of the population and in particular those who already know what's out there. Agencies need to think about diversifying their outreach (not just ethnic but also ability level, economic status, etc.). Making information available in other languages or culturally relevant formats is typically not done.

Youth focused programs are a welcome development but more efforts need to be focused on the entire family. Parents need to share in the experience and they are essential to providing these children with opportunities for future experiences.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lack of direction and resolution of conflict resolution. There are many conflicts among user groups on public lands. In general, agencies have shown a lack of leadership in addressing these conflicts that then end up in court.

Gear is expensive. Many activities require gear and/or training that is expensive.

Laws and policies have not been updated to reflect current values and needs. Historic laws such as the 1872 Mining Law remain the books. Policies that place greater value on resource extraction than experiences on public lands remain.

Lack of opportunities to get outdoors

Transportation barriers-lack of money

Political climate for protecting land

Lack of understanding of the economics and benefits of outdoor recreation

Loss of access

Difficulty in compromising on access (e.g. mountain biking and wilderness issue)

1872 Mining Act and other historic settlement area laws

Elimination or reduction of outdoor education-Leave no Child Behind

Perception that it's not safe outside

Technology

If places were protected we could spend more time enjoying and less time working for protection



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lack of scientific knowledge

Federal funding prioritization

Territorialism vs. finding commonalities

Education and funding for transportation to outdoor places

No one knows what it means to get people outside-what does conservation mean to people

Demystifying conservation/environmentalism. Immigrant kids are not familiar with what it means to be outside

Outdoor School-it can be scary for kids that have not spent time outside before

Knowledge gap-people don't always know that they have free access to public lands-make it simple for people to figure out how to use their public lands

Administrative rules can be confusing-lack of uniformity. Agencies complain about people not using their public lands but there are barriers

Access is key-let people know that our protected public lands are available to all

Keep it simple-help people understand what the rules are

Lack of diversity in outdoor pursuits. Important to model-if you see people that look like you recreating in the outdoors, you might be able to envision spending more time outside.

We need to think about making our agencies more diverse-how do we accommodate more kinds of diversity (not just ethnic and racial but ability/disability, economic, etc.)

Outreach efforts are marketed to existing constituencies-not to new diverse constituencies

Hire people from the community who know the community members (community ambassadors)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Federal funding of Land and Water Conservation Fund

Managing multiple use-uses may conflict or have different impacts

Wilderness designations that don't move forward because of multiple uses

Mountain biking and ATV use may cause different impacts

Lack of conflict resolution direction

Not enough outdoor options in cities and other areas-Forest Park as an example

Lack of safe access for people to recreate-public access sites are limited

Undervalue natural resources-have not identified or communicated the existing "special places".  
Value of carbon sequestration or watershed

Better connection between federal government and state shouldn't have to rely on the economic market for this

Technology-youth are attracted to being inside

Culturally specific organizations are poorly funded

Accessibility-trails not always in great shape

Kid focused programs devalue families and child adult bonds

Transportation as a barrier

Non-profit organizations operate as volunteers so if "life" happens then organizations disappear

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Changing mindset

Establishing awareness

Tying connection together and making it personal

Creating advocates

Reaching the greatest audience

Federal agencies not doing their job because of non involvement uncaring or understanding

Accountability

Access/transportation

Never getting out of town/lack of awareness of how easily it is

Politics

Natural Resource harvesting/allocation vs. conservation and the financial imbalance

Disconnect between recreation and health and other broad issues

Conflicts between user groups

Framing conservation in terms of policies and disconnect exist. Oregon supports outdoor conservation but perhaps doesn't relate to policies

Connecting hunting/fishing with trail/bikers/outdoor enthusiasts

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Issues of fear (historical context)

Lack of information easily available in other languages

Advocate for access-get young people into the outdoors and introduce them to it. Take ownership and then advocate for it.

Better access to nature in the urban environment.

Need for better access-lots of competing interests take away from "quiet recreation"

For urban areas accessible information is not available-think about venues to communicate including church groups, farmers markets, etc. Once people connect they will return.

Need to integrate into the culture-how do we do this?

Culturally appropriate communication-will raise level of awareness

Economics is one of the obstacles. Outdoor Industry is very inclusive but in general it's expensive to do things outside (gear, training, etc.)

Need to create subsidies for those who experience economic barriers to getting outside.

Several strong factors can work to keep people indoors including fear about safety, questions about the value of outdoor experiences, a lack of access via public transportation to outdoor resources, and the absence of information about opportunities and costs.

For program/property managers, lack of funds certainly presents a primary challenge, but along with that came comments that major challenges exist in the simple disbursement of funding from the Federal Government and the delays and problems of red tape. Liability also effects the activities of program and property managers as does a sheer lack of time to plan, organize, and carry out their projects.

Another thematic thread in response to the question of challenges relates more to the need for stronger public relations messaging about the importance and value of getting outdoors. With the lack of environmental education in schools, the first challenge is to convince people to get outside. Several participants expressed that as outdoor enthusiasts they were in the minority within their urban populations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fear of the outdoors o Fear of wildlife, violence (perceived or real) o Need to feel safe o Inside vs. Outside - what is safe?

Overbearing parents

Outdoor recreation - competes with other choices o Sports o Technology

Transportation o Linkages to open spaces o Public transportation not enough space to transport bikes o Accessibility - transit (car/bus/self propel)

Equal access - transportation to open space from minority population areas

Inaccessibility and lack of awareness of opportunities to get out

Access to open space (ocean, rivers, trailheads)

Understanding if things are free

Expensive - costs outweigh the benefits

Poverty limits potential to get out

Recreation not seen as important/relevant in everyday life

Resources (cross-reference; information sharing)

Funding

More economic recovery money for SCA/CCC Type programs

Pettiness and competition for federal funds

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Waiting in line for free resources/programs

Liability

Time to develop programs and develop leaders, finding time to get outside

No universal Environmental Education in Schools

Green Jobs and nature connection experiences

Land development patterns

Balancing protection - enjoy/conservate not interfere

Stream line regulatory process for stewardship

Disproportionate distribution of urban open space

Urban populations o Turf wars o Lack of resources (Don't allow \$\$ to get out of turf)

a. Fully fund LWCF - 21%, 353

b. Address current obstacles: access, culture, values - 18%, 312

c. Lack of education to explain value of resources, how to respect property, and how to do conservation planning - 17%, 280

d. Insufficient public information - 16%, 275

e. Loss of access through funding - 15%, 252

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

f. Limits on research - 13%, 219

1.) Maine's land ethic is in danger because of loss of access and not enough funding.

2.) Lack of funding. Lack of coordination of organizations. Need to work across boundaries.

3.) Political ideology - even though an opportunity may arise with public support, it could be blocked by public ideology. Group ideology - some people have idea of what some piece of land should be used for, all are opinionated and different groups have different meaning of outdoors. Public policies are written for the west - need a flexible federal approach so ME can understand how to fit into national opportunities. not everyone understands the concept of public lands (little state and national public lands in ME). Need right mix of public, political financial support.

4.) Limits on research - money, time, and infrastructure. School curriculum requirements create environment of competing demands and priorities. Federal landowner liability (not an issue in Maine).

5.) Focus on removing large obstacles - make it easier for people to access the outdoors. We need everything from a shift in cultural values, to removing negative media hype about the outdoors, and public infrastructure. Low income population presents cost barriers. Lack of understanding conservation (something is being taken away). Need to make outdoor recreation a destination.

6.) Entry level deterrents/obstacles such as insufficient public information, entry-level knowledge, mentors. Funding for people who steward resources and deliver recreational programming. Fear of change and of federal government. Societal hurdles - lifestyle, technology, access, etc. Lack of coordination across sectors (transportation, health, and conservation).

7.) Education to explain values of resources, how to respect property, and how to do conservation planning. Money - need funding. Need incentives for private access.

Poor air or water quality issues don't encourage conservation or affinity.

Changes in family structure, such as single parent households, create fewer opportunities for getting out with families. Kids may not get connected with the grandparents' farm, for example.

More work hours in America shortens recreation time.

A lack of commitment to stewardship, or to ethics. Not getting landowner permission for hunting, for example.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A few people's lack of common sense or respect for the land can shut down access for everyone, including proper users.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is used nationally for federal land acquisition. Most counties in Wyoming have laws opposing net gain in federal land.

Children go outdoors less than they used to – they watch TV. My parents used to send me outside. They didn't allow me to stay inside.

We have to potential to love our wilderness areas to death.

We can think about natural systems and social systems—what falls short is the education piece-- the connection between the two

There is a stigma of land managers vs. private landowners. Cultural friction.

There is a perception that it's expensive and takes lots of equipment to get kids outside.

There's a diminished societal acceptance of risk. There is an aversion to risk and expensive associated litigation.

Commissioners outlawing certain types of animals in Fremont County, such as wolves and bears—politics work against much of our wildlife.

Emotions run high.

Individual organizational goals are place above those of the county.

When people whose wages come from tax dollars lecture ranch owners about Coordinated Research Management Programs, it wears on ranch owners. These are conflicting priorities. Fewer farmers or ranchers that have sizeable property, so this creates pressure on land owners. As landowners, we are only caretakers for a certain amount of time—it's not really ours. The world has more needs with the same amount of finite resources.

I'm now losing sheep to predators in broad daylight, and that hasn't happened for the 33 years I've been doing this. People need to see that things are shifting wildly.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Teachers are burdened with limited time, there is a high cost of insurance to get kids outdoors, there is too much paperwork to develop and maintain school and extracurricular programs for kids. These programs take a tremendous amount of work and energy.

The mining, gas, oil, uranium, and coal industries.

The lack of a central clearinghouse for program access, or rules for various types of access. We need a one-stop shop for all of the information, as well as better outreach and resource sharing.

We need a better structure for transportation – it's hard to get kids transported to the outdoors.

In just a generation or two, a remarkable amount has been lost. Reservation youth often haven't ever fished in their lives.

Safety and money inhibit us from taking out groups of kids.

Access to transportation limits group activities.

There is a disconnect with between people's food and where it comes from.

Regulations limit what families can do together, like collecting firewood or cutting poles. Now you just buy all this at the store.

Media sensationalizing the outdoors, with extreme and crazy survival stories, making regular nature seem boring.

Bad press, like bear attacks, instill fear.

More bears and wolves make families more cautious.

The economy makes it harder to buy and use ATV's limiting parents' ability to take kids out

Cultural shifts deter people from outdoor experiences, these are hard to change

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Trail crews lack knowledge and experience to do their job correctly.

When a decision is reached by a land agency regarding natural resources there is a vocal opposition. Agencies' hands are tied and nothing happens. For example, with timber management, there are acres and acres of dead trees that aren't being logged.

There is political polarity on sustainable use, with two extremes as the only possibilities. No middle ground blocks sustainable management.

As fishing and hiking are easy for us, there is a reluctance to teach too many the trade.

It's fine if people want to get out, but don't show them our favorite fishing spot. Once-secret areas are now in marketing materials. Bringing people in droves.

While less people are going outside, some places are being more impacted.

The education system doesn't recognize the legitimacy of outdoor education. Outward Bound doesn't count for school credit.

We are so convenience based -we need things quick. There is no interest in the outdoors. There is no good draw away from technology. But technology can help fix this.

There is a lack of access to public lands in this state.

There is inconsistent leadership at the federal level. Though it's great that the current Administration is advocating for outdoors, there's no follow through. In two years there might be a new focus.

Numerous environmental terrorists are harming the health of our forests.

We can't have a timber harvest to combat beetle kill, so there might be no solution. This might be something we may not be able to stop. We are looking too much at right now and not 100 years from now, when there could be benefits to what is going on right here right now. We can't prevent everything.

There's no real focused, multi-agency effort, on providing educational opportunities that teaches kids about and in the outdoors. Agencies have different foci.

Kids are more computer-oriented. They are afraid to go outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Time management of individuals, and the scheduling of free time. Electronic interference should be limited.

There's not enough transparency in federal planning.

Youth are bombarded with consumer advertising, which drowns out the call to go outdoors.

Deferred maintenance projects at parks reduce their appeal.

Youth don't even know about this stuff! Communication is insufficient.

Events don't always make it clear that kids are welcome.

Parents are afraid to let their kids play outdoors, and they over-schedule their kids' time.

Many teenagers are so involved in activities/sports (overachiever lifestyle) that they don't feel they have time to go outdoors.

If it's not scheduled, it's easier to play a video game

People do not lobby actively enough on an individual level for our government to address these priorities.

Our educational priorities, such as a focus on high-stakes testing, do not allow for enough field trips. We would probably produce more scientists if we connected students to the natural world.

Many communities are not structured to enhance exposure to outdoor opportunities (bikeable/walkable, signs, etc.)

The session was clearly marked by emphasis on the importance of access to land, both to sustain our economies and maintain our active lifestyles and cultural heritage. Regarding federal involvement in land management and formal protection of public land, we heard both ends of the opinion spectrum. Many expressed strong desire for less federal government control and no more additional protection (e.g., Wilderness designation) as a means of improving access. Others supported the concept of additional protection to encourage more recreation access and relieve pressure from extractive uses. A common theme involved the need for more consistent and clear regulations and administrative processes to remove barriers for visiting the outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The topic of education was dominant in two primary realms: education that facilitates visitation for all people, and school education that exposes children to the outdoors at an early age and provides the tools to become lifelong recreates and appreciators of the land. Attendees consistently expressed the concern that many don't visit the outdoors because they don't know where to go, what programs and resources are available, or feel they don't have the skills to do so safely. People almost unanimously agreed that our existing education system fails to introduce children and youth to the outdoors in a way that connects them for life. The importance of parents in exposing their children to outdoor pursuits is seen as critical, and conversely the role children can play in involving their entire families in the outdoors is also important.

Participants at the session told numerous stories of effective partnerships at a local level that utilize existing resources and organizations to connect people to the outdoors and conserve open spaces. Sadly, many stories ended with reports of partnerships dissolving due to resource scarcity. This region, like others, is blessed with incredible talent, motivation and capability. Coupled with adequate funding and resources, these efforts could be sustained over time to significant long-term positive impact. Many conversations focused on building and sustaining partnerships between federal agencies and local school districts, and also incorporating non-profit groups, outdoor education institutions, and local businesses.

Open field trips to ALL schools. My brother did a field trip at his elementary school, but I didn't get to do that.

Federal land management agencies don't work, the DEQ and EPA don't function well because there is no one there with the know-how. Public lands need to be return to the public, and the public should own and manage public lands, few folk left that know how to run the lands.

It is hard to balance our need for industrial development of these lands with my love for these lands. I drive a car. It has an impact. To best address this, we need to be smart with our impact. And balance development with protecting lands.

Getting kids outdoors! You need to get them there. Children age are 8-10 open to the strongest impact. It's a problem that they can't get enough kids to go to the park.

No child left behind is forcing teachers to find the most objective parts of education, and forcing them to teach to the test. Funding is tied to whether student know facts. It need to need to change. Students love to learn outside.

Communication between public lands folks and the public could be better, and many forms of communication should be used.

The system has rid itself of good teachers that would take them outside. Access to our youth is biggest and school system don't provide funding.

People are close minded; they ignore all of the issues, and they need to open their minds to get anything done.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

People are getting lazy, sponsored by technology

In the olden days, we just got kicked outside to go play. We weren't going on sponsored ski trips. That seems to have gone away.

From a young age parents are placing children in front of TV's, they making it a babysitter and a reward.

News from the TV only reports about death in the outdoors.

A lot of parents are holding down many jobs, they have to feed their kids and regroup for their next jobs and the solution is plop them in front of the TV. I was amazed at how many children had not been up sinks canyon (8 miles from town) to go on a hike, feed the fish, etc.

Some outdoor activities are not fun when you are out of shape and over weight. Skiing is not fun when you are out of shape.

Poor nutrition and lack of activity is a deterrent. Parents aren't paying attention to this.

School food is bad, and bad for you

Teachers will cancel field trips, like a trip to Yellowstone, as a punishment.

Young children aren't going on as many field trips.

PE teachers in Wyoming should be able to run an outdoor field trip.

Limiting youth access to cell phones and TV, as they are a barrier to kids' going outside.

Improving communication. This includes two aspects. First, communication between groups and agencies about what is working and what is not. Second, between groups and the public, where better messaging, promotion and advertising can make a give difference. In some cases, opportunities exist for people underrepresented in the outdoors (like inner-city kids) but they do not get the message.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to focus on cultures in big cities. Amazing at the boy scout level, few scout masters knew the animals in Wyoming. Takes dedication. We can figure out ways to manage land for the best uses; we live in a small population, and there's no need to have every use on every acre of public lands.

Public lands belong to the state, but the state asks the feds to manage it. The federal government should discuss land management with locals, and communicate at a local level.

A lot of groups don't want to be educated. The federal government should look for right ways to manage lands, and recognize individuals that are experts.

Kids don't show up, and don't have outdoor activities as a priority. Can we create an incentive for kids to volunteer to build trails, etc.?

Wilderness classification is bad, and the Wilderness act is outdated. It's designed to keep folks out of the wilderness. It's protecting disease. The federal government should aid local communities to restore forest health.

There is a lack of resources and support for winter outdoor activities. People don't have the training or equipment necessary for winter recreation.

With folks migrating to urban setting and a flagging economy, more folks are heading outside when they take trips. We need to be doing more outdoor education within the public in the school system, but it should be slow, and not widespread.

There's not enough MONEY!

There's not enough access.

Educational priorities, i.e. curriculum and funding, are an obstacle to outdoor activities.

USFS needs adequate funding/personnel to support partnerships to the fullest extent possible. Volunteers are turned away because there is not enough staff to train and assist them.

Some schools have no PE program. Some school have not sports at all.

Hard to get kids transported TO the outdoors - need a better structure for transportation.

Too much federal government interference in local issues.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Money is a barrier – people can't afford to drive, or to pay entry, or leave the city.

Sheer numbers of visitors impact the environment and other people's experiences.

People don't know how to act or what to do in the outdoors – there's a lack of education and experience.

There are complaints about the new Forest Service travel management map – it doesn't really let people see what's going on. The map is so poor. It's easy for me to get confused. Then, if enforcement is hard edged, that's a turn off for users.

Provide opportunities to a wide spectrum of users- conflicts are bound to happen. There can be a push to create duplicative trails, which is a no good.

Mineral development, like oil, gas, and uranium, creates a challenge to recreation and conservation. Extraction creates impact. Example might be Sublette County's Jonah Field, which wiped out historic antelope hunting.

Youth lack good outdoor role models.

Media sensationalism, such as bear attacks, focus on the scary, bad aspects of the outdoors.

Social structures that are indoors encourage young people hang out at malls or online. We need to build social structures that include the outdoors.

Poor maps and confusing characterizations/land classification by the federal government, like class I viewsheds or "special recreation areas," pose a challenge.

There's a lack of credit to land owners. The federal government has already decided to be recreation focused. But programs that help recreation have a negative impact on landowners.

Wyoming Conservation Corps has been very successful. Why not promote that on a national basis because kids involved in that can earn college credits and get a healthy stipend.

Roadside access points to beautiful places and fishing areas work well. We would like to see more pavilions and picnic tables and more family friendly places that would encourage families to get out.

Education and coverage of existing resources. How many miles of trail people do have access to and what do we already have in our backyards?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Government regulation is a double-edged sword. If you look at list of things you can/can't do and where you can/can't go, it's government interference basically.

Funding. There is a lack of education about how you treat public spaces. People don't realize they're paying to fix what they just broke.

A lack of money. Money to keep trails open, keep them passable.

Money that is collected on local basis must go into the ground, not into some black hole someplace. Keep funds raised locally local.

Vandalism and destruction of public structures by public. Money does go into fixing these things, pumping outhouses.

The media portrays the idea that as soon as children walk out the door, the boogeyman is going to get them. The media has not done us any favors. Parents are paranoid and scared to let their kids be kids and have opportunity to be outside. Don't throw crimes against children in our faces every day.

Media doesn't cover recreation. "If it doesn't bleed it won't read." Examples of media over coverage include bear attacks, lyme disease.

Level the scale between actual versus perceived risk.

Multi-use. Trying to make every group happy is impossible. Every group wants more and is willing to give less.

There is a lack of volunteerism from the users.

The lack of a clear understanding by volunteers makes them unreliable and problematic. They come and go as they please.

New additions are considered sexier than maintenance. This is a challenge.

The Good Ole Boy Attitude pervades decisions.. We did it this way and we won't change. There is a reluctance to change.

Deterioration of our infrastructures is a challenge.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fear factor - urbanized folk are afraid of the outdoors, need a guide.

The desire to find solitude is at odds with the increased crowding of outdoor places.

We need to protect places from the people who enjoy them.

People don't want to work to have fun, and there needs to be a way for these people to access remote areas.

Kids can't recreate on their own - educate parents

Tough economy makes expensive weekends harder to do for families.

Major obstacles to advancing a 21st century approach to conservation include the following. A) The Need for Full Operational Funding for the National Park Service. Compared to the overall federal budget, the Park Service is very small—only one tenth of 1 percent. Providing Parks the funds needed to serve visitors and protect resources is a tiny investment in our national heritage, and provides economic benefits and jobs in struggling communities nationwide. A recent NPCA-commissioned report, *The U.S. National Park System: An Economic Asset at Risk*, found that the National Parks generate over four dollars in value to the public for every tax dollar invested by the Federal Government.

The President's 2011 budget request for the National Park Service is approximately \$2.7 billion—a decrease of \$21.6 million over the current fiscal year 2010 budget. Within the total budget, nearly \$100 million in park programs are reduced or eliminated—including Save America's Treasures and Preserve America grants—and parks are left without funding to pay for cost of living adjustments for staff. The operations budget proposal does not come close to meeting the \$100 million request by the National Parks Second Century Commission, and is insufficient to maintain current park operations and visitor services.

As recommended by the National Parks Second Century Commission in their final report to Congress and the Administration, NPCA is advocating for a multi-year commitment that reduces the operations shortfall by at least \$100 million per year, as well as an additional \$500 million to meet the construction and maintenance needs of our National Parks. First and foremost, the President and Congress must support operations funding for the National Park Service, sufficient to meet its' needs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In spite of these successes, the LWCF program has been dramatically underfunded. Every year, \$900 million from federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) drilling lease proceeds are supposed to be dedicated to the LWCF. But the full funding of \$900 million promised by Congress has been reached only once since 1965. Congress has diverted as much as \$17 billion -- 85 percent -- of the Fund's dedicated revenue for projects unrelated to conservation or recreation. Over the last eight years LWCF funding for federal land protection has dropped over 70 percent, hitting a low of \$130 million in Fiscal Year 2008. In order to preserve America's treasured landscapes and places of national significance, it is essential that the President and Congress fully fund a mandatory LWCF program. Current events in the Gulf of Mexico make keeping this promise more important than ever.

A major issue for the Parkway is the fact that, while the Park encompasses only 82,000 acres of public land, it has more than 1,000 miles of boundary to manage and interacts with, 500,000 acres of scenic landscape outside its boundary. The Parkway was designed and created to maximize scenic views and give visitors the impression that they are in a park with boundaries to the horizon. Over the years, population has increased and development pressures have grown, such that today it is a real possibility that many of the scenic views and defining landscapes that make up the visitor experience could be irreparably marred or altogether lost.

Cities are where economic, political, and intellectual capital is concentrated and where public opinion is shaped. Law and policy emerging from urban centers will increasingly determine the fate of biodiversity far from their borders. This law and policy for a community, a country, a planet may be grounded in the values and experiences of an urban population. Will outdoor experiences be among them? Author Richard Louv suggests not, unless we can develop an effective remedy for the phenomenon he terms "nature deficit disorder." Outdoor experiences – a connection with the natural world – seem no longer be a primary part of growing up.

While perhaps not unique to urban youngsters, the disconnection from nature is certainly related to the opportunity – or lack of opportunity – to experience nature, which may be more acute in urban areas. Protecting and restoring nature and the opportunity to experience it will be of increasing importance if we hope to develop a citizenry that broadly shares values of a natural world, whether we label it conservation, ecological literacy, or biodiversity. In nature-filled cities may be the preservation of the wild.

- The traditional view that natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation are interests that compete with economic prosperity, and cultural and social development is a false paradigm

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

· The Departments of Interior, Agriculture, Transportation, and perhaps others, need to develop and resource a “Sustainable Communities Program.” AND wherever, self-organized partnerships evolve that include local, state, and federal agencies, farmers, sportsmen, environmentalists, business interests, and educators, AND they can cast a common vision for their natural resource future, AND leverage local human and financial resources, (a good example is the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning’s GoTo 2040 Plan), federal funding programs need to be “de-siloed” and local priorities should be allowed to drive resource management and funding decisions.

I’ve been in environmental education for about 20 years. We have a generation of children who are being raised by caregivers who were not outside themselves much when growing up. Also, children today have an environment in which it is easy to stay inside, and with parents and caregivers also inside, it’s even easier. So how can we get them outside? We need more places to go, in our backyards and neighborhoods. Second, we need to work on outdoor education, and to help caregivers’ get over their ambivalence about getting outside and how to do that. We need to reach children and their parents.

I also represent Eden Place Nature Center in Chicago. Everything we do is close within the community, and I think we need more investment in smaller organizations already operating in communities to make a large scale difference. We train youth, and pay them when funding is available. Allowing them the time to learn and come back the following year is what we hope for. We also recognize the outdoors is a personal experience and should not always be looked at as a quota. We work closely with the schools in our area to plant the seed with youth, implanting the passion and love and give them something they enjoy doing. That leads them to get their families involved. The Chicago area has a lot of park districts, but on the south side the park districts are not as cooperative as they might be. A lot of youth on the south side don’t have a place to go and we can provide that. And we can redefine ‘outdoors’ as a safe place between school and home.

The resource is significant but the picture is not all rosy—there are serious threats to the long term viability of this resource. Fragmentation, hydrologic alterations, invasive species, fire deprivation, development, and an increasingly disconnected public. These are familiar threats to natural resource managers everywhere.

Vast portions of the American agricultural landscape have had the hydrology substantially altered to efficiently move water from the land. This can significantly improve agricultural productivity and provide substantial environmental benefits, but can have unintended consequences to downstream water quality and quantity as it relates to volume and velocity. The application of drainage management tools and practices can be utilized to cost effectively manage surface and subsurface water in a manner that results in improved water quality, reduced flooding, added recreational opportunities, enhanced and expanded habitat conservation and, oftentimes, improve agricultural production.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of the most effective techniques to reliably improve the productivity of row crops is to improve field drainage. Doing so allows earlier access to the field for spring planting and reduces the likelihood of flooding once crops are planted. Unfortunately, improving drainage can facilitate nitrogen loss from the field. This robs crops of essential nutrients for growth and may make excess nitrogen available in undesirable locations like drinking water or marine estuaries. By managing the hydrology of agricultural fields it is possible to retain the positive benefits of drainage while significantly reducing nutrient loss. Production improvements can be supported, nitrogen losses demonstrably reduced and habitat protected.

Future listening sessions should be announced well in advance so people can plan their calendars and so interested organizations can assist in spreading the word. The website needs to be kept upto-date. It also needs to be kept simple. I have heard some complaints from people who find it hard to navigate. And while I understand and support the need for registration to make comments and to vote, I think it is not a good idea to have one's votes linked to one's personal profile for all other users to see. (I have no problem with the comments themselves being linked, however.) Of course, AGOI does not exist in a vacuum, and there are other issues which affect it, but which were probably beyond the scope of the listening session. But without an examination of these other issues, AGOI cannot be totally successful. Most important is funding, although population (which was mentioned at UCD) needs to be taken into account as well.

#### POPULATION

We can't hope to make outdoors accessible to everyone if the population keeps growing. We need to come up with a policy to minimize population growth and even reduce it. It's not just a matter of immigration, either, although projections seem to show that the bulk of future population growth will come from immigration and descendants of present immigrants. This is important for both urban outdoors issues like city parks and recreation areas and facilities as well as wildlands.

#### USERS OF PUBLIC LANDS

Land managers must remember that users of public lands are the owners of those lands. There is an increasing trend in which land managers view the public as customers, when in fact, American citizens are the owners of the land and the employers of the land managers. Even if the idea behind this thinking is to promote "good customer service," the thinking is backward. Land managers need to see themselves as "public servants" and act accordingly.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

#### LOCAL INTERESTS VS. NATIONAL INTEREST

The Administration needs to proudly broadcast its support for public lands, from the President and Secretary of the Interior on down, and at every opportunity. It was disconcerting to see Secretary Salazar say that land use decisions would be made at the local level in Utah when politicians and others in that state, representing a minority of Americans, voiced opposition to the

possibility of new national monuments. This is not to say that local opinions should be ignored, but federal public lands belong to all Americans. Only a small minority of Americans lives in those states having the most vocal anti-public lands attitudes, and this minority should not be allowed veto power over proposals and management policies that benefit the majority of Americans.

The history of land conservation issues repeatedly shows that in the long term local citizens see the benefit of conservation initiatives, even if they initially opposed a park or monument designation. For example, Utah's national parks are now among the crown jewels of the National Park System, even though most of them faced vehement local opposition initially.

#### ACCESS & MOTORIZED RECREATION

Not everyone can go everywhere. People need to face up to that simple fact. Therefore, not every group of persons should be given the same level of access -- not because they are less deserving as people, but because some methods of access are destructive of other important values. There have been proposals in Yosemite National Park, for example, to build tramways to the tops of Glacier Point and Half Dome so people can get up to the summits more easily. High levels of motorized access should not be allowed everywhere, because they are destructive of wilderness values, for example. Not every trail should be paved.

Off-highway vehicles should not be allowed free travel everywhere. In fact they should be severely curtailed, as they are destructive of habitat, solitude, and quiet. Furthermore, quiet recreationists-hikers, hunters and anglers, photographers, rafters, birders and wildlife viewers, cross-country skiers, and others-make up the majority of the users of America's public lands. Their desire for peace and quiet in the outdoors should take precedence over the noise of OHV and snowmobiles. OHVs and snowmobiles ruin the experience for them, but the reverse is not true.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

#### PARTNERSHIPS & CONCESSIONAIRES

There is a growing trend toward the development of public-private partnerships in the management of our federal (and other) public lands. While useful in the short term, because of funding constraints, in the long term these partnerships will tend to undermine the notion of public lands being the birthright of every American. Rather, the natural temptation will be to plan

around and for those projects that will attract private funding. And while this temptation might be overcome, it will take a special kind of land manager to do so. In any event, the commercial interests of planners must be always subservient to public interest and benefit.

A related topic is the role that private concessionaires play in the running of our public lands. Again, the public interest must take precedence over the interests of private concessionaires. Resource management decisions must be made on the basis of sound science and not private desires. Concessionaire fees must return a fair value to the agency since it is a public resource being exploited [or private gain (even while providing a public service)]. But charges to the public (citizens) should not be exorbitant, either, such that average citizens are priced out. Prices for lodging in the national parks are becoming far beyond the range of ordinary Americans to enjoy. A quick look at some lodgings shows the following examples:

Yosemite Lodge, mid-week, after Labor Day, \$208 minimum for 2.

Awaynee Hotel, Yosemite, 2 adults, mid-week, after Labor Day, \$498 for 2.

High Sierra Camps, Yosemite, (tent cabins, including dinner & breakfast), \$153/person.

Zion National Park Lodge, mid-week after Labor Day, minimum \$158.95 for 2.

Fees need to be reasonable for families to be able to camp, but the use of concessionaires, by the Forest Service in particular, to run campgrounds causes several problems. The first is that not only must campers pay the costs of maintaining the campground, they must also cover the concessionaire's fee to the government plus cover a reasonable profit. So campers pay much higher fees than they might if the government were running the campground. Secondly, concessionaires are closing "non-profitable" campgrounds earlier and earlier every year, whereas

the Forest Service used to keep campgrounds open, with bad weather being the more decisive factor. The trend toward concessionaire operations is depriving people of opportunities to enjoy their public lands in an inexpensive manner.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

#### OHVs & GETTING CHILDREN OUTDOORS

It was disturbing at the Davis session to hear OHV proponents say that OHVs are good ways to get kids away from their computers, and that as a consequence, more public lands should be made available for OHV use.

The idea behind getting children outdoors rests on at least two propositions. The first is that exposure to Nature is beneficial for children (and adults, too, for that matter). Nature is a wonderful way to learn about science, and increasingly, exposure to Nature is linked to mental health benefits as well. The second proposition is that getting children outdoors increases their physical activity, leading to physical health benefits.

OHV recreation may get children outdoors, but it does not get them close to nature. Instead the thrill comes from driving the machine. And OHV use does not promote physical activity. Far better for both purposes is to get children out hiking. (OHV use also exposes children to pollution from exhaust and to the risk of accidents.)

Overall, OHV use is not good for our public lands. The temptation to go off-trail is great, and user-created trails, once established, are hard to eradicate. Trails fragment wildlife habitat. OHV use contributes to soil erosion, and increasingly, there is evidence that the dust blows away, sometimes settling on snowpack, causing earlier and more rapid snowmelt.

The region is primarily privately owned in family ranches that focus on raising livestock. The traditions of that community are being rapidly lost as financial conditions, including government incentives, pressure ranching families to convert native prairie and wetlands to cropland. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ducks Unlimited, and numerous other partners have worked for decades to preserve the remaining native prairies and rich habitat by helping ranch families retain their land as productive working landscapes for livestock and wildlife.

In spite of the progress of these partnerships in protecting this landscape, the ranching and outdoors lifestyles, and the nationwide benefits that the PPR provides, this vital region of America's Great Outdoors and the lifestyle it supports is being chipped away faster than it can be conserved. Ducks Unlimited encourages the Administration to support the efforts of these partnerships and enhance their abilities to protect these core national values by recognizing the PPR as a key component of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative, and by increasing funding to protect and restore this landscape.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

#### Farm Bill priorities

The Farm Bill and waterfowl are inextricably linked. The management of our nation's agricultural lands greatly affects duck populations, particularly in the nesting grounds of the grasslands and wetlands of the PPR. DU's approach to the Farm Bill is pragmatic: we realize that quality cropland should and will be devoted to providing food, fiber, and fuel for our nation. We also realize that not all ground is suitable for crop production. Some of it is too rocky, steep, wet, or dry to reliably produce a crop; hence, DU's commonsense approach of "Farm the Best and Conserve the Rest."

The remaining 22 million acres of native prairie in the U.S. portion of the PPR produce an abundant fall flight of ducks, geese, and many other migratory bird species from this country each year while simultaneously providing the backbone for a robust ranching industry. Unfortunately, this native prairie habitat base is being whittled away, the victim of drought-tolerant crop varieties, high commodity prices, increasing demand for food, and federal policies that encourage farming marginal cropland. The PPR has already lost 70 percent or more of its native grassland, and DU researchers have documented annual loss rates of up to 2 percent of this habitat in the heart of the "duck factory." This loss rate of 2% translates into the loss of 50,000 or more ducks each year, and means that 50% of the remaining prairie will be gone in about 30 years.

We must remove farm bill policies that subsidize the conversion of native prairie and wetlands, fully enforce swampbuster, make sodsaver mandatory, and take other policy steps to remove all federal incentives that encourage the continued conversion of our native prairies and wetlands.

Farm Bill programs such as the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which sets aside marginal croplands that provide wildlife habitat as well as conserving soil, improving water quality, and sequestering carbon, are particularly vital to the waterfowl populations of the PPR. The PPR has lost nearly 1.6 million acres of CRP lands since 2007, and another 2.8 million acres of contracts are set to expire by 2012. Biologists expect that the loss of this waterfowl breeding habitat will have a significant impact on waterfowl production in the U.S. Focusing some resources of the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP), which compensates farmers and ranchers who retire flood-prone croplands and restore wetlands, on the PPR also would help to reverse the loss of these habitats and grazing lands. The key to both of these programs is funding-lack of funding keeps the U.S.D.A. from being able to enroll all those landowners who wish to take part in these conservation programs.

Access



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Knowledge of opportunities or simple familiarity of what activities are possible

School curriculum limits ability for kids to get outdoors. Field trips are limited by time and constraints

Extra-curricular activities (soccer, clubs, etc.) also keep kids from outdoors. Supervised activities are "safer" than outdoors

Parental involvement is a challenge -- programs like Scouts keep parents involved, Time is biggest issue facing parental involvement

Liability issues in outdoor programs

Loss of outdoor ideals through passing generations -- less people in each generation learning about outdoors, Loss of the "conservation ethic". Outdoor classrooms/education campaigns can help parents learn -- pass on to kids

Funding for recreation is not a priority (as opposed to agriculture, etc.)

Systems are not set up for effective partnerships. Many barriers/red tape in federal agencies. Agencies have lost trust of the people

Agencies are disconnected from each other -- causes confusion of the public. Disconnect between city parks and state/fed. Parks

Nature is not "cool"

Electronics and technology (with both youth and adults)

Media and society. Need to make outdoors attractive to people

Initiatives are good, but rarely funded -- can end up setting agencies back

"Traditional thinking" -- may have to totally rethink kids and outdoors

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Outdoor recreation can be expensive

Competition to outdoors from many other ways to spend time and money

Exposure of most people to outdoors

Lack of advertising from agencies

Marketing -- need to become part of media

There are "do'ers" and "watchers" -- need to find a way to get to watchers

The Need for Full Operational Funding for the National Park Service

Compared to the overall federal budget, the Park Service is very small ---only one tenth of 1 percent. Providing Parks the funds needed to serve visitors and protect resources is a tiny investment in our national heritage, and provides economic benefits and jobs in struggling communities nationwide.

First and foremost, the President and Congress must support operations funding for the National Park Service, sufficient to meet its' needs.

Lack of a Secure and Fully Funded, Mandatory Land and Water Conservation Fund

The opportunity now exists to provide landscape level protection for this corridor through the innovative use of a dual National Park and Preserve designation.

Thus an expansion of the National Monument would provide the medium for communicating a superior telling of the ancestral Muscogean story and its intersection with American history. Ideally, a boundary adjustment for the Monument would extend to the northern border of the Bond Swamp National Wildlife Refuge. It would include the full extent of the Ocmulgee Old Fields and as much of the Muscogee Traditional Cultural Property as possible.

- Access to existing public lands, not shortage of federal lands, is #1 issue why hunters stop hunting. ESA and "Sensational" criteria scores higher than access needs and should be changed

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Treasured Landscapes such as the Great Lakes and Chesapeake Bay need to be managed with a comprehensive ecosystem approach. Targeting alien species like carp is important, but non point source pollution, global climate change, and greenhouse gas emissions are far more destructive in the long run. We need to provide new legislation and funding to address these issues in order to better understand and manage for fish and wildlife welfare through adaptation, mitigation, and restoration.

Youth in the Outdoors: Programs designed to Engage Youth and get kids outside to explore and play should be continued and expanded. It is critical to get them out and light their conservation passion.

LWCF State F&W have hard time accessing State side LWCF  
Investment criteria should ensure State F&W should be eligible

The #1 issue threatening fish and wildlife populations is Habitat Loss/Fragmentation. The resolution needs to be at the State and local levels, not Federal. The federal role should be development and distribution of Awareness Educational materials provided to local entities.

There is a lack of coordinated Recreation Management Planning for FS & BLM. Recreational Shooting is often not explicitly protected in plans. There is concern that FS planning Rule may not protect recreational shooting, due to incompatible activities being approved nearby. The FS and BLM should designate Shooting Areas in the Plans.

- Hunting is under represented in FS Planning. States Fish and Wildlife agencies should be given official Cooperating Agency role, and not be treated just another public commenter.

Forest Health not just invasive species control, but needs to be more proactive. Aggressive management and control measures need to be taken in cases such as the bark beetle infestation in the West. It is not acceptable to just monitor and map the spread and document tree mortality.

Visitation at NPS areas is higher than National Wildlife Refuges and National Forests, but despite excellent interpretive programming by the NPS, they have not done a good job of interpreting the need for active management of habitats and wildlife populations. Visitors come away with the inaccurate impression that plant and animal populations never need active management. The NPS should improve this area of interpretation.

Urban Kids have to have local opportunities for outside recreation. Familiarity with the outdoors begins with threshold experiences in small “green spots” near home

Research shows that in order to successfully get people outdoors on a sustained basis, access must be available locally. Local opportunities and settings for outdoor recreation are critical.

Outdoor Communities must step up and become good mentors. The traditional model of youth being mentored by their parents or older friends and relatives is too often broken and no longer effective. We must all step up and pass along our knowledge and passion for the outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many outside areas are being closed off due to liability concerns by the landowner. Is there a Federal solution to limiting liability? Capping?

Looking for coordination of all Departments and programs- Interior, HHS, Education, EPA, Agriculture, to team up in alignment to leverage limited capacities and provide better overall package of services and opportunities to States and Communities.

USDA and Interior should make better use of existing conservation package of authorities for new and innovative tax incentives to encourage landowners participation in recreational access programs such as USDA's Open Fields.

Prairies of N/S Dakota, important for nesting wild fowl. Loosing area pretty fast, ability to show how able to work with ranchers on working lands with easements. Currently, 600 ranchers willing to work together on conservation of 300,000 acres, looking for donors with matching funds to help preserve. Organizations like DU can effectively assist Feds and landowners by brokering conservation easements, but they need a more efficient system.

Call for education legislation with no child left inside, want to get kids out side reconnection

Prairie Pothole region, really need to look at a way to look at conservation in the 21st century look at places at landscape scale and adopt a model of public/private partnerships. Like to see fed to use all existing tools/programs that are currently formula driven, to create a new pool of funds to really help certain areas. National Fish Conservation Act must be passed into law.

Dep of Commerce, marine resource management, different approach to marine resources, but they are not learning from the lessons of Public Lands Management (e.g. successful Wildlife Refuge model).

Echo what everyone is said. Climate change is the biggest threat to climate change now and in the future. National adaptation strategy is important and urgently needed. LWCF as a conservation tool is an important part, and should be fully funded.

Prairie Pothole region is very important and at risk of being lost, and should be a designated Treasured Landscape. Key conservation programs in the Farm Bill should be focused on the Prairie Pothole Treasured landscape.

During the past 20 years there has been a dramatic increase in obesity in the United States. In 2008, every state in the nation had a prevalence of obesity 20% or more, with the exception of Colorado, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The U.S. Forest Service in its groundbreaking Forest on the Edge report in 2005 predicted unprecedented new threats to eastern forests from forest subdivision and development through 2030.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The report locates the top fifteen watersheds in the nation for projected future development in the East and anticipates that 44 million acres of private forest nationwide will be lost to development through 2030

The vast majority of eastern forests are privately owned and not protected from development

Less than twenty percent of eastern forests are currently conserved from development and major changes to eastern landscapes are looming

It is imperative that we continue to make significant public and private investments in forest conservation to limit and offset impacts from new development on our most critical forest resource areas.

I am writing to you to implore you to save Bristol Bay from a mining disaster. We have already ruined our Gulf Coast line with a massive oil spill. We cannot afford to leave our children a ruined country. The destruction that will occur is unthinkable. As you know Bristol Bay area is a treasure drawing many forms of wildlife, that require our protection to their habitat such as: grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales spawning salmon which are the linchpin of this glorious wilderness, supporting valuable commercial fisheries, indigenous people and a vast array of wildlife. Yet the whole system could come crashing down if giant mining interests get their way.

The only way these foreign mining companies can get at the rich gold and copper deposits located in this pristine area that we the United State people have preserved, is to extract this ore through destructive and pollution-producing hard-rock mining. At risk is over 1 million acres of public land. This land should be preserved for our children and grandchildren. What kind of a legacy are we leaving exchanging dollars for natural resources that once gone will never come back? I tell you this beautiful piece of natural beauty must remain in its natural glory. It is our duty as human beings protecting the earth to be excellent sheppard's of this treasure. I implore you to use your conscience and protect this natural wonder that we the people of the United States have inherited.

Think about it, do we want pristine areas with animals in their natural habitat roaming free? Or an open-pit mine that would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building)? As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A proposed single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans and United States citizens all over the country are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. I live in New England and feel strongly we need to protect this area. It is our duty.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. The Pebble Mine proposal threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.

Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority.

VTC's initial reaction is that the proposal fails to meet some of its key stated goals. Second, the proposal probably marks the most profound overhaul of the North Woods economic and cultural fabric of all-time. As such, VTC is worried that far reaching decisions will be made within the federal bureaucracy, the uppermost levels of state government, and the preservationist group board rooms before the residents of the North Woods region have a chance to determine whether they are even interested in a complete overhaul of their current way of life.

VTC fears that NEFA's proposal is sending us in that direction again. NEFA's Draft Concept Paper speaks of 15 million new "conserved" acres in the Northeast, and recruitment of funding from private interests, such as those involved in the Champion purchase, whose policies are well-known to include all of the restrictions mentioned above. The \$2 billion proposal also suggests large federal land purchases. The timing of the proposal closely follows the Green Mt. National Forest Twenty-Year Land Plan controversy that rocked Vermont from 2003-2006. The outcome of this controversy resulted in 42,000 acres (65 square miles) of new federally designated "wilderness". As NEFA members know, federal "wilderness" designation involves many of the aforementioned restrictions associated with the Champion Lands purchase. The GMNF "wilderness" designation would have been much more expansive if the Vermont Traditions Coalition, the administration of Gov. Jim Douglas, ten forest host towns, and a plethora of other traditional interests had not fought the "wilderness" proposal tooth and nail including two trips by Vermont Traditions Coalition representatives to the nation's capitol. The Vermont House of Representatives even passed a Resolution calling upon the U. S. Forest Service and Congressional delegation to refrain from designating any new "wilderness" in the Green Mt. National Forest. Regarding the NEFA proposal, why would all the interests that have been victimized by the restrictions outlined above want to bring on a massive new injection of the same prescription? Why would they be interested in a drawn out highly technical, highly contentious public input process which pits ordinary citizens who want to preserve their current way of life against a small army of well-paid hired personnel associated with numerous preservationist groups?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

At present, Vermont includes the ever expanding 400,000 acre Green Mt. Forest stretching from our southern border all the way into Chittenden County on the Northwest side of the state .. There's a proposed federal Wild & Scenic designation stretched over a sprawling chunk of Northwest Vermont. In Northeast Vermont, there's the former Champion Lands and substantial expanses of easement lands. Plus, there are thousands of acres of state lands throughout Northern Vermont. Finally, VTC understands that there is a new proposal that has not been widely publicized to designate the Lake Champlain basin as a "Heritage Area." Do Vermonters and other residents of the great North Woods really want wealthy national preservation groups, the federal government, and state entities controlling much of the remaining real estate on the northern tier? The model NEFA proposes seems to be exactly that. While NEFA talks about preservation of the culture and traditions of the North Woods, the original Champion lands purchase and NEFA's Draft Concept Paper suggest that a restrictive model controlled by outside interests will once again be advocated by the controlling interests.

In addition to the 65 square miles of restrictive "wilderness" that Vermont's Congressional delegation added to the Green Mt. National Forest in 2006, there are 91 square miles of pre-existing restrictive "wilderness" in the GMNF: a total of approximately 100,000 acres. Plus, much of the remaining land in the forest is locked up in other restrictive federally designated categories. Timber sale acreage on federal lands throughout the country has nose-dived in recent decades. Due to an entanglement of procedural pre-requisites to any timber sale, the federal government doesn't even come close to "Allowable Timber Sale" quotas that delineate the timber cutting goals of the forest.

That's not all. While the State of Vermont's public lands timber cutting efforts have greatly improved during the last eight years, Vermont state government still falls woefully short of cutting even the available timber left after exclusion of cutting by "sensitive" land classifications. Conservation easements owned by preservation groups, whose mission is often hostile to timber cutting, also tend to sharply limit our open landscape's timber management potential rather than preserving it. Rather than supply "expanded forest products production and consumption" as your Concept Paper proclaims, federal ownership and preservationist groups ownership sharply limits timber product availability for the forest products industry. NEFA's purported solution to future forest products industry sustainability fails, and produces outcomes contrary to NEFA's stated goals.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The limits on timber cutting and termination of traditional access roads by the federal government and easement owners also discourage hunting. A landscape with reduced timber management depletes the health and abundance of virtually all wildlife species. Lack of access roads prevents sportsmen from using large amounts of the preserved land. Plus, restrictions placed on access roads, snowmobiling and ATV riding sharply-limit recreational tourism potential. The Champion Lands proposal often years ago, like your proposal, touts the eco-tourism potential of the public and preservationist group land acquisitions, but then proposes restrictions on traditional tourism opportunities such as fishing, hunting, and motorized recreation. It is no secret that, by far, the number one tourist driver of the Champion lands region economy is snowmobiling, yet the Champion lands purchases sought limitations on future snowmobile trails in the Champion region. The Nature Conservancy and Vermont Land Trust routinely try to terminate motorized recreation in easement lands that they acquire even if motorized recreation trails pre-exist the easement acquisition. Plus, the Nature Conservancy stops open hunting on lands it requires, and mandates "Hunting By Permission Only". Often times, finding out where to get permission and other impediments make what should be an unnecessary requirement even more difficult to comply with. Plus, TNC is quick to shut off "sensitive areas" to hunting (while continuing to allow other user groups to utilize these areas).

Like timber cutting, creation of recreational amenities on public land has nose dived in recent years. The federal government has created such a tangle of procedural prerequisites to recreational amenity creation that federal land managers have trouble creating such amenities even when they want to. Instead, federal trends demonstrate that closure of access roads, trails, camping areas, and other amenities is more likely than creation of such amenities.

The federal land management system also suffers from a revolving door of land managers. National Forest managers are routinely transferred to a different national forest location every few years thereby diminishing institutional knowledge and mission connectivity. Vt. Traditions Coalition opposes NEFA's advocacy of regionalism, because smaller bureaucratic entities such as the individual states are able to better manage their lands than larger entities such as the federal government. For many reasons, regionalizing the future of North Woods land management will create negative consequences for residents of the NOLih Woods. To the maximum extent possible, residents of the North Woods should remain in control of their land base. The above-referenced federal and preservationist group initiatives that have been completed or are being attempted already involve a dangerous amount of land use control being transferred from NOLih Woods residents to outside conglomerates and the loss of local control that goes with it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The federal government's appetite for restrictive land designations that cut off public access and use of public land shows no signs of going away soon. Major new "wilderness" designations involving millions of acres throughout the United States passed in the last couple of years. Now, proposals are already floating about for another massive national effort to add millions of acres of federally designated "wilderness" to the millions of acres of recently designated "wilderness" and the millions of acres of long-time "wilderness". Thus, the entities that NEFA selects to preserve the future of forest industry sustainability and traditional rural land uses, in fact, have a demonstrable record of failure to deliver on such promises. Furthermore, time and again, these entities have demonstrated an appetite for adding new restricted acreages that ban many of the activities NEFA claims they will promote. Fundamentally, there is no "end game" to the drive to add restrictive roadless acreages to the vast expanses of previously restricted lands.

NEFA's proposed \$2 billion, ten year acquisition of 15 million acres (23,437 square miles) of the North Woods sections of New England and New York does not deliver on NEFA's stated goals, and therefore, if NEFA's goals are truly as stated, NEFA needs to seek a different solution. The proposal needs to paint a realistic picture of its outcomes. What is actually being proposed appears to be a National Park. At present, Vermont Traditions Coalition has seen no indication that the people of the North Woods want to undergo such a wholesale transition in their way of life.

In the 1990's, a study commission thoroughly considered the desires of North Woods residents for their future. It is VTC's understanding that ideas along the lines of the NEFA Draft Concept Paper were rejected. The outcome of the 1990s study, if VTC's recollection is correct, calls into question whether NEFA should even be embarking on the herein referenced proposal. If NEFA insists on moving forward with the proposal regardless of whether it conflicts with the desires reflected in the 1990s study, then, at the least, a thorough public input process should be undertaken before decisions are made, not after. For a proposal as dramatic and far reaching as NEFA's Draft Concept Paper, a much longer comment period for public input and greater outreach than NEFA has used would seem to be highly advisable.

Rather than reiterate those March 31, 2010 Comments for you in the context of the Great Outdoors Initiative, VTC will simply include them here. VTC strongly suspects that the Great Outdoors Initiative is headed toward the same policy that's advocated by the Concept Paper. VTC therefore asks that you simply extrapolate the comments from the March 31 VTC submission to the Great Outdoors Initiative. If the Great Outdoors Initiative is headed in the direction of restrictions on recreation, timber management, and road access to federal lands or federal lands to be acquired, VTC's opposition and the rationale for it are clear. Based on the experiences of the last 12 years, both in Vermont and nationally, VTC does not trust the federal government as a landowner and strongly opposes land ownership interests being conveyed to private preservationists groups with restriction agendas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

VTC understands the importance of the great outdoors and the need to reconnect the people with nature. More importantly we understand the importance of protecting Vermont's rural identity and traditional land use

practices which make Vermont as unique as it is. As more and more lands are being conserved in the name of the public good, the rigid, broad-based federal land restrictions that come with these purchases are taking away our way of life, piece by piece, year by year and in essence discollecing people from the "great outdoors".

These federal land restrictions have worked to displace hunting camps, shut down snowmobile trails, outlaw all motorized use, ban horseback riding and mountain biking, close off road networks, shut down timber harvesting, end fish stocking, and on and on. These federal restrictions and ever changing land plans cater to, in many cases, unnecessarily to only a small user group. VTC believes all forms of recreation are important. Not only to the people who visit, but to those who live there and depend on recreation to fuel the economy. These broad-based restrictions that are filtered down from federal agencies working in conjunction with wealthy, national, extreme environmental organizations work to only disconnect people from nature, local economies and divided recreational user groups. Battles over land use can create great distaste, ripping local communities apart over unnecessary federal restrictions. VTC has witnessed this firsthand. When the federal government worked with the Nature Conservancy and the Vermont Land Trust to conserve the 126,000 acre champion lands timber company lands as part of the Silvio Conte Refuge system, they coined the lands pristine. Yet, they strived to remove the people who cared for the land for generations. A decade later those scars are still not healed.

Working forests provide many public benefits. These forests provide clean air, clean water, forest products, wildlife habitat, recreation, jobs, renewable energy and help mitigate climate change. Forests are as important an infrastructure to our country as roads and bridges. Here in New Hampshire, as in many other parts of the East, the majority of these working forests are privately-owned. Unlike public property, there is no guarantee that these lands will stay in forests.

New Hampshire is one of the fastest growing states in New England, yet it remains about 84% forested. As the economy picks up we will see a renewed threat from fragmentation and conversion. We must act now to protect these private forests, for once they are gone it is too late. I applaud the Administration for this initiative, and I look forward to important things happening as a result. Thank you again for seeking input.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

As an agriculture professional, the food statement is completely uneducated and off base. It was written by someone who obviously does not understand how food is really produced and how natural resources are managed in the real world.

In Massachusetts, OHV enthusiasts are the only user group that pay fees for recreational use of public lands. yet we are the only user group that is regularly ignored in the process. Land closures focused specifically on the OHV user group happen regularly without comment of any kind. Currently OHV use for the type of riding i do (ATV) is limited to 2 state parks in all the state of Massachusetts. There was never any comment period, open hearing or notification. I am limited to two parks almost 4 hours drive away. This does not constitute fair representation by D.E.M officials and more than just being exclusionary it is downright discrimination against the one user group that is REQUIRED to pay a usage fee in the state. Almost cause for a class action lawsuit.

To clarify a statement above, OHV users are the only user group required to pay a usage fee, collected by means of a sales tax and yearly registration. Other user groups pay fees at certain parks but they are voluntary in that the user can find other parks with no user fees.

Further restriction of public lands will only concentrate the use into smaller and smaller areas. Before long those areas will become undesirable wastelands from overuse. Responsible management by user groups with limited involvement by government is the best way to ensure the well-being of public lands. The public is very capable of good stewardship and responsibility for the conservation of the natural resources which are ours by right. Using wilderness designations to lock down public lands breeds suspicion of the government's motivation. Conservation and scientific study groups are welcome in these areas because they help maintain their wild nature, but not with the motivation to restrict human access. There are countless examples of user groups throughout the country which have successfully maintained and improved sensitive areas with multiple users. Rather than sealing up these areas to access to us and our posterity, preserve the freedom of everyone to access these areas for recreation and our appreciation.

We do not need more Wilderness. There are other methods to conserve large areas without Wilderness, such as National Recreation Areas or Backcountry designation, which conserve land but still allow access. I can count on one hand the number of hikers or horsemen I've seen while riding some of the country's remote trail systems....Wilderness shuts out everyone but them, and they end up with vast tracts of land that most people won't or can't go into. Backcountry designation keeps the land accessible. No more Wilderness!

As George Santayana said: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it." Keeping history alive and available to all of our citizens is very important for our continued education on our past mistakes. Civil War battlefields remind us in a tangible way of an important (some might argue THE most important) part of our history.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most people who use off road vehicles already have a drivers license. It is not their driving safety and skills that are being challenged, it their common sense. Just because someone invested in an off road vehicle does that mean we have to provide them with a place to operate their vehicle? The vehicle does not come with any other licenses or permits to operate it on the open land, range, or mountain region and destroy it. If someone purchases such a vehicle it should be assumed that they own their own tract of land to operate on. It is not our responsibility to see that their have a place to use their purchase, I don't care how much it cost. What is wrong with off roading with mules, horses, mountain bikes or feet?

The NJ Pinelands National Reserve (The Pine Barrens) was regonized as a federal and state treasure back in 1978 by the United States Congress. In 1979 New Jersey passed the Pinelands Protection Act and established the Pinelands Commission in 1980 to monitor the areas growth and protect 1.1 million acres of Pinelands in South New Jersey. After 30 years development has been monitored but nearly nothing has been done to protect the area from people who want to deposit their refuse in it or tramp over it in their off road vehicles. The area is not one bit user friendly. The citizens of NJ have very limited access and almost no facilities for recreation such as hiking and exploring. Few of the roads are usable or marked and there are few access/information points available. People who want to explore and get out into nature are pretty much left to their own devices. The State of New Jersey invest little money or time into this ecological gem. By making a large part of it into a National Park it would insure that it is kept safe from those who want to use it for their own personal dumping and playground and open it up to the citizens of NJ and the United States. Such a designation would also help to further insure that the flora and fauna, some of which are endangered and rare, are more readily protected.

\$1000 per barrel of oil and \$1000 per ton of coal should be added to the lease price of any public land oil or coal lease to cover the cost of health care for millions of people whose lungs are damaged by burned fossil fuel, for the cleanup of environmental pollution and for the ongoing damage to the whole globe by global warming.

A few environmental groups seem to have been hijacked by the corperations they were supposed to watch and help protect the environment against, so being a so called leader of one of these groups may not be a good litmus test for choosing heads of agencies like the FWS. On the other hand, the environmentalists who have a proven track record of caring about wild places and who have fought in the courts to uphold environmental laws for little or no money; absolutely and of course they should be at the top of FWS, BLM, USFS, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A lot of emphasis has been placed on saving the Amazon rainforest in order to offset carbon emissions and reverse global climate change. This is a popular idea among utilities in the US because it is fairly cheap to buy land in the jungle and it causes no pain to utility users here. However, it is not nearly enough to save just one old forest. Global climate change is everyone's problem and is going to require way more than a drop in the bucket approach to fix it. We should be saving every large swath of old-growth forest on Earth and restore what we can as fast as we can. The economic consequences of not doing that are going to make the recent financial crisis look like a dollar stuck in an ATM, and the environmental consequences of inaction are going to make the Gulf oil spill look like a plugged toilet.

A more than adequate compromise was made between wilderness and non wilderness about 60 years ago when the national forests became giant logging industrial forests. If it's still roadless, it is rare and should be preserved as wilderness. It doesn't matter if you think it is not spectacular or that you think you could use it some other way. Just leave it alone. It doesn't matter if you ever see it either.

This has a lot to do with the great outdoors. GMO crops change the way the whole world of plants works. They are a threat to the wild just like any form of pollution is.

Certain people here on this blog evidently think that every kid in New York City should drive their car 2000 miles to the top of the Colorado Plateau just to experience what any one of our great grand parents used to be able to experience from the comfort of their homes. It's been 200 years since this whole country was a wilderness, that's 1.9 billion acres in the lower 48 states. Of that, there is less than 1 percent of that wilderness left and most of that is rock, ice and bone dry desert. Why is it so hard for some people to find value in preserving what's left?

Whether species are migratory or not, their habitat will be moving either north or south, depending on what the climate is doing. Because the problem is global, the Pacific Crest will be affected. In order to connect Mexico and Canada with a park on government land, there are not a whole lot of choices for boundaries. Your point about the freeway crossings is important. It was irresponsible to build interstate freeways that totally cut off migrations of animals, but that is done, so we need to figure out how that might be mitigated in the near future.

Our lower 48 states is 1.9 billion acres. I may be wrong, and I encourage you to show me the location of a million acres of contiguous forested wilderness in the lower 48. Please look at the landscape carefully in satellite photos before you respond. Rock and ice do not qualify as wilderness forest, nor do logged over lands.

Diversity is something that seems hard for loggers to understand. Fallen trees, even huge areas of them, create habitats that won't exist if people go around cleaning up everything that people think of as unsightly. Forests don't exist just for our ideas about what forests are. Any proposal to log in National Parks is a bad idea because untouched land is important to our understanding of the difference between natural condition and managed condition. If we don't have a way to measure that, we have no foundation for scientific analysis.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For those of you who use google earth, take a flight across the USA at about 15000 feet and you will see that most of our country is divided up into ranches, checkerboards of farmland and checkerboards made by logging right up to property lines. Very little of the country is unfenced and most of the wild land is deep desert or solid rock. I am a supporter of property rights, but people who think of public land as part of their ranch are welfare ranchers who should quit leaching off taxpayers.

This post is about oil, gas and coal leases on public land and is not "off subject". It reflects a view held by many that costs to our society are not calculated carefully when public land managers decide on lease prices.

Get a better web designer, get a bigger computer, get a faster connection. This website barely works. I've brought it to the attention of DOI and nothing was done. If you want to have a lively discussion of the issues, make your website work a lot better. Otherwise, you're wasting everyone's time and you are definitely not helping the Whitehouse understand public land issues. This is the worst, most sluggish website I've ever visited. It's hard to log in, almost impossible to vote, you push buttons and they disappear and nothing happens. GET IT RIGHT!

I am always amazed at the crowd on this list who would execute all the wildlife just so they can "recreate" with huge machines. The term "recreation" is defined pretty loosely. I don't see any "recreation" in driving a noisy vehicle, shooting a gun, towing a house.

I can't believe that this country is dumping garbage in the ocean and burning it on barges at sea. Everything should be recycled. Everything should be packaged as small as possible. Nothing should go to waste.

I just want to remind you that this post is talking about a tiny, tiny fraction of the US. The lower 48 states amounts to 1.9 billion acres. If you don't like the concept of wild land that is left totally to nature, please visit any of the 1.9 billion other acres in the US. If you want nature with roads and cell phones, go to LA or New York city. That is nature too, and is totally accessible.

I keep hearing that a million acres is huge. Just because you can't count that high doesn't mean it's big. A viable population of most large mammals cannot live on a million acres. A million acres is a tiny, tiny fraction of the area of the United States. A million acres is nothing alongside the area affected by the gulf oil spill. A million acres is trivial alongside the area of the Earth affected by man made climate change. Wilderness areas are not set aside only for your enjoyment. They are a refuge for wildlife and plant species, a source of clean water and clean air, and a reminder of what we've already lost, which is 1.8 billion acres of wilderness here in the lower 48.

I looked for a definition of "Klamath" and found nothing except for the location of the river. The Klamath is imperiled by oxygen depletion caused by over fertilization by livestock grazing in the Klamath Basin in marshlands and then the water being stored and ripened in the man made lakes. Your attack against American Indian fishing is pure BS too.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I suggest to \_\_\_\_\_ that you utilize the potential that the internet gives you and research google maps satellite photos of our country to really understand that almost every acre of the USA except for the rock and ice are developed, fenced, logged, mined. Yes, there are many acres of bone dry desert and desolate mountains declared as wilderness, but that does nothing to stop the constant movement toward extinction of species who need moderation. How would you like it if the only place available for you to live was the top of a 14000 foot peak.

I think the biggest problem with OHV's is their ability to quickly destroy things when the people at the controls are not aware of problems they are creating. One of the things that is most offensive to me about OHVs is the noise. Why would I want to go for a hike and hear nothing but revving engines? The noise can be heard a mile away. When you are riding an OHV you don't even realize there are other people using the land for recreation. It appears you don't care, so I have no sympathy for families of OHVers or their fond memories.

I worked in a timbered national forest for many years. People who believe in letting fires burn and not heavily managing forests do not necessarily have "more money than sense" as \_\_\_\_ says. And we're not all insulated from reality in big cities either, as some people imply. And, when you write a letter, don't say we when you mean you. Rather than suggesting that your so called eco groups have the big bucks, and file lawsuits, look at the big timber big bucks and their lawsuits that threaten the government if national forests don't liquidate all the trees. Big timber is as manipulative and threatening as the mafia.

If it weren't for the right to sue land managers, the land managers would simply ignore the law. Laws are being broken. That is why there are lawsuits. On the other hand, why should the federal government subsidize mining, logging and ranching on our public land? Why is it so OK for the government to allow industry to become welfare recipients?

If you get rid of the subsidies for timber companies, you automatically help the recycling industry. I'm still amazed at how hard it is to get recycled paper. Stop giving welfare to the timber industry!

If you need to use your neighbors property so you can live in your space, good luck. Ranchers need to join the plight of all the rest of us. We have to do what we can to survive within the limits that are handed to us. Just because you own property and you call yourself a rancher does not mean that you have a right to use my property (I own a share of that public land) for your gain. Get real.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In the last ten years I'll bet almost everyone in the USA visited a national or state park. Most probably went to a naturalist program. I understand your desire to help folks understand the protected places, but this blog is filled with people who are misinformed and downright nasty toward what they call eco freaks. I've noticed over the years that there's absolutely nothing you can say to these people to get them to think about the world in a different way. No matter how the facts present themselves, no matter whether they have asthma and cancer, no matter that fluctuations in the weather get more radical or that cities keep eating their family farms or that oil keeps dumping into the ocean destroying their fishing. They just don't get it and they never will and park programs to them are just like watching TV or camping from the comfort of their motorhomes. These people are permanently, unalterably disconnected from the world they live in. They see the world as a cartoon where they are the only thing that matters. They don't want to know about the world, just want to use people like you and your park programs for their entertainment. I am going to call these people eco-phobes from now on and I hope you will too. And I will refer to the oil industry people as drill-huggers. I am going to make up degrading titles for each of these groups of people just as they have made up titles for people who care about the clean air, clean water and wild places. And, best of all, I will never support naturalist programs that entertain them or their kids between TV programs.

In the lower 48, wild areas are basically large city parks surrounded by clearcuts and mines. They are mostly polluted little things protecting values that humans find important like mountain tops and recreational opportunities. For the most part they can be walked across in a day and are almost unnoticeable from an airplane. They are almost never the preferred habitat of any species, are 99 percent rock or ice, never include the full habitat of any large animal. If you stand on one side of almost any one of these areas, you can easily see the other side of it. The philosophy of putting lines around these areas encourages people to think small and whimpish thoughts. Everything is managed by people for the benefit of people who think that their "use" of these wild areas is the only reason for them to exist. I don't mind that some small areas are set aside for the people who don't have time or the physique to go on major, thought provoking journeys, but there's definitely no room here for Lewis and Clark.

It cracks me up to hear the OHV crowd use the disabled American argument to support their case for more OHV trails. In my opinion, all of you must be disabled. You better get off your asses and go hiking or your bodies will atrophy and all you'll be able to do is watch TV. You are lazy. You are lame. You wish that was a disability. For people who are truly disabled, do you really want to be lumped in with these lazy lumps of fat who are using you as an excuse for their fat behavior.

It's not about protecting user groups, it's about wildlife.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've seen fire fighters light a line along a road five miles from a lightening fire. The fires never did meet by the time winter rains came. This is arson, by my standards, and vandalism. It happens all the time. Fire is used by the government to increase funding for fire fighting. The size of fires the previous season is what dictates how much money fire control gets in the next year. It's not a good way to get objective land management. The National park Service should take over management of all the sensitive areas. Any area with a low density of roads on government land should become a national park and be managed with a great deal of respect for the natural condition of the land. There are a hundred such proposals made by the New National Parks Project.

Livestock does a lot of damage in some places, including spreading noxious weeds. That costs taxpayers a lot of money and degrades a lot of land for every other use. Cattle also stomp wet meadows to death and ruin the water quality in creeks. A lot of the land where cattle graze is city watershed. Cattle pollute the water so cities have to spend more on water treatment. Cattle also ruin trails for hikers, making them big and ugly with crap all over them and cattle hugely increase the fly population and kill all the meadow flowers. Ranchers on public land also poison and shoot carnivores that threaten their cows and sheep. That upsets the whole balance of nature.

Most of those roads were only there to get to large trees that have already been cut. With the nation wide concern about the decline in salmon runs, a huge food source of yesteryear, it would be more cost effective to remove culverts and outslope the road surfaces. You're blaming environmentalists for the problem. The endangered species act is an attempt to protect people like you and your families and friends from becoming extinct. The roads are a problem for the salmon and a bunch of other species. That problem directly affects your food supply. Wouldn't you rather have the fish than the thousands of miles of dusty roads that lead to stumps and brush?

Mr Evers, you need to stand on the edge of New York City and imagine the lack of native wildlife from sea to shining sea. I used to live in Montana and am aware of the rock and ice in the Rocky Mountains.

Much of wilderness areas are set aside because a lot of people consider those areas sacred ground. Just as I would not attempt to ride a motorcycle through your church, ORV and OHV users should not ride motorized vehicles through my church. If I rode a motorcycle through your church I would expect serious consequences. If you rode one through my church, you should expect what???

My great grandfather was a logger on the end of a misery whip in the redwood forests near what is now Redwood National Park. At that time they thought the forest was a never ending resource. It was considered a radical idea to preserve any of it. Now there is only a tiny fraction of the original ancient forest left and cutting even one tree can effect endangered wildlife. The radicals are now those who do the logging. All logging in old growth should end, even if the trees are fire killed snags or are dying from insects or disease. Big trees are a habitat type whether they are dead or alive. Any more, only a radical could cut an ancient tree.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Nature is basically a dictator and it's laws are inflexible. Governments who don't align laws carefully to reflect the laws of nature won't last for long. This is where we are getting in trouble with carbon emissions, ocean acidification, air and water pollution, over fishing and farmland destruction right now. We need to line up our law with the law of nature right away, or we are going to be extinct.

OHV use causes erosion, wildlife disruption and there is way plenty of land dedicated to this sport. It has nothing to do with wilderness and connecting the wilderness and OHV use is as ludicrous as connecting the Iraq war with American wilderness. In fact, if you want to ride around in an OHV, why don't you go to Iraq. Then you can do all the things you love to do all at the same time, and you can get paid for it.

Oran, The middle ground is long gone. There are 1.9 billion acres in the lower 48 states and only a handful of areas are roadless. By middle ground I assume you mean that a billion acres of wilderness should be set aside; right? I would agree with that.

Over 95 percent of the old growth trees in the US have been cut. Party's over.

I am in favor of new national parks, but there is no such thing as erecting a lodge and a monorail without destroying a roadless area. There are no roadless areas that are expendable. How about putting the lodge outside of the roadless area and making the park a little bigger to include a road that is already there. There are lots of national park proposals that do just that.

People think dogs are stupid because dogs only know 7 people words. Well...how many dog words do you know. Learn how to listen to the wildlife. They are saying plenty! Be a better listener.

Quit buying things from overseas that can be made close to home. Twenty eight of the worlds largest container ships pollute more than all the cars in the world. How? They burn tar and waste plastic and their engines are as big as coal fired power plants. Just over the horizon, out at sea, out of sight and out of mind, and as soon as they leave US waters, the smoke flows black out of their stacks, unregulated. A coastal breeze brings their acid haze onshore. If you have trouble breathing, don't go to the beach. Don't go to the parks. The sulphuric acid haze from ships is everywhere.

Rachel, You are absolutely right about starvation forcing people to cause environmental havoc. I think agriculture is required to produce way too much food today because people eat and waste way too much in this country. Also, hamburger takes a lot more land to produce than rice and potatoes. As always, living on Earth is a balancing act. In my opinion, this is the best of three alternatives I put forward, not ecotopia, but we may not go extinct in the next few years on this course.

this is not just about roads. It is about scenery devaluation, air and noise pollution, campsite crowding and funding for the maintenance of facilities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Large vehicles take away from the national park experience. If I'm looking at the rear end of a huge RV, I can't see the view. If you can afford to drive around in a gas hog, you can afford to pay more to camp and drive on roads. If you do not support this, like I have said, you want me to give you welfare. I don't want to.

Scenario 1 - Money and business rule Business owns the government and all laws end up serving the largest corporations. Propaganda is all that media broadcasts, so, even though people think they have a democracy, they end up voting the way they are told to by the media, and the media is owned by the largest corporations. Resources are liquidated as fast as possible and conglomerating companies becomes the business goal. Soon there is a financial crisis and in a state of emergency the government declares that everyone will become slaves to the largest corporations. The only people who are allowed to eat decent food are the heads of the largest corporations. The rest of us get dog chow.

Scenario 2 - present course Money and business rule but large corporations allow a little voice by the little people. This is so the little guys don't think about rioting. Most people think they've got it pretty good, not being bothered by the government, so they go along with the program and let the big corporations have the vast majority of control. Resources are liquidated faster than is sustainable and the ocean gets over fished, oil becomes harder and harder to find, farmland becomes paved to make cities. Eventually, there is not enough food and people complain about costs, but the corporations make scapegoats for the worker bees to hate and they tell the workers that all their problems are caused by what they call enviro-freaks. The worker bees fall for the bait and the corporations keep on with business as usual. Eventually though, the resources run out and rioting and then civil war can't be avoided. Environmental problems like the gulf oil spill make it impossible to restart any economy, no matter what kind of government takes over.

some people support local control down to whoever lives next door. States are big and don't give a damn about what anyone thinks, just like the fed. Federal land is owned by all of us and the guy next door shouldn't have any more say about management than someone on top of a tower in NY, and states shouldn't have any more say than the number of folks who live in the state.

The government has done an absolutely awesome job of making sure these corridors have been destroyed, clearcutting, freeway building and allowing cities to grow between them. Restoration will be a big word in the 21st century.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The government needs to get out of the welfare business and quit giving extravagant amounts of money to people who spend their time lazing around wasting natural resources and when they should be out there working for a living like the rest of us hard working Americans. Every year millions of government dollars go to mining, logging, cattle grazing, auto companies, huge banks and oil drillers. The government builds them roads, leases land to them for almost nothing and then taxpayers have to come in and clean up their messes when they're done destroying the planet for their profits. And quit subsidizing OHVs and their high maintenance trails. And quit making big campsites in National Parks to accommodate people who waste gas and parking space moving their house around. Get out of the welfare business and this country would run like it was intended by our founding fathers.

The insect infestations of the present are rooted in land management activities of the past, like heavy handed fire control efforts caused by the Smoky the Bear sales pitch. Smoky the Bear was serving the logging industry and only the logging industry, snuffing every lightening fire that would have reduced fuel loading and insect populations, to the advantage of the production of wood. That worked out very badly, as you can see. But it's no wonder that there is a distrust of land managers because, really, they have not done a splendid job in the past, and I would say that there are probably many "manager wanna be's" who would not do a very good job in the future. The laws are conflicting because a lot of people have mixed feelings about the term 'management' and would rather just leave well enough alone, leaving nature to clean up the mess in good time. It's too bad, but that's the way it is.

The lower 48 states is 1.9 billion acres and only a small fraction of 1 percent of that land is off limits to OHVs. If you can't find somewhere to ride you're OHV in this country, you are not looking very hard. Maybe you are spending too much time watching TV or eating, or maybe you can't visualize small fractions. Quit your ridiculous griping about the lack of opportunities for OHVs. Your argument is absolutely absurd.

The more space you take up and the more damage you do to roads, the more you should pay to use an area of public land. If you use public transportation, or walk into an area, your fees should be minimal. If you drive in an F350 towing a trailer with OHV on the rear, you need to pay accordingly to the damage you are causing to roads, air quality, camp space, etc. If you don't like this idea, you are expecting people like me who live lightly on the land to support you and your heavy handed ways. In other words, you are expecting me to give you welfare. (and quit complaining about the backlog of maintenance in National Parks. Just pay the higher fees or quit damaging the roads.) Vehicle weight should be used as a measure of how much unnecessary crap you are carrying that you don't need.

The most common feature of our national park system is wet meadows between rock mountains. Horses can do a great deal of damage to these wet meadows in a hurry. If the national park system was expanded to include more robust grazer environments like the Great Plains, I would be in favor of this. As it stands right now, the wet meadows where horses would feed are taking a beating already.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem remains the same: OHVs, because of their weight, speed and their ability to get to places where no one else goes, cause damage that taxpayers have to pay to fix, a lot of damage. I don't care how many of you are responsible riders who do your best to mitigate problems. One idiot on an ATV can cause thousands in damage. I don't want to pay for that; not one time. But it wouldn't be just one time. Damage would amount to millions. Electric OHVs will probably be even heavier because of batteries. I look forward to the conversion because of noise reduction and no gas fumes.

The real costs of doing business on public land include damage to water quality, damage to wildlife habitat, damage to conflicting uses like dispersed recreation, and restoration. These hidden costs become a burden on taxpayers. Example: In the hay-day of logging in the Pacific NW, roads were being built by the government to access timber sales, where the roads were costing way more than the trees would ever be worth. Example: Miners pay almost nothing for mining claims and never clean up their messes.

The real costs of doing business on public land include damage to water quality, damage to wildlife habitat, damage to conflicting uses like dispersed recreation. These hidden costs become a burden on taxpayers and are never covered by fees collected from loggers, miners or ranchers. Period. Welfare is what they call it in other circles.

The reason our cultural heritage is important is because our distant ancestors were small in number and remnants of their deeds are few and far between. Now that there are 350 million of us in the USA, I wonder how much importance future generations will put on finding one more plastic piece of junk, one more chemical killed landscape. Will archeologists in the future think finding the remnants of one of our billion ugly buildings requires a closer look, or will it be more important for them to study a remnant of wilderness.

The reason the USA is a rich country is that in just 200 years we have consumed almost all of the resources of the entire Earth. We have built an infrastructure to get the trees and minerals to market like no other. The people who made the decisions to build and bulldoze had no guilt about what they pillaged to boost their profits. I live in a 3000 square foot house, though I dare say it's not as comfortable as the 400 square foot cabin I lived in for years. I would gladly live in a tent. We don't need all the crap that we're being sold. We need to gather things carefully from the land again, because there's not much left. We took everything, and in such a short time.

There are 1.9 billion acres in the lower 48 states. Less than 1 percent of that has wilderness potential. Go tell your problem to Lewis and Clark. You're fighting for the right to cut the last tree. Then what?

There is no such thing as seeing the "wilderness" from an ORV. If you are in a vehicle, you have changed the environment by your presence. You can enjoy the scenery, but you have made the wildlife run away, you have destroyed the solitude. There are lots of places where you can ride your ORVs. The national forest road system could stretch from here to the moon and back. Better yet, enjoy the solitude of downtown LA or New York City. Everything started with an ORV. Look where it leads.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This country is falling into a deep hole created by the suction dredging of human minds for the profit of the video game and mindless entertainment industry. You are what you eat, so to speak. If you watch a bunch of crap, you are a bunch of crap. If you know somebody who is wasting their time watching TV all day and then playing shoot em up video games all night, break their computers. Throw their TVs in the garbage. Make them go outside. Get a life America. Your life is being stolen from you and replaced with garbage.

This idea that should be extended to all commercial uses including mining and logging. This is public land owned by all of us and in many cases taxpayers are subsidizing private company profits as the USFS and BLM, for example, build and maintain roads specifically to groves of trees that are then cut, or to mineral formations that are then raided. Taxpayers don't get good value for the resources and cooperations rake in the profits. And then taxpayers have roads to nowhere and need to maintain them.

This is a concept that would allow migrations of species and may keep plants, animals and fish off the endangered species list during the uncertain times of global climate change. If species cannot migrate as their habitat moves with the new climate, they will become endangered and their listing under the endangered species act will have a devastating effect on our economy. This is a very important topic and I hope the anti environment people will try to understand the problem before they place comments. It is expected that about 40 percent of species will become endangered over the next 40 years. I think that figure will be much higher. This will affect everyone's lifestyle. I guarantee it.

This may be a good idea for some people but I am amazed at what you say it costs to go camping. A sleeping bag is fifty bucks and a piece of foam is twenty. America. Go camping. It's a very low cost way to travel. You don't need to have the look of a sportsman promoted by Il Bean. John Muir camped on a rock with nothing but a wool blanket. He never complained. Let's see if America has the fortitude to do without now and then.

Thousands of high quality employers move their business to places where employees can find recreation in pristine areas. This makes business sense because employee health is very important to the bottom line. Air and water pollution do the opposite to company profits and degrade whole communities as workers are basically thrown away when they are too sick to work anymore. Those workers declare bankruptcy, go on welfare and need government medical assistance, all paid for by the taxpayers. The intelligent dialog is the hard thing to come by. I don't know if that is possible. I could listen to a conservative talk radio show and shortly would find the same quotes used here in this blog by someone professing to have gone on a fact finding research mission to the north pole. There's very little that will change the mindset you are talking about. A lot of people have been beating their heads against the wall for years trying to communicate with people who maybe don't have enough math education to even understand the numbers involved. How do you explain to a young worker that someday they will probably have cancer and will be thrown away if they allow their companies ruin the land with toxic waste. I really don't see why this is hard to understand, but for some people, it is impossible.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Under the Hetch Hetchy Reservoir lies a valley similar the the most visited recreation valley in the nation; Yosemite. Like Yosemite it has waterfalls, towering cliffs and it would have lush meadows and a meandering, clear river. It is truly sublime, has been inside Yosemite National Park for a hundred years, but someone nurtured ignorance and dammed the Tuolumne River and flooded the place. Tear down the Hetch Hetchy Dam!

Well, the industrialists win and I have to live in the mess they make. Congress pulled the plug on carbon caps, so as far as I'm concerned, we all get to watch global climate change unfold with no effort being made to stop it. And the enviophobes, as always, are going to find a way to rationalize it as "not man made" even in the face of massive evidence, so they don't have to take any responsibility for it. The enviophobe response when climate change firmly grips the economy and sends us permanently into a tailspin will be, as usual, a massive buildup of arms, which will, as usual, do nothing to solve any problem. Have a good time folks. Enjoy the ride.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I do believe that there is a time and a place of OHV use. I do. For instance I thoroughly enjoy the San Juan Islands and camping and hiking on them. Most people would not have the means to get a OHV to those islands but if they allowed it would ruin a truly tranquil environment. When I ride in the mountains out here, I am riding on pre existing roads that are allowed to OHV travel. It is not permitted to wonder of these roads unless it is clearly marked. I do think there should be areas that OHV's are not permitted but I still believe that the government should REOPEN ( key word) areas that we used be able to ride on. This would spread the riders out over more area and the OHV user/acre ratio would go down. Trail wear from OHV's would go down because of less traffic and there would be less disturbance due to less encounters on trails. In regards to the animal species, I agree. If there is something that only lives in that area and is having problems with human interaction, yeah, there should be restrictions. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of beautiful landscape that can be explored and experienced through responsible OHV use and hiking, skiing, etc. I think that more of these kinds of areas could be open for use OHV's and other forms of outdoor recreation, or at least the access roads that can get you to most of the good places to offset the closing of one area. That way certain areas don't get overrun with traffic. In regards to the funding; In Washington there had been a Act in place since about 1976 that helped fund OHV trail use and maintenance in Washington state. When the highway-fuel tax was implemented, you were able to apply for a refund of the tax for vehicles that were used off highway; boats, ORV's, tractors, etc. In this Act, the ORV user's agreed that they would give up their right to receive a refund on their fuel tax if the money went to a special committee (NOVA: Non-Highway and Off-road Vehicles) that would use the funds to better the areas for ORV use. This worked great. We would still pay for tabs on the bikes so the DOL was happy and we were happy that we had more funding to improve and maintain the trails. Over the years, the money started to get spread around to non-ORV groups. Wasn't the greatest thing that could have happened, but we still were getting a good deal of support funds. Then last year, the Act was voted out of use by the legislature and now it just goes back to the highway (as far as I know) and the NOVA committee would no longer be in place. As of last year I believe it accounted for about \$4.5 million. That is why I might seem a little bitter, and for that, I am sorry. Honestly I try not to get bitter about it because I can still ride my motorcycle and be happy. I am more than happy to try and work things out together, but I feel that this recreational sport has been somewhat ignored in this state, as well as others and I feel that it should no longer go over looked.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is more than 80% of Washington's land that OHV's cannot use and everyone else can and that # has increased over the years. The OHV population has not shrunk and has actually grown in size. I agree that the states should really decide what is done and should only receive funding from the government to help states fund their decisions. That is still great but how much is strictly dedicated to OHV's like the NOVA fund was? We had the funding to help repair, add and reconstruct areas as well as open up the possibility of a new area to ride on before. Now with half the funding, the DNR is sitting on the Reiter foothills project. The Reiter area, which is one of the most popular areas in western Washington to ride, because it is taking longer than expected and as far as I am concerned it is costing too much money and they can't do anything about it with the amount of money they had. If the extra 4-5 million dollars was there to help, we might actually be able to have it open by now and be over running areas like Walker Valley ORV park, Gifford Pinchot, Belfair, Capital Forest, etc. All of the people that used to go to Reiter every weekend didn't just stop riding, they went somewhere else. Less area = more traffic. More traffic = more maintenance. More maintenance = more money (that we don't have). So by closing an area, we have created more problems that we have solved. In terms of the sound regulation, 96dB at about 2 feet (ish, correct me if I am wrong) from the tail pipe is the new standard in exhaust level regulations. That is pretty dang quiet, with my quiet core in my exhaust, it isn't much louder than your average Briggs lawn mower, of course not nearly as loud as the Harley Davidsons that cruise your streets every day with NO MUFFLERS!!! Between 80 and 90dB is the range of your average alarm clock and the noise heard while standing on a busy street. 90 to 100 dB on average includes your lawn mower, shop tools, and standing next to a freeway. An acoustic guitar played with your fingers can be in the 80 dB range. The MAX our bikes can be in these tests is 96dB. Many exhausts are not. I know that mine isn't without the quiet core so I bought one. It is easily 96 dB. I can be legal and my bike runs. It is not required in Washington to have a 96 dB muffler, but it is required that the bike is sold with that muffler and that if you are to race in any form of off road or closed course race you need to meet 96 dB....for newer water cooled bikes.... My bike is air cooled and I believe my upper limit is a 102 dB which is about 5 times as loud as 96 dB. Some OHV riders believe that I might be selling out to the man because I have the ability to make my exhaust quiet, well get over it. Because I have my quiet core I get to bring my bike to more respectable levels and still get to ride. If it comes down to putting in a quiet core to keep you riding wouldn't you do it?! Just relax.

Thank you and that is great that you were able to ride and experience that! Where I have been riding lately, I see very few motorcycle tracks because we stay on the hard packed roads. The cows are allowed to free range out there and I have absolutely no problem with that, but they leave some impressive tracks in the soft soil by the streams where they drink. Nothing wrong with grazing cattle or wildlife, but seeing that shows that 1. there are responsible dirt bike riders that follow the rules and stay on the roads and 2. the natural wildlife that lives there "damages" the wilderness. Again, they can go anywhere they want and the numbers of animals spread and you can't really tell where they have been. Kind of applies to herds of ORV's: let them spread out and their tracks thin out. There we go, we got a nature metaphor for ORV's! woot woot.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I did not mean to offend you with that comment. In this case, this was an official ORV area that is maintained by the DNR and volunteers that are more often than not ORV users. I am not doubting that hikers and mountain bikers and other users help clear trails. this was just a situation that this group of ORV users experienced on the trail. Not trying to offend.

Try to ride dirt bike for yourself, I believe that will answer your question! Off-road motorcycle and motocross riders are some of the most agile, fit, high endurance people. You don't see 300lbs massive bodies suffering from diabetes and choking from 50 feet walk across parking lot here. I am a woman, very dedicated off-road motorcycle enthusiast, and in order to keep riding, I do minimum 30 miles of cross training/ mountain running, gym workouts that definitely are much harder than pink-obsessed aerobics or yoga classes. Then weekend comes, that's when real workout on the bike comes. Besides, you are always outdoors. One more thing, and trust me on that: if someone has depression problem, send him/ her to me for my off-road clinic. There is not room for depression, bad mood or so. We are healthy and we are happy!!!!

If this were part of a comprehensive strategy to connect youth, adults and families to the great outdoors it would be great to see this skill promoted. It can start with basic following trails and camping, or even riding your bike in the city, from one urban park to another; but what's key is that active problem solving in the context of enjoying the great outdoors which will be a prime component of that strategy. We must start looking into a future where we can develop stewards and activate families and friends to spend their valuable time and energy learning more about the great outdoors and how to protect and preserve...

I need to amend one portion and defend our two stroke brethren. Most racing dirt bikes that are/have been competitive in the last 8 years are 4 strokes. two strokes are not really the norm any more as far as racing. Now, you can have a two stroke that is properly setup for woods riding or just buy a KTM woods style two stroke that are quiet and very very nice off road machines. Putting a respectable muffler on a two stroke, as with a 4 stroke, is relatively easy but is still the riders choice. When you look at a catalog that has different exhausts in it, it has all of the exhausts, not just the woods pipes. Guys think, "well that one will give me the most power (better have a S.A.), or that one will give me the 97% of the possible power, but it is quiet. Umm, I am going to get the loud one." you got hear the power. No. you don't, and neither does the rest of the valley you are riding in. granted, right now my bike does not have the quiet core in it, I haven't put it back in yet after a couple races that I partook in. My bike is louder without it, but it still isn't as loud as some. Another thing, I am aware that I don't have my quiet core in and when I see people or animals I immediately back down and try to be as respectful as possible. I.e. not holding it wide open to get by the quickly. Slow down, thump, thump, thump past them and start to get on it after I am a little ways away from them. It's just common courtesy. I just read a post today on another forum I frequent about how a group hikers were pissed a group of dirt bikes coming up a trail that they were hiking on. One of the guys made the comment, "well you wouldn't have been able to hike up this far if we hadn't carried saws up on our bikes and cleared the trail for EVERYONE 3 months ago. How about that?"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ok. I am younger OHV user; I am 20. I ride motorcycles on designated roads and trails for motorized use. I go down spur roads that are dead ends just to see where they will pop out in the forest. I just went riding last evening cruising the forest roads enjoying the sun's colors reflecting off of the trees. I rode about 90 miles yesterday. I saw some amazing things. You want to guess what I saw? I saw an entire herd of elk (about 70 head) galloping across a field. I stopped and watched in awe. It was an amazing sight. They weren't scared of me, they were still 100 yards away or so. They were doing their own thing, and I let them. I cruise the roads. I observe the nature. You want to know my grief about trails and roads? When I was riding last night the hardest time I had riding was dealing with the ruts of 4x4's on the roads. The trucks come up there when it is still muddy and go over board trying to get through it. I have a Toyota 4runner and I have gone on the logging roads too. If there is a muddy spot on the road, I go slow and steady as long as I can and 99% of the time I can get through a spot while doing disturbing the ground very little. Once it is dry it is like riding on a slot car track and can really mess you up if you aren't paying attention. Here's the difference between a dirt bike and a 4x4. dirt bike 250 pounds with a 5" max wide tire. ONE wheel drive. My stock 4Runner for example, 3500 pounds 4 10.5" wide tires that are about 31" tall. the weight tends to push the truck down into the mud and then all 4 tires have to work. Creates a bunch of 10.5" wide ruts in the road. I use my SUV to take my friends and family to look out points that i can get to by road. I can't do that with my motorcycle. A dirt bike most of the time on roads and trails get through it leaving either slight surface earth disturbance maybe going down a inch or two that is about 4-5" wide. About as wide as a big hiking boot. A responsible off-road motorcycle rider knows how to tread lightly. IT IS POSSIBLE!!! yeah, I know, it looks cool watching a bunch of earth fly up in the air, but it isn't really doing much and in undisturbed earth it is just stupid. How many 5" wide trenches do you see in the trails? Ok, how many 10-15" wide trenches do you see? They are typically in parallel rows because they are on ATV's or trucks and SUV's. When I go down these roads, you probably can't even tell I was ever there. I have been closer to nature dirt bike riding than anything else. I have seen more natural beauty in one day than many people can say they have seen in a year. Yesterday i saw some amazing cliff formations that were about 40 miles from the last paved road. You can't hike that in a day and come back again. Also shutting down the OHV areas aren't going to stop people from riding. By shutting down more areas it forces more people into fewer areas and then those areas become completely over used and broken down. It isn't are fault that we didn't have anywhere to go. Think of it in our shoes. If some said that you couldn't hike in an area anymore because there was some plant that grew along the trails that can't be disturbed or something (I don't know, just roll with it), would you stop hiking? No. But what would you do? You would go somewhere else as would everyone else who used to hike there would have to go somewhere else. Then you shut down a few dozen more hiking areas and everyone starts going to the same 10 places that are closest to the most populous areas and they get crowded and over run with hikers. There will be more garbage, trail damage from traffic not the specific hiker's (POINT: different vehicle types) but from way to may people using the area. The point is, if there was more open areas for ORV's to go, it would spread out the ORV user population over more area making it much more peaceful for everyone. It scares the crap out of me to see horses or hikers on the trail because as aware as I am when i am riding, I would hate to spook someone and make the person or the animal jump into my path and hit them . I am not

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

out to shut down or belittle one's choice of recreational activity, but let's keep an open mind for god's sake. Think about this: In a political conversation with someone, have they ever actually changed your mind enough to make you go vote for a different party? (honestly?) No. You are not going to convince a ORV user to stop using his or her orv. IT'S THAT SIMPLE! Have you heard any ORV rider ask you to stop hiking and get a dirt bike because it's better? No. We are trying to be nice, but we get the book and then every possible comment thrown at us, and we can't do anything about it. We try. We are taking care of our trails. Here in Washington we had our main source of income for ORV trail protection and maintenance cut, which was about 4.5 million dollars. We have seen a uprising in the number of volunteers at work parties and have been working side by side with the DNR to get trail fixes and improvements done. We are trying to save what we enjoy doing with our friends and families. There is plenty of land for everyone.

Promote and stop restricting and discriminating off-road motorcycles. All recreational trails should be opened for skilled, two- wheel motorized riders. This is the only safe place or the young away from cities, predators, drugs, shopping malls, no good "friends", sickening activities. Quads (4-wheelers) are different: most common quad rider is typically a red neck type macho male with diminished self esteem that is trying to compensate for a certain deficiencies by being rowdy, obnoxious, drunk and unsafe for others. Motorcycle riders do not drink (seems like obvious suicide), respect trails rules and other riders, do very little to none damage (how much can you damage with two narrow wheels, considering that it is quite painful and "body-damaging" to trail blaze on the bike. I am a professional independent woman, have been riding since I was 5 years old, and I wish every kid grows up with this wonderful, exciting sport developing skills, thinking, coordination and outstanding physical and mental endurance, available for all ages and groups. I am seriously getting sick and tired of the entire hypocrisy of so called eco- environmental Nazi groups that either have no brains or simply too corrupted by making money on environmental "permits" to admit that even if every citizen of this country were to ride dirt bike every weekend, their emission readings won't even scratch a surface of what freight trucks, jumbo jets, ports and industrial equipment, in particular power stations, dump into the atmosphere. Oops. I forgot that it is not about environment, it's about money. You can make money destroying land by massive development, you can make money on making deals with trucking industry (even Mexicans truckers have more rights in our country than our own citizens wishing to exercise outdoors), making money on Chinese imports being hauled into this country by ships and then distributed by trucks, on corporates and government flying their jets... name it! But you can't really satisfy your greed on kids riding dirt bikes. But once again, we all are willing to pay a fee for maintenance and parking facilities as long as the areas are OPENED!!!! There is another problem that has become a national disease: If I don't or I can't do it, you shouldn't have rights either. Who are you people to keep complaining and telling other what they should be or should not be doing???? You should be raising a flag, high and clear, about mexican drug dealers and growers that are now totally free to grow dope on our CLOSED FOR PUBLIC public lands, compliments of tree- huggers and government radicals.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The good parts of this "idea" are clouded by poor choice of words and negative concepts that overshadow the important aspects of your side by side comparison. Miguel, I challenge you to transform your comment into something that can have a greater relevance and discussion on this forum. Many of us know what you mean but you can see from your ideas demotion that it does not resonate with people you are trying to converse with here... If you can provide solutions and ideas for how to combat the complex change in how people think about open space and open minds, you may get thru to us ;)

Can you name 3 American OHV manufactures that can compete with Japanese motorcycle companies? I love buying USA but this market doesn't really have an USA option that is competitive with the others. Now, regardless if i had an off road harley or a chinese knock-off, we would still have the problem of not enough OHV areas. We have just as much right to own and ride our Japanese machines as we do to own an American machine, so it doesn't matter if we have an American made or not, the issue of land use for OHV's still stands.

One example of potential dangers of GMO are crops with antibiotic-resistant genes. The British Medical Association, the leading association of doctors in Britain, urged an end to the use of antibiotic resistance genes in genetically engineered crops in a 1999 report. "There should be a ban on the use of antibiotic resistance marker genes in GM [genetically modified] food, as the risk to human health from antibiotic resistance developing in micro-organisms is one of the major public health threats that will be faced in the 21st Century. The risk that antibiotic resistance may be passed on to bacteria affecting human beings, through marker genes in the food chain, is one that cannot at present be ruled out," the Association said.[11]. Pesticide and Herbicide toxicity is not adequately tested. We are introducing tens of thousands of novel compounds into our environment without understanding the long term consequences. Example is the neurotoxic effects of cyperquat that has been linked to irreversible brain damage and Parkinsons.

National estuaries are locally beloved, but very underfunded by the federal govt. The time has come to give national estuaries the same status as national parks and national rivers, and make them eligible for federal-side Land & Water Conservation Funds (LWCF), and a formal part of America's Great Outdoors (AGO). AGO presents an opportunity to develop a cross-cutting federal initiative to leverage greater protection of recognized national priorities by focusing and funding existing federal programs, such as LWCF. The results would be: - Preservation and restoration of estuaries and watershed lands - Connecting people to nature with new blueways and trailways - Working waters which support local tourism and outdoor recreation businesses as well as fishing and clamming.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Through language and perceptive differences as to what is important, and unclear definitions of cultural and historical value, we frequently end up alienating what we should embrace and demolish what we should develop. As a consequence, individuals, organizations and communities suffer needlessly. Only when we cultivate and actualize more effective communication, embrace with sincerity inclusiveness and establish together across race, ethnic and cultural lines defined cultural principles that allow for the introduction of creative ways of implementing the process of development will success in sustainable cultural development proceed as an enduring public resource.

I have only become an OHV enthusiast in the last 5 years. I grew up in a place where it wasn't very common. However, my future husband and I spend our vacation time on the dunes in Winchester Bay Oregon, with other friends and family members. As a group, we spend thousands of dollars every time we visit. We abide by the laws, stay in designated areas, and are respectful to the families that live there. I however have noticed, that even in the last 5 years- more and more land is being closed for us to have the option to ride on. There are places on the sand dunes ( where the hills may be so steep, even an ATV could not get up) are off limits because we are protecting the beach grass.... That is too extreme! These are not places where people want to get "Unplugged", and enjoy the beach grass! Yet, my sport, my love and my vacation is being taken away. Without this, I also enjoy nature, outdoors, hiking, and fishing. I am suggesting those who are against OHV'S to research how much actual damage they are causing to National Land- which you and I own.

The US has to change backwards, mistaken, endless-frontier land policies from planning "no more wilderness" which will ensure that there isn't, to planning for our open spaces and unique places. The endless frontier exists no longer and as individual Americans like myself recognize, our wilderness areas need to be protected from further development in order to ensure the health of our selves, the remaining plants and animals, and the planet.

The forest dept. closed some of my favorite mtn bike trails due to noise complaints, exhaust, and tire rut damages from motorcycles. It took more money, time and effort to destroy/barricade/block off the trail than it would have been to divert the motorcycles with signage to less populated areas of the trail, leaving the shorter, closer trails for hikers and cyclists. Now no one can use the trails at all (without a long off-trail hike). And I can't imagine the dust, exhaust and noise required by the heavy machinery digging ditches and dragging trees across the existing trailways! There are miles of trails everywhere, just designate some as non-motorized. Don't close our access to nature by blocking it off. And return the right of way to animals and pedestrians please.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I couldn't agree more with what has been said. As one who spends an average of 100 fishing days a year on this river, and having first begun to walk its banks in 1983, I am appalled at the lack of stewardship and general carelessness that has characterized management of the trout fishery once acclaimed as "world class." When the energy industry began to astronomically increase activities on the mesas above the river, the river began to show signs of deterioration. Little or no efforts were made to control the erosion from such activities and we now have a riverbed covered with, in some instances, feet of sediment or "silt," as most refer to it. The BLM apparently made no efforts to ensure guidelines were being followed to protect the flora and fauna in the process although it is the responsible agency to ensure things are done properly. I am very disappointed, and discouraged. The re-operation of Navajo Dam by the BOR essentially put the final nails in the coffin as flows were drastically reduced with no consideration given to the impact to the trout fishery. In fact, BOR was quite transparent in stating the trout fishery was of little or no priority in the "decision tree" to regulating flows from the dam. Rationales for keeping flows very low always referred back to the "endangered species" downstream and the mandate to simulate a "natural hydrograph," which turned out to be little more than a smokescreen to store water at virtually every cost, witness the unwillingness to conduct an annual "peak flow discharge" in the late spring which is part of this "natural hydrograph" schematic and has been helpful to some extent in scouring the riverbed and helping to restore some of the aquatic invertebrates that are necessary for the trout's survival. The reason given had something to do with the basin snowpack being at "only 86% of normal..." Well, couldn't we have had a peak flow discharge of 86% of normal in terms of the time period, usually about 3-4 weeks from beginning to end? Even that would have helped in my estimation. Gone are the PMD hatches that characterized the San Juan Quality Trout Waters in July and August in the past; the baetis, or BWO's are also fewer in numbers and the sizes are dropping dramatically.....all due to the lack of importance the fishery commands in the larger scheme of things, the present and future projects of the BOR! I'm very disappointed and saddened that such a wonderful resource can just be canceled at will by some of our government agencies and would like a far greater degree of accountability and integrity to be exercised in such matters. Hopefully a new administration with a more global view of things will lead to restoration of our wild places without which.....and part of the irony here, we ourselves will not survive.

While I think it's great so many celebrities speak publicly (and act accordingly for documentation by paparazzi) about their local & organic passions, I feel that we're missing public recognition of the experts working in the field. I watched the Earth Day documentary on our local PBS station this week and was moved to see Johnny Carson interview scientists directly to inform the public about the Earth Day movement. I'm pretty sure basic celebrity PSAs still run during Saturday morning cartoons...but we've got a long way to go to take it to a meaningful level with adult consumers. Finding a way to get back to such a high level of esteem for those working in the field will go a long way to encourage the brightest of today's youth to seek out STEM careers for their futures.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Actually, the point is that they are accessible for recreation already, but only by adjacent property owners, and not the public who own the land. I'd be willing to agree with your point that not every place needs to be accessible for recreation if the land truly was inaccessible, and that included adjacent private owners. As it stands, the accessibility is unequal. That needs to change.

Your consistent desire not to use any tax dollars for, well, anything is just nonsensical. Do you like driving on maintained roads? How about enjoying a peaceful society because we have a police force? How about the ability to call 911 if you have an emergency, and then highly-trained assistance shows up to help within minutes? The list of worthy, tax-dollar-funded projects and services is lengthy, and it's myopic to simply say "not with my tax dollars" to every single idea proposed on this site.

Federal lands belong to all of us. They should be managed for the greater good, not based on what a small number of individuals think. If they are managed by each state, then the lands become fragmented. Preserved in some states, and trashed in others.

Getting some protections, whether conservation easements or fee title purchase, for more land, particularly in states with a low percentage of public land such as those in the Great Lakes and Mississippi basins, is far more important to our nation's present and future than increasing the level of protection of existing federal land. Moreover, the majority of people in states with vast amounts of existing federal land are opposed to Wilderness designation in high numbers while people in states without a large public land base support greater land protections. Compare what most Alaskans or Utahans think about Wilderness with what most Wisconsinites or lowans think about conservation easements or having more state parks and trails.

I agree that resource development should be last after protection of the resource, but it isn't the BLM that needs to be disbanded. It's that when an administration comes in that thinks resource extraction is a priority, that's what the BLM is told to do.

I also believe that sportsmen's license fees should not be diverted to support activities other than hunting, trapping, and fishing, etc. Activities such as; bird watching, and butterfly feed plots. These are also good land uses, but should be funded by the participants of those activities. Sportmen, and sportswomen pay the fees, and play second fiddle to those that would eliminate our activities if they could.

Many counties have thousands of acres of BLM or other federal land within their boundaries, but the public has no access to these lands because they are landlocked. We need to gain access to these lands in order to enjoy them for recreation.

Presently, the DEA and local law enforcement bust illegal marijuana gardens, but leave the associated pipes and trash. There needs to be funding for cleanup of the illegal grow sites. These sites ruin our landscapes, foul the water, and trash our lands. In the Ukiah BLM District, there are over 200 grow sites and only funding to clean up 3.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Recreation is a basic service. Without the opportunity to recreate, we will have more criminal activity, less connection to the natural world and understanding of the world at large, more health issues, etc. There will never be enough tax dollars for everything we want, but in order for society to be balanced, we need to make sure that we have opportunities to take care of our well being through outdoor recreation, as well as police, fire, etc. Recreation is not a luxury. It is essential.

Reform the 1872 mining law to require royalties on extracted minerals, leases on land instead of claims, and end patenting. Selling of mining claims has become big business, yet these claims cost next to nothing to obtain. Many claimants are simply waiting to patent the land and develop it as recreational or summer residences. Stop the privatization of public land.

So you're saying that if President Obama goes hiking, all of our wilderness issues will be solved? I'm all for leadership by example, but I'm pretty sure that's not going to be nearly enough. Policy will make the biggest difference towards protecting our future and the health of our planet.

Stop allowing patenting of mining claims. In the Tahoe National Forest, all the rivers and streams have mining claims on them. If they are patented, then they will become private and stop public recreation on all patented lands. This would fragment the forest, and open it up to home development.

The BLM needs to obtain access to the 9,100-acre BLM Berryessa Peak Unit from the Yolo County side of the Blue Ridge. This is the closest public land to all the towns in the County, but the public has no access.

The BLM started work on a 38-mile ridgeline trail in the late 1960's, that runs from Cache Creek to Putah Creek along the Yolo/Napa county lines. They need to complete this trail. They stopped after only building 8 miles, because a few people who had exclusive access to BLM land further down the ridge, complained. They need to finish the trail.

The land access decision making process is in the hands of career bureaucrats who are allowing themselves to be manipulated by special interests and failing to ensure that valid science and proper analysis are applied prior to land access decisions. The Federal Government must start from the default position that public lands should be kept open for the public to use and lands made available for all use patterns. Withdrawing land from public access should require a stringent burden of proof be provided by anyone who wants to exclude the public from public land. Today land is closed on trivial and unproven pretexts. This must be immediately stopped.

The method used here of cobbling together statistics from various, and sometimes biased, sources is flawed. "Users" does not equal "Uses". Public lands are open to EVERYONE, all users. But the things we share, in this case public lands, cannot be available to all uses. There must be rules that we all abide by when using the things we share, i.e. our shared public lands which are open to all users but out of necessity not all uses. "Users" does not equal "Uses".

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem with this approach is that there are those for whom agreement is impossible. We have people on local County committees who completely oppose the basic idea of public parks, so it is impossible to get them to agree to trail projects because the very idea of public land is disagreeable to them. So we can't even begin to have a dialogue they won't even agree on the foundation of that dialogue.

The real problem with "over population" is the lack of education or undereducation of women. When women are given access to a good education, they will make sound decisions about the size of their families.

This is a huge issue, and one that needs resolving in favor of the public gaining access. Those that would 'demote' this idea either don't care about public recreation and are working contrary to the ideas behind America's Great Outdoors, or they have exclusive access to public land and wish to keep it that way. Demand public access to public land. If you google 'landlocked BLM', you come up with results that show private owners charging fees to access public property, or private hunting lodges touting how they control all access to large tracts of public property. This privatization of the public estate is just wrong and greedy.

How much local produced items do you purchase? How many things have you bought this week produced on YOUR main street? How many things have you bought which were produced within 100, 500, 1000, 5000 miles of your residence. You preach to us about waste of gasoline (aka energy, causes of GHGs, etc). What a hypocrite you are. How often do you hit the local Walmart? How about we move on the FUD and tackle some real issues. Just for some facts: I use 5 gallons of gasoline in my dirt bike in a weeks time during a good week of riding; normally it's measured in a months time. You use 5 gallons commuting to your job on the highway daily. After you ride to work solo in your Volvo, your wife and 3 kids tumble into the minivan heading out to swimming, soccer, and baseball. After wasting another 5 gallons hauling the kids around each night from one side of town to the other, does she run over to McDonald's cuz she's too busy to fix dinner before the kids have to get into bed? Give us a break. You waste FAR more in your 'normal' activities then we do in a month on average to support our 'OHV' activities. To address the FUD around noise, I was on the trail yesterday...and we can't hear bikes a minute or more behind us out on the trail. This noise issue is a fallacy more often then not - but it's highly dependent on the natural surroundings. Nothing is 'cut and dried'. Where I live, the trees are a great container of sound...and we also have silencers on our bikes as discussed above. I agree standing next to a bunch of bikes all riding isn't pleasant...I don't like it when I'm not riding myself - but we're not saying everyone should have to endure that. If I don't want to camp around the OHV camp sites cuz of the noise, I don't - I camp else where and truck my bike in for the ride. ...how about simply equal access and a sensible sustainable plan for our use.

Your numbers are flawed. You are inappropriately mixing reports to arrive at your desired conclusion. Wheeled recreation is not most popular.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Why do we think that *\_people\_* are the only important constituents in the discussion of wilderness? What about the wilderness itself, and its inhabitants? What about the ecosystem? Someone should be speaking for it. Is it that important that humans should be able to trample ever square mile of this planet? Maybe it's important to have places where people don't go. Maybe there should be places where *\_nobody\_* goes.

I agree. More resources need to be available so the general public can enjoy these majestic animals in their natural habitat. Please allow these horses to be put in a sanctuary. I was not pleased that land agencies have not taken the initiative to produce positive results. Visitors would definitely want to see these animals in person and learn more about them by hiring Park rangers to offer interpretive programs. Great Idea..

Many people claim that federal land use planning for public lands (such as national forests or lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management) is broken. These land use plans cost millions of dollars to develop, routinely take 2-4 years to develop, and are instantaneously out of date as soon as they are finished. They are cumbersome paper documents that can only reliably be found in the offices of the federal agencies. We need an interdisciplinary task force, perhaps even a Congressional Commission made up of the finest planning, scientific and technological minds that will look forward to the next decade and figure out a methodology and technology that would allow the agencies to plan in a completely different way. One that:

- Creates an “open source” web-based planning tool that everyone could access
- Builds off of Google Earth type of platform
- Allows the agency to set the data standards but allows more than agency data to be considered
- Allows for natural values (ecosystem services) to be mapped
- Allows nimble, fast, transparent, predictive landscape analysis of various alternatives and of cumulative impacts
- Allows for adaptive management scenarios to be identified and analyzed up front and then tracked on the back end
- Allows a translation from a proposal in the plan to the budget that would be required to carry it out
- Allows the agency to update final plans as agency decisions and actions are made (i.e. an area is thinned for fire protection or an area is leased for oil and gas or a new trail is constructed) or for changing conditions (an area is burned in a fire or affected by another disturbance) so that the plan is always up to date with current conditions
- Tracks promised mitigation measures with actual mitigation and monitoring requirements
- Allows a comparison of cumulative impacts assumed during planning with what monitoring is actually showing
- Encourages cross-jurisdictional, cross agency and landscape level planning

• In essence, create a transparent planning process and a living document once approved. The advantage of having a Congressional Commission is that Congress would be invested in the outcome. In addition, Congress could invite key people from organizations such as Google, ESRI, Microsoft, Apple, National Geographic, Universities, and land use planning consultants and experts to work alongside some of the most creative agency planning staff. It is time to move federal resource planning and management into the 21st century.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live in SW Virginia, where recycling is looked at as something foreign and not worth consideration. As a result it is extremely difficult to recycle cardboard, glass and non-aluminum metals. If there were a mandatory deposit on bottles and cans, there would be motivation from the local populace to recycle and collect bottles and cans from the roadsides, parking lots, etc. As of now, public places, natural areas, roadsides, streamsides, campsites and other outdoor use areas, are littered. Firepits at remote campsites always have a pile of bottles in the middle. A deposit would rid us of the littering, which is prevalent in Appalachia.

I think it would be useful for us to all stop using the word wilderness, as it is an incredibly slippery term with very heavy connotations. Can we please have this discussion using words such as "undeveloped" and "roadless." These words have spatial implications instead of being value laden frameworks. If we don't clear up the terminology then we cannot have an informed debate. That said, it is naive to think that we have any "wilderness" or undisturbed land left anywhere on the earth. Human impacts are everywhere, and we must allow people to interact meaningfully with our public lands to garner appreciation and stewardship. Its nice to refer Leopold and Marshall but perhaps we should get ourselves into a mindset like E.O. Wilson explains with his theory of "Biophilia" and Richard Louv's ideas of reconnection. We would do much better to protect our public resources from the effects of heavy industry and sprawling sub- and ex-urban development than to restrict recreationists from using it.

Ensuring that permanently protected private lands indeed remain "permanently protected" coupled with respecting local community values and quality of life are at the heart of this issue. Improper siting of utility infrastructure - especially in the hunt for domestic, sustainable energy development - can have huge unintended consequences by needlessly fragmenting open lands and working farms & ranches; destroying habitat; despoiling cherished & historic landscapes. Federal legislation to avoid protected private lands from the start in the siting of utilities is a good idea well worth supporting.

Off road vehicles are noisy, gas fuming, peace disturbing vehicles and have no place in National Parks (or anywhere in my opinion). Even if a dedicated area is set aside, the noise can carry miles - unless you are willing to build sound walls around a dedicated area these vehicles simply have no place. If you want to explore area where no one has been, how about being able to rent horses or bicycles. At least the peace won't disturb anyone fairly close by. ORVs are hazardous for wildlife.

Exactly Mark, I'm a OHV rider, but we need to find a sensible solution. Closing trails and land is NOT the answer. Don't let the irresponsible ruin it for the responsible riders.

OHV is not damaging to the environment, you environmental extremists need to get off your soapbox. Lets keep shutting down trails and land for OHV use so our kids have what to do????? i can honestly say this much if I didn't have access to private/public land for riding and racing I don't want to think of the trouble I could have got myself into. We need to keep the trails open, private landowners have the RIGHT to ride on there property just like you have the RIGHT to hike the trails. It's a priviledge i enjoy having and will fight to keep.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

About 600,000 citizen soldiers lost their lives in the Civil War. Considering that the population of the country was about 1/10th of what it is now, that is the equivalent of losing 6 million Americans today -- over 1000 times the number we have lost in Iraq and Afganistan. These brave men deserve to be honored perpetually, and saving the battlefields on which they sacrificed from development is an ideal way to do it. Plus, it preserves open land in populated areas for the recreational use of future generations. I support Civil War battlefield preservation with my personal funds and believe it is an appropriate use of Federal funds as well.

did you just call Solar and Wind co's "Big Energy"??? Are you joking? I guess the land grabs that oil and coal co's are making left and right are to serve our best interests in meeting our energy needs? Your comment is the first I've heard that mentions BLM using the Wilderness Act to designate any space for Solar or Wind projects. LOL.

Oil companies have already been given over 42 million acres of land that they have already been approved to drill on. Of that 42 million, they are using about 12 million. Why do they need to take away more land that the public could benefit from for their own selfish greed when they have 30 million acres they are sitting on and not even using?

There are many threatened landscapes worthy of wilderness protection, but southern Utah's redrock country is iconic, unique in all the world, and fragile. Cedar Mesa and the vast and complex San Rafael area in particular would be national parks anywhere else. Our open space on Federal land--belonging to all Americans, not just those who live nearest--can be enjoyed by all: hikers, paddlers, and ORV riders. But multiple use is possible only if sensible decisions are made to grant wilderness protection to lands with wilderness characteristics. ORV use scars the landscape, but that is acceptable in areas without outstanding scenic beauty or wilderness characteristics; the land heals itself over time. It is only the unfettered access to public lands for ORV use that destroys wilderness. Let's end the squabbling and designate the appropriate parts of our open space for appropriate uses. We will all come out ahead. Let's hope that BLM can rise to the occasion and meet its responsibilities instead of caving in to local interests.

Where I live, the only places we off-road are in the middle of nowhere. So I don't really understand this whole noise complaint...not to mention when you enjoy the sport, the sound of a screaming engine is actually soothing. People who drive low-rider cars with exhaust that is overboard are more annoying to me. But, who am I to say that they can't do that? Some of you sound like you belong in a retirement home... Offroading has brought my family closer, and I am glad that we can all hang out in an environment away from rat race. There are idiots in every sport/hobby...but those people do not represent the majority of the sport. Sure, there are offroaders that trash the place, just as there are campers and hikers that do that. But majority of offroaders are people that appreciate nature, are down-to-earth, and responsible. You don't drive hours to the middle of nowhere, weathering the harshness of the desert, covered in dust, all comforts left at home, and not be a nature lover! :)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

From my viewpoint as a motorcyclist damaged trails are a problem. It only takes a few irresponsible (ab)users to damage a wet or steep section of trail. I think the heart of the matter is how do we correct the actions of the few who make life difficult for the many? This is where the enforcement agencies do NOT want to step in. It is up to us Citizens to force the government agencies to address the specific problems. Let us not take the easy way out by closing swaths of public land.

Sustaining and improving OHV and wheeled access to our public lands is important to me and many Americans. I would also like to see more chances for USERS to get involved in maintaining the trails and parks. If the Forest Service cannot support us then let us do the work.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My counter The great tragedy is that technology is one of the few subjects that the left and the right, and the environmentalists and the corporations, all tend to view in the same way....technology is neutral!! And yet technology is certainly not neutral, and we need to understand this. Nuclear power and solar power will both light the lamps in your house. But to have nuclear power requires that society provide huge financial resources from central sources, apply fabulously high technology skills, and employ a military capacity to protect poisonous materials from terrorism and from accidental release, for all the 250,000 years that it remains highly dangerous. So society is essentially committed to a centralized technical military and financial mode of organization for a quarter of a million years. On the other hand, solar energy can be built by you and me, paid for by us, and it would not require support from any central system, whether technical, military, or financial. At least not from now on, because the technical base has been achieved. What this guy is selling is another 1/4 million years of enslavement to the centralized government we have in place. He is not saying hey why don't we cut back on how much we consume. During world war 2 all forms of energy be it food gas or lamps were all rationed. The fact of the matter that no one is saying is no form of mass produced energy is sustainable. Now to put the second to last nail in the coffin; Safety isn't the real issue (to the government that is)nuclear power hasn't become ubiquitous in the US, it is because it's so damn expensive. Even after decades of subsidies, it can't compete with other forms of energy. The cost of a kilowatt-hour of electricity generated by nuclear power is about 7 cents, coal 5 cents, natural gas 4 cents(note it is on the rise), wind power, solar, and hydro, at 3-5 cents. What is more amazing about the continuing high cost of nuclear power is the scale of subsidies lavished on the industry. In the past 50 years wind, solar and nuclear power combined have been funded to the tune of \$145 billion. Unfortunately 95% of those funds went to nuclear energy, the other two forms managed dramatic drops in unit costs, efficiency and, production of energy. Some versions of the White House- backed energy bill offer federal loan guarantees to cover half the cost of the first new plants to be built in 30 years. yet the Congressional Budget Office warns that it expects these plants to be " uneconomic to operate". Last nail on safety; On August 14, in New York, there was an electricity failure that plunged fifty million people into darkness. 16 nuclear power plants automatically shut down in the US and Canada. nuclear power plants run on off site power, not their own reactors. If the grid fails, reactors are designed to automatically close down. One or more diesel generators, with the capacity to power basic safety equipment including the cooling system, are supposed to start up. If a generator fails, the reactor cannot be restarted without off site power: another wonder of fanatic technological optimism. Something has to continually pump circulating cooling water to the reactor and to the giant, densely packed wasted fuel pools, or those fuel rods, active and spent, will catch fire and reproduce Chernobyl or worse. Don't just listen to me..... Please feel free to actually research these issues and find your own answers instead just moving with the herd, and repeating the propaganda.

As a wildlife-hugger even I can support this idea :) ...as long as hunting groups stop spreading unscientific info about predators. Science is showing wolves and other predators can actually INCREASE deer and elk populations and their herd health in some areas and often most places are wildly overpopulated and overbrowsed by game species (look at Yellowstone). Yet hunting lobbies are foaming at the mouth about wolves when science just doesn't support their premise.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do you feel like it is good to at least set aside a little bit of our land out there for quieter access and for wildlife habitat? Honestly, sometimes I wish it was no access for anyone, but Wilderness designation is truly important to preserve some core habitat for wildlife. If wilderness advocates were willing to give a little and help build ORV trails elsewhere, could you meet in the middle and give some land up for wildlife and ecosystem protection (elk are pretty calm critters and it's awesome you saw some, but there are more sensitive species than them that really and truly need less interruption from humans). I think it is worth meeting in the middle to find a way! What do you think? PS- every type of user got their budget cut, not just ORV access. We all our working hard to make up the difference (my favorite conservation group is even building bike trails, so there are conservationists out there willing to work with all folks! You just need to help by not coming into the conversation with a closed mind and a chip on your shoulder, even when it seems like you should be angry)

I am actually watching closely a wilderness collaboration between timber, conservation folks, and recreationists right now where in fact, OHVs are actually being given MORE miles of trails than are being taken away, and yet still the heels are dug in and they state directly that their policy is "no loss"...not no net loss! I think its zealots on either side that make this so hard. If people would just be reasonable instead of emotional... To offer counterpoint to your statement...OHVs (motorized ones anyway--not sure if you consider mtn bikes OHVs) can be heard for miles around, so hiking in solitude isn't always that when there is access nearby, and OHVs can be hard on the environment especially if they abuse the access, as you said. I think that is the hard thing for hikers, horsebackers--the noise (I am actually not a backcountry hiker; I've got enough to do in my own yard :) and an injury limits me to small park trails )

I am a so-called treehugger (actually I am more of a bear and deer hugger :P) and I don't really see a problem with this idea. I see more and more that conservation groups are coming to the table, trying to make collaborative agreements that benefit all parties and still manage to help the environment. Sadly, more and more I see every attempt they make is met with stonewalling and refusal to give up a single thing by the off-road community, even when compensated elsewhere to no net loss. It is met with ire and anger instead of an attitude of trying to find solutions. Yes, there are zealots on BOTH sides. Let's just try to figure it out civilly. Look for and support those groups that are making an effort to collaborate. Here in WA, there is a great group, the Northeast WA Forestry Coalition that is making a real effort to bring everyone to the table. Even Sec. Vilsack pointed out how great it is.

It isn't that people are not doing there job - the eco groups have big money and file law suits that stop any kind of forest management that would help - but you don't see them out fighting the fires - those 'dead sticks' breed disease and insects that are killing the healthy stands of trees - they do not prevent erosion, the live roots of trees do - and YES THEY DO BURN when lightening strikes - We are tired of people that don't have much of a clue, but have more money than sense - stopping any healthy forest management – we are not un-educated in forest practices and have lived in the forest for many generations – we don't need to have special interest groups with money and an attitude think they are saving us -



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

FYI--Hikers/horsepackers/skiers/etc pay for access via trailhead passes as well. In the PNW, most places require a NW Forest Pass or a National Park pass, etc. For me, Wilderness isn't just about who gets to play there, though. It's about core ecological reserves in an increasingly developed world. As I've said in other comments, I would honestly be ok with no trail access into some wilderness areas, but I know THAT is an unpopular idea on all sides! :)

There has to be a balance and at this time there isn't due to eco-groups filing law suits that stop all management of our forests - until the special interest groups stop pouring money into stopping all activity in our forests - or forests will continue to die due to fire and disease - wanting what was 150 years ago by no management isn't going to make our forests healthy and restricting human activity in the forests isn't going to do anything except attract people growing pot - more than it is already. Where is the money that backs all this insane closure of our public lands??? We live here we see it - it needs to stop and we need to take care of our forests and the people that live here - not close it down so no one can see what is really going on!

Let's establish a 'Home for the Buffalo to roam' in Kansas in the Flint Hills area near the Tall Grass Prairie.

Here are numbers (all in sq mi): Us total area = 3,537,441 BLM lands = 395,313 Forest service lands = 301,195 National Park lands = 81,081 Total of these federal lands = 777,589 Wilderness areas = 168,000 Until recently in my local national forest, almost all the area of it that was not designated wilderness or given a special local designation was open to ATV's. Recently this has changed with the advent of a travel management plan. It is a big change and a serious reduction in area, to go from just about everything, to about half that much. I don't wonder if this isn't a recent change for many, that people are still mad about and trying to find a work-around. Meanwhile, there are twice as many people on the earth as there were when I was born. So there are presumably more people who want to do more things on more public lands, but there aren't more public lands. I do believe that the ATV's in my area are still quite ahead as far as access is concerned. I wistfully dream that locally as much wilderness could be designated as they have designated for ATV riding. I know however that this really isn't possible because of the geography and state of the forest. So on my local forest this plan would never be able to give the parity that it claims it can. The deck is already stacked in the ATV's favor.

Hey KC, we CAN buy more if we fully fund the LWCF: please vote: { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/36F43F09FE08AEF08625774B001C924C?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Is there a policy in place for the harvesting seeds of indigenous trees prior to logging operations? or of the trees to be harvested, is there a policy of gathering the seeds, cones, laying on the forest floor for future plantings? I have heard of a boondoggle in the forest where non-native trees were planted and then needed to be removed due to disease and other maladies. Would it be better to gather the seeds, cones before the trees are cut or to harvest them laying on the ground, however the seeds could become damaged due to the heavy machinery and logging operations.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a great tool for the federal gov't to give back to the state and we can make it know that it should be fully funded: { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/36F43F09FE08AEF08625774B001C924C?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was established over 40 years ago as a powerful tool to bring recreation access to the great outdoors for millions of Americans by using a portion of fees collected from oil/gas operations. What a great use of a little bit of the money made by these industries to give back to states' conservation needs, reconnect people with wild places, and ensure working lands are not converted to development.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;This tool helps states acquire open space or conservation easements, to build recreation areas, and to protect ecosystems by underwriting projects that bring a broad range of people to the outdoors. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;From small things like ballparks to wild ecosystems, the Fund gives states the power and leadership role to determine their own healthy future. The Fund has helped create or improve national treasures like Harper's Ferry, the Big Sur Coast, Yellowstone, NYC's Central Park, and San Francisco's Golden Gate Park.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;There is just one thing wrong with the Fund: It has only been fully funded twice in 45 years. There is so much more this fund can do to get people outside, get them playing, and get them thinking about wild places.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund: Make the powerful tools we already have work to their fullest potential!&lt;br /&gt;

This monument will do nothing but further restrict usage of those who live in the area proposed by the people at KS Wild. There is no way it will bring more tourism to an area already economically depressed by out of control enviromentalism. There are no tourists here now !! Why would the monument increase tourism ? My family has lived here for over 35 years and my property would be inside the monument. There are too many gray areas and not enough info from Interior on how landowners will be affected. There are few jobs here as it is, and I feel that is this monument becomes a reality, many more jobs will be lost, mine included ! NO SISKIYOU CREST NATIONAL MONUMENT !!!!

Yup, good idea. We have to fund these laws and all the existing tools before we say they are broken. Of course they can't work well when you strangle them... I created an idea for funding Land and Water Conservation Fund, maybe vote for that, too? Thanks! { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/36F43F09FE08AEF08625774B001C924C?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I was vacationing at June lake this past week. I saw many downed trees' and such. If those downed trees are not removed they become kindling for a fire. Thus causing a bigger devastation.

If the OHV scare away the wildlife, then why were the deer comfortable to come feed in the campground in the afternoon near where the OHV's were being ridden?

Never mind wind and solar aren't very productive ways of energy yet.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of the biggest problems we face in many Wilderness areas not meet the wilderness criteria but still are.

All sportsmen should know our outdoor pursuits depend on maintaining viable fish and wildlife habitat. Unless tools like conservation easements that help groups like Ducks Unlimited and the landowners we work with are in place our lifestyle will continue to be at risk. More than 70 percent of wildlife gets food and shelter from our working farm, ranch and forest lands, but we're losing these habitats to development at the alarming rate of 5,000 acres each day. This legislation encourages voluntary, incentive-based donations of future development rights to ensure that farm and ranch families can continue to work their land, sell hunting leases and provide wildlife habitat for future generations. Ducks Unlimited has had great success using this incentive to accelerate the pace of waterfowl habitat conservation. This incentive helps Ducks Unlimited leverage Farm Bill and North American Wetlands Conservation Act funding. Landowners considering a perpetual commitment to conservation should not be pressured by an artificial deadline, and many will never begin the lengthy process without the reassurance of a permanent incentive.

I understand your wanting to protect the bison. But I'm not even sure a true 100% pure bison exists. Even if there is a true bison left they have adapted to partially domesticated life to survive. There is also a reason they are about extinct. They are a very large animal that can do a lot of damage to the land, especially if they are not controlled in some way. They carry diseases that can be passed on to other wildlife and domestic animals, also humans, if they are not vaccinated against them. Sorry, bad idea.

Sir, I would really like you to come and visit us on the ranch and try to keep up with us as we work to provide quality meat for the people of this world. You seem to be the one who has all the time to sit at your computer and dream up ideas and comment on things you think you know all about. It's obvious you don't have a clue. Just what do you do for a living?

Our land trust is working with a family who wants to protect its forest land with a conservation easement. We are working with the USDA Forest Legacy program to fund the easement purchase. Unfortunately we've had to convince our County to hold the conservation easement once protected because land trusts aren't allowed to hold the easement even with our conservation easement management experience. This will be our County's first conservation easement, and I'm grateful they are willing to hold it because if they weren't the family would not realize its protection dream. USDA has other conservation easement programs that DO allow land trusts to hold conservation easements, so what's different with Forest Legacy? It adds a significant challenge to our protection work.

But by locking ohvs out you are locking out land that will never be seen, except by airplane. A compromise usually feels like both sides lost.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think that the U.S. Congress has helped to promote land conservation by enacting several incentives for landowners. But the Internal Revenue Service is putting a damper on landowners' interest in giving conservation easements by encouraging certain IRS agents / 'engineers' / 'appraisers' to harass easement donors. I am now in the process of being 'audited' because of a conservation easement that I donated to a local land trust. The claims of the 'engineer' have been petty, often false, and almost always presented antagonistically. I am confident that a reasonable judge will decide in my favor, but the cost to me in time and money will be enormous. It makes little sense to me for Congress, on one hand, to promote conservation easements while the IRS, on the other hand, discourages them.

Not at all, actually the area does not meet the criteria to be made wilderness. It is full of mines, and old roads that even have old (40's & 50's) cars on them. How is locking out ohvs in that area preserving nature the way it is suppose to be?

The original request was that ALL groups be brought to the table to discuss these important issues; it is critical that everyone be given a voice. Most importantly, the local people, whom any issue will most affect should be heard loudly and clearly. It is easy to support any initiative if that initiative does not directly affect one's self, however for those people living within the affected area, the initiative takes on an entirely new meaning. Conservation works best if it is completed in 'bottom-up' fashion with buy-in from the local community, but for some reason, many at the top fail to grasp this simple, yet important concept. Don't just listen to those most affected, hear them and use their input. There is lots of room to find common ground, but too often the vision of a few takes precedence over the livelihoods of others. By large margin this blog is comprised of people who are not making a living off of the landscape and people who do not live in the communities that are most affected. People in these communities are too busy trying to etch out a living and raise our food and fiber than to spend their time debating on these forums. But their voices matters and every opportunity possible should be provided so that they can share their thoughts.

The wilderness area I ride my dirt bike AROUND on a designated trail, I have never in 20 years of riding that area, seen a hiker or horseback rider. But yet I am locked out.

There has to be a way to coexist. I fully understand your' right to enjoy hunting. But a 50 inch path is not destroying the wilderness. I don't hunt, but I do enjoy my ohv. And they keep taking away the land for me to use. I like to do 50 to 60 mile loops when I ride, and the only people I have ever seen walking out that far are the ones with broken ohvs. The more land they take from the ohvs, the more we are going to be in the same spot.

We just have to face it. ORV users are going to doom the earth to a horrible death. ORV are the cause of everything wrong on this planet.

Well put!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear President Obama and advisors, One of the biggest threats I see to the balance and protection of Earth and nature is the genetic manipulation of food crops and the resulting increase in the use of herbicides and pesticides that kill bees, birds, frogs, fish and ultimately humans. GMO crops themselves have also been implicated in killing cattle and in causing human illness. This is big business with big money behind it, yet it is supported in part by the farm subsidy programs paid for with our tax dollars. As a tax payer, I don't want to support farms growing GMO crops! (I also don't want to see former Monsanto executives appointed to public office!!) It would make much more sense to offer farm subsidies to the organic farmers who grow food without poisoning the environment, particularly those who grow the fruits and vegetables that are so necessary for human health, rather than supporting the financial health of mega-corporations (like Monsanto) that bully farmers into growing crops for the environmentally-destructive meat industry and the junk food industry with its demand for the cheap high fructose corn syrup that is rapidly undermining the health of our nation. We need GMO labeling laws to allow consumers to choose whether to buy these products or not (and most would not). We need laws protecting our farmers from the bullying of large corporations. I think a large percentage of the U.S. population would agree with both of these points. We also need to put the health of our environment and of our human population above financial interests by supporting clean, sustainable energy, clean sustainable farming, and much less meat consumption, since cattle are a significant factor in greenhouse gas production (in addition to high meat consumption being a major factor in diabetes, heart disease and cancer). I am also very concerned with the unregulated use of nano technology, because these microscopic particles can penetrate through the skin and enter the brains of humans and animals. There is no way of knowing what harm they could do when unleashed into the general environment. Of course there is a lot more we need to do to protect our planet, but these issues stand out as the greatest threats at the present time, because they could have huge consequences. And, though we can already see the increased pollution from toxic herbicide (i.e. Roundup and the like) and pesticide use, as well as allergic reactions to GMO crops, we really have no idea how much damage they could do once unleashed in the wider environment. I cannot overstate how important I feel these issues are and I hope someone in the Federal government will take note and start listening to the demands of the majority of U.S. taxpayers on the GMO issue in particular. For a cleaner, greener world, Bernadette Wulf

Agreed. I think most of us have our own ideas and we rush to add them here before checking to see if there are already similar ideas. I know I did that when I first found this site. Would be much more conducive to consolidate similar ideas. The site does give one the opportunity to delete their ideas. Also, I doubt very seriously if there is really any benefit to garnering votes for your own pet project. This is not a competition that will award some sort of prize for the highest number of votes.

Community gardens are popping up around the country. More emphasis should be put on encouraging butterfly gardens and other wildlife gardens to help connect children with nurturing nature.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Everyone is responsible for pollution of the nation's waterways and ground water. Individual as well as corporate responsibility must be acknowledged and action taken to reduce waste and its polluting effects. Septic systems and sewers are as polluting as farmlands. Manufacturing and mining is a big polluter. All of us need to look at ways to reduce pollution. If tax credits will be enough incentive, then let's use them. However, they will not work if transfer of credits is allowed. The biggest polluters will just buy the credits of others.

Children and adults, all of us, need to learn to protect and appreciate the area in which we live. Local history and environmental education can encourage and help direct, students and all community residents to observe, to question, to discover and to formulate answers that will give them a sense of place.

I agree that there needs to be a designated trail system for ORV users. However, I am disheartened when I see designated wilderness - not touched by the hand of man - covered with tracks from reckless, thoughtless, careless ORV tracks. This hurts it for everyone. I just returned from SE Utah which has the most unique, spectacular and diverse wilderness in the world. I can state that with some certainty because everywhere I went there tourists from all over the world in awe of the geology, the solitude, the untouched beauty, the historic cultural sites of cliff dwellings, etc. There are currently 17,000 miles of designated ORV trails in SE Utah. Surely that should be enough to keep riders happy and on a variety of trails without damaging more wilderness. Despite a sign posted at Factory Butte by the president of the ORV group to not ride off designated trails, or they might all be closed to ORVs, I observed tracks from various vehicles running in off in a number of places where there was no designated road, or even a well worn path and where there were clear signs saying 'not a designated trail'. These are the actions that will negatively impact the availability of useable ORV trails.

I agree with this challenge. The outdoors and recreation message needs to be taken into all communities within our urban centers. My son-in-law's brother's Boy Scout troop made up mostly of minority boys earned their merit badge for hiking in the outdoors by walking along canals in the Los Angeles area. If they had a connection to the National Forests (NF), they could easily have earned this merit badge at either the San Bernardino NF or the Angeles NF and learned so much more about our natural resources and how to use them.

I emphatically agree that the planning process needs to solicit ideas from all user groups. However, I am not aware of any intentional exclusion of specific user groups. On the contrary, many of the natural resource planners seek out those groups who may have an interest in land management. Planning requires active participation of land managers, individual users and groups of users. The planning process requires advertisement of opportunities to provide comments in local news media. User groups and individuals who are interested in commenting on planning need to actively seek out these advertisements or contact their land managers to open the line for communication. There is a dual responsibility requiring those interested in land management activities to seek out opportunities to comment and land managers to provide those opportunities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just returning from a camping and fishin trip in Utah's Uintah Mountians. Ashley National Forest people are trying but loosing to an off road vehicle crowd that just won't take no for an answer. Barracades and boulders are pushed and pulled from trailheads. Four-wheel trails split off in numerous directions, obliterating wildlife and people paths. Marsh and riparian areas are sometimes mud-holes you want to be careful not to step in. I agree with Jaclyn, some kind of interim protection needs to be put in place.

The hikers are much more prevalent than horseback riders, and that points out hte issue with your plan: If we allocate based on number of users rather than the requirement of the mode, you end up with an unworkable system. There may be far fewer riders than hikers, but riders require more space than hikers. We've tried sharing these spaces, but it's usually not very safe for one ot the other of the participants. This is coming from someone who had a close friend killed by a hiker's negligent actions. The hiker thought it would be funny to scare the horse, the rider was dragged for 3/4 mile through heavy brush and rocks before the horse broke a leg. Neither the horse or the rider survived, the hiker ran away and was never found. I've had mountain biking friends seriously injusred by hikers also. Many hikers love to take their dogs on the trail with them, and the dogs cause riders to crash because the hikers can't control their animals..

I think you missed the point, look at the tag to see sarcasm. But yes this is a polarized issue. Maybe we could double our green sticker fees again and close more areas, that way the few remaining areas get beat up so bad that we can prove land use is bad while still providing money for other interests to continue usurping. What kind of fees are your interests contributing to state economies? Have a nice day, I look forward to sharing the great outdoors with you too, really!

OHV and ATV and motorbike areas are sacrifice areas in my mind. The forest, public lands, whatever are places for enjoying appreciating and reconnecting with the natural world. Noise and machines are incompatible with this.

Really, really bad idea. We need Wilderness. God isn't making any more of it. We already have too many machines. Hooting around on a bike or ATV may be fun, having the wind in your face and going fast over rough terrain, but it's man against nature, not with nature.

So many good points... 1. My family has a little bit of land as do our neighbors. We take care of it to the best of our ability. As the newer neighbors with wineries install "mammal barriers" the deer, coyotes and mountain lions are forced into more restricted travel patterns and over concentration. Traditional ranchers would not have done this. 2. Public easements and conservation easements although written with the best of intent can be overly restrictive, our attorney advised us against it, the more detail in the document, the worse it gets for land owner. 3. Shooting of wolves and coyotes is a bad thing, but not all ranchers "hate wild life". There needs to be some form of economic support for a rancher not shooting predators. 4. This author wants to keep his private property private as do most of us, but the public is also loosing access to the areas that they might otherwise enjoy. I resent loosing access to public land just because I ride a horse, bicycle or motorcycle. Just my thoughts



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The HPF has never been fully funded in accordance to the formula that created it. We need to fully fund HPF and make a permanent fixture to assure the preservation of our cultural resources. The preservation of cultural resources goes hand-in-hand with the preservation of our natural resources. Now is the time to maximize our efforts for both.

I have an idea, use OHV funds for OHV. You know, like a budget. Unless you are also ok with your Social Security money being used for other things too.

I agree. The FS has blocked off several roads in the central Oregon coast range where I enjoy recreating. I ride dualsport motorcycles and enjoy exploring old roads. Just a few weeks ago I was riding my favorite road (which is on land with a timber lease to Roseburg resource company) and found a brand new gate had been put up to keep me out, but let the timber trucks in. I was absolutely disgusted to be locked out of your and my public lands, while a private company is allowed access. From what I understand about timber leases, the logging company owns the TREES, not the land they are planted on. Let me back in.

The White House press release dated April 16, 2010 announcing a "21st Century Strategy for America's Great Outdoors" starts a long-overdue conversation - congratulations! For too long THOSE WHO VISIT the Great Outdoors have sought to impose their version of environmental stewardship upon THOSE WHO LIVE AND WORK IN the Great Outdoors. Residents of the Great Outdoors include, farmers, ranchers, loggers, miners, guides, fisherman (and women), and hunters, to mention just a few. Some of us who abandoned the urban life for rural life have done so as the result of some childhood fantasy created in part by the rich baritoned-voice of Smokey the Bear. In his day he carried a message representative of the federal land agencies (BLM, USFS). Today, forest practices have been transformed based on greater understanding of ecosystems as a whole. It is time to reinvent Smokey and get him in front of the public with a new message and a new image.

These battlefields represent a critical moment in America's history and it is imperative that we save as many as possible. Many are threatened by development and will be lost forever without action. These fields are invaluable teaching tools for instructing the generations to come about this time in our history--they must be preserved.

this is public land and I should not be charged for non consumptive use; camping hiking horse back hunting ohv use etc.

We need more quality single track trail miles both on blm and usfs public lands that are available for two wheel mechanized and MOTORIZED use. An emphasis needs to be put on 20 to 60 mile LOOPS. There is no need or reason to close existing single track as this only puts more user pressure on the system as does the dead end trail approach!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When my family goes camping, it includes 3 generations of ATV Rider. No other sport allows us the opportunity to enjoy the outdoors together like this when age and health issues are taken into consideration. We promote safe, responsible, and low impact land use, stay on the trails, and always pack out our own and someone else's garbage. My goal is to have 4 generations in the same camp spot some day and OHV use may just allow me to do that.

Europe has great architecture and castles and very old cities to admire. America is a very young country and we must preserve what we have left from our history or it will be gone. We do not have thousands of years of histories as do the European and Asian countries. Our history is so precious to us, we take it for granted so many times. It was fought for so hard and people treat it as if we can just throw it away.

These are all great suggestions. All of them should be implemented before there is irreparable damage to our environment and wildlife. The time has come for our government and compassionate caring citizens to take actions such as those voiced here.

America has a problem with people sitting on their butts. Video games, television and computers to name just a few more modern phenomena, all contribute to people of all ages growing into sedentary, unhealthy lifestyles; while simultaneously Federal land use policies are driving people off public lands. I say we strive to strike....a balance. Public lands are plentiful and resilient and I have a hard time believing that honest Americans recreating on these lands will harm them forever. We are already harming ourselves physically. I believe we should actually promote useage of public lands for hunting, fishing, canoeing, hiking, mountain biking, OHV use, horseback riding and the like. Americans need to get off the couch and go exercise and enjoy the God created beauty of this great country. All this talk of new Wilderness areas is political horseplay and needs to stop. Recreation pales in comparison to the damage that industrial development can do and we need to stop kidding ourselves regarding imaginary "environmental damage" created by people just being somewhere - in order to support some political agenda. Lets take a page from President Teddy Roosevelt's playbook and get out there. He created our National Park system so we could enjoy the outdoors and I think you will find that the more people get out there and experience our public lands, the more conservationists and folks wanting to actively protect and manage it you will find.

Designating land as a WSA designation is too dramatic of a tool to protect the land. Without sufficient oversight, the BLM can effectively shut down a piece of land to all but a very small percentage of users. There needs to be a tool in place that can incrementally restrict the access and usage of BLM land (conservation rather than preservation). In many cases, the BLM land in question is already being used by a variety of recreational users which should, by definition, preclude an area from earning a "wilderness" designation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Mountain bike riders should be allowed in USFS designated wilderness areas. They are not motorized and have little impact when operated appropriately. Put in place a system where riders would have to earn a license to access the trails in the Wilderness areas. IMBA could develop training and testing. Riders should also have to perform a number of hours (50?) of trail maintenance within the annually to maintain their license. I believe most serious riders would have no reservations about earning the right to use the Wilderness areas. This would address some of the problems of inappropriate riding practices and provide the USFS with some much needed trail maintenance.

Having seen the infiltration of a BLM unit after which following a perversion of WSAs to stop OHV use on existing trails I have to say that the BLM tries to do a good job but can be derailed against the public interest.

I am sure this sounds like a great idea to anyone who lives in the city and doesn't try to make their living off of the land you speak of. I am sure I could think of different or better ways to use your city, block, or even home. If you think turning the whole country into a park I hope you know that your food doesn't just magically appear in the supermarket.

Single track trails are as important as hiking and atv trails. The real problem is too much push back against OHV use by judgemental enbjourmentalists whose goal seems not be a balance but to put an end to all activities as they so deem

Several national parks such as Theodore Roosevelt national park in ND and Rocky Mountain Nat'l park in Colorado are way overpopulated with elk that are damaging the habitat. Citizens could reconnect with the outdoors and do a service to the parks if citizens were allowed to hunt the elk in these parks. Benefits of hunting versus other means of control include: this generates revenue instead of expending it, encourages outdoor activity participation, promotes physical fitness, and we could even require prospective hunters to contribute volunteer hours to the park in addition to the cost of a tag in order to hunt.

i don't think the gov has allowed patenting or "perfecting the claim" since they put a stop to homesteading. so i think your beating a dead horse.

If you look at the National Parks, there are many ecosystems represented. However, a Grand Prairie is lacking and I do think that's a national tragedy. But, the same country that mandated Yellowstone be returned to it's former ecological functioning (big predators and all) could easily do the same for the Prairie!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

most of the roads in the usfs road systems were required by the usfs and built by logging companies to access trees, and were left for the usfs to fight fires. early on they became convenient for people to access areas never seen before by the public. later on, the us gov and the states figured out how to tax these people for "road Maintenance", and started the green sticker program. so ohv people have been paying all along for you to have access to all your hiking destinations. as years have gone by i've seen less and less maintenance on the roads in the national forest i live in the middle of, but have paid continually increasing fees on green stickers. most people i know that access the forest with ohv's are actually stewards of the forest and help maintain these roads themselves by filling potholes, clearing the roadway of fallen trees and rocks, and picking up trash all the cityfied people leave. i know it's cityfied people because there's not a micky d's for 90 miles, but we pick up their cups. bottom line, i don't ask you to pay for roads i use, so don't ask me to pay for your trail, but if you ask nice, i will help you build your own trail, neighbor.

Folks you need to understand what wildlife corridors are all about. You will not be able to retire next to them. In fact if you look up the plan from the self serving greedy Environmentalist you will learn they want to close off 90% of the lands where no human can live. This is scam to force every American into the cities. The Nature Conservancy is selling land back to the Government sometime at a huge profit. The other things everyone forget's is these far left wing extremist hate Humans. They want the roads the National power grid all human building rip up. I for one want to keep the land open just the way it is so future generation can drive out and explore the lands camp where they want and enjoy the land not box into a city like a slave.

Great post. The anti human side that drives cars lives in houses are the worst hypocrite alive. They hate people and want to kick people off private property steal jobs close off any and everything man does. These people need to crush their cars. burn their houses to the ground clean up the land and give it away to save the animals oh yes and leave the country. Oh that right they only want that to happen to rural America. It is high time these greedy self serving Eco Nazi are told no more. No more jobs close off so you can live in fairy tale land, no more closing off logging so we can have more forest fires, no more closing the roads off to vehicle traffic, no more taking of our land for your sick fantasy dreams of forcing everyone into the cities like slaves.

It is time to get the animal worshipping wolf people out of hunting laws. These people have watch the game herds get wiped out by wolves and laugh about it. Wolves have completely wiped out the Bighorn sheep, the Mt Goat and moose in Yellowstone park if you are save the predator type you people caused this destruction. Some parts of Montana are so low on game outfitters are asking the season be closed. The wolves are the worst disaster in the lower 48 history. Where ever these useless mutts are nothing but death and destruction. People dogs ripped to shreds children stalked Alaskan school teacher ripped to shreds. Enough of the wolf lies get those predators under control right NOW.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Last time I checked our public land are managed for multiple use. Mountain Bikes have lots of opportunity and there is also plenty of land for those who think wheeled vehicles have no place - it's called wilderness. Over half of California's public land is wilderness. That is more than enough. If you want all wheeled vehicles banned from public land that is pretty extreme. There is plenty for all and there have been major strides toward managing land for different uses so damage is controlled. Lots of people volunteer countless hours to do this, and we would be very disappointed if there was no place for us. Think about a scenario where all land is private and we have just a few parks where people can do only highly regulated managed activity. Sounds like a county without much personal freedom doesn't it? I prefer living in a democracy where everyone has rights, don't you?

My family and I are avid OHV riders ( we backpack too by the way, but I have a bad knee now so I can't do the long hikes any more). Over the years we have found our favorite places closed to OHV use, especially recently due to Travel Management. We always ride responsibly and use quiet exhaust systems and respect other users. We often stop to admire wildlife we see along the trail, it is thrilling to see a bear or bobcat. They usually stop when we stop so we get a great photo. I think they would run if they saw a hiker. We abhor seeing wheel tracks across a meadow and wonder what yahoo would do such a thing, you would have to be totally ignorant to do something like that, plus it brings down heat on our community. We have plenty of that as it is. We find it heartbreaking to find our trails and areas closed and do everything we can to promote responsible recreation and ask people to stay on the trail. We volunteer hours and hours to do trail work to make up for the lack of funding from the government even though we sometimes have to fight to do this. We go to hours and hours of boring meetings and read 600 page long environmental documents and write comments on them to help keep just a few miles of trail and believe me there are lots of other things we'd rather do. We have to do all this ourselves because we don't have the money to hire high priced lawyers. Thank goodness the NEPA process allows ordinary folks to at least participate, even though we usually end up with an adverse court decision in the end that closes our areas. We'll tolerate previously disturbed areas, no problem, in fact we're used to being given the places no one else wants. So let us at least have those and leave us alone.

Please take care of the huge backlog of maintenance that needs to be done on our existing National Parks and National Monuments before you even begin to think of creating more Parks/Mons. It is a National disgrace that we haven't taken care of our existing National Park system in a manner it so sorely needs!

Thank you. Stir up the lunatic fringe yes we know who the lunatic fringe truly are Eco Nazi a convict Eco Terrorist is working on the Wildland project. This lunatic said he wants 90% of the people of American removed forever. Anyone that support the wildland project is just a good German brown shirt.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The wolves are the biggest wildlife disaster known to man. They have done NOTHING good. Plenty of bad forced ranchers out of work, small business closed down due to the hunters no longer coming back, killed people, sport killed our wildlife. Wyoming had 1200 moose before the wolves today only 116 remain. The wolves don't balance nature they wipe it out. NO MORE WOLVES ANYWHERE.

Wolves are a fake endangered species wiping out everything in their path stop supporting super predators. leave the land open to all users. Wilderness area truly means cutting the public off from the land.

I think a better idea for us Americans (or US Americans), would be to put a large tax on tobacco products. That extra lump of money will be needed when the tobacco users are clogging up our hospitals with their self imposed medical problems. Heck, while I'm at it, the same goes for unhealthy foods. Unhealthy foods should have a huge tax too!

I think it is perfectly clear what is saying. Quit trying to shut us out of public land. I agree with when he says "In our great country we have worked, died and fought for, we should be able to access the land we own". I'm not sure how many of you have fought for our country, but I sure have. I've served 5 tours in Iraq and I've had multiple friends of mine die in combat. I can assure you that none of the Soldiers I have worked with would like to see public land closed because a lower case "w" becomes a upper case "W". If doesn't know what I'm suggesting, I'm suggesting that land being improperly designated as Wilderness (with a capital "W") is shutting out people who use it responsibly. People who use the land for good old family fun should have access to our land. People like hunters, fishers, hikers, mountain bikers, and OHV users. It's no wonder there is a problem with obesity in America, it's because there aren't enough families taking their kids outside to do things like riding dirt bikes or camping. Families can't do those things if lands are shut because they are redesignated as Wilderness with a capital W. Keep lands open for public use, because some of us have fought and died for the right to use them.

Invasive species are a major concern to farmers and ranchers. They have been very diligently working to control and monitoring outbreaks of noxious weeds on there property and have watched in vein as the neighboring public lands become evermore infested, choking out native species. The local conservation districts work very hard but are understaffed and underfunded. Education and extra funding to the local level would go a long way.

Thomas Fogle, you are a genius sir! Now that makes sense. There is such thing as new wilderness. Try using your computer for something other than typing uneducated rants and do some research. The United States isn't the only country on the Earth. Mother Nature has reestablished her dominance and created new wilderness all over the world. Climates change and new wilderness is established. You just don't notice it in your lifetime. Try looking beyond what directly in front of your face (your computer) and get outside and enjoy nature, although that's tough to do when you are shut out.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Lewis and Clark Trail was the first of transcontinental discovery. There is something in the Lewis and Clark story for everyone. If you have read the Lewis and Clark story and have not found something that captivates your imagination, you have not gone deep enough. It is a Trail from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But, it is only partially recognized. We need to "complete the Trail" by including the eastern legacy (St. Louis to Washington City, Philadelphia, and Monticello). Bryant R. Boswell (10 Jun 2010)

I feel strongly that all public land needs to be taken care of regardless of what types of recreation is done on the land. The Forest Service and other entities that manage these federal and state lands cannot do it on their own. Each type of group that recreates on public land has councils, associations and clubs, etc. Some of these groups are more active than others, but when one or more of these groups donates time and resources to maintain the land, these groups should not EVER be in jeopardy of losing the right to recreate responsibly on these lands. I belong to one of these groups and we donate many man hours each year helping the forest service maintain trail systems. We cut out trees so that horsemen, mountain bikers, hikers and OHV users can use the trails that have been there in some cases over 100 years. When these trees are not cut out users from each group find ways around the fallen trees and end up re-routing trails in a direction that can actually cause erosion or other issues. The group that I belong to also works with the forest service helping build water bars on these trails so that any water that would normally travel down the trail and erode is run off of the trail in a natural way to preserve the trail and not cause unnecessary side effects to the area. Whether I hike in the area, ride my mountain bike, horse or off road motorcycle I reap the benefits of these work/service projects. There are many other groups that do the same types of work all over the country. When we all get involved and donate our time to keep the areas beautiful our groups should not have our access taken away. This theory applies from designated wilderness area that doesn't even allow foot traffic to mountain trails that look at closing down access to mountain bikers or OHV users that have recreated there for years. If a group is using an area and is donating time and helping to keep the area beautiful and usable, why suggest taking away that groups right to use the area?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

We all have opinions on what access is okay. What it really comes down to is what you like to do on public lands. If your idea of recreating responsibly is in danger then you have an opinion on why that type of recreation is okay. Public land is public land. The real issue is taking land that is okay to use today and taking away someones right to use that land. Taking away access to land that someone has used for years should be expected to cause some controversy. As Americans we love our country and we all have cultural and family traditions with what we do when we recreate. When someone attempts to change a cultural tradition of one group, they should expect it to be met with opposition. Keep the lands open for what they were meant to be used for. Responsible recreation and use. Opening up new lands for new types of use is a totally different topic, but taking something away that has been there for generations and is still functioning should not be done no matter what type of recreation you prefer. Just because you prefer to walk on public land vs. ride a horse (which was there first anyway), a mountain bike or motorcycle doesn't mean that you are more responsible. It just means that the type of recreation you prefer "appears" to have less of an impact on the environment. One last thought. Our interstate highway system is used daily. Without maintenance to that highway system it would be broken down and impassable. We have the same issues with our public lands. If nobody is maintaining them, the trail systems we use and maintain today will become overgrown, eroded and impassable. If a group that uses the land loses access you may well also see that the group you just secluded will also no longer maintain the areas and leave the burden on the already overburdened forest service or state entities. These areas will also become unusable over time the elements will deteriorate the trails systems that cover these areas. We are then left with some beautiful pristine wilderness that we can look at in pictures and cannot enjoy.

My idea is to create an environmental stimulus for the US American economy by paying \$.03 cents for every cigarette butt collected and turned in for proper disposal. Some many smokers have used parks, intersections, lakes, and beaches as ashtrays. This is not fair to non-smokers. The time has come to put income in the pockets of those US Americans who want to preserve safe, healthy, and beautiful environments.

Off shore drilling must be stopped. Period. Require mandatory education in middle and high schools regarding the environment, wilderness preservation, etc. Require physical education classes to prevent the epidemic of obesity in kids-get them away from the computers and outside. Require voluntary action in some sort of environmental activity for graduation.

People who are not experienced in the outdoors will usually choose the easy way to interact with it (ride in a car, see a movie, shop in a store). They need naturalist programs to teach them how to enjoy untamed wildlife and unspoiled landscape. Don't cave in to pressure to Disneyfy our parks. With encouragement and opportunity, people can get beyond golf courses and tennis courts.

Yes, well deer carry ticks that can pass on diseases to humans, and skunks and raccoons can carry rabies, etc. Are we going to get rid of all animals because they are unsanitary and might cause some harm?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The BLM is underfunded and understaffed. The government is out of money and can't afford to properly maintain the wilderness. They need the help of OHV volunteers to maintain it. They are the ones who keep the fire roads open by clearing fallen trees and repairing washed out access trails. Without these trails, the whole area would burn and we would lose our precious wilderness.

The off-road crowd actually plays a vital role in the maintenance of the wilderness. Many of them work with the BLM to keep open fire roads and access trails by clearing fallen trees and repairing washed out areas. I have numerous friends who are Forest Service Volunteers that patrol the forests looking for fires, illegal campfires, and trails that stray from the designated path. The government is out of money and can't afford to maintain more forests. They are understaffed and underfunded. They need the help of OHV volunteers, and that means keeping those areas open.

Having just returned from a fabulous adventure on the Wild and Scenic Missouri River, through the Upper Missouri River Breaks National Monument, I was reminded how important it is to protect places like this through inclusion in the National Conservation Lands. This is the only section (149 miles) of the entire 2,200 miles of the Missouri River where you have any hope of experiencing the river as Lewis and Clark saw it more than 200 years ago. The National Monument protects rare plants and animals, dinosaur fossils and native American sites. These lands conserve the essential fabric of the West by protecting for our grandkids the lands, water, and wildlife we inherited from our grandparents. It is essential that National Conservation Lands receive strong policy guidance from the Department of the Interior that ensures their protection so that 200 years from now, kids can still experience the landscapes that inspired our country.

I am very much a nature lover. However, I can't agree with this suggestion if it suggested as a BROAD approach to all nature areas. Certainly there can be some areas left wild and other with accommodations for the less "rustic" adventurer. Certainly you can see the need for access for less fit individuals, clean restrooms and phones to use in case of emergencies.

I just wanted to add an interesting statistic to this discussion. I monitor the statistics on the Take Care of Your Share website. I can tell how many people find the website by using search terms such as "how can I take care of the planet" or "taking care of our planet" etc. Almost NONE of those searches come from within the United States. What it LOOKS like is that there are many more people in other countries that are looking for ways to make a difference, on a personal level. It is very disheartening. { <a href="http://www.takecareofyourshare.com/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I think it's an interesting idea to provide park passes to people in exchange for volunteer hours and wouldn't be surprised to find that this idea is already in play. However, I don't see why it should be restricted to government employees. The people with the most time to devote to volunteer are probably retirees or other people that are not employed full-time and these are the same people that would benefit the most from free passes and discounts.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's too bad that we there isn't a way to combine all of these suggestions about Master Naturalist programs into one. It would make it easier to see how many people are in favor of them if there was only one place to vote for them.

Most of the major national parks have plenty of luxury accommodations. There are very few places where only rustic camping is available.

Somewhere along the line, trying to protect the environment has become a competition rather than a cooperative effort. I believe that it got much worse once "being green" started to be an economic issue rather than an environmental one. Environmental groups should learn to work together rather than feeling like they have to compete with each other. I assume the competitive aspect has to do with getting donations and I don't know the solution. But we are all on the same page and groups need to learn that. Working against each other is detrimental to the cause.

Uggggggghhh. The thought of turning the wilderness into another Disneyworld.

OHV users are an important and influential portion of the economic model of preservation for public lands that allow motorized sports. More often lately OHV users are demonized as destructive, careless, abusers of said lands. However, a larger and larger portion of the fees we pay are earmarked for support and restoration of these public lands (vehicle registration fees, land access fees, etc). Additionally, many OHV users promote conservation, upkeep, and social responsibility either through organized groups or through a fundamental belief that these lands are worth protecting and improving in order to enjoy them properly. Limiting or revoking rights already given should not be a strategy employed to satisfy the few mobilized against the actions of the masses of OHV users. The idea then is simple: instead of taking something away from OHV users, continue to provide access to these lands, adding something to their responsibilities that equate to an investment in the lands they use (other than the taxes, fees and volunteer time already given). Offer reduced vehicle registration fees or provide free land use passes for OHV users that volunteer time towards restoration or upkeep programs. The great American financial incentive at work, and much of this activity can be done while using an OHV, making the act of contributing to preservation and upkeep more enjoyable. OHV users are family oriented. Time spent together is rewarding and rich in outdoor experience. Self reliance and conservation are natural compliments to outdoor activity. Leverage the hundreds of thousands of OHV users to promote these concepts rather than souring their spirits with limitations and reductions of freedoms.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Over the past decades Multiple Use Lands and Trails have been closed at an alarming rate. This has been done with Wilderness and Monument Designations supported by a vocal minority and against the wishes and recommendations of the local residents, Forest Service and BLM. These closures have concentrated use on the remaining Multiple Use lands putting them in danger of being over used. The restrictions on the Wilderness and Monument lands have also eliminated conservation work. This is true in Sequoia National Forest and other Forests and BLM lands. The America's Great Outdoor Initiative must permanently protect remaining Multiple Use lands in order to: 1. Promote active conservation work and Forest Health. 2. Ensure all forms of recreation continue to be allowed for current and future generations. 3. Prevent any further concentration of use or closures of these lands where the majority of the public recreate. 4. Support local rural economies which depend on the income generated by the recreational user of Multiple Use lands, as well as sustainable grazing and timber harvesting which provide much needed products, jobs, income and taxes. 5. Protect Multiple Use lands where the majority of the public can go to refresh and recharge while recreating and supporting local rural economies. I attended the Los Angeles listening session on July 8, but was not chosen to speak so I have provided my testimony and suggestion here. I am the Executive Director of Stewards of the Sequoia. Since forming in 2004 we have continued to be the largest on the ground volunteer organization in the Sequoia National Forest. Our volunteers perform maintenance on over 200 miles of trails per year. Our conservation work has provided over \$350,000 in benefit to the local community and the Forest Lands at zero cost to the community. Our work is done on Multiple Use Trails which are enjoyed by everyone including motorized recreation, mountain bike, horse riding, hiking, hunting, fishing, rock climbing, camping and more. Our concerns are based on actual day to day involvement and working in the forest with land managers.

Preserved for whom? If you can't have access, what good is it? Guess you could look at a postcard or something.... Look at a map of the western US, Most of the land is already "preserved".

Regarding ORV/OHVs and the comment that "touring at low speeds is the only public land use that should occur", kinda makes "public" land less so. If by "public" you're referring to lands set aside as outdoor recreation areas, and also supported by taxpayers, and you are against the use of said land for anything other than "touring speeds", then you are specifically intending to deny land access to those who prefer offroad riding at anything but "touring speeds". Sadly, public lands are paid for by people that like to go fast too. In fact, here in the west (California, Nevada, Arizona) where the vast majority of offroad open area riding takes place, OHV users are by and large excellent stewards of lands that are set aside for such use. I simply don't understand the mindset that public lands should only be enjoyed in utter quiet, or that rights should be limited or stripped for some class(es) of users and not others.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Renewable Resource Harvesting such as Logging, Forest Thinning and Active Forest Management in America must comply to the strictest environmental standards in the world. So there is little risk of damaging the environment. Actually by discouraging logging in America we are supporting poor logging practices in other countries where they may have little or no environmental regulations, not to mention wasted fuel and energy shipping wood from far away places. Each of uses wood products every day and it will be provided from somewhere. It just makes sense to support Renewable Resource harvesting in America using the best practices in the world.

makes some excellent points. While I understand points, the fact is that people that enjoy the outdoors are also its most ardent supporters. If we take away the recreational aspect of our national parks, the majority of support for land preservation would disappear. Let's face it. Environmentalists make up far too small a percentage of our population, and the rest of the population has a tendency to be ignorant of the problems that exist a few miles from their front door. In Illinois recently, the governor proposed cutting educational funding by \$1.4 billion dollars. In Greece, the government is being forced to make massive cuts to all of its public services. The government is already trillions of dollars in debt. Do we really want to alienate such a large segment of people that actually support the preservation of federal lands and waters?

Stable wildlife populations require healthy and connected ecosystems. Some species migrate seasonally, others require large territories to hunt, and many--especially predator species--need to be able to move across great distances to maintain the genetic diversity that is key to their survival. Human encroachment on intact ecosystems leads to habitat fragmentation, recognized as a primary cause of the decline of species worldwide. Roads and highways, in particular, are a principal cause of habitat fragmentation, creating barriers to wildlife movement and resulting in animal-vehicle collisions. Global climate change will alter ecosystems and force wildlife to shift their range, underscoring the need for wildlife to move across the landscape. The issue of habitat fragmentation needs great attention now, in order to protect key remaining habitats and restore crucial linkages between habitat areas.

The argument that our National Forests are open to EVERYONE, but closed to those who do not enjoy my form of recreation is ELITIST, self-serving and invalid. To a reasonable person dispersed wheeled recreation has no more impacts than any other form of dispersed recreation. Wheeled recreation is a great way to enjoy the Outdoors and how most young people prefer to enjoy their public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The assertion that wilderness quality lands continue to exist because they are "protected" by grazing interests ranges to the bizarre. The ecological quality of public lands in the west is very poor and much of the problem can be traced to the the crested wheat grass biological deserts created in the interest of cattle grazing. That said-- another poster is correct in that the 1964 Wilderness Act is clear that grazing is not an impediment to Wilderness designation and vice-versa. The discussion of how to protect the ecological resource of the Public Lands while still allowing for grazing is a separate discussion from wilderness. Given the effect rampant ORV use would have on cattle ranching, I wonder how ranchers are reacting to the apparent push for greater access for those destructive machines.

The health of the land is not determined by who recreates there. It is determined by how many people recreate there. In the case of many popular hiking spots the areas are overused and in very poor condition. The same is true where OHV recreation has been forced onto too small a trail system by those who seek to close our public lands to the majority of the public. The reality is every form of recreation has impacts. Water runs down the hill on every trail. How the trail is laid out determines how much erosion takes place, not who uses the trail. Many of the hiking trails I have been on had really bad erosion since hikers are most likely to shortcut switchbacks, which increase the speed of water flow and erosion. Trails that allow OHV use are often better laid out and receive more maintenance due to OHV self funded programs than other non motorized trails. People who enjoy motorized recreation volunteer and provide more trail funding than all other groups combined.

The law of supply and demand applies. Asphalt and concrete are permanent and very common, wilderness is fragile and rare. We should value more that which is rare and should therefore attach a very high value on wilderness. Opponents of wilderness are reflecting the values of 400 years ago when the attributes of civilization were very rare in North America and wilderness was common (and perceived as threatening). It's time America's for public lands policy to reflect the values of the 21st rather than the 17th century. It's time place a very high value and priority on protecting those last vestiges of North America that reflect the hand of God rather than the footprint of man.

The point is the Nations young people and the public already enjoy Off Road Recreation and Mountain Biking far more than other forms of recreation. There is nothing cobbled together about studies showing the participation in each form of recreation from the USDA Forest Service, International Mountain Bike Association, Outdoor Foundation and American Horse Council. Please note that not one of those organizations is an Off Road organization, yet their numbers confirm Off Roding is the most popular form of recreation. However if you doubt them, please go to an area where wheeled recreation is still allowed and see for yourself the huge numbers of people. The attempt to encourage people to hike for recreation has been a failure as shown by dropping visitation to National Parks where only hiking is allowed, while even in the face of more and more closures, more people choose wheeled recreation. Let's help our young people to get out more by providing more places for them to do what they already want to do, enjoy wheeled recreation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are many areas that are designated for mountain bikers and preserved with the aid of mountain biking associations. Without the demand by these individuals and groups, those lands would not be used and their preservation would be at risk. Within each of the areas that I bike are trails designated for hikers as well as wilderness areas in which biking is restricted. Multi-use trails allow for partnerships between local organizations and federal government in the management of these lands. It helps the government to share the burden and helps local economies when these groups sponsor activities on federal lands. These activities help taxpayers recognize why we would want to preserve lands. They allow more people to enjoy the use of those lands and develop an appreciation for them. Without mountain bikers, hikers, fisherman, hunters and the many others that use federal lands to pursue their passions, we would lose a huge amount of support at the polls and with the funds that they pay to pursue their hobbies. As a hiker, mtn biker, fisherman and hunter, I hope we all recognize that if we can't work together during these times of financial hardship that we may lose the very lands that we all want preserved.

There are many dissertations on why wilderness areas are crucial and necessary for healthy people, habitats, water sources, and wildlife. The list is too long to regurgitate here. But three major points are worth reiterating. There are few places left unadulterated by the hands of man. We have a responsibility to preserve any and all lands that meet wilderness criteria in perpetuity for the benefit of ourselves and, more importantly, our children. After all, we are merely borrowing these lands from them. Some places are too valuable not to protect from human adulteration. Some would cry "elitist." That is a very anthropocentric and selfish point of view. These places are worth protecting from humans as much as they are worth preserving for humans. The damage a single person could do is enough to destroy the rich tapestry of these ecosystems forever, in some cases. To those who say that wilderness is closed to people, doesn't allow access to the old or unable, or to firefighters, is a concept for the elite or affluent, and so forth, are simply ignorant to the facts of wilderness designation.

While I understand the importance of designating lands for OHV use, 1:1 is somewhat excessive. One, there are more than two types of people that use the lands. Two, we all need to recognize that OHV use does come at a higher cost to the lands and waters that we're trying to preserve. HOWEVER, hikers, bikers, environmentalists should begin to recognize their dependency on the OHV community. Obviously it is a large and vocal community, which very clearly cares about the retention and management of public lands. As someone else, the government has NO MONEY. If we all want to continue to enjoy public lands, if we want clean water, safe animals and plants, we need to find common ground. And we need to do it quickly.

I understand your concept about treating bison as a game species; in many cases worldwide, game species receive better protection than ag species. I'm not clear on whether you are wanting to designate the bovine mix bison *\*only\** as the game species?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

From the mountains to the sea, this outdoor destination is the backyard for urban L.A. For millions, it's important for recreation, drinking water, clean air, open space, wetlands, historical and cultural significance and habitat. But it needs improved park access for the San Gabriel Valley, more services to link diverse communities, and federal protections for the last wild places.

I would like to add to this that this is just the ramblings of a crazy man. The original author was just this week arrested for assaulting two mountain bikers on a trail with a hand saw. He attacked the cyclist and cut one across the chest with the saw. He will have his day in court so lets move on. As a mountain biker I agree that not all trails should be open to mountain biking but I do feel that this is a legitimate outdoor activity and when trails are designed for mountain bike use the destruction that the author points out is minimal. The conflict in the past arose because mountain bikers pushed for access to trails when there were none to ride on and may have done damage to the trails because they were not designed for cycling. Those days are past and trail design has improved. If a land manager works with local mountain bike groups and implements IMBA construction methods the damage can be limited. I know every trail work day we have are well attended and mountain bikers work very hard to build trail the right way while reducing the impact on nature. Should mountain bikers be allowed access to all land? No. Should mountain bikers be able to develop specific trails designed for their sport? Yes. Lastly, I suppose the author was out preserving nature with that hand saw he attacked the cyclist with. Yeah Right!!!!

I fully agree. If we want people - kids, families - to spend more time in the outdoors, we should be making it easier and cheaper for them. Not nickel and diming them at every campground and trailhead with a program that does not work.

The USFS in particular has utilized contractors and concessioners to collect FLREA (the former Fee Demo) fee money and campground fees. This practice results in a never ending escalation of the program as more fees are needed to justify the jobs to collect more fees. End the use of contractors and end fee collection at trailheads, return to volunteer campground hosts, and the problem is solved.

Three Rivers Land Conservancy is steward for natural areas in the Portland Metro urban area. Urban land is too expensive for a land trust to acquire. We hold easements and provide stewardship for land that we do not own. Owners of ecologically significant land are more likely to grant a conservation easement if there is a tax incentive to do so.

As I commented on your other post, the Federal Government reached out and closed our local trail system in spite of a long standing partnership of trail maintenance.

Great idea but it doesn't always work. I along with countless others, spent 2 or 3 weekends a year for over 7 years doing clean ups and maintenance on our favorite trail system only to have access closed 2 years ago by the Forest Service.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I guess we shouldn't be driving cars, using boats or flying planes. Wait a minute, we should never have allowed horses (well at least those ridden by humans) either. Do you realize how pathetic you sound? By having things like mountain bike and OHV use you extend the reach and use of the great outdoors to many more people. If it is done properly there is little impact on the ecosystems and I doubt you are going to put ANYTHING in danger of extinction. Wait a minute....do you live in a house? Do you drive on the road and park your CAR in parking lots that give access to natural areas? Bet they have a HUGE impact on the ecosystem. What are you wearing on your back? Oh...all these things are ok because they benefit YOU! How does that song go again.....This land is your land....this land is my land..... Maybe if you tried looking from another perspective and apply some logic you would see just how one sided and ridiculous your statements are.

I agree with most of this quote from above. Lets keep things like this for a while.. I think we can make things VERY Sustainable and allow all citizens to enjoy OUR Country. "We do not need more Wilderness. There are other methods to conserve large areas without Wilderness, such as National Recreation Areas or Backcountry designation, which conserve land but still allow access. I can count on one hand the number of hikers or horsemen I've seen while riding some of the country's remote trail systems....Wilderness shuts out everyone but them, and they end up with vast tracts of land that most people won't or can't go into. Backcountry designation keeps the land accessible. No more Wilderness!"

I doubt they hauled that trash in on an atv I can just see it now my own refrigerator man just reach back and grab a cold soda. just use you brain man Ive been out there off highway is usually the cleanest places you see, I ve been to the beaches, and lakes and seen the damage there too

I think this idea deserves promotion simply because it is a step in the right direction. Do I think mt. bikers should need a license to ride in Wilderness areas, no I do not. Just as equestrians don't need a license to use those areas. But if licensing makes the opposition feel better about sharing the land, then sure, let's do it. The only reason I see for prohibiting mountain bikes in areas which are otherwise open to hiking and equestrian use is when it is a popular area and there are frequent trail conflicts due to overuse. It is sensible to manage and restrict use to specific users in those cases only. But in remote wilderness areas where trail conflicts between different users are extremely rare, it is absolutely ridiculous that mt. bikes are banned yet equestrians are not. Motorized use is a different issue due to the higher environmental impact, however there is no reason why we shouldn't be able to support a reasonable number of managed trails open to them in all these areas as well. The key is "management", as there's plenty of land for us all to be happy!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I tried to show my son the Salem Church battlefield in Spotsylvania, Va, but could not keep his interest. We were walking through the furniture store parking lot, the bank parking lot, and I just COULD NOT keep his interest. He could not tell what I was talking about with all of the cars trying to park in the parking lots. Also, the asphalt was too hot to make it pleasant. I think the idea of allowing commercial development on Civil War battlefields IS A BAD IDEA. It does not work. And it is very hard to figure out what might have been here 150 years ago after the bulldozers have cleared the area and leveled all of the terrain. On the other hand, when we walked across the Spotsylvania Courthouse battlefield, my son could easily tell how the battle unfolded. The terrain, woods, and fields are very similar to what the battlefield was like 150 years ago. AND, nice and cool, with the trees. No asphalt to bake you into surrender!! So my idea is to, preserve the Civil War battlefields NOW. Don't try to do it later after the commercial property has totally transformed the area so that you do not recognize it. Also, trying to buy the commercial property later and transform it later will not work. It will be too costly and too difficult to bring the area back up to the pre-commercialization state.

Jaclyn - Section (d) (4) (2) of the Wilderness Act states: "the grazing of livestock where established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture." Key words in that sentence "subject to". Those legal terms get you every time. While I agree that public land should be protected and should be protected from companies that continually exploit the American peoples resources. I disagree that we need to further "protect" the land from the people. Wilderness areas only prohibit entry by anyone except government employees or persons on foot. Most are, here goes that term again, "Subject to" restrictions by horseback and mountain bike. All are subject to no motor vehicle use on existing roads! Unless of course you are a government employee and then you can enjoy the peoples property all to yourself. Protect it for Us, not from Us!

"That means keeping the machines out, the cycles, ATVs, cell towers and cell phones, recreational cabins, visitor centers, permanent climbing anchors, motor boats, chainsaws, helicopters, backhoes, and military trainings." Banning the public from public lands is bad policy. Effectively banning handicapped people from public lands is unconscionable.

I strongly agree that we need to use our sites to promote not just recreation but also education. Our heritage is our strength and needs to be better passed along to future generations. In particular, there needs to be more funding to protect, preserve and interpret the Civil War and Revolutionary War sites in our country.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The battlefields of our nation's most turbulent and defining four year period must be preserved. Joshua Lawrence Chamberlain said 120 years ago at Gettysburg, "In great deeds something abides. On great fields something stays. Forms change and pass; bodies disappear; but spirits linger, to consecrate ground for the vision place of souls. And reverent men and women from afar, and generations that know us not and that we know not of, heartdrawn to see where and by whom great things were suffered and done for them, shall come to this deathless field to ponder and dream; and lo! the shadow of a mighty presence shall wrap them in its bosom, and the power of the vision pass into their souls." Just like Chamberlain we must be visionaries! Don Torrence

The time is NOW to preserve what is left of Civil War Battlefields! Why the urgency? Reflect for a moment what has happened to so many of the Revolutionary War Battlefield sites. So many of them are in the heart of a city and are not preserved. We have an opportunity to save and preserve the remaining Civil War battlefields. Our government and our citizens must act NOW! Battlefields are memorials to those who helped to make our country what it is today. Battlefields are lessons of what has shaped our society. Battlefields are outside in fresh air and not in a room full of electronics or gizmos.

is incorrect when he states that that "most conservation initiatives ...end up excludng the public from public lands." Actually virtually all public lands are wide open to all members of the public. The controversies over "access" really revolve around the wishes of people and groups who want more access for motorized recreation. Access to the public is almost never restricted on public lands; access to motors is sometimes restricted to protect values that are important to a large majority of the public. These values include protecting wildlife habitat, minimizing erosion, minimizing noise and disturbance, and protecting wild landscapes.

is incorrect when he states that public access is retricted in Wilderness Areas. All Wilderness Areas are wide open to all members of the public. Many OHV enthusiasts spread this kind of misinformation, in an attempt to increase motorized access into wild areas.

This is a great idea! Too bad that more people do not see the common sense in sharing our outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many of these ideas start out sounding straightforward and moderate, then the writers begin framing their individual political agendas by using phrases such as "locking up public lands," "controlled by a vocal minority," "wildlife terrorizing gearheads" and so on. Or mentioning red herrings like "disabled users can't access wilderness"--how many truly disabled people have you seen riding ATVs? Talk about a tiny minority. That's when I decide I can't promote or vote for either "side." I do a little offroad motorcycle riding, and a lot of climbing, hiking, and camping in Colorado. I have never been disturbed by an offroad vehicle while hiking, nor witnessed any deliberate trail (or off-trail) destruction by OHVs. If seeing a rut made by an offroad vehicle sends you into a rage, don't frequent the handful of areas where that happens. From the earth's point of view, that rut is very temporary. Off-road riding near the metropolitan front range is fairly restricted due to population and development, so riders and drivers of OHVs are necessarily concentrated in a few areas along the foothills. These areas may have environmental damage from overuse, as does Rocky Mountain National Park from an overabundance of elk. On the other hand, there are many open space parks in the foothills with hundreds of miles of trails open only to non-motorized use. The proportion seems about right to me. By the same token, if I'm willing to travel 20+ miles away from Denver/Boulder/Co. Spgs. metro areas, there are many riding opportunities and not that many hikers, etc. And riding areas (and consequent traffic) are highly dispersed, so recreational vehicles are creating much less damage than current oil/gas drilling or even mining that occurred over 100 years ago. If you live in the Western US, you know there is a lot of land and relatively few people. The conflicts between recreational users of public lands has been blown out of proportion by "vocal minorities" on both sides of the issue. I'm guessing most of the people complaining about the opposition have never ventured more than 200 yards from a parking lot. To sum up, my idea is: Do not attack your presumed opponent when formulating an idea. Wild lands are apolitical by nature, and you may have more in common with your "enemies" than your friends when it comes to conservation or multiple use philosophies. Don't mindlessly transmit your chosen faction's talking points, but use your actual experience to mold your opinion. Just because public land is called Wilderness by current law doesn't mean your grandchildren won't be riding electric motorbikes there in 50 years--laws can be changed after all.

Repeal the Fee Demonstration program. Analysis has shown it to have no net value, as it consumes all it brings in in administrative costs. It is an annoyance and an insult to ask folks to pay a fee to use scenic waypoints that their tax dollars have already paid for. If your goal is to encourage people to reconnect with the outdoors, then this barrier must go.

Snow country (boreal) forests are the largest, least understood, and most neglected by environmentalist. Skiers are also the largest, least understood, and most neglected outdoor constituency using this forest. As a retired national park ranger and professional skier I've observed this unfortunate disconnect with increasing interest ever since I wrote a Mineral King editorial for Powder Magazine back in the late '70s. My Ski Trails book (2008) provides the tools to remedy this critical information gap. Mineral King's Supreme Court case is only the beginning of skiing's contribution to environmental restoration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A lot of the hiking trails in my area (and I've heard similar anecdotes from other regions) are practically destroyed every spring by masses of ATVers (including trails where ATV use is supposed to be restricted). The trails are rendered practically unuseable to anyone but ATVers, making the designation "multi-use trail" a joke. Off-roading is a perfectly legitimate form of outdoor recreation even if not my chosen way and I respect that, but it's clear that offroading in innappropriate settings (non-motorized trails) as well as responsible offroading (tearing up multi-use trails) is a problem. It's my belief that stricter penalties need to be imposed, but more importantly, that enforcement be taken seriously. The non-motorized status of hiking trails is completely unenforced in many areas and as a result no one hits the trails but the ATVers themselves. There are many responsible ATVers and offroaders out there who certainly deserve the right to do so (in fact, perhaps there should be more motorized-specific areas to reduce the wear on multi-use paths). In order to preserve their rights, it's essential to keep the irresponsible users off the public trails. Every ATVer who wants to go mudding has a few acres (or a buddy with a few acres) where they can go do so. Law enforcement needs to get serious about showing that public trails are NOT the place to do so.

Let's get out of Afghanistan and Iraq and use the billions of dollars saved to preserve what makes this country truly great; its natural treasures. One fine example of which is the Saugatuck Dunes along the coast of Lake Michigan, now threatened with destruction by land speculators.

Battlefields are like cemeteries. Would you want Walmart to build a parking lot over your loved ones' graves or tombstones? We need to preserve these battlefields not only out of respect, but to also help preserve our land, bodies of water, and habitats.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

you are only assuming that ORVs chase away the wildlife. You can not possibly know that as fact unless you yourself chased away wildlife on a motorized vehicle. I am a 56 year old woman who grew up in the great outdoors. My seventeen years experience enjoying the scenery on our public lands with a motorized vehicle says that you are wrong in your assumption. I happen to see a lot of wildlife. Just this past weekend, I saw a big black bear on an ORV trail. My husband later in the same place saw the same big black bear. My motorized vehicle did not chase the bear away nor did his. Not everyone likes hiking so making them hike for enjoyment and physical activity is unrealistic. You can't make everyone like walking in lock step. ORVing can be very physical and certainly more physical than would be if hiking is the only option allowed for everyone. Motor vehicles do not scare the wildlife as much as a hiker standing and pointing at the animal, such as a deer, saying "Look a deer." That scares the animals more. Also how do you know that animals break there legs on ORV trails? Have you seen it happen? I don't think so. Look how dangerous the forest is with all the under brush and fallen trees. I am sure that legs are more likely getting broken on forest debris than on a uneven ORV trail tread. I get so tired of hearing the same old rhetoric coming from the wilderness advocates as if they are authorities on ORV recreation when they don't even use one. They make a lot of assumptions and call them fact. Recreation with a motor vehicle is just as legitimate as any other form of recreation. My experience out in public lands is that there are more people enjoying recreating with some form of motorized vehicle than any other form of recreation. There aren't that many hikers as compared to ORVers, but most of the public lands are given to the hikers while the ORVers are given much less and getting lesser every day. It only takes a couple of years for hiking trails to disappear from lack of maintenance and use. Since hiking trail disappear they use ORV trails because they are kept maintained by the ORV community. Then the hikers complains that ORVer are using the trails and disturbing their solitude. The hikers should be grateful that we go out and clear our trails every Spring and SHARE our trails with them so they have a place to hike. The Forest Service mission says that they are to meet the recreating needs of the public. I say they are doing a very poor job of it. They are certainly not meeting the needs of motorized recreationists.

Frankly, why must our public lands be kept as wild as they can be? I don't see the point. It appears to me that a select few think that the land should be for their own personal use and not for anyone else. The more land locked up in wilderness the more conflict there is with what is left. Since when does the hiker take the high road and everyone else's desires and needs don't matter. The hiker is a very small portion of the users that interact with public lands. I think hikers should only be allowed to hike in wildernesses since it was set aside for their use only and there is more wilderness land for their personal use than there is multi-use land for the rest of us. Hikers have a bad reputation for being selfish, greedy and creating conflict with others they don't approve of.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I object to spending over \$2 billion of my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations. Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduces access to most people. The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas, we need less. The goal to reconnect Americans especially youth with the outdoors can best be done by providing more places for them to enjoy their favorite forms of outdoor recreation. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. Off Road Vehicle use is by far the most popular form of recreation, followed by Mountain Biking. Multiple Use lands are where the majority of people recreate, as well as where much of our timber and beef products come from, but these lands have been closed at an alarming rate. The President must protect these precious lands by designating them permanently as Multiple Use. The Initiative must preserve Multiple Use lands as Multiple Use for current and future generations to enjoy these and all other forms of recreation. The President is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. The President needs to include the two largest forms of recreation as a priority in his plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors. That would be Off Highway Vehicle recreation and Mountain Biking. More areas need to be opened to people who enjoy these most popular ways to enjoy the outdoors. The proposed Wildlife Corridors along with the proposed Wilderness and Monument designations would harm rural areas, push people out of their homes and force them into cities. This destruction of our Rural Communities, also known as the United Nations Wildlands Project, is detrimental to the interests of all Americans and should not be supported in any way by the Outdoors Initiative.

we know you and your activities are far superior to anyone else's according to you. Unfortunately for you, the rest of us don't agree with you. All your babble is unsubstantiated. For example, you see one dead deer that you don't know how it died, but you are sure that it was either hit by an ORV or shot by someone that rides an ORV. You make a lot of assumptions and present them as facts. I have heard the statement before that we haul TVs, old refrigerators and dryers out to discard on our trails. I as an ORVer have always wondered how that is done. I have always wondered how I could haul an old refrigerator on the back of my dirt bike. What a feat that would be. You think you are such an authority on my recreation. Maybe you, can tell me how it is done. People will common sense find your silly statements laughable. Words like ruin and destroy are commonly over-used and misused to describe changes that occur to an ever changing environment. With statements like these you lose all credibility.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Have any of you taken the time to visit this areas that you want to turn into a bison commons? Or have you taken the time to visit with the people that care for this land ? If you have you would realize that your idea is totally of the wall it would destory the beauty that has been created with years of had work and sweat of the people that live there. The wildlife that is now present in this areas was not here 100+ years ago as you have been lead to beleive. The bison had destroyed the ground with over grazing which with cattle and sheep that has been managed and the land has become more productive. So please take the time to visit with the people that are putting their hard work into the land before making any judgements.

As the Federal government begins to connect land to people they need to take into account living cultures (people) such as the Gladesmen Culture in So. Fl. For cultures to survive their cultural community members must be supported by land management entities in accessing very remote areas of public lands in their traditional ways that existed prior to gov't. takeover. The association of place to cultural community members is critical to the cultures survival. Failing to do this will breed very stiff opposition every time to any plans being developed on a public property.

At first glance this idea seems very positive and harmless. There might be a few unintended consequences associated with this idea. Many power line easements may be private property owned by power companies who own the power transmission systems. They very well may not want the liabilities associated with formally inviting recreation activities onto their property. Unless one has touched a high voltage power transmission tower when it is damp one does not understand how serious an electrical shock one will receive. I have experienced that situation. It wasn't fatal but it might be to someone with a sensitivity to such things (e.g. person w/heart problems, pacemaker etc.). Cost and coordination of such a program in my opinion would be prohibitive during the austere times that taxpayers are and will be facing for decades into the future. Now if the beneficiaries of such a program (hikers and bicyclists could fund it entirely themselves including insurance that problem could be avoided. Possibly a license tag for bicycles and a permit for hiking-who knows. As far as orchards growing food for the homeless goes that cost would also have to be borne by someone (e.g. you and me) or the beneficiaries. I do not think the homeless can afford to pay and I doubt even the beneficiaries would want to. This idea could assist getting folks outdoors but not without a massive coordination and cost. Nice idea but too costly in my humble opinion.

The Constitution was designed to prevent the Feds from meddling in State policies. One need not worry though since many methods have been devised to avoid the mandates and protections that our Constitution is supposed to guarantee. A couple that come to mind are that our Judicial system now uses precedent rather than the Constitution to decide cases and States are regularly bribed to sell their State's decision making independence by entering into Section 6 agreements with the US Fish and Wildlife Agency as offered by the Endangered Species Act so as to further its purposes. There are many other methods also. If one really wants to learn how to minimize or destroy the appeal of hunting and fishing study the way Florida manages these activities. As they sincerely try to enhance the activities they are destroying them. One must live here and be involved in the issues to fully appreciate their folly.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Federal Highway Administration already diverts vast some of gas tax revenue away from highway upkeep to bicycle pathway programs. Bicyclists are hostile and arrogant to motorists also. I have seen them takeover 4 lane highways as they peddle 8 or 10 abreast through an area with total disregard for anyone but themselves. Possibly bicyclists should begin paying for the infrastructure they demand. License tags for bicycles to pay for their infrastructure is long overdue. That might slow down their outrageous requests. Believe it or not \$28,000,000 dollars was spent to pave the top of the flood control dike that encircles Lake Okeechobee in Florida for a handful of these folks who do not contribute a nickel as far as I know. This is one example of many that should not be allowed.

The Feds are enjoined alright by the US Constitution from meddling in States except that States are seduced into willingly selling the independence guaranteed by the Constitution in return for Federal dollars offered for doing so. A prime example is Section 6 Cooperative Agreements that further the purposes of the Endangered Species Act and allow the Constitution to be blatantly violated albeit for the right price.

The reason for the permit being issued could have been because nobody went to the County complaining about the project. In fact everyone in the locale might have been supportive of the project and the jobs it would create. Project mitigation might have produced a net gain for wildlife and habitat. Sometimes the glass is half full but we cannot allow ourselves to realize it.

Yes the states were required to do comprehensive plans because they were already taking the money without having the required plans. I sat through a 2 day development seminar for Florida's plan and witnessed what I consider fraud injected into the program in public. I reported this to the powers that be and nothing was done. I wouldn't recommend funding programs such as these from what I saw. It was strictly a rush for the money and nothing else.

You don't need to go racial sir since there are all colors running around America now. A whopping bunch of them have the firepower to prevent any species from running them out or worse. The feral horses don't have guns so they receive what fate hands out. Adoption is better than being dog food.

THIS is important. So many of the other suggestions baffle me in their ability to concentrate on utterly non-essential things. Protecting wildlife in the last few places where we have left them anything seems of paramount importance to me. I think all these points are excellent. Not without difficulties, sure, but we as Americans might feel better about ourselves if we for once did the RIGHT and not the EASIEST or MOST PROFITABLE thing.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a result of Congressional hearings in 2008, the Government Accounting Office published a report on OHV use on federal lands in 2009 { <a href="http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d09509.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } This reports tells the facts that motorized recreation is one of the top 4 threats to national forests (page 10), and that federal agencies are unable to sustainably manage OHVs on federal lands (page 35). Unlike wilderness areas that are relatively inexpensive to manage, sustainable management of OHVs would include having the necessary human and financial resources available to ensure compliance with regulations, educate users, maintain OHV use areas, and evaluate the existing OHV program. The OHV industry and their dealers and customers want all of the American taxpayers to subsidize the extremely high costs of motorized recreation by providing free land and paying all of the costs to make this high intensity use sustainable. I am happy to pay taxes to maintain wilderness anywhere it occurs, but you can forget about using my tax dollars to subsidize the OHV industry. OHVs should be banned from all public lands, and the manufactures, dealers, and their customers should buy their own land and pay all the costs to manage and use it.

I agree with the many comments already made. I just want to add that there is very little time to make substantial preservation progress as every day that goes by sees more precious battlefield lands taken over by housing developments, shopping centers, road construction, and so forth. Hence, maximum effort needs to be made in the next few years, or the opportunity to do so will be forever lost.

I could not agree more. Public land is looked at as free land by municipal, state and even Federal managers. When one person wants the cheapest, quickest way to get a project completed, they immediately look at cutting costs by having that project completed on Free parks. This is the greatest example of that type of thinking. Despite more valleys than the entire Sierra Mountains could provide, they had to choose the one that was already in the ownership of the Government. Take it down, and take down many more. Right now the Gold Ray Dam removal is underway on the Rogue River in Oregon. The Elwa Dam is soon to start being dismantled on the Elwa River in Olympic National Park in Washington State. We can have energy, and progress if we begin to think outside the dam box.

I like the idea of thinking BIG. This is the way to protect areas for the wildlife that should include us, but not be for our benefit first. Wilderness should be for the plants and animals first, and only secondarily for us humans. We will get the benefits if the wildlife does.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

North of the California border lies a few groves of unprotected Sequoia Semper Vierens , the Coastal Redwood trees. These are located in the Siskiyou National Forest and none are protected from being logged. They are the northern most reaches of the ancient redwood trees and as such are an incredible gift to our nation, some 15 feet in diameter. I would like to see all these groves, and those in the Alfred E. Loeb Oregon State Park , adjacent to these groves,protected as National Wilderness. There is a vast area of the Siskiyou National Forest (in excess of 250,00-acres), that need to be designated Wilderness with Federal Protection. This would also protect the now unprotected Myrtle Trees of Oregon along with Port Orford Cedars besides the Redwoods. A Siskiyou National Park is really needed here, encompassing these wilderness areas and others.

This idea is not only long overdue, it is necessary with global warming. We are stewards of land, not owners--all of us. We have tremendous amounts of Federal, State, County, City and private land that should be looked at not only for "what we can get out it", but rather how we as individuals can help it. A good shepherd watches over his sheep,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Sounds a little crazy at first, but think about it. We have the ability to control the amount of oxygen we produce, and the amount of moisture that we release into the atmosphere. How do we do it? By increasing on a massive scale the biomass (trees, etc.) that we plant. Trees create oxygen and atmosphere. Planting more biomass creates microclimates. Many microclimates create macroclimates. Microclimates can have positive benefits for reducing greenhouse gases and positively impacting moisture levels and climatic change. Don't Conservation agencies already do that? Yes, but not on a large enough scale. We need a new agency whose single mission focus is on atmospheric production, not lumber production. An agency who will research and focus on the most effective means of restoring our oxygen and climatic balance. A great deal of effort has been directed toward carbon dioxide reductions, while little attention has been given to increasing oxygen production. What are the benefits? JOBS -Besides the benefits already mentioned, this could be a massive jobs program all across the U.S. Just as the Civilian Conservation Corps. was established in post-Depression America, an agency for atmospheric production could employ 100's of thousands workers in a productive meaningful way. WATER - This program will preserve and increase our shrinking supply and growing drought of precious clean water. ATMOSPHERIC - Trees and biomass not only produce oxygen and water, but they consume carbon-dioxide, conserve evaporation and regulate temperatures in the process. How do we get started? Legislatively - Establish an agency for this purpose. Partner - Partner with the many federal and private organizations already in existence that serve a conservation role. Physically - One only needs to look at aerial views to see that there are millions of acres that can be planted, both public and private. You'll find many of those in your own backyard, from urban areas to remote regions. Begin with buffers along EVERY creek, stream and river to preserve our scarce supply of pure water. There are literally millions of places where trees don't currently exist where they could be planted. Through succession planting dry arroyos devoid of water could be converted to flowing streams. Microclimates are created that would allow, over time, the expansion of these buffer areas. SUMMARY: We have millions and millions of acres that could become oxygen-producing, water-producing, carbon-dioxide cleansing factories that would moderate our growing climatic changes while creating thousands of jobs. CALL TO ACTION: Don't just vote on this idea. Write a letter....to your newspaper...to your Congressman...to the President...to anyone that will listen and can move this forward from "just an idea" to a real goal that we can achieve for the betterment of our environment and America's Great Outdoors.

Stiffer penalties and strong enforcement in the area of ORV users will do more for conserving our natural resources than any single measure other than closing access to them and/or limiting areas where ORV's can operate. It will also assist in the "Reconnect with the Great Outdoors" program by making the forest the calm and peaceful place it once was. I live in the National Forest in Montana and this is our biggest problem relating to the conservation of our public lands.

The Historic Preservation Fund comes from the licencing of outer continental oil, gas, and mineral explorations. Considering the news from the Gulf this last week, we need full funding for the HP Fund in order just to protect the many thousands of "at risk" cultural properties in the Gulf Coast. These properties promote tourism, better quality of life, and a historical connection between the people of the Gulf and their homeland. People are worried about the loss of their Gulf Coast "Heritage" and this matching fund would greatly help these people.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

these threads are informative. there seem to be handful of professional anti-access agitators posting the same crap in every one, and a fairly broad spectrum of sensible and respectful multiple-use advocates that appreciate the need for a variety of recreation.

The non-motorized community needs to provide the money for these "trails", most of the money right now comes from motorized use in the way of gas tax. As for trails for motorized use they are being converted to non-motorized or not being maintained, as a motorized user I feel we need more trails for motorized use, not less.

Full, permanent funding of the HPF will support local government efforts through additional funding for the portion of HPF funding that must be passed through state historic preservation offices to Certified Local Governments (CLG's). Local preservation efforts are where the "rubber meets the road" and any financial assistance directed to these cities and towns will result in better trained local preservation commissions, more relevant design guidelines, and a greater level of protection for historic neighborhoods and commercial districts throughout the country. Marty McCune, Chair, National Alliance of Preservation Commissions

I first heard of this initiative in a short talk "Flat Hat Chat #7" by NPS Director Jarvis. I immediately thought of a place in my National Park community which is presently occupied by a dilapidated trailer park. This same place in the late 1800's was a productive homestead supplying goods to all accommodations in Yosemite Valley, Wawona as well as the mines at Bodie on the other side of the Sierra. Fruit trees from Hennessey's orchard remain as well as sections of the historic walls not destroyed or filled when first "re" developed in the late 1950's, early 1960's. The site has potential to be restored and could demonstrate a living history, preserving both the historic features and sustainable lifestyle. Work could be supported by visiting at risk youth mentored by local community members.

For my life time I have gone camping, fishing, hunting and hiking in the Colorado rockies, its a shame when you are fishing and enjoying the quiet that you came for, and a motorcycle or four wheeler buzzes by and disrupts the tranquil beauty, I came to enjoy. They are not there to see the wildlife or enjoy the quiet beauty. They can drive on roads and make noise where other vehicles are. There should be a place for just off road vehicles to go, they can all get together, and enjoy the noise and company of others just like themselves, and let the rest of us enjoy the parks in peace and quiet.

I agree completely with Sandy McGuire's idea of a National Park in western Kansas. As a 70 year resident of Kansas I feel our state is pathetically under-represented in the National Park's system even though Kansas has much to offer. Although the Tallgrass Prairie preserve is wonderful it gives a very limited view of what the true prairie was. It make sense both economically for the residents of western Kansas, but for future generations to actually experience the American prairie in terms of both it's wildlife and plants and to learn about the importance of this endangered ecosystem. " It is one of nature's most efficient carbon traps as plants draw carbon from the air and store it underground" (KC Star 6/6/2010)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have brought my son up in the back seat of our Jeep, and now, he is doing the same with his children. We go out with friends and as a family, promoting respect for the environment and those around us. My grand children are very lucky to get to go out into the back country and have the experience of seeing wildlife and open spaces. 95% of our children in the cities haven't a clue that there IS open space and back country. All they know are video games, and that is a sad commentary of our times.

Methane is a difficult greenhouse gas to control and everyone knows that. Before you can successfully burn it to provide energy, effective equipment and methods must be in place so you are not trading one problem for another. However, we went from cathode tube to transistors to solid state to microchips in short order, and the time between innovations is shortened. Surely we can meet that challenge. We would want to spend the R&D time, energy and money for this reason: Using methane to generate energy is a smart way to go because there is nothing more renewable. Cities, towns, burgs, businesses, and farms all generate many metric tons of sewage, a primary source of methane gas. Let's capture it, refine it, and burn it instead of dump it. Separate out the water for the water reclamation facilities (we have them in Arizona and they are used to water golf courses) and use the resulting matter to generate methane. Once the methane has been processed out, the remaining material has enough safe nutrients to be made into fertilizer. They do that in Pennsylvania now. There may have been an experimental community in Virginia or Maryland years ago that did exactly this. If they are still functioning as a community, let's look at their success. If they are not, then let's examine their failures and learn from them. But, let's do it. It is the ULTIMATE recycling venture!!

Tell me, Mr. Hines, where did your car, computer, furniture, pots & pans, toilet, rake, toilet paper, computer paper, glasses, hearing aids, dishes, clothes, food, meat, fruits and vegetables, tools, refrigerator, washer & dryer, etc., etc., etc. come from? Everything is either grown on the land or mined from the land. So, let's not lock up more land in wilderness and become more dependent on other countries than we already are. Or ..... are you willing to live in a cave and wipe your butt with banana leaf? Humans are and have to be part of the equation of living on this earth. We have to be respectful of Mother Earth, but, unless we are willing to go back and live like cavemen, we NEED miners. We NEED farmers. We NEED lumberjacks. We NEED oil drillers. They all provide for what we are and have today. Both Boxer and Feinstein have unnecessarily locked up public lands into wilderness so that they would have a warm and fuzzy feeling while sitting in their arm chairs. Most of these wilderness areas certainly didn't meet the definition of the 1964 Wilderness Act of "lands untramled by man" when roads and trails, old mining camps, etc. were already in existence on the land.

No off road vehicles!! Not in the parks and not in our neighborhoods.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

People should not disturb by peace with off road vehicles. It doesn't matter if it is in a park or at home in their own backyard. No one has the right to disturb other people's right to peace and quiet. It is a matter of RESPECT. It is too bad that people do not have RESPECT for one another anymore. RESPECT means do not disturb my peace and quiet!! Is that too hard to understand?????

If anyone thinks it is legal to run an ATV on their own property at all hours I would like to know what city and state they live in so I can check their city and state laws. Even if it was not illegal, it is immoral to disturb your neighbor's peace and quiet.

the one thing that i see and have been involved with is that big money such as the Sierra Club and agencies like that, want all access to the forest closed to all motorized and the way they get away with it is, "endangered species" (tho they've never seen that species in that area ever), erosion, (the forest service has never been out to stop or reroute ceertain areas) conflict, (with 2000 people using the forest in our area, they close trails so there's conflict because they're squizzing everyone in one area). It's the common sense approach that is lacking and it's easier to close down the forest to everyone or make it a wilderness instead of using the resources that they have at had such as volunteers. Our small group of 10 re-open all the trails every year by chain sawing the downfall and the forest service doesn't have to pay for a thing. It's volunteer. If they just asked, they'd be surprised how many people are out there to help re-route, clean, etc. It's a no brainer.

This idea has been demoted by a concentrated group of people who are promoting this casino. That is an illustration of the problem with this system. I believe there may need to be incentives for communities to protect their historic treasures and if the nation cares about its history it will find a way to do that.

This should be linked with "Federal Government role" and "Challenges" as well. The feds say it's a state issue, the state says its local, the locals say it's state, and everyone is just waiting for the appointed Pa Gaming Control Board to make the decision on the application, as though our national honor were not at stake. The Gettysburg Address is the most memorized speech in the world. This casino less than 3000 FEET from hallowed ground would be such an embarressment to the United States.

With the many competing needs at a local level, purchasing private lands or easements to provide access to public lands and resources, or trail connectivity, often are a lower priority. Many communities in rural areas, such as Idaho, have few resources for these property purchases, and open space ballot measures can be difficult to pass. Full funding and robust state program would go a long way to help these communities improve public access and quality of life for their residents.

If you truly want to foment physical fitness and see the wilderness, employ your own two feet instead of using fossil fuels.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I like this idea, except that directional drilling also has a lot of negative ecological consequences. I would add to this thought that continued use and development of natural resources should not occur without expanding and strengthening our recycling programs in the U.S. Until nothing is being wasted we should be cautious about our emphasis on extracting more.

The Roadless Area Conservation Rule has been in and out of the courts since it was enacted under the Clinton administration. It provides an excellent opportunity to protect wildlands under a less limiting designation than federally-designated wilderness. Encoding the protections guaranteed to roadless areas under the RACR seems like an excellent compromise between conservation objectives, industry interests, and recreation interests. Roads are a threat to the ecological integrity of our wildlands. While it is undeniable that motorized users also need and deserve access to wild places where they can recreate, such use is not appropriate everywhere. It causes erosion, disrupts wildlife, and negatively impacts water quality. Industry use of roads has similarly unfortunate impacts. By preventing additional road construction we can maintain existing access for motorized users and industry without ruling out opportunities for quiet recreation. In essence, we preserve the status quo. It seems to me that much of the debate here is focused around either Wilderness or Not Wilderness. Perhaps both sides should be considering workable compromises that serve the national interests of resource sustainability, economic independence, ecological health, biodiversity, and recreational access for a wide range of user groups, rather than digging our heels in.

Trail Rider: Wilderness areas are not closed off to people with disabilities, wheelchairs are allowed in the wilderness (as an exception to the general nonmotorized/mechanized thing) and there are wheelchairs that can handle trails and rough terrain. Where I live, a local nonprofit provides access to these expensive technologies for people who could not usually afford them, to help disabled people enjoy the outdoors. Wilderness areas provide many more recreational opportunities than just backpacking-- they are extremely valuable for wildlife habitat and offer great possibilities for hunting and fishing. They also protect watersheds and, theoretically, ensure that we have scientific references to check our land management elsewhere. Multiple use did not work. It resulted in overexploitation of natural resources that proved ecologically destructive. While I agree that the United States should strive for resource independence, and that this is one function of the public lands, we also need to take the long term future into account. Unless ecological function of the public lands is placed above all other objectives, we will not be handing down a livable situation to future generations. Rather than persisting with the failed strategy of multiple use as a principle of resource management, it is time to consider other options.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For the second time in five years, investors have applied for a license to operate a casino on the Gettysburg Battlefield's doorstep. In 2006, a local grass roots movement, assisted by a coalition of state and national organizations, defeated the first application . This year, one of those investors, now in league with a former legislator and racetrack operator, has applied for a gambling license once again. While the 2006 casino site was 1 1/2 miles away, this site would be 3000 feet from the southern entrance to the Battlefield, close to where Pickett's charge occurred and right on the Journey Through Hallowed Ground Trail, a National Scenic Byway originating in Monticello and ending in Gettysburg. Incidentally, creators of that Byway rejected Charlestown WVA's request to be included on the Trail despite it's historical significance specifically because the gambling venues in Charlestown were considered antithetical to heritage tourism. In 2006, 86% of those who testified during 3 days of public hearings spoke against locating a casino in Gettysburg. Despite that, our state legislators have either been unwilling or have lacked the political courage to protect this national treasure and other precious sites in our Commonwealth from such threats. now, the future of one of our nation's most significant and consecrated places is now up to the PA Gaming Control Board, a group of seven political appointees with gambling connections, who have the authority to either grant or reject this license application. We are, therefore, beseeching the federal government to enact legislation requiring a buffer zone around Gettysburg National Military Park specifically, and other such historic national parks generally, so that gambling establishments and other incompatible venues will not be permitted to threaten the priceless quality of experiences that these solemn sites provide for all our nation's citizens. If we fail to do this, then look for an amusement park or a miniature golf course near Shanksville after the Flight 93 Memorial is completed. Are there any places left in this country that are so powerful, so meaningful, so intrinsically a part of the American fabric that they are not for sale? If there are, then Gettysburg is one of them. There are thousands of casinos. There is only one Gettysburg. If we can't preserve our history, then shame on us all.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am imploring the federal government to protect the Gettysburg National Military Park (and other historic sites) from ill-advised ventures such as one now before the PA Gaming Control Board. It is an application to open a casino...a venue for frivolous escapist entertainment...3000 feet from the southernmost (and most used) entrance to the revered Gettysburg National Military Park. It will be located right on the "Journey Through Hallowed Ground", a National Scenic Byway which extends from Monticello to Gettysburg. Ironically, the creators of that byway purposely avoided nearby Charlestown WVA, despite its strategic location and significant historic importance, because of the racetracks and slots parlors there, which they deemed incompatible with heritage tourism. The investors say "it's not on battlefield property" but it will significantly and negatively affect the character of the area that is so intrinsically a part of the Gettysburg experience. The Battlefield, its contextual community, and the 51,000 casualties suffered on July 1, 2, and 3, 1863, represent the essence of what America is all about. Nothing that the word "Gettysburg" conjures up in the national consciousness can abide a casino and all the tawdriness it represents and attracts. One small example of this: thousands of children and adults each year follow their guides on the path of Pickett's charge, hiking across the Emmittsburg road where this casino will be located. How can that priceless experience be continued when the road is widened to handle the increasing volume of traffic? Abraham Lincoln, in his November 1863 address, beseeched us to be responsible stewards of this Hallowed Ground, where so many fought and died so that the words "all men are created equal" could truly have resonance for each citizen. Have we placed greed over any concern to preserve our historic sites for future generations? These investors tout economic development as their purpose for this travesty, but we have statistics showing indisputably that it will wreak economic and social havoc for this particular community. No one would object to economic development in keeping with the unique character of this place, but not a casino. Would we build a go-cart track at Shanksville, the site of the Flight 93 crash on Sept. 11? Would we open an amusement park at the gates of the cemetery in Normandy? A water park at the Arizona Memorial in Pearl Harbor? I think not. Four years ago, this same investor attempted to open a 3000-machine slots parlor 1 1/2 mile from the battlefield and was turned down by a torrent of public outrage expressed locally, regionally and nationally. Yet here we are again, locked in the same struggle because our state legislators lacked the political will to place a buffer around such sites to protect them from such predatory and inappropriate development. Ron Maxwell, Director of the epic movie "Gettysburg" spoke there recently in impassioned opposition to this casino. He was vilified by casino supporters for stating his opinion that these investors are not altruistic, but instead, exploiting the international fame of Gettysburg by locating it there; however, I suggest that if the battle had been fought elsewhere, or not at all, Gettysburg would still be a sleepy farm town in rural Adams County...a location no greedy investor would ever consider as a venue for a gambling establishment. The countless folks who come to Gettysburg each year to learn, to reflect, to grieve for the pain and death suffered there to save our union, don't come to gamble. Heritage tourists overwhelmingly say just the thought of a casino is repugnant to them. Please protect this sanctified hallowed ground and important outdoor classroom from such a threat. Assure all Americans that it will be preserved for future generations to embrace and to appreciate what happened there.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This flurry of negative comments is indicative of the type of shenanigans that local supporters of this casino indulge in. Their entire campaign has been one of "dirty tricks" such as this, false assertions, misrepresentation, questionable "contributions:" to solicit support...and I could go on ad infinitum. To desecrate this iconic historic shrine with enterprises so antithetical to everything Gettysburg conjures up in the national consciousness is a travesty. The folks who are guilty of the negative comments on this website are one dimensional; they live only in the moment, with no appreciation for the past and no sense of stewardship or responsibility to our future generations. What a sad indictment of our society. You get 5 miles outside of Gettysburg, and the entire nation is incredulous that something so disdainful would even be considered!

A fine idea, and as far as getting funding by "balancing competing interests" goes, we should look at what this country spends on our armed forces. An NPR commentator said the U.S. annually spends more money on defense than the rest of the world does put together.

A great many social and economic problems worldwide, as well as most of our environmental and conservation problems, have roots in human overpopulation. No one denies the right of people to have as many children as they wish. However, for a very long time, businesses and religious groups have effectively blocked our addressing overpopulation as a serious national and worldwide concern. For the sakes of our children, our societies and our fellow creatures, the President of the United States and other world leaders should make a strong case for intelligent family planning.

Agreed. A good idea. We have entirely too much nighttime illumination. In some coastal areas it confuses turtle hatchlings. In the interior it messes with migrations.

on most topics I'm with you and I'll promote this one, but entirely too much is made of religious thoughts, things that are sacred to some people, beliefs of various ethnic groups, etc. Fact is, each of us is here for a limited amount of time; and the things that rattle around in our heads are not all that important. We each should strive to be happy and productive without harming others. Where we agree is that "others" includes the rest of our fellow creatures and the ecosystems that gave rise to us. It would be nice if we each could leave this world without trashing it. One of the positive things we can do is protect sufficient wilderness areas where the hundreds of thousands of other species can exist and evolve without our interference. No development, no mining, no forestry, no trails. That doesn't mean there shouldn't also be ample places for motorized recreation, but we have converted entirely too much of this planet to human uses.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When people give opinions (in a democracy), you get a cross-section of what the public DESIRES. And, because people (myself included) are selfish, the most selfish ideas will get the most support. In the case of "land conservation" (this is the topic of the website, as I understand it), your comments will reflect this phenomenon in that most comments will be about land USE. That is, people will say "it's MY land!" and "I want to USE the land like this...". That is not land conservation as I see it. Land USE is in many ways the OPPOSITE of land CONSERVATION. For example, a majority of people will comment on how they should be able to access all areas of the land, and how they should be able to ride their motorized vehicles all over it. People who respect wilderness for its aesthetic value will be in the minority. Similarly, the people who would sell the timber on their land for money outnumber the people who would leave it alone and enjoy it for its beauty. Please keep this in mind. You might do well to do the OPPOSITE of what is suggested by users of this site, if your true aim is land CONSERVATION rather than land USE.

You are certainly right about this... "The same environmentalists who lobbied government to mandate Solar and Wind Energy are now crying out that paving our deserts and other natural areas with solar panels and wind generators should be stopped." That kind of action will accomplish nothing! Nuclear is the way to go. It is much safer than people think! Citing Chernobyl is a prime example of how little people know about current nuclear technology. The public knows so little about it and therefore fears it.

As a biologist, I study populations of various animal species. The bottom line is that populations of many many of our wonderful birds, mammals and others are declining. One major cause is loss of habitat. We urgently need to protect our remaining wilderness areas or we will lose these species. Our children should also have the chance to see Cerulean Warblers, Ocelots, Long-billed Curlews, Kit Foxes and all the other wonderful creatures that enrich our lives. We will lose them if we spoil our wild areas by careless, short-sighted development.

I think it would be a wonderful idea if our active duty service men and women did not have to pay to enjoy the very national parks they work to protect and defend. My son was a ranger with the National Park Service for 6 years, and it always bothered both of us that our active duty soldiers are required to pay admission to our national parks. They deserve to be treated better than that!

If we do not learn from our past, we are doomed to repeat our mistakes. So many of our ancestors fought in a war which many historians refer to as America's "Second War of Independence", and the war which created a nation out of individual states. It is incumbent on us to honor those who fought, and to preserve this hallowed ground for future generations. It is not enough to read about Civil War history. We must preserve battlefields to provide a more tangible history experience. The time is now to do all we can to save these sites as they are constantly disappearing due to urban sprawl.

In fact, many wilderness areas are susceptible to erosion, which is greatly worsened by offroad vehicles. This results in the degradation of what should be pristine wilderness areas. It is urgent that wilderness be protected from such unsustainable use.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many of our animal and plant species are threatened with extinction and a major cause of species' decline is loss of habitat. A wilderness preserve is like an island. The smaller the island, the fewer the number of species that can survive there. We must protect more and larger wilderness areas so that we do not lose the many and varied lifeforms that enrich our lives. This fabulous biodiversity is indeed the greatest inheritance we can leave our children.

We really need MORE wilderness areas, not less. Many species are threatened with extinction. Urban sprawl continues to degrade our outdoors. So much has already been lost. Let us not lose any more of our wide wild places. Overturn the 'No More Wilderness' settlement.

Ah - all the old arguments come out , pitching one person with his or her way of life against another. Cows vs wolves. Ranchers vs. new people. What if, instead of going straight for your gun, pardner, you consider what the West (since most of the east is already developed) will look like in 100 years--after you are gone? Will it be stripped, run over by drills, polluted from coal, coal bed methane extraction? As you fly over it will you see more scars on all the mountains? You are never farther than 20 miles from a road already. So how do we "manage" forest, animals, plants, water, air? Is it going to be about money? machines? pollution? fighting? Or can we learn to understand that everything one person does to what we were all given for free, I might remind you, will affect everyone ultimately on the planet. Look what happened to the oil rig in the Gulf! So while we would all like to be able to go anywhere anytime and do what we want, what ultimately will be the best for everything Not manmade. After all, is there a master plan? Have we suddenly become , each one of us God? Or will we work together so that the world tomorrow is better off not worse off than when arrived.

I think that everyone is missing some creative thinking . In the future, when all wild things are subdued, turned into circus animals, drowned in oil spilled from exploding oil rigs, harvested to the last bluefin tuna for sushi, thumped by seismic thumper trucks into concrete like soil and the last bird is only seen in a picture on a computer screen, then some will wish they had thought of this idea sooner: - build special domes similar to football stadiums only 3 or 4 times larger and fill them with OHV type vehicles. The vehicles would sit on a platform. In front of them would be a computer screen. Similar to the simulators used by pilots in training, a driver would sit on the OHV, the platform movement could be controlled by the driver to simulate riding over any type of terrain he or she would like. He would wear a helmet through which he would hear any kind of sounds he would like as though he were outdoors. On the computer screen he would see any type of terrain he would like to ride over. All emissions from the machine could either be smelled by him or whisked away. Another part of each booth type enclosure could be a machine that blew dust or mud of any type all over the driver. No more trail degradation, wild animals spooked, air pollution in our forests and deserts and streams. My daughter, a pilot, assures me that when she was in the simulator training to be a helicopter pilot on her way to serving her country in the Gulf, she truly felt as though she were flying over the ocean in a storm. How about it? Just as good as the roller domes in Mad Max movies! Perhaps accidents could be programmed in so the drivers could experience all the thrills of off road exploration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is becoming more and more difficult to find any place in the United States where there is no intrusion of man made machine noises. We need to find a way to show the importance of places where people can hear only Natural sounds and understand the importance of this silence. Also to understand the beauty of something created by Nature and untrammelled by humans - Awaken a "Sense of Wonder"

Let's be careful about what constitutes access and who will truly be excluded. If motorized access is allowed in all wilderness areas then those who need quiet places will not be able to get away from city and machine noises. Many young people today don't even know what to do in a quiet place. So - machines will have to be made silent and not emit pollutants and not in any way destroy trails, cause erosion, etc. My Dad, when he was 90 and no longer able to hunt or hike or fish, did not demand access to all the land he would have liked to access. Why is there a need for noise in the wilderness that is man made?

Take a look at how many acres are now available for exploration for minerals valued more than the lives the land sustains. Then find out how many acres now available for exploration have been explored by seismic thumper trucks or any other means available for ascertaining what might lie beneath the surface. Then find out how many acres that have been explored have been developed. Then find out how many acres developed have yielded what was expected. Then tell everyone you know why we need more acres sold off that should be left as much as possible as Nature created them. And why should we value everything that land sustains that is undeveloped? Can you tell me why we should not value it? I think all of us who understand that everything is connected on this planet and that we have strafed, drilled, polluted, paved over and raped a great deal of it already to our detriment should, ask those opposed to any more wilderness to prove that it is better for our collective health as one species on Earth if we just go ahead and open all land everywhere to development. The burden of proof should be on anyone who does not value the everything given to our race and all living beings for FREE, not on those who understand its value. Unfortunately the BLM is a fox guarding a henhouse. They are supposed to protect and sell off land - money versus our future health.

The challenge that we face is industry - minerals management and more of it. The earth is rapidly being overtaken by industrial interests, where they can, and the litter and packaging from these sources is marring many highways and byways. An advertising or a public relations campaign touting the outdoors is very much in need of being launched. For instance, in California, where we live in San Jose, I am appalled when I learn, as a state park volunteer at Henry W. Coe State Park, that FOLKS HERE HAVE NEVER HEARD OF IT! How can such ignorance be. Some of these people have lived here for YEARS. Even a reporter from the San José Mercury News blithely mentions regularly in his environmental stories that people "have never heard of Henry W. Coe State Park." This is just stupid. An ad campaign - never mind the cost - could remedy this by helping to save California's 278 state parks. The cost should not become a factor. Volunteers could do this or a nonprofit. Visibility is very important. California needs to be jolted out of its torpor and those who say they never visit state parks engaged by the ads. "The future belongs to those who believe in the beauty of their dreams." - Eleanor Roosevelt

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The challenges facing our government and this country regarding wilderness--wild places where the hand of Nature is more apparent than the hands(and feet and machines of man) is that of lack of understanding and using the paradigm of money as a measuring stick of importance. Perhaps instead of only looking at money, we might consider that a day or more in a place not roughed up by humans might actually have a health benefit. And a person who has time in the woods, beside a stream, in a field of wildflowers, or listening to birds or the wind might not need to spend quite as much time as he or she had before in a doctor's office or psychologist's office. I believe that one challenge might be this to everyone who says " prove the value of wilderness" :prove that the wilderness, wild and beautiful places mostly free of man's hand do not have value to our mental, physical and spiritual health. "No more wilderness?" The challenge is learning to understand its value and importance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The TRACK (Trails, Ridges, & Active, Caring Kids) program provides adventures for children and families of all ages. Whether following the clues from a brochure, an interpretive sign or with a guide, TRACK trails encourage kids of all ages to explore the world, find answers to questions and uncover hidden clues along the trail. Each TRACK trail provides multiple self-guided brochures or adventures at the trailhead and downloadable versions are available on the website ([www.kidsinparks.com](http://www.kidsinparks.com)). Modeled like a motivationally based scavenger hunt, as children search for the 'treasures' along the trail, they are promoted to traverse more of the trail's length. When children successfully complete the trail and register their adventure on the web site, they are sent an 'award' or incentive. With each adventure registered, the prizes get better and better. Overall program success and assessment is built into the delivery of those incentives.

**Background** There is mounting pressure on our time, pocketbook and physical condition. Park visitation has decreased, our waistlines have increased and our resources to deal with either have dwindled. Our children's preferred setting to play is inside, "where all the electrical outlets are," as one child said. At the Blue Ridge Parkway, only 7-12% of visitors bring children. Statistics show that children spend about 8 hours a day interacting with electronic media. With about one in four children overweight or obese, clearly nutritional and recreational choices are having a detrimental and devastating impact on our youth. Our challenge is to get kids unplugged, outside and onto the trails in our parks and public lands.

From studies that show increased brain activity and higher SAT scores when children play in natural settings, to research that links lower incidences of bullying, ADHD and depression in kids that play outside, there is clear evidence that children benefit from time in nature. Nature has restorative and healing qualities; our public lands are not just places set aside and protected for future generations, but are places that hold both significance and meaning for our lives today. We know that it is through a personal meaningful connection with natural and cultural resources that lasting positive impacts can be achieved both for the children and for the place. Getting visitors outdoors and children moving helps develop healthy stewards connected meaningfully to their heritage and their home. The TRACK program is designed to make hiking and walking more attractive to kids and families in order to increase physical activity and connection to the cultural heritage and natural resources of our local communities.

**Kids in Parks** is an Initiative of the Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation, the Blue Ridge Parkway and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina Foundation. It represents a unique partnership joining the public and private sectors in one common goal: to promote the health of our kids, our parks and our communities. Partner groups include schools, City and County Parks, State Parks, the National Forest Service, the National Park Service and private foundations throughout North Carolina and Virginia. The mission is to promote children's health, combat childhood obesity and reconnect youth with the outdoors by increasing physical activity, improving nutritional choices and engaging and educating families using outdoor activities along trails that are fun, exciting and promote stewardship.

**The TRACK Trail Program** The TRACK Trail program is a series of networked TRACK Trails on and in communities along the Blue Ridge Parkway. The idea is to create incremental steps with built in motivational incentives (discoveries made with each step along the trail and prizes sent after completing each trail) that lead families and children into the outdoors where they can have a fun family adventure along a trail in their local National Park. TRACK Trails are networked and linked through the web page [www.kidsinparks.com](http://www.kidsinparks.com), consistent trailhead signage, unified

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

brochure design and overall theoretical approach. A family could go on a TRACK Trail adventure in their local community park, visit the website to register for the prize and then see the other TRACK Trails. In this manner, we are building in the small steps of change needed to move a family from not even knowing about the possible avenues for recreation in their National Parks and public lands to having hiking on trails become a preferred option or at least a known choice. Our program is available for everyone with no real limits on participants. We have designed a sustainable program that does not require an initial major shift in existing norms, is easy to participate in, provides instant feedback allowing participants to monitor success, has multiple points of entry, utilizes multiple mediums of communication, and is FUN.

Many of today's urban youth have limited opportunities to experience nature on the scale that our national parks offer. Limited resources to travel to parks and wilderness areas, lack of educational opportunities and socio-economic issues all play a part in the disconnection between young people living in urban America and America's national parks. As a result, local parks have become learning centers and taken the place as a source of environmental education and experience with the natural world where youth can engage in learning, exploration and self discovery – and where an interest in the outdoors is first developed. Eighty percent of the American population now lives in urban areas. The environmental challenges faced by our nation require a new generation of leaders with knowledge of eco-systems, land and wildlife conservation management as well as the political expertise to balance demands between the natural and human worlds in our public parks. Our nation's city parks provide an excellent opportunity as training grounds for environmental stewardship and leadership among young people living in cities. This knowledge can then be transferred to management and stewardship of our national parks. More than 150 national park sites are within a 50-mile radius of a city of 100,000 or larger. This is nearly half of all parks in the National Park System. While many city parks have programming to bring young people into city parks, there are few coordinated programs that link urban youth with national parks. Support is needed to create connections between urban park programming and national parks, fostering and showcasing new models for city park and national park interaction. Tremendous innovation around youth development and green jobs is already taking place in our city parks: • In Chicago, where the "After School Matters" program developed by the Garfield Park Conservatory Alliance includes skills development and product development for the Conservatory store; • In Boston, through The Youth Conservation Corps, a city-wide effort to catalyze increased youth stewardship of parks developed by the Boston Natural Areas Network that exposes teens to environmental employment, higher education opportunities and community activism; • In New York, with the Bronx River Alliance's Bronx River Conservation Crew, a site partner to a green jobs training program for young adults in the South Bronx. The BRA's vision is to maximize the Bronx River as an economic, environmental and educational resource. Conservation crews serve as an example and mentor to young people and have become "local heroes" who are advocates of the river. What's missing is the link between great work at the city level and how to expand that work into adjacent and distant national park locations and, in turn, bring the best of national park programming into urban areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think a little more research into the current policy on mining is in order. The mine shafts, tailings piles etc. are all left from old mines. I see alot more responsible activities at active mines than those 100 plus years ago. When does a mine stop being an eye sore and transition into a historical site?

we love to go atv riding as a family. were out side, looking at nature explaining things to the kids. n y state dosent give tax payers nothing for atvs but take our money. we ride in pa. other states have it. my family loves riding on the atvs..

Great idea, particularly now that many school districts are terminating middle school team sports or migrating to pay to play rule. Outdoor recreation, especially tied to local parks, seems a very cost effective way to promote not only a healthy lifestyle, but the conservation ethic. Still, I'd like to know how Texas is funding this program as there are inevitably transportation and programming costs.

Your assertion is patently incorrect. We "the OHV Community" do not whine and complain to get access of every single acre. But we do lobby and promote the fact that we are a large and recognized steward of public lands and have every right to access where history and reason dictate it's use. Locking up existing areas of use serves only to push any negative impacts and conflicts to greater levels serving no greater public service. Or is that your agenda?

All users cause damage. But more remote locations have fewer people to do so. Hikers cause minimal damage but by allowing all access to wilderness areas the damage will be quickened and nothing will be left in 1 or 2 generations.

Motor vehicles -- and I drive one every single day -- cause air pollution, noise, damage to the ground on which they move, and all kinds of bad things. National parks and wilderness areas are unique and need to be preserved for future generations. There is an inherent conflict between preservation and motor vehicles. Moreover -- and this is based purely on my observation of human behavior -- it seems to me that people value things more if they have to work a little harder to get them. If you can pop into a wilderness area the way you can pop into a mall, will you value it as much? There is lots of non-protected open space that people can access in their motor vehicles. BLM lands are certainly accessible by car and RV. Why should we open up even more of our precious and endangered outdoor space when the inevitable result will be to love it to death?

Motorized recreation burns fossil fuel. If we have learned anything from the Gulf oil disaster, it is that we need to encourage less, not more, fossil fuel consumption. Encouraging and/or supporting motor sports and motorized recreation takes us in the complete opposite direction. Our planet can't survive like this. If you value your family, and want a healthy world for them to grow up and raise their own children, then help us cut our unhealthy dependence on fossil fuels.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A huge road block to getting anything positive done on the ground, whether it is building a trail, planting trees, thinning overgrown forests or just about anything else on public lands is lawsuits. They are most often filed over technicalities, such as document not being filed properly, not about any valid issues about the project. This happens because litigation groups can get their legal fees paid with our tax dollars under the Equal Access Justice Act. Reports show Enviro Groups like the Wilderness Society, Forest Guardians and Center for Biological Diversity have received \$4,716,264,730.00 (that is billion with a "b") in total payments were paid in taxpayer dollars from the Judgment Fund from 2003 through July 2007 for attorney fees and costs in cases against the federal government. For example: There are much needed Forest fuel reduction projects which would reduce dangerously high fuels loads in our unnaturally overgrown National Forests. Enviro Groups file lawsuits blocking these projects, a death sentence for the Forest which ends up incinerated along with all the wildlife and destruction of the watershed. Or lawsuits forcing trail closures which concentrate use and increase impacts on the land. Or lawsuits to ban fish stocking which cause native trout population to become over fished and also severely reduced the food supply to native wildlife like eagles. The original purpose of the Equal Justice Act was to help fund grass roots groups filing suits on behalf of the environment, but it has become twisted. This source of money has created an incentive to file suits merely to get the money, no matter that these suits are harming the environment by blocking needed projects. In order to help America's Great Outdoors the President should reform the Equal Access Justice Act and eliminate paying legal fees except based on merit.

All too often special interest groups promote Wilderness areas as a way of excluding the public. Let's keep BLM land open to all, not just a group of backpackers. Spending public money on these projects is not what the public wants now, or any time in the future. These projects are about excluding the public, not preserving public land. If the same money wasted on these projects ( taxes and private funding ) was used to improve BLM lands and access, we could put thousands of people to work with worthy project. The BLM has a poor record of how it manages it's land. Look at the Wild Horse over population in Nevada. Ever wonder what caused the "over grazing" ?? The BLM caused the problem by leasing the land to ranchers to graze cattle, no feed left for the Wild horses. This is just one small example of their management style, for a price, public land used for special interest groups at the expense of nature and native animals.

As an avid mountain biker and an avid hiker, I find it ridiculous to think that people could make such ignorant claims as \_\_\_\_\_. Yes, mountain biking does hasten erosion. Yes, I have personally seen small animals dead on trails. BUT - the lands on which they are currently living are preserved because people like me, hikers, bikers, fisherman, and hunters have deemed it important to support their preservation. We need to recognize that when budgets are tight the only way to continue to preserve the wonderful lands and habitats that we have been is through understanding and partnerships. Multi purpose trails mean greater community support. How is that not evident? How can we continue to preserve and maintain our national parks, forests, rivers etc. without the support of voters and tax payers? If you cannot recognize that the preservation of these magnificent places depends upon more than just your own type of use than you are allowing selfishness to cloud your perception.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

By not allowing mechanized use of any kind into an area, closes the use of such area to more people than it grants access to. This would include physically disabled, and elderly. I feel that if all user groups were allowed adequate and reasonable input into designation of an all access area everyone could enjoy the area. Granted every group would need to compromise in some form or another. If this couldn't work out, then being a democracy, use should be granted to the largest user groups that can agree based on registration, granting access to the majority.

Encouraging our youth and the public to get out in the backcountry is important for physical health and to keep people connecting to nature. It is great the President wants to encourage recreation through his Great Outdoor Initiative. The most popular forms of Nature Recreation as a principal activity are: OHV recreation enjoyed by almost 80 million or about 28% of people in America, followed by mountain bike recreation with 50 million or 18% of the people, followed by hiking with 30 million or 11% of the people, followed by horseback riding with 2 million or 2% of the people, according to reports by USDA Forest Service, IMBA, Outdoor Foundation, American Horse Council. Considering wheeled recreation such as OHV and Mountain Bikes are the most popular forms of recreation, then the best way to accomplish the goal of encouraging people to enjoy the backcountry and to preserve access would be to provide more places where people can enjoy wheeled vehicle recreation. The Outdoor Initiative should remove support for the designation of Wilderness Areas and Monuments as both these land designations discourage or prohibit wheeled recreation and would therefore not be in keeping with the guiding principle of encouraging outdoor recreation. The Outdoor Initiative should support opening more trails to all forms of wheeled recreation so the public will have greater access to enjoy the Great American Outdoors.

Encouraging our youth and the public to get out in the backcountry is important for physical health and to keep people connecting to nature. It is great the President wants to encourage recreation through his Great Outdoor Initiative. The most popular forms of Nature Recreation as a principal activity are: OHV recreation enjoyed by almost 80 million or about 28% of people in America, followed by mountain bike recreation with 50 million or 18% of the people, followed by hiking with 30 million or 11% of the people, followed by horseback riding with 2 million or 2% of the people, according to reports by USDA Forest Service, IMBA, Outdoor Foundation, American Horse Council. Considering wheeled recreation such as OHV and Mountain Bikes are the most popular forms of recreation, then the best way to accomplish the goal of encouraging people to enjoy the backcountry and to preserve access would be to provide more places where people can enjoy wheeled vehicle recreation. The Outdoor Initiative should remove support for the designation of Wilderness Areas and Monuments as both these land designations discourage or prohibit wheeled recreation and would therefore not be in keeping with the guiding principle of encouraging outdoor recreation. The Outdoor Initiative should support opening more trails to all forms of wheeled recreation so the public will have greater access to enjoy the Great American Outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

How is it that OHV or any other recreational use can destroy the land? Where OHV use has not been concentrated onto too small a trail system there are large healthy populations of wildlife and plant life. Studies have shown that OHV use on a dispersed trail system is less stressful to wildlife than non motorized use because the motorized user leaves the area more quickly and sticks to the trails, whereas the non motorized user remains in the area longer and are unpredictable in that they may leave the trail (non motorized user are allowed to travel cross country and often do) It is only by looking specifically at the trail tread that any reduction in productivity of the land can be seen, but of course that is true for any trail OHV, Mountain Bike, Horse, Hiker. I have seen areas closed after a large Wildfire, which by the way totally destroyed the habitat, watershed and created six foot deep gullies. However after a mere year there is no evidence of the trails ever being there. Where is the so called irreparable damage caused by OHV's that we keep hearing about? I have seen trails closed and it would be hard to find evidence of use after two years. That cannot be considered permanent damage on any level and certainly not on a geological or natural timescale. This whole damage concept is really about personal perception. Just like the sound of brisk wind in the trees or a spring river being as loud as most OHV's, yet if someone who does not like OHV's hears the wind they don't mind it, but they object to the passing sound of an OHV.

I agree. As a teacher it is sometimes a daunting idea to change your curriculum. With AP courses and tight schedules to teach materials prior to state testing, it is hard to take your students out of the classroom. However, it is possible. I have a hard time thinking that rangers, wildlife biologists, environmentalists, and activist groups wouldn't jump at the chance to partnership with local schools to aid in the development and implementation of such programs. I envision weekend trips hiking the Appalachian Trail, camping on Cumberland Island to observe local fauna, walking in Gettysburg to truly understand the nature of the confrontation. We have preserved so many things that there are countless opportunities for educators to expand their classroom and offer students a much more meaningful educational experience.

I do not support such a Nat'l Conservation area designation. The land is already Nat'l forest and multi-use as it should be. We get clean water, hiking, views now. And I can drive in there to enjoy these things. Don't change anything. It's not broken, no need to fix it.

I hope you mean this is a retro active sense. California is up 9 million acres of Wilderness. We are due 9million new acres of OHV accessible land. This is just the Wilderness designations in the last 10 to 15 years and does not take into account areas that have just been closed.

I think this is a great idea. I agree completely. I've spent thousands of dollars on hiking, biking, fishing and hunting gear over the past 10 years. I love the activities and so I've been willing to spend it. With the advent of things like craig's list, an individual that can't afford to pay the extra cash for the tax can surely find the equipment from another source. An excise tax is a hidden cost anyway, and so most of us would just assume prices had gone up. As long as the money wasn't wasted or diverted in the bureaucratic nightmare of government budgets, I'd be happy to pay the money.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Puzzled by the desired outcome of this proposal. If you are suggesting that wilderness designation be limited to areas the size of "The Bob" or the Selway-Bitterroot ..... we're 100 years too late. In the lower 48 we've destroyed most of the opportunities for protection of large scale naturalness (but not all of them (see America's [not Utah's] Red Rock Country located in the state of Utah) or the Boulder Mountains in Idaho. If you are suggesting that it's not worthwhile or is inappropriate to protect less expansive areas then I REALLY disagree. Smaller areas are even more vulnerable than large ones (because they are unprotected by distance from roads). They are also likely necessary to protect in order to ensure that protected lands provide biological diversity.

It just is not feasible for most folks to explore the Nat'l Forest and BLM lands on foot or horseback. Keep the public land open and accessible to the public. Stop designating Wilderness Areas.

It seems to me that one of the main issues that will be confronting the federal government in future years will be its ability to continue funding the maintenance and acquisition of public lands. As we watch European governments struggle with vast cuts to their federal budgets, I worry that there will simply be no way to continue to preserve the land and water that we do in the way we do. The question then becomes one of how can we ensure the preservation of our lands without them being leased out to private entities that will actually harm the nature that we are trying to preserve and limit the use of those lands by the public. I feel that as a frequent user of federal lands for various pursuits it is incumbent upon me to help in their management. This means voting, volunteering and educating others. One person recommended the return of the CCC, an amazing idea. Others have commented on partnerships between local and state-wide organizations and the government. These need to be expanded and further developed. These partnerships help the government to shoulder the cost of management, but they also do something much more important. They increase popular understanding of the necessity for preserving federal lands. Furthermore, they help to give people a stake in this preservation. the government needs to develop area-specific curricula to help educate future generations. At the elementary level, students could learn about nature first hand in the lands surrounding their homes. In middle schools, students could conduct experiments, learn about plant and animal identification, study basic animal behaviors, and learn about the necessity of land management. In high school, the partnerships could take on more meaning with job shadowing, work-study programs, as well as developing skills in biology, chemistry, geology, paleontology, history etc actually in the field. While this might not seem to coincide with the fact that maintaining and managing our public lands is becoming prohibitively expensive, the development of future environmentalists and outdoors enthusiasts is absolutely essential for the continued support for our preserves. Field and Stream recently discussed the decline in youth interest in the outdoors. If these young people are ignorant of the magnificence of our natural preserves or the significance of our historical ones, will they even notice when they are gone?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Larger dispersed trail systems do not fragment habitat. We are not talking about building houses in the forest, these are trails just like the ones the animals make. The concept that recreation trails have a negative impact on wildlife is born from a human perception of a minority that certain forms of recreation are unacceptable and that man is not part of the environment. Many studies regarding wildlife disturbance actually show that motorized and mechanized trail use is less disturbing to wildlife than non motorized, because motorized and mechanized stays on the trails, is predictable and pass through the area more quickly than non motorized users do. Since non motorized users have exclusive use of 109 million acres of Wilderness lands (all our National Forest lands combined are only 192 million acres) there can be no reason for any complaints that people cannot enjoy nature without hearing an OHV. Just visit a Wilderness area that we set aside for you.

Local knowledge and expertise will provide better results during any local forest public land use plan. Top down mandates, plans and regulations hamper effective local management and cannot respond to the changed local needs on the ground. One example is the Travel Management Plan which was mandated to be done in every National Forest in order to ensure that trails were properly maintained. Over the past five years it has consumed huge amounts of time and money to merely yield a map. Had the same resource been applied to the maintenance of the existing trails most of the concerns could have been addressed. In order to ensure America's Great Outdoors are managed well effectively, top down planning should be minimized.

are you kidding me? Killing small animals? Do you have any data? Maybe there's a squished RED LEGGED FROG. I had to laugh a bit about your comments on lack of scientific data. I have seen so many emotional viewpoints expressed by preservationists that were dragged into court that had no scientific supporting data. Most recently the effort of PEER to shut down Carnegie in Livermore based on some irrelevant water management code. The statement about OHV and Mtn bikes driving animals away is a classic example the kind of BS used in these emotional viewpoints. Many dollars have spent to study animal patterns and it is just not true that animals are driven away. Inside of the highly used Hollister Hills OHV park it has been shown that the animal population inside the park is significantly higher than the surrounding area. Hopefully the general public will see through these fabricated stories and vote the correct way.

OHV Recreation is just another way to enjoy the beauty of the outdoors. Those who do not enjoy OHV recreation need to look beyond their limited point of view to realize we all want to enjoy the outdoors. OHV's also provide a way for those who cannot hike long distances to enjoy the small part of their public lands where OHV use is allowed. For those who cannot abide other people enjoying themselves through motorized recreation, we have already set aside the best of the best places as non motorized in Wilderness. All forms of land use have impacts. I have seen many areas denuded by hikers and huge erosion gullies caused by their shortcutting trails. In the long run I doubt any trail impacts are actually significant. I have seen areas closed where anti OHV people had claimed irreversible OHV damage to the land and within one or two years there was no visible evidence of an OHV ever being there.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While interaction through computers and other gadgets is likely inevitable, and needs no promotion, let's not fool ourselves that this will solve any problems or develop any greater appreciation for nature than screen-savers do. We need to get people, especially youth, INTO nature, into the wild, and away from computer screens, away from viewing Nature as just another product that someone else takes care of. If people don't actually put their feet down on the ground and see what a footprint is, then they won't appreciate how fragile a system it is. We need to move away from intermediacy of interaction and toward an immediacy of interaction with nature. Half of the joy of exploring nature is not knowing where a trail leads, getting lost, exploring. GPS can't do that for you.

100% promote and approve!! All access to everyone and every user group to all public lands is important. Leaving one user group out of the equation due to personal preference or other justifications has only created conflicts in management agencies and between user groups. Proper management of these areas is key to the success. Management teams in the form of Non Profit organizations are popping up all over America to assist with just this type of demand. Put them to work and manage the user groups and their public land effectively and promote responsible recreation and you will have a win win situation for all user groups.

The earth was created to be walked on, trampled by and used by HUMANS! By attempting to alienate any one user group in an effort to hoard the land or resources for your own personal gain or view point is selfish and self serving. 1 for 1 gives the land managers a real goal to accomplish when considering closing an area or designating a portion of land as Wilderness. The 1 for 1 idea gives the human haters (unless you ride a mountain bike, hike or weave baskets) a rule they HAVE to be accounted for. It is the very same premise of low income housing rules in local communities now. If you take you have to give equally elsewhere. Why would anyone be opposed to this? The only opposition here would be to oppose government involvement in any way shape or form. I personally agree with Little government involvement, but since that is never going to be the case we should have some equality in the government decisions to take from one and give to another by setting some guidelines. Same idea as welfare recipients? You want free food, free medical and free money then pee in a cup! Show your students report card and attendance record! and the list goes on, There is no such thing as a free lunch!

"Prior to the Wilderness area locking up the trails in my area, volunteer MOTORCYCLE groups did 95% of all trail maintenance on this patch of 300miles of trail." If there were 300 miles of trail in an area that was then declared as Wilderness, then it was one more case of an area that did not meet Congress' idea of "untrammelled" country, and it should never have been declared as Wilderness. But now it is, and the law prohibits mechanized as well as motorized use. Carving out some sort of exception for one group while excluding others makes a mockery of the law. Either the Wilderness Act means what it says, or it doesn't--at the cost of one more chink in the foundation of law our government is supposedly based upon. Demoted.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

this is a discussion of federal lands and federal policies. The federally established and defined term is 'OHV,' and it includes street-legal vehicles such as 4x4 trucks and SUVs used off paved highways. The use of the term 'ORV' is a wedge tactic to try and separate non-street-legal vehicles (ATVs, ROVs, and off-road motorcycles), which are nonetheless legal on many Forest roads, from the discussion. If an area contains human-created trails, or "ancient petroglyphs, pictographs, and dwellings," it does not meet the intent of Congress under the Wilderness Act. There are other means to protect such archaeological relics.

"Given the effect rampant ORV use would have on cattle ranching, I wonder how ranchers are reacting to the apparent push for greater access for those destructive machines." First off, it's OHV, not ORV, which would be eliminated by increased Wilderness Area designation; and most ranchers understand that sanctions against OHV also impact their ability to do their work.

Even if they're not "big city legislators," they're often eastern state legislators like Rep. Hinchey (D-NY22), who keeps sponsoring western state Wilderness legislation. I said it elsewhere; one for one--for every acre someone like Hinchey proposes, he should have to find an acre of proposed Wilderness in his home district.

your use of the terms "wilderness area," as in "you are still operation a heavy, noisy, polluting, gas burning machine into wilderness areas" ignores the fact that the term has been defined in federal law (earning itself capital letters in the process) as an area where motorized travel is prohibited. People who ride into Was are already violating federal law and should be prosecuted. As for the rest of public lands, some are legal for OHV use and some are not. Expanding use may be appropriate in some areas, curtailing use in some likewise, but the opportunity should exist because Americans can rightfully expect that some of their public lands be made available for motorized recreation. as for your idea, I presume that your goals for having licensing are to educate and regulate users to some degree, a process that already happening in many states with requirements for OHV registration and safety training. Until such time as you could provide more detail to your idea, such as whether your licensing regime will allow kids who can now legally join their adult family members in riding on public land, I would have to defer either promoting or demoting your idea. We have recently seen states make youth riding at various ages on certain machine types illegal, despite the facts that most youth injuries occur from unsupervised, untrained use of adult-sized machines. I can show you child after child who can safely use a child-sized machine with training and supervision. Would you allow them to be licensed?

"Looking at your voting record I can plainly see you are no fan of nature, wildlife or the preservation of either so I am not surprised by you comments but the least you could do is provide a valid argument." No, he just doesn't perceive those things the same way you do. The idea that one set of values is the only "correct" set is exactly the kind of fundamentalism that our nation's constitution was constructed to avoid.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I see land managers soliciting comments from user groups without informing those users of their rights under NEPA. A district FS employee will tell you that comments are welcomed outside of formal comment periods, without telling you that those comments have absolutely no bearing on the legal process NEPA requires. The constituent is left feeling he or she made a contribution that the land manager has legal obligation to integrate in the decision process, but that in reality has no bearing on the decision to be made, and that gives the commenter no legal standing to participate in further appeals.

I'm a 51-y.o. veteran actively applying for FS jobs, to no avail. I see the agencies stacked with people who come from green-friendly academia, with little place for people like me who might look more favorably on motorized recreation or resource development in the forests. Demoted.

In my experience here in NM, most of the resource damage is coming from folks engaged in a "traditional cultural lifestyle" that has nothing to do with OHV recreation: partying in pick-ups. The evidence can be seen along the side of forest roads in discarded Bud Light cans and broken booze bottles. These are not bona fide motorized recreationists (I dislike the coinage of that new word, but it serves a purpose) like serious ATV and off-road motorcycle riders; these are local drunkards out for a joyride in the family 4X4. So enforcement actions would most judiciously be funded from a tax on cheap liquor. And seizure of the vehicle in question (after appropriate due process) means that some beer-drinker's family is gonna be walking. But because we responsible riders do treasure public land trails, as we have been challenged to demonstrate by Mr. Dawson, we reluctantly agree to have our OHV registration money diverted to enforcement (most of the time we have no choice because the OHV boards are politically stacked against us and in favor of the local miscreants). That registration money is being diverted from trail building and maintenance, actions that benefits multiple use, because we lack the political strength to place resource damage costs where they truly belong, on the irresponsible users of alcohol. So what we will need is covert surveillance at trailheads to catch the beer drinkers when they are at loose, and surveillance of the local LEOs doing enforcement to make sure that they are actually busting their cousins and brothers who are doing the damage, and not just driving around in their units burning OHV registration money in their fuel tanks. But then, Mr. Dawson, you will have to live up to these words: "And if there is less destruction caused by OHV riders, then the rest of us will have less reason to object to the creation of new OHV routes." Because when the real causes of resource damage are understood, so will be the real reasons why you all disapprove of OHV use on public lands--because you simply don't like motorized recreation and you want everyone to visit public lands only on your terms.

you are the one misinterpreting the statistics, regardless of the source. The uses identified in the survey are NOT exclusive. That is my point. I trust the USFS study to convey exactly what it does, that a certain percentage engages in a certain activity. The survey does not convey that self-identified hikers or birdwatchers or OHVs are engaging ONLY in those activities, and it in no way conveys that participation in motorized recreation is exclusive of non-motorized recreation or vice versa.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

your statistics do not document EXCLUSIVE use. I may go to the forest on my motorcycle, and then engage in other non-motorized activities. The statistics are easily mis-interpreted. The 44,000 acre Cerro Grande fire was started by the US government and shut down access to an extensive multi-use trail network developed and maintained by dirt bikers from the local Los Alamos NM area. Kind, courteous motorcyclists lost their trails, perhaps permanently, because the government could not be trusted with matches. Opportunity was lost. The Great Outdoor Initiative should incorporate restoring sustainable access to historical use areas.

Much of this land has already been considered for Wilderness quality and been rejected under the standards of the Wilderness Act. But SUWA and others keep bringing up the same areas again and again whenever the political climate seems favorable for their ultimate goal of keeping the general public out of areas it considers of value.

People are citing the USFS study as evidence that because a larger percentage claim participation in so-called "quiet recreation," planning decisions should somehow favor those uses to the exclusion of other uses.

your ignorance and stereotyping of "OHV drivers" is breathtaking. you don't even understand what "wilderness areas" are. please note that to appeal a final decision on a Travel Management Plan, you must gain standing by filing a comment during the official Draft Plan comment period. Forest Service personnel will tell you that they will always accept comments, but only those comments filed during the official comment period grant you standing to appeal. A basic flaw of the Travel Management Planning process is that under NEPA, a "no action" alternative must be developed and considered, but the direction given to the Forests says that they will establish a management plan. So in Forests where there existing trail networks, there WILL be a change to those networks which disregards the NEPA-mandated "no change" alternative. In short, the game is fixed.

Start thinking about our history and stop destroying it. We owe it to our kids and to the men and woman who gave us history to talk about.

Under the impending USFS travel management rule implementation, thousands of miles of existing trails will be lost, as well as dispersed camping corridors that are whittled down to a fraction of the existing open area. Use will be far more concentrated but you can bet there will be no more money for trail maintenance. This is happening right now, and it will take a rebellion to reverse the consequences.

Environmentalists and hunters/fishermen should be natural allies: both realize that protecting habitat is crucial to maintaining species diversity. I fall solidly in the first category, but I have many friends who are responsible hunters who share the same conservation concerns I do. I don't mean to get into a ethical debate about hunting; I know many on the environmental side oppose it. But they need to ask themselves whether in the great scheme of things it would advance their goals to be pulling in tandem with hunters and fishermen. I think it would. If we can get to the table together, we can talk about things like the role of predators and the need to cull deal populations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I share your concern, but the fact is that we as a country have taken no meaningful steps to move away from fossil fuels. Very few of us as individuals have taken any steps to reduce our carbon footprint. Until we create a consensus on what we as a society are willing to do, our politicians are going to remain as divided as the country is. And with no other fuel source on the horizon, we're going to continue to need coal that comes from strip mines, oil that comes from deep-water rigs and natural gas that comes from shale. Our economy depends on it. And I'll point out that burning natural gas is less damaging than burning coal or oil. For the time being, we're just going to have to do a better job of regulating the producers.

It is OUR land. Not just for a few to use. WE are the public. It just is not feasible for most folks to explore the Nat'l Forest and BLM lands on foot or horseback. Keep the public land open and accessible to the public. Stop designating Wilderness Areas. My wife is no longer able to hike. Will you ban her from enjoying the outdoors?

This is exactly the kind of thing we have government for: promoting the common good, in this case the preservation of other species that constitute critical components of the natural world we depend upon. I whole-heartedly endorse suggestions. Unfortunately, finding funding will be the challenge.

I strongly support a Buffalo Commons National Park on the High Plains of Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. Many counties on the High Plains are losing population and once those residents over 55 die, the High Plains will essentially be de-populated. The land can be acquired from willing sellers who would retain life estates (right to live on the land until they and their spouses die). Then it can be restored and species re-introduced. Eco-tourism and wind farms can be an economic lifeline for the remaining towns.

There are millions of acres of private inholdings in our national parks and wilderness areas. Frequently, these private landowners are building trophy homes or otherwise developing these lands in our national parks and wilderness areas. That is why a program should be established to buy these inholdings. A federal real estate transfer fee could be established to fund this program. Every parcel conveyed in America could have a \$20 federal fee imposed.

There have been several proposals over the years to create a Tallgrass Prairie National Park which would have up to 300,000 acres, including one east of Matfield Green where there is open range and an out-of-this world view. All were defeated by ranchers, the Kansas Farm Bureau and Kansas Livestock Assn. In order for it to have a natural ecosystem with bison roaming up to 3 miles a day, we need a very large park. Because of the opposition we ended up with the minuscule 11,000 acres which can't be expanded according to the enabling legislation.

We need a 300,000-acre Tallgrass Prairie National Park as originally proposed in the Kansas Flint Hills. The Tallgrass Prairie National Preserve at 11,000 acres is just too small to replicate a tallgrass prairie ecosystem with roving herds of bison.

Well, the program should have billions to fund the acquisition of in-holdings before they are developed. Time is of the essence. I don't see congress appropriating billions unless there IS a dedicated funding source such as some excise tax.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is a strong link between the way we develop our cities, towns and other urban areas and the preservation of open lands-- both private and public. Suburban sprawl puts enormous pressure on private land owners to develop green space. We need to look at the problem from a wider angle, and reduce the development pressure by focusing development within existing urban areas. The EPA is already involved in promoting Smart Growth, the philosophy of densifying development in urban cores, making development mixed use (residential and commercial), thus making walking, biking, and public transportation a real option. This in turn reduces the need to drive everywhere, relieves development pressure, and reduces pollution. But the federal government can do more to promote this! 1.) First of all, the EPA can take on a strong role in creating a pro-Smart growth policy and then using that platform to educate the public, the states and the local governments about the negative effects of urban sprawl. We first have to identify urban sprawl as a problem and present Smart Growth as the solution. The federal government, through its agencies, can put pressure on cities and towns to follow the smart growth model of development. I envision a major PR campaign. 2.) The federal government hugely influences our nation's transportation infrastructure, policy, and planning. Transportation is intimately connected with land use planning. We need to do everything possible to promote public transportation options and development that supports those modes. 3.) Open space preservation -- preserving existing green space through public and private land conservation through support to federal and state land management agencies, as well as and private land trusts 4.) Promote greater regionalism in terms of land use planning. Currently most planning is done at the county level. We need to promote regional and state-level planning, and coordinate that with conservation planning. 5.) Provide state, regional, and local governments incentives for smart growth and comprehensive planning. Perhaps a national land use policy could act as a guide to state and regional governments...? 6.) Revitalize urban areas and make changes in housing policy and other tax-related policy to encourage this.

As we all know, our planet is in trouble. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to preserve our wildlife as it is suggested here. It is our only hope before it is too late.

the wilderness act lists among the attributes to be eligible "ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical value" so petroglyphs, etc. being of potential scientific, education, or historical value would not be disqualifiers. You mentioned the Utah wilderness proposal earlier saying it has been found not to qualify - actually nearly every acre the BLM has inventoried subsequent to that proposal has been found to have wilderness character by the BLM. Since Congress has not voted on it there is no definitive finding.

One of the biggest threats to Wilderness Areas is the gradual erosion of protection by various user groups such as mountain bikes and ATV's that want access for their use. The big problem with multiple use trails is that they really aren't: the dominant group turns to be the ones with the biggest most intrusive machines and everyone else is relegated to a secondary status and a vastly degraded experience. Certainly everyone has a right to do their thing, but this has to be done by segregating conflicting uses-not by cynically calming to want it for "everybody" when in fact they want it for their own uses. In this increasingly crowded and mechanized world we need places to escape and be in nature without being harassed by machines.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

The 5% of environmentalist that cause problems are the ones who chain themselves to trees and burn equipment that is used to do a legal job and must be payed for by all when it is destroyed. I agree that we can't just go out and ride anywhere, but if it is all made out of bounds then I will be ridding illegal.

For educational and quality of life reasons, the battlefields should be preserved. Young people will benefit from real, open air, not just virtual, experience to enhance their knowledge of history. Planners and environmentalists have copiously written about the unfortunate consequences of sprawl, and repetitive US 1 big box shopping mall "normalcy".. Anchoring history and saving open space is of great value, esthetic, educational, like National Parks.

The artist Christo insists on imposing his "art" on the Arkansas River headwaters in Colorado. Should one person be allowed to force residents and recreationists of a mountain canyon to endure 3 years of construction for his 2-week display, endangering humans and wildlife?

Why is BLM even considering allowing any part of the Bighorn Sheep Canyon in south-central Colorado be covered with polypropelene fabric because Christo has the money and influence to impose his outdoor "art" on the area? Colorado's distinctive bighorn sheep herd is already stressed and endangered. The traffic issues during the 2-1/2 year construction phase will cause economic chaos to the area's seasonal recreation industry. If it's not here, it's somewhere else, someone else, some other personal gain. When and where do we draw the line? As of July 16, 2010, there are only 45 days to file official protest against this egotistical travesty. See [www.roarcolorado.org](http://www.roarcolorado.org) or [www.christosrealplan.org](http://www.christosrealplan.org) for info. For updates on DEIS see { <a href="http://www.blm.gov/co/st/en/fo/rgfo/planning/otr.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

State Fish and Game agencies are a logical way to promote habitat restoration and preservation using federal \$\$\$. This program was just barely able to establish itself in many States when it was pitched overboard. Many States have private lands programs that need a consistant source of funding, other State Fish and Game agencies have no program or capacity to work with private landowners; this was a valuable program for those states with a high percentage of private property (like Texas) but most importantly, for states with a small amount of private land compared to public land such as BLM. Most always, the most valuable wildlife habitat is privately owned--if we have no consistant funding to support our work with these landowners, they lose faith in government and we lose wonderful oportunities to build bridges with the public we work for. In some cases, he Landowner Incentive Program also provided the mechanism to increase collaboration with the Natural Resources Conservation Service to facilitate capacity in both agencies to promote important Farm Bill programs like the FRPP, WHIP, WRP, etc.

We visit Gettysburg PA. every year. I cannot think of a better cause to preserve than our historical battlefields. I take my niece & nephew with me and to think that they may not have the opportunity to take their children is a sad thought. The sacrifices that these soldiers have made for our freedom should always be remembered by preserving these historical sites.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dark skies are essential to our lives and the environment. Having proper lighting saves energy and saves money. It's a win-win situation for everyone. Our night sky is being void of stars and the nature wonders that our ancestors saw in the past. I'm all for proper lighting and energy savings. We need the use of more proper outdoor lights and the sale of proper fixtures and not barn lights at our local Home Depot and Lowes. The technology is here, but the education on using proper lighting has far to go. Here in Texas, we still have some dark skies, but it is fast disappearing and if something isn't done to protect it, then our future generation will lose this beloved natural wonder.

I love to read about Civil War history, but there's nothing like walking on the actual land where the battles were fought to really bring the history alive. We can't afford to let this land be built over and destroyed. We need to take action now to preserve it for future generations to enjoy before it's lost forever.

The Buffalo Commons National Park is a wonderful idea. As a lifelong Kansan, I have always dreamed of seeing a portion of the prairie returned to the majestic buffalo. Western Kansas is dying, and this could spurn new interest and growth in the surrounding areas, preserve an important part of America's great history, and serve as the foundation for a biological and cultural renaissance. Our state song is "Home on the Range," but there's hardly any range left in Kansas. We need a Buffalo Commons National Park!

While I have visited many Civil War Battlefields and enjoyed and appreciate what the government has done in preserving them, unfortunately many of the battlefields have not been totally saved. It's important that these sites are preserved for the memory of those that fought there, the education of future generations and the open space that they supply in this every more congested country. I hope that my grandchildren and further generations have an even better experience at these battlefields than I did.

Mountain bikes don't belong in the mountains? Huh? That's like saying dirt bikes don't belong in the dirt. Hikers don't belong on hiking trails. Cars don't belong on roads. There are millions of acres of undeveloped public land in national forests, BLM land, national parks, etc. There's plenty of room for largely foot traffic only in areas like Yosemite, or ohv use like in national forests and on BLM land, as well as mountain biking and hiking. I'm not a big fan of quads, because they kick up tons of dust, but they have every bit as much right to ride as I do to bike, hike or ride a dirt bike. Just make certain areas targeted to specific types of use that can coexist well together. No need for vast closures of land to OHV. They pay hefty sticker fees and deserve the right to ride on public lands. There's enough for everyone.

Planes can fly over your 'isolated' wilderness, too. Are we going to ban flights now? And there's always that group of hikers with the guy with the loud voice. You know the one.. .the one whose voice echos off the valley walls no matter how much vegetation is there to absorb the sound. Are you going to propose a 100 mile hiker free zone so you can have that area all to yourself? You're going to have to get used to the fact you're not the only one in this world. You share the sidewalk with thousands. You can share a forest with a dozen. They share it with you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All wilderness quality land should IMMEDIATELY be protected. Period. Including the Arctic National Wildlife refuge. All roadless areas protected under Clinton should be in this category. And finally, all available wilderness areas in the Tongass National Forest in Alaska should be protected. They were left out of the roadless rule in the first place. Even if every bit of wilderness left in this country is protected, it will still leave plenty of room for the off road crowd. Some day, as this country gets more and more overcrowded, our children and grandchildren will thank us.

Are you kidding, EXERCISE???? How about going for a hike or actually using a bicycle? Now that would be exercise. Going from the TV remote to hoping on a motorized vehicle hardly counts as exercise or enjoying the outdoors. How can you hear anything with your motors rumbling? And more important, my hiking does not bother you in any way, but I can hear, and see, your motorized vehicles for miles. Your activity destroys MY activity. And there are plenty of places where you can use your vehicles. Way way more than wilderness. Just do the math on acreage dedicated to wilderness compared to available areas to ride. I live in the upper peninsula of Michigan, and I can show you miles and miles of forest trails, sand dunes, streams, aquatic areas, that have been pulverized by ATV people. I would say the majority are NOT responsible. My hiking has yet to destroy one trail.

I agree, there needs to be more connection between agencies (USFS, NPS, BLM) and local communities where they operate. Less us vs. them and more "we". Local oversight groups for nearby national parks and monuments etc. More grassroots change than top down from D. C. Use local knowledge, contractors, volunteers, non-profits to build a network and consensus.

I know of 35,000 acres of state public land that is landlocked by Weyerhaeuser. The state land butts against USFS land with trails. There is no legal public access to either the state or USFS trailheads. And since the land has no legal access, it is ineligible for most grants (recreation plans, trail work, etc.) This situation only continues because Weyerhaeuser knows 1) the state has no power of eminent domain to acquire a public access easement 2) the USFS has no money to acquire an easement. This whole situation is WRONG. And it is just one corner of one state. Multiply this across the nation and hundreds of thousands of acres of public land is locked by private interests. PS. the access would be on existing roads, and not punching anything new into roadless areas.

I've been spearheading a campaign to obtain an easement on existing roads to 35,000 acres of landlocked state land. This land is backed against a USFS national Monument. Trails come to the state/USFS boundary, but there is no legal public access to the area (total of about 50,000 public landlocked acres). The state Dept. of Nat. Resources has no eminent domain for public access. The USFS has not been aggressive in helping the situation, although their trailheads are landlocked. The landowner at first refused to participate in easement discussions as a willing partner. Why should they, when they have control of 50,000 more acres? We need to acquire access in these situations--willing landowner or not. Yes, I'm for property rights, but the public land should have rights, too. P.S. The blocking landowner is Weyerhaeuser, not a small farmer or rancher.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We've all heard our lands our being loved to death, but times have changed, and now areas are "regulated to death". Permits, passes, fees, reservatios a year ahead, reams of hunting/fishing/hiking regulations. No wonder people stay on the couch. At Mt. St. Helens, the backcountry is so restricted elk us it more than hikers! The rules make it nearly impossible to take the average child backpacking. The fishing rules on Coldwater Lake are are so difficult, the state sponsored "take a city kid fishing event" netted ZERO fish for over 50 kids. Yellowstone is another example. Fishing is so regulated and confusing, we arrived at one of the suggested places for kids to fish (from the official rules book), only to find "no fishing" signs. We gave up. Read the posts, Wilderness Areas (a great idea to start with) have even lost support. You've got to let people in if you want to maintain the public's support (and funding). If this means a few footprints left behind, so be it.

Where I live, Weyerhaeuser has a chunk of 40,000 acres of state and USFS land landlocked, and they think this is "ok". Does anyone in the public agree?

Here in northern Illinois There is a severe lack of public OHV land and that causes illegal riding in areas with no designated trail and people blazing new trail and Resulting in excessive damage. Illinois needs to open there eyes and have a few less hiking and bike trails and more ohv trails. There would also be less polution caused by all of us Illinois people loading up our big diesel and gas guzzling trucks Towing huge trailers and driving 2 to 6 hours every weekend to wisconsin to leagly ride our machines and get into nature. Even if Illinois opened trails in the winter when hiking and biking are not as common That would at least be a start.

I have a second homeTahoe which has nearly a thousand miles of hiking trails surrounding the lake. OHV trails are less than 100 miles, how is this considered "fair use" for all Americans who these lands belong to? All Americans own this land and we all should have equal access to it. OHV trails have and remain to be closed at a alarming rate closing off access to a large segment of the population that pays taxes and should share their right to these lands.....

There's an old saying "United We Stand and Divided We Fall" Why not use the ideas and expertise that comes from interested partners. The partnership would provide a lobbying strength from it's combined members. The Nature Conservancy (nature.org) is noted for their ability to restore land to where it should be. They are at the Gulf spill now and have been since day one. Also, The Sierra Club is prominent in it's environmental approach. Using [www.care2.com](http://www.care2.com) would not be a bad idea. We need to create and reinforce awareness and positive approaches to our park lands. Care 2 has 13 million members worldwide. We need to get more people concerned at the grass roots level

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are at least four challenges faced by youth and adults, families and community groups, within the context of our relationship with natural landscapes and watersheds: 1) kids spend less time outside in nature than in previous generations, Response: We can demonstrate that children as young as five can learn an amazing amount about, and come to care passionately for, the health of water and wildlife, landscape and habitat over a brief period of time, if they come regularly to one place and have opportunities to share what they have learned; 2) children spend less time interacting with adults than 25 years ago, Response: Given the appropriate opportunity youth will choose to spend regular time with adults over other activities, especially virtual ones, are able to learn to pair and partner with different adults, and learn important relationship skills more quickly and efficiently than older peers and adults; 3) adults demonstrating healthy group functioning to youth is increasingly unavailable to youth (this is because we have moved to the 'one serving the many' cultural form, where one teacher/coach/leader directs many youth, telling them what to do, rather than the traditional 'many serving the one' barn-raising type of group coordination where adults demonstrate and show youth what to do and how to do it). Response: A combined team composed of a group of 6-10 adults and a group of 6-10 youth allows youth to see, imitate and model effective group functioning skills demonstrated by those adults. This configuration also allows the explicit and systematic development of inter-group skills, as well. 4) individual, couple, family and community interactions with the natural environment has decreased in regularity and, as a consequence, has increased detrimental effects upon the health of water, land and wildlife by human ignorance and carelessness. Response: The creation of community nodes up and down a watershed and/or across a landscape is possible if existing community groups can begin to align and synchronize their efforts with one another. Using 123Mystery skills to teach and optimize the formation of groups and inter-group alliances focused upon preservation, restoration and conservation activities within a watershed/landscape can transform those communities and significantly improve the health of that watershed/landscape. Using the brief orientation exercises we have constructed, a very quick and efficient way to orient small and large groups to the enhanced utility of upgrading and optimizing old formats typically used for environmental education and action, offering innovative concepts, processes and skills as a precise and potent intervention alternative, essentially moves participants from the old individualized education emphasis to the newer, optimized dualized learning format involving pairing individuals and pairing groups for greater efficiency, effectiveness and productive effort within and across communities in a more coherent, focused and cohesive manner (e.g. -- Stewardship Environmental Education Leadership Skills (SEELS) Training Team initiating (adult/youth) Rotary/Boy Scout Water Resource Teams in community nodes down the full length of connected watersheds --).



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is plenty of land to allow all types of public recreation without one person's ideals dictating another's. The idea that we should close our public land to all access only fits a single groups ideals. I personally enjoy the outdoors in many ways - on water, foot, bicycle, and dirt bike and I don't believe that any single recreation group should have the final say in how our land is designated and accessed. I also don't believe it's a good idea for hikers, equestrian, and OHV's to share the same trails or areas as it causes safety issues and lack of enjoyment for all user groups. We have more than enough beautiful land to share and enjoy within our respective recreation styles - but nobody will enjoy the land if it's designated as wilderness and we're all locked out.

America's cultural resources define who we are and are indispensable. HistoriCorps is the future of preserving these resources on public lands. It comes at a critical time when these resources are fading just when budgets are being trimmed to take care of them. It is also important as an opportunity for the participants, primarily young people, to learn more about the resources themselves and the skills needed to preserve them.

comment is spot on!! However, I do agree that a program of awareness and stronger enforcement is appropriate. No matter what activity you are talking about, there are always a small number of people who refuse to obey the rules. This is just as true for hikers and stock users as it is for ORV users. Stronger penalties and more effective enforcement for all Forest visitors is in order.

I think some clarification of your comment is needed -- perhaps you misunderstood my comment. No one is advocating that existing Wilderness Areas should be available for motorized use. Use of motorized or mechanical devices in Wilderness Areas is strictly illegal, and no one is advocating that should be changed.

Everyone endorses the concept of conserving public land for the benefit of the public. Unfortunately, most conservation initiatives proposed by Federal Agencies and influential "conservation groups" end up excluding the public from public lands. Conservation and Access do not have to be mutually exclusive. The America's Great Outdoors Initiative should explicitly adopt a policy encouraging access opportunities for all Forest visitors and explicitly reject proposals which deny access to any responsible and sustainable recreation activity on public land.

Federal Agencies are specifically enjoined from attempts to manage state or private lands. Any attempts to educate or influence states or individuals to manage their lands in any way, shape, or form is a bad idea. A simple case of Federal over-reach. States, ranchers, and individuals have a far better understanding of their land management needs than any Federal Agency. This is a bad idea and should be deleted from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative altogether.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Federal top-down driven initiatives such as this Great Outdoors initiative are driven by wealthy, influential Beltway conservation groups and are specifically designed and choreographed to shape public opinion rather than acquire input from the public. As just one of many examples of how this is done, the listening sessions for this initiative are scheduled during working hours on a weekday. Few ordinary citizens will be able to attend, but paid professional employees of wealthy conservation groups are sure to attend, virtually guaranteeing the outcome. Organizers of these listening sessions also are careful to hold listening sessions at "friendly" locations. For example, the listening session for Montana is to be held in Missoula, where virtually every conservation group has a full-time office. Why not Great Falls? It's a bigger population center than Missoula, but also known to be much more conservative. These Orwellian initiatives to shape public opinion rather than listen for public input are "Business as Usual" in Washington DC, in contradiction to Candidate Obama's promises.

I agree. The Forest Service and BLM are supposed to be "decentralized" organizations where decisions are made at the lowest possible organizational level. Yet all of the major initiatives such as the Roadless Rule, Forest Plans, Travel Planning, Planning Rule Revisions, and now the AGO initiative are carefully designed and crafted by conservation organizations and bureaucrats in Washington, DC to restrain the intended flexibility of local managers. Local input is routinely ignored, and local land managers are rewarded for being "good soldiers" and supporting the Washington, DC agenda. The classic example is the AGO initiative. It is designed to get the answer that Beltway conservation groups want to hear -- specifically, that the Administration should designate some 13 million acres of additional National Monuments.

I am going to promote this idea, because these trail systems can provide extraordinary experiences for Forest visitors. However, these trail systems must be shared trails, including availability for appropriate bikes and OHVs.

I am opposed to Federal subsidies for nonprofit Land Trusts to purchase land. If Land Trusts want to purchase land, they should use their own money -- not mine.

I find it curious that while you advocate engaging all stakeholders, those you mention in your idea are all conservation groups -- no timber or mineral interests, no sportsmen or OHV interests, no Indian tribes, etc.

I love idea. In a world where intolerance seems to be gaining momentum, it is refreshing to hear a "live and let live" point of view. We also need to recognize that rewarding and enabling intolerant behavior breeds more intolerance. Segregating Forest visitors based upon who can make the most noise and/or file the most lawsuits enables extremist behavior.

If the consuming public wants more environmentally friendly landscapes they will ask for it. How do you propose to pay for a government-sponsored tax incentive program?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If we wish to encourage people to reconnect with outdoor activities, attractive and appropriate opportunities need to be provided. What constitutes an attractive and appropriate opportunity for public access to public lands should be determined by how the public uses public land. Unfortunately, many of the ideas brought forward in the name of "conservation" effectively discourage public access to public land and contradict the stated objective of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. For example, creating more Wilderness Areas denies access to at least 96% of Forest visitors, concentrates visitors into increasingly smaller areas (bad for the visitors and the resources). Virtually all Forest visitors pursue their activities by traveling significant distances on Forest roads or motorized trails. Limiting/eliminating these roads and trails discourages the public from reconnecting from the outdoors.

Land conservation has and always will be vitally connected to, and dependent on, private land stewardship. As a manager of a public land, conservation agency, I recognize the value of protecting and managing conservation lands for public use, education, and protection. However, I also co-own a small midwestern farm, which has limited production value given the non prime soils. Much of the farm is woodland/wetland complex in near pre-settlement condition. Development pressure is high as the area is a favored vacation and retirement area. As landowners, we struggle to raise the funds needed to pay the taxes. A better, less complicated program is needed to encourage conservation and continued stewardship of areas like mine. Private stewardship accounts for the great majority of privately owned conservation lands. Creating a program that reduces taxes or otherwise allows landowners to manage lands for conservation functions and values, without the burdon of requiring public access, will be a key aspect to future land conservation.

Lets not forget what Wilderness is all about: A portion of public land set aside where natural processes and ecosystems can be self-sustaining without human influence that provide opportunities for quiet recreation and solitude. Small parcels of land can't do that. Current regulations require a minimum size of 5,000 acres -- far too small an area to sustain its own ecosystem, and Wilderness advocates desparate for more Wilderness are continually ignoring the basic requirements for Wilderness by "cherry stemming" roads, utility corridors, and private land. In my opinion, Wilderness areas need to be very large -- perhaps at least 200,000 acres with virtually no evidence of human disturbance.

THANK YOU !!! I couldn't have said it better!!! 1:1 is NO compromise at all!

With the United States literally on the verge of bankruptcy, it is inappropriate to increase funding for these projects -- significant belt-tightening would be more appropriate.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I heartily agree! I don't think it would take much to re-tool the program so as to meet modern needs; abolish the gender/marital status rules, up the pay, make the Corps an independent government program as it was originally. Many glowing testimonials can be found from those who served in the CCC during the great depression of the 30s; providing jobs, reforestation and maintaining our natural resources, planting lots of trees (which eat up CO2) and having a fantastic training, learning and working experience for people of all ages..it's a win-win. No reason why this can't be funded, either; Nader's proposal of taxing the biggest polluters (BP comes to mind) something like 0.5% per CO2 amount output (with NO "credits"!) would provide plenty of money to pay a civilian corps. We could also levy a tax on the big banks that practice casino capitalism (Goldman-Sachs comes to mind) equal to the tax we citizens pay for gambling winnings; that would raise plenty!!

Man is a visitor in America's great outdoors, not the resident. A good visitor respects the wildlife and the wildlife habitat that are an integral part of the great outdoor experience. This means in America's great outdoors natural process control wildlife populations and wildlife habitat. If the presence of wildlife interferes with Man's enjoyment of the great outdoors, Man must yield to the wildlife and the preservation of the wildlife habitat. Man does not choose the wildlife numbers and species. Natural processes control the balance. The only exception is when Man must correct an imbalance greater by their intrusion into the great outdoors or pollution of neighboring spaces. And when making this correction no wildlife should be a loser. The Great Outdoors is first the home of wildlife, free from disturbance of Man. Man must be a benign presence in America's great outdoors. Private lands adjacent to America's great outdoors must be tolerant of the wanderings of wildlife onto their lands as those lands provide the buffer between America's great outdoors and Man's world where wildlife are sometimes the visitors. That is the challenge.

no more wilderness, we do not need more the land does not need to be taken away from the majority of people it needs to be used in a responsible manner, not buried in a hole for a select few.

Our greatest challenge is to plan for use by everyone, and not submit to extremists. Not everyone can hike deep into a section of public land, and not everyone wants to hear a quad runner blasting by. Everywhere does not need to be accessed by motor vehicles, and everywhere should not be accessible only by foot. Access needs to be for everyone - hikers, rock collectors, and even off roaders.

Separating OHV use from "other" uses would almost certainly result in a significant LOSS of areas for OHV users. The direction has been for more and more areas to be closed to OHV use, and by the time the "other" users had made all their choices, little would be left; no desirable areas would be designated for OHV use! Very BAD idea!

This idea is of little to no value, as the nature, scope, and goals of the so-called "ideas and projects" is what matters. Without knowing the details and goals of each "idea" and "project," it's impossible to support, or not support, the idea. The last thing most people would want is to help or support some idea or project that they didn't want to happen!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Urban families need urban parks, urban trails, scenic highways and pocket parks. The local governments know what the people need and want, but they need help with the funding. How can we raise urban children in central Los Angeles who have never been to the beaches of the Pacific Ocean? Or to the nearby Santa Monica Mountains? They need not only their own central parks (almost none now) but also public transportation to the available recreation 20 or 50 miles away, like the beaches of Santa Monica Bay and the wild state and federal preserves in the Santa Monica Mountains. The U.S. Government can help local governments (both the City and County of Los Angeles, for example) with the funding for recreation access to green space inside the inner city and transportation to recreation at the edge of the city. See what the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy has accomplished on both of those access issues. Talk to its long time leader Joe Edmiston.

way to go guys keep our roads open it is not only ohv use, but hunting and fishing, closing existing roads will lead to the distruction of land, because like with every thing else there are those who dont follow the rules. so if you close them they will now have an excuse because you locked them out

We dont need people who have never stepped foot off of concrete to tell us that live in the country how to "protect" our lands. Nobody cares more for the land than we that have spent our entire lives here. So I say "NO" to more national monuments and wilderness areas. Give the ecofreaks an inch and they'll take a mile.

We recently visited the BLM lands in Southeastern Utah and, although we had been there before, our breath was taken away by the raw and unspoiled beauty that abounds there. Sadly however there was ample evidence of new impacts from those who want to use motorized vehicles off of existing roads and marked trails, which would be regulated if these pristine areas were designated as wilderness. Once these areas are shredded by ORVs or other damaging activities we, the American Public, will have permanently lost these wild features. There is plenty of room for ORV use in designated BLM areas - areas that do not have these wilderness characteristics - and a huge number of gas and oil leases that have never been utilized. There is no necessity to despoil the prescious wild areas that remain.

well I guess the answer is to take put all those atvs and motorcycles in your backyard and see what happens when you take away all the roads they used to ride on. I bet you would like that we need space for everyone,

While these ideas have merit, do you realize how extremely horrific they sound if you were to apply them equally and with the same verbiage to not only the plant kingdom but also the animal kingdom, including the human animal? If so then we have to send not only the Mexicans back to Mexico, but the blacks back to Africa and the whites back to Europe leaving only the true Native Americans. Who is to say what is an invasive species and what is evolution?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You are very well spoken and I agree with every word you wrote. I recently spent 4 days riding off-road in Nevada on my street legal dirt bike. Nevada has some of the most beautiful land that this country has to offer. I can guarantee that our dirt bikes did not harm the area at all. In all my years of riding in the back country the only areas that I have seen disturbed are areas where the herds of wild mustang congregate. B Meyer - OHVers have given up so much over the last 20 years that we are extremely frustrated that environmentalists are still asking for MORE. Please look at a map of the country and see how much is left to responsible OHV recreation. Better yet, look at one of those maps from 20 years ago to see the difference. Also, it frustrates me greatly that you say that you don't even go hiking in the back country yet you talk with authority how horrible OHVers are. All OHVers - you should have quiet pipes!! One question for anti OHVers - What happens when electric bikes become available - then will it be ok to be out there with the hikers???

I agree with quiet pipes and look forward to technology that continues to make vehicles quieter and cleaner. I also again want to state that we are just trying to stop you from taking MORE land and keep existing trails and roads open.

I don't believe anyone is advocating for more roads, I believe most people on this site are advocating for the ongoing use of existing roads. Wilderness designation means that there are no roads for you to park your car on and go hiking.

I love to hike, scuba dive and ride off-road motorcycles. I consider myself an environmentalist. Enjoying nature is incredibly important to me and my family. To all of you who think that the off-road community has been unwilling to compromise, you should look at the MILLIONS of acres that we have given up/lost over the last 20 years. 99% of the off-road community love and support the beauty and fun that is only accessible via motorized means. Much of this country is now completely inaccessible to human beings - unless you can afford to be dropped off and picked up via helicopter. It is even more frustrating to see how crowded the few remaining ohv areas have become. This madness really has to stop at some point soon. There seems to be no end to the "wilderness" appetite. I see far more cooperation and compromise from every group except the anti-access "wilderness" group. All citizens should be able to responsibly recreate in this country.

If they don't round them up the herds grow very large and push out native species. They eventually overgraze (is that a word) their territory and many horses starve. There is no easy answer to trying to manage mother nature.

It is so frustrating to read most of the anti ORV comments. First, you all need to realize how much land has been designated as roadless over the last 20 years. We are tired of losing land for a sport we enjoy. 99% of off-roaders are respectful outdoor enthusiasts. Conversely, the more land you close the more you force ORVs into a small area and the negative impacts become greater. Most people cannot hike 50-100 miles from a road. There are plenty of areas where existing dirt roads should be available to motorized traffic.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Maybe part of this is based on where you live. I live in California and every hiking trail I've ever been on has been at least 3 feet wide and well worn. This is true even 20 miles from the nearest road (in sequoias and mammoth areas). Dirt bike trails are usually narrower and rarely wider unless you are talking about an actual dirt road. I agree that people who drive through mud leave the road chewed up and I would prefer that it isn't done, but there is not much mud in California so it's not an issue that I see much. Also, I don't think that anti-ORVers realize that all we are asking for is to allow motorized recreation on EXISTING roads and trails. I am not advocating for unlimited cross country access. Nor does allowing access mean that there would be thousands of ORVers descending on the land. Just like hiking, not that many people go hundreds of miles from the nearest paved road.

Please, please, please, PLEASE realize how much land has been closed to ORV since 1970 and quit saying we are unwilling to give up anything. There was very little fighting in the beginning as we were all willing and agreeable to preserving land. But enough is enough!!! That is why you are seeing such an outcry on this site, we have given up more than any sane person should expect and I am tired of people like you saying otherwise.

Riding a dirt bike or ATV is extremely physically demanding. Believe me hiking is not better exercise - though please don't read that as hiking is not good exercise. I am just saying that it is no better than riding. I wish you and all the other anti-ORV people would quit painting the sport with such a broad brush. Yosemite National park is far dirtier than almost everywhere that I off-road and that is because a lot of people are concentrated in such a small area.

Where do you see all of this destruction that you keep talking about? I have been an off-roader for 40 years in California, Nevada and Utah and have never seen the widespread destruction that environmentalists talk about. I see far more litter and hear far more noise at the beach and at most heavily used hiking areas than I do in the back country. Even the ever smaller places in the desert that are open to off-roading are only impacted in that they have a lot of trails on them. How is that so different than places where there are a lot of hiking trails? 99% of off-roaders respect and maintain the great outdoors. I'm sure that most off roaders spend more time outdoors than most environmentalists.

I love to hike and I agree that there should be areas set aside for hiking, but truly it is the hikers that are least compatible with other uses. OHVers are happy to share trails/areas with just about anybody - miners, ranchers, loggers, bicyclists, rock climbers, snow mobilers, horse back riders, etc. etc. I also agree that all motorized recreation should be as quiet as possible - loud pipes on vehicles are just plain annoying.

The reason that you never see hikers and horseman hundreds of miles from a paved road is that it is almost impossible to get there without a motor. you are way far off base if you tell me that hikers and horseman want to be hundreds of miles off of a road but don't because they might hear a motor. That is an absurd statement that is exactly the kind of hyperbole that is out of control in the anti-ORV groups.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are 2 electric motorcycles being made now. Just like with cars the technology is improving and may help curb the noise issue. As for now education is important and quiet pipes should always be used outside of racing events.

The old adage "Build it and they will come" works to a certain point, but if a community includes their own heritage, even more people will share in the project. Many of our communities are built around a historic theme--for us it was our 1900's Fort Thomas. The Fort was built just after the Spanish American War and was used as an induction center for WWI and WWII as well as the Korean War. The City was allowed to purchase nearly all the acreage and has turned it into a public park, complete with mountain bike trails and walking trails. In the past year we have added the Fort Thomas Military and Community Museum in a home built in 1905 for the administrator of the Army Hospital. We have already outgrown the space and need funding to add to our building. We also hope to obtain a WWI Army Stables Building to use for community events such as our farmer's market, a public kitchen where people will be able to can vegetables to sell at the market. That building is now being used for storage and we have received permission to purchase the building if we will construct something else for the Army to use. A mere \$75,000 is all we need to complete the transition. We want to use these historic buildings and build on the wonderful history to create interest, economic revitalization, and sustainability. Please provide the funding needed for our cities to achieve the goals of combining history with the great outdoors!

- Preserved Civil War battlefields are tangible links to our country's past.
- The 150th anniversary commemoration is expected to stimulate renewed interest in the conflict and generate unprecedented tourism to Civil War sites.
- Protection of America's remaining Civil War battlefields will leave a lasting legacy of national commitment to preservation and conservation.
- Preserved battlefields revitalize local economies and create jobs by encouraging heritage tourism. The more historic land that is preserved, the longer visitors stay in a community and the more time they spend patronizing local businesses.
- Battlefields are outdoor classrooms for this and future generations. They allow visitors to walk in the footsteps of the Civil War heroes and experience the landscape much as it was during the conflict.
- Preserved battlefields help protect water resources; sustain parks, working farms, forests and ranches; and provide open space for passive outdoor recreation.
- Battlefield preservation in Pennsylvania, Maryland and Virginia, where many significant sites are located, is also vital for protecting the Chesapeake Bay. Parkland created through battlefield preservation near growing population centers like Nashville, Atlanta and elsewhere can benefit quality of life for residents.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Establish a summer youth camp program within the national parks with an emphasis on urban youth. Make it "work-fun" experience by incorporating public service opportunities along with outdoor recreational fun. Most of these kids never consider careers in conservation, forestry, or related areas because they have never had a personal experience with natural places outside of the TV. Adult and college age volunteers (retired folks, NRCS Earth Team Volunteers, student interns, etc.) could supply most staffing needs. Campers could assist with trail maintenance, campground clean-up, even minor facility repair and upkeep, and other such things. This would help get these things done on a regular basis without extra funds and teach responsibility to a video clip generation used to having the world revolve around them. Offer travel grants through youth organizations such as the YMCA to make it possible for kids in Indianapolis or Los Angeles to experience Yellowstone or the Great Smoky Mountains. As a camper and backpacker, I would be willing to pay a small increase for park services to fund this venture. If our youth don't appreciate the need for natural areas, we may not have them for long.

-Local land-use policies that ignore the cultural and natural resources deserving of protection for future generations, and that ignore the value of maintaining authentic surroundings of presently preserved assets. A clear example is Mattawoman Creek, Maryland's most productive fish nursery, threatened by overdevelopment and unneeded new highways. -Lack of federal leadership in exercising tools like permit denial when proposed development projects like new highways would have unacceptable indirect and secondary impacts. An example is Charles County's proposed Cross County Connector that -threatens Mattawoman Creek and its protective forests with unbridled growth. -Federal subsidies to projects destructive of natural resources, like the Maryland Airport in Charles County, Maryland that would harm Mattawoman Creek

OHV use in the National forests and BLM lands is one of the few activities that me as a single mom enjoy with my young adult children, who both like to ride dirt bikes, quads, etc...I have a 16 year old boy and a 19 year old girl. there are NOT many activities that allow us to get out as a family and enjoy our Nations Beautiful lands...More and more of these lands and trails are closing....These lands should REMAIN public, and not just for those able to Hike only.....Keep the lands open, and Open more trails.

One of the problems with humanity is our tendency be egocentric in our belief that "if it doesn't center around human desires, then it doesn't matter". The old tree falling in the forest question shows our arrogance. Wild areas just can't be classified as useless unless I get to do whatever makes me happy in them. Motorized vehicles disturb more than the silence, they contribute to soil erosion and frighten wildlife, and allowing them on trails also used by hikers and horsemen can be a recipe for disaster. I work for a Soil and Water Conservation District in Indiana, and soil erosion is no joke. It can destroy trails, cause mudslides, and result in the loss of our valuable topsoil. Wilderness areas are not closed to the public. Americans are getting more obese by the day because we value convenience and speed over everything. Get off the dirt bike or ATV and walk, for heaven's sake.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The southwest is an arid environment that was never meant to sustain the millions of humans who have flocked there for the sunshine. Reality has got to set in sometime, folks. The sun shines in the southwest because it doesn't RAIN (i.e. limited water resources). Want a green lawn, showers, or a swimming pool - move to a wetter climate!

While the Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program is a great idea, it misses the mark in one important area. The requirement of actual funding from a land trust organization is unrealistic and is hamstringing the program. Most land trusts are non-profits and are not financially able to provide the cash necessary to actually purchase part of the easement from the landowner. The program should allow the landowner to donate the full amount without outside funding. Farmers and ranchers who do this are not in it for the money - such a decision actually costs them and their heirs any potential income related to the development of their land. My state of Indiana is blessed with lots of prime farmland, which we are losing at the rate of about 60,000 acres per year from conversion to commercial or residential uses. Let's make it easier for willing farmers and ranchers to protect their land from development.

I agree wholeheartedly about setting aside land for a "Great Plains National Park" or "Buffalo Commons National Park", whatever it will be named. The plains of Kansas is one of the most beautiful places on earth, I think. It begins in the Flint Hills and rolls west, north and south from there. I believe it really embodies the trials and tribulations of the people and animals that lived on the land long before it was "settled". I think that the area should be re-populated with the animals and plants indigenous to the area. The last thing we need in Kansas is another parking lot, apartment complex or strip mall. We need to preserve this land and our heritage for the next generations to come.

Youth and adults need social support systems and places in nature that they identify with positive experiences. Urbanizing populations need to experience nature close to home through frequent encounters over extended periods of time with supportive mentors as the major part of their recruitment and retention into nature. Community Conservation Clubs should be formed in every local community for persons to gather, to share programs, to plan, to support each other, and to have fun. Clubs should be supported through joint efforts of local, state, and national nature-based agencies and nongovernmental organizations and businesses. Existing leadership would be central to expanding their memberships and actions and they can add new Community Conservation Clubs locally. Businesses have a role to provide meeting spaces, program support, and participation by their employees.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I suppose it depends on what you mean by "functioning system". A landscape managed for cattle isn't necessarily a better home for wildlife, plant or animal. My admittedly limited experience has been that rangeland is a good place for cattle at the expense of native critters. We have to STOP accessing oil, natural gas, coal, and we have to stop trying to convince ourselves that we need to. As for other minerals, nothing trashes a landscape like mining. Seems like every place I go in Colorado I see ugly-colored water running out of the rock into streams, the leftovers from mining a century ago. Mechanized mining has not improved the impact any. And what about the value of functional watersheds to aid in flood control, forests for wildlife, groundwater recharge, space to find solitude and recreation. These things have value as well. Yes! I've made several trips to Germany in recent years to visit a brother that lives there. Germans love their forests. Love Them! But they waited waay too long to start loving them. German forests are like Disneyland - yes there are trees, but the blocks are too small to really work as a functional forest with wildlife and room to roam in solitude. America IS a special place, the first nation to recognize that undisturbed landscapes had value. I say let's keep those wild landscapes before we look like Europe. No offense intended, but wilderness should be BIG, not a little corner left over from the farms and factories.

Why not? Hunters have paid an excise tax on firearms and ammunition under the Pittman-Robertson Act. Funds are paid out to the States for use in wildlife preservation projects. As noted by Ron; I gotta read the other responses before running off at the mouth ;- ) I don't see why those of us who use public lands for things other than hunting shouldn't contribute. I can see where might be a bit wary of a fixed percentage excise tax. Let's face it - paying a percentage on a 4-wheeler is going to be a lot more than the same percentage on a backpack, even a really good one. I probably have the cost of couple OHVs in my basement if I count all the backpacks, tents, sleeping bags, ice tools, climbing boots, snowshoes, skis... The difference is I bought them a little at a time. If I had to plunk down that money all at once, an excise tax might be a barrier to entry. Even though I don't especially like OHVs, that does seem a bit of an unfair burden. I would suggest a sliding scale, with a lower percentage for items that cost thousands of dollars vs. ones that are only \$20, \$30, \$100, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ED OUT is an exciting new partnership that uses parks, forests, and refuges as outdoor classrooms to improve learning, enhance fun and learning during the summer, better prepare students for the next school year, and encourage outdoor recreation experiences that help America's youth fight the epidemic of childhood obesity. ED OUT resulted from discussions among Prince William (Virginia) County Schools leadership, senior federal executives and leading national recreation officials at a June 2009 awards program at the U.S. Department of the Interior honoring the school system's role in Monarch Live, a remote learning program highlighting the birth and migration of Monarch butterflies in the Americas. The Prince William County School District has some 80,000 students in grades K-12. It is the second largest, the fastest growing and one of the most technologically advanced school systems in Virginia. The system includes 88 schools – including 55 elementary, 15 middle and 10 high schools – and more than 5,000 teachers. The system is quite diverse in population: White... 39.7%; Hispanic... 24.3%; African American...22.9%; Asian...7.7%; Other...5.3%. ED OUT launched after less than a year's planning during Great Outdoors Month 2010, as nearly 600 students went outdoors on June 4 for education and fun. Students in 4th and 7th grades rotated through learning stations and activities during the day, just as they would during most school days. But the difference was that the instruction was provided by adjunct faculty drawn from NASA and the Forest Service, BLM and the National Wildlife Federation and many more. Science, art and history were presented in ways that tied to the coming year's curriculum – and a new website ([www.edout.us](http://www.edout.us)) provided even more information on how summer months could be used to combine fun and getting a head start on the next academic year. From learning about light spectrums and wetland mitigation projects to drawing entries for the Junior Duck Stamp Contest and learning about the music of nature, the students were attentive and very engaged. Healthy lunches – with carrots and fruit and juice – provided energy while special water bottles and ample refill opportunities kept the action going even on a hot day with temperatures in the 90's. The day wrapped with a mass swearing in of Junior Forest Rangers followed by fruit popsicles – and lots of smiles. The day utilized one of the closing days of the academic year - after traditional testing and teaching have largely concluded, and a time of significant challenge in most classrooms. The program also helps students understand more about career opportunities involving the Great Outdoors. When fully implemented, ED OUT will offer each child in grades K-11 a day of experiential learning outdoors. The day may involve outdoor activities in and nearby school campuses, including planting gardens, trees and introductions to outdoor fun. In addition, tens of thousands of students will travel to nearby recreation sites, where adjunct faculty will work with classroom teachers to deliver lessons ranging from physical sciences to history to art to forensic science. While in the outdoors, students enjoy a healthy lunch and learn more about good eating practices and the connection between eating and activity levels. This reinforces the school systems efforts beginning in 2007 to revamp school cafeteria menus to emphasize healthier eating habits, a process begun after the school system found itself a regional leader in the percentage of children classified as obese and overweight. Participating student are provided with (1) suggested summer break activities, readings and trips specifically addressing the academic program of the next grade, including suggested family trips and activities, (2) information about nearby summer fun at federal, state and local sites, and (3) special offers from recreation retailers and service providers. A new website, [www.edout.us](http://www.edout.us), provides information

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

and opportunities for students, parents and teachers alike to access the wealth of information about ways to make the outdoors an exciting and relevant year-round classroom. Following its successful June 2010 pilot effort, Prince William County is planning to drastically increase the number of its students invited to participate in ED OUT. Expansion of ED OUT to other school districts across the nation is also underway. Pilot locations are under consideration in the Denver, Chicago and Seattle/Portland metropolitan areas. Prince William County Schools' (PWCS) dynamic superintendent, Dr. Steven Walts, who participated in most of the ED OUT planning and the pilot effort, told the event partners that the day had overcome the challenges of making the final days of the school year quality learning time and proved to the students that great fun and adventure can be found beyond electronic screens – where studies now show American youth spend, on average, 7.5 hours daily.

Partnership Will Provide Campsites for Extended Care Patients LITTLE ROCK, Ark., July 29 -- The Army Corps of Engineers and University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences entered an agreement today to provide at least six new campsites in Maumelle Park to accommodate patients undergoing extended medical treatment in the Little Rock area. The Challenge-Cost Share Agreement outlines how the Corps and UAMS will share in constructing and operating the new campsites. Maumelle Park has historically been an economical source of lodging for out-of-town patients who come to Little Rock for medical treatment. "Throughout the past year, more than 81 people were documented in Maumelle Park as seeking long-term stays related to medical treatment," said Miles Johnson, the acting project operations manager of the Corps' Russellville Project Office. "The funding provided by UAMS will meet a definite need." UAMS is providing \$90,000 for the partnership to be led by its hospital, UAMS Medical Center, its Winthrop P. Rockefeller Cancer Institute, and the UAMS Myeloma Institute for Research and Therapy. "We see patients from around the world, many of whom must stay in Little Rock for weeks or months while undergoing treatment," said Peter Emanuel, M.D., director of the Cancer Institute at UAMS. "Having these campsites available for extended periods of time will provide patients and their loved ones with an affordable option for lodging in a beautiful setting and at the same time help ease financial burdens." "UAMS is very pleased to partner with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make these campsites available for patients," said UAMS Chancellor I. Dodd Wilson, M.D. "We are very appreciative of the support and compassion the Corps has shown in helping make this possible." Current regulations limit the time individuals may stay in federal parks. UAMS funding will enable patients to enjoy extended, uninterrupted stays in the park, contributing to their recovery in a restive setting. The Corps obtained seed money to be used for construction management, septic needs and daily utilities and maintenance. UAMS funds will provide for the remaining campsite building needs. The extended stay campsites will be reserved specifically for medical care patients as recommended through Patient Advocates Services of Little Rock Hospitals. Maumelle Park is on the bank of the Arkansas River west of Little Rock. Take Pinnacle Valley Road off Arkansas Highway 10. The park's unique environment provides an excellent setting for camping, boating, fishing or getting away from it all. The park offers eight group picnic shelters and 129 campsites with electricity and water hook ups. Other amenities include a boat launch ramp, playground, hot showers, public telephones and a dump station.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ah, you had my support until the last sentence. Government + money = disaster and deficit.

I also agree with Sheri's comment. A modern CCC would create a huge liability for a litigation happy society. Such a program would also cost the employed American taxpayer a fortune in taxes to support. Personally, I don't want even more of my tax money being spent to employ those that are currently unemployed, especially in a program run by the Federal Government. The current collectors of government entitlements should comprise this workforce, if there is to be one. As federal employees they should be mandated to not be capable of suing their employer, much like the military. History lesson: WW2 ended the Great depression, not the New Deal, the WPA, or the CCC.

I only wish there were suitable alternatives to plastic for so many other consumer items...like computers.

Grazing on public lands only helps to conserve that land. Ranchers are responsible for the fence upkeep, water condition, and, in many cases, the supply of water in the grazed area. Simply put, many of the wildlife species found in these areas would not be able to live there if it were not for the ranchers constant vigil over the land. Regarding #6; I believe this is more humane than letting them over populate the areas and consequently dying of starvation due to over grazing. Again you choose to make this about your own personal crusade against OHV's? Ridiculous.

I would like to see the subsidies removed all across the board. If the "goliath" farms and meat producers are the only ones that can survive, then that's a free market at work. Historically, however, this has not been the case at all.

I'd support this if it could be done through private funding, but involving government monies, no thanks.

Many hikers "wander off" their designated trails and on to private property. They also destroy some watering systems, fences, and scare horses as well as cattle. Breaking rules is certainly not limited to the OHV community. The OHV community, however, participates in massive clean up efforts. There are miles and miles of trails that are not accessible to OHV's, but are to horses and hikers alike. The Imperial Valley sand dunes are not frequented by hikers, but have had massive closures effected upon them. Simply put, OHV's are facing serious restrictions on riding trails that hikers do not use. Open these areas back up and the number of OHV users would probably decrease on the other trails. I live in the Arizona desert, and the "hiking" done by the massive influx of illegal immigrants across public and private land, is doing much more destruction than OHV's.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Since there is already wildlife in the areas that these trails exist in, isn't it reasonable to assume that the OHV community is not truly destroying anything except for your argument? The OHV community participates in more clean up efforts than the back packers, hikers, photographers, etc. do. Your opinion that "a OHV user is the very nature of his hobby is damaging to the environment and a downright nuisance to wildlife and others that enjoy the outdoors", is exactly that, an opinion. Why don't you support the opening of land that has been removed from OHV usage? Then we might not be so likely to recreate in alternative places that seem to upset you so much. You want us off of public land because YOU don't like us there? Now who's "greedy and uncaring"?

There are plenty of irresponsible campers, hikers and back packers as well. Most of the fires raging through my home state of Arizona, were caused by campers being careless with their camp fires, not OHV riders. The land allowed for OHV use is rapidly being taken away. How about just restoring the land already removed from OHV usage? I am part of a large group of OHV enthusiasts that recreate in the outdoors in order to spend quality time with our families. I don't want MY government to dictate to me how, when, and where I can spend this time.

Require voluntary action? It's not voluntary if it's required, it's forced.

Well stated. If solar were more profitable than other forms of power generation, they would be the norm and not the exception. Subsidies only encourage misappropriation of tax dollars.

What next? Are we going to build a refuge for all of the wild chickens running around Miami? How about a Pigeon sanctuary in New York? How long before a wild horse refuge will be another over budgeted, and poorly run government program? If someone wants to purchase large sections of land and run wild horses on it then more power to them. If it can be done profitably then it will be done by a sharp entrepreneur . Burdening taxpayers with this responsibility is irresponsible. As far as the ORV's scaring the horses; there are many, many places that wild horses can go that ORV's can't.

I would like to address the comment that public lands off-limits to OHVs are "empty, unused, lonely and desolate." Being an experienced backpacker and just returning from a roadless area I can tell you that these places are not unused or desolate. I come across deer, elk, pronghorn antelope, numerous species of birds, wildflowers, insects and reptiles which all live in these places. When you enter a wilderness or national park, remember it is there for you to enjoy, but it is not your home, treat it with respect and leave it as you found it. There is value in wild spaces even if they are not totally accessible to all people.

The future demographics of the country is changing rapidly but there is no representation of minorities outside to relate to media wise, even though there are millions spending money on outdoors expenditures yearly. We need the next generation to continue to be stewards as well but they must have visual messages to make a natural transition into the field and open opportunities to partake of. Outdoors is for everyone.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To get more urban dwellers out, there needs to be safety measures taken in order to spend more time in the city parks and neighborhoods. In the poor urban cores there is crime that families have concerns about when taking their children outside to play. Maybe gangs need to be made to be disbanded or qualified as domestic terrorist and dealt with accordingly so families can live and breathe again. These are obstacles in going outside or how does one even begin to think about conservation and the earth when being outdoors can cost your you life in the city. The future will be in the hands of these voters one day. What is happening in one neighborhood soon becomes the norm in more neighborhoods unless things change.

I would have no great argument against OHV designated areas so long as: One, the areas contained sufficient buffer zones surrounding them so the OHV noise could not be heard by persons living in, or using, nearby land, and Two, no taxes be used in their development (we have far greater needs than such areas, i.e., let those who want to use OHVs, and/or those who want to sell OHVs, pay for them.)

ignorance ah yes. i have seen hikers smoking, flipping ashes around, while complaining about motorized users. i have seen the trash left behind by a church group in a camp ground. so do not talk to loudly about ignorance. it is spread in both camps motorized and non. all of us need to use the outdoors with respect. to many are ready to close off wildness to all but the most fit. and there are too few who will fit that frame. when the day comes when i cannot easily walk i will be happily exploring on my atv enjoying in the best way possible but not from the parking lot.

OHV's are a big part of this discussion. OHV's have been using our public lands for the past 50 years. OHV use is a valid use of Public Lands. To say otherwise is either uniformed or biased. Restricting access is not the way we should manage our public lands. OHV folks are using our public lands for the same reason as any other American, to enjoy and appreciate the beauty and wonder of our great land. Muti-Use Land Management is the only way to be fair to ALL Americans.

This is such a critical incentive for all farmers and ranchers across the country that are interested in conserving their properties for future generations. It maintains bipartisan support, a rare achievement in modern politics. Making these incentives permanent is critical for the future of private lands conservation.

These trails are a piece of our national heritage and must be preserved. Once gone they cannot be replaced. They are under pressure from development, energy needs and lack of protection. There are workable compromises available thay will preserve this national treasure. Duane Iles



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

By far the greatest threat to American's access to public land is privatization and commercialization. On many rivers and lands owned by the public commercial outfitters are given preferential treatment for use. The Colorado River in the Grand Canyon and the Salmon River in Idaho are prime examples. In Montana you can witness this on an annual basis. Unrestricted commercial use on rivers, guaranteed hunting licenses (numbers are limited) for commercial outfitters and infrastructure built specifically for commercial operations are some of the symptoms. Public lands barricaded by private lands restrict access for the general public and allow public lands to become the wealthy's playground. If we are to save wildlands we need a broad constituency. Access to publically held land and waters should be a major priority. Meaningful restrictions on commercial operations on public lands is a second priority. This will help reconnect the public with the great outdoors. Limited or no access is a major roadblock of connecting with the great outdoors.

All this falsely and arrogantly assumes that pristine wilderness is an 'intrinsic value' that takes precedence over human values and human uses. "Industrial, economic, recreational, access, and user-based arguments" are most certainly not "irrelevant". It is bad enough that the political process is already being cynically manipulated for ideological purposes without in addition decreeing that "argument is irrelevant" so land fingered by political special-interests should be locked up without even bothering with Congressional approval. Under the Constitution unowned land was not supposed to be permanently retained by the Federal government at all, let alone controlled by a permanent bureaucracy operating outside Congressional processes.

Authorization for acquisition is not a mandate to buy everything in site regardless of the rights of the property owners. That kind of attitude creates, properly, more opposition to more funding and authority for government acquisition.

Conservation easements are controversial because they are so political. Viroso want them as a means to control land and undermine private property rights, and landowners are being pushed into them because it is the only way they can cut down on the horrendous taxes. In many cases, the wealthier, politically connected use easements to tie up land around their estates that they weren't going to use anyway, or couldn't use because of regulations -- at the same time they use them as a means of pressuring neighbors into giving up the use of their land by economic or regulatory strangulation if they don't go along with the easements. Large trusts like TNC and the Maine Coast Heritage Trust use easements to take land out of private ownership and out of the private economy forever by flipping it to government agencies. The whole system is very corrupt.

I would like to be able to return to my own "familiar" private property without the constant threat from land trusts, activist groups and government agencies maneuvering to take over my property and trample my rights.

Isn't there supposed to be separation of church and state in this country? I am tired of these religious fanatics pronouncing that I have to give up my own property because they think it's "sacred". This is the essence of the Obama "Treasured Lands" agenda -- they treasure what you own and want to take it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The original Congressional authorization for National Parks does in fact require that parks be "for people". They are not supposed to be for an arrogant elite of wilderness advocates, and would not last if they were. They are also not supposed to be deliberately chosen for the purpose of preventing development of energy resources and other human uses over "huge areas" as a tool in an anti-Industrial Revolution. Land now targeted for new parks is also not restricted to plans for "change of use" (i.e. to non-use) of land already controlled by government. NPS and other agency and activist plans include enormous amounts of private property, which is a threat to people all over the country. This expansionist political drive for government takeover of more and more land has as a byproduct caused the terrible neglect of maintenance in existing National Parks.

The whole concept of "stakeholder" is invalid because it presumes that those with a political interest in controlling other people's private property and resources have any right to do so. "Stakeholders" is an attempt to elevate pressure group warfare into something legitimate.

There is no sense of ownership of common property because we have no ownership when the government controls it.

These politically inspired "incentive" plans are filled with corruption as they attempt to manipulate private property out of the control of its owners. Once the government is involved, the property is targeted for acquisition and control. It is a sorry political substitute for the Endangered Species Act that has provided an "incentive" to landowners to "shoot, shovel, and shut up" even when they otherwise enjoy the natural features of their own property. Government and activist involvement means punishment, even when they are waving around dollar bills as an enticement.

We private landowners do in fact take care of our property. But the term "stewards" has the unfortunate connotation of taking care of it for someone else, and that is a false premise. Viros don't want us taking care of our land because we do it in accordance with our own standards and our own preferences; viros want to control everything for their own political purposes requiring worshipping of pristine nature as an "intrinsic value" taking precedence over human values and goals.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Return to a Multiple Use philosophy. Before the great (?) environmental and preservational movements of the '70s, this worked best. We all shared the land with respect for those who recreated on it and for those who produced commodity resources from it. Commodity production creates wealth. If we don't create our commodity resources, we must import them, exporting our wealth in the process. It seems hard for urban America to grasp that land, whether public or private, is the larder from which we derive all our needs to maintain our quality of life, but this we must understand and respect. The chief obstacle now to Multiple Use is the fragmenting of our public lands into special use areas. The Federal Government should cease being intimidated by vocal minorities and return to a Multiple Use philosophy for the common good. Our political leaders can assist in this by de-politicizing our land management agencies. These are staffed by trained professionals that we have hired to manage our lands. Let them do their jobs. One tool that would help in these regards is to allow no more life-time appointments for Federal District judges. Far too often, with no accountability to hinder them, they follow their own agenda, with little regard to the impact their decisions have on those trying to produce raw materials and on the rural communities affected by their decisions. Another tool would be to rescind the Equal Access to Law consideration for all of the professional protesters who seek to inhibit any further meaningful development of our public lands. Our public land management agencies must pay these court costs out of their own budgets. This seriously erodes their ability to meet their more important obligations. A third tool is to amend the NEPA and ESA laws so that only those appeals of public land management programs by folks who have standing and credibility, and whose appeals have substance, will be considered by the agencies. This would do much to inhibit the myriad of appeals filed by bored college students with nothing better to do on Saturday nights. Finally, with regard to public lands conservation, we need no more. We have National Parks, National Monuments, Wilderness Areas, Wildlife Management Areas, and Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, to name the most common. Enough is enough! It is time we start managing our public lands in a more realistic, responsible, and mature manner, and bring an end to the public land wars of the PAST THREE DECADES. Montana

Keep our public land open to the public. Many area's around moab are great to see using OHV. Local citizens in the state shouldn't have any extremist dictating how the lands should be managed. It is sad when and extremist organization like SUWA with less than 10,000 members dictate the land management in this country.

Motorized use of public lands is a legitimate use of those lands. Shared trails open to motorcycles/mountain bikes/horses and hikers are possible and can be highly successful. The Sovereign Singletrack Trail near Moab, Utah is one such example of this type of trail. All across the western United States we see trails being closed, often with no input sought from the public before the closure. Singletrack muti-use trails are a sustainable and legitimate use of public lands. It would be a truly great thing to see a nationwide network of such trails developed within all the Nation Forests and BLM holdings of this country.

As we continue to add more humans to the planet at the rate of 200,000 a day, there is an obvious need for more Wilderness to meet the demand of those who desire the intellectual fulfillment and relief from urban pressures that can only be found in such an environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The idea of "Wilderness" is not to exclude people from ANY lands. Wilderness is just a concept of some determined people - and the Congress of the United States - to try and preserve some small portions of our public lands so that we, and more importantly, future generations can know that there are some places where the human presence is minimal or non-existent. Places where the works and forces of nature are unimpeded by mankind. Places that we haven't impacted or destroyed. As Edward Abbey so simply put it, "The concept of wilderness needs no defense. It only needs more defenders."

Challenge – Our organization has been providing outdoor education programs over 35 years to youth in the public and private sectors and when trying to reserve “group sites” at some of the National Parks, these sites go very quickly because there are not enough. Group sites are critical when working with large groups of students. An example is Yosemite National Park, we need to solicit assistance from several of our staff on the 15th of each month to arrive in the office by 6:30, set up their computers to recreation.gov (the site that reserves for the National Parks) and at 7:00 a.m. SHARP, everyone needs to select a group site, these sites are taken within five minutes. Please increase the number of group sites available for so we can continue our mission of nurturing and educating these youth groups and providing an environmental stewardship inspiration.

I agree with; there's a good reason why many of the OHV trails are being closed. They negatively impact water quality and disturb wildlife. They also pollute. Some Off-Road events near where I live have so badly degraded the system (with human waste, oil, gas) that they have been closed by the local environmental management agencies for cleanup.

I disagree with this idea entirely. There are reasons we have environmental regulations - it's called the Tragedy of the Commons. While reform is a good idea, I think it also needs to be well-thought out. And as for your statement that we don't need land conservation anymore, I wholeheartedly disagree. As the populations of our cities and towns increase, we will need more public land to recreate on/ filter our water and air/produce our timber/protect displaced wildlife/provide ecosystem services. Many places are already overcrowded as it is - even wilderness areas! I can't even get a permit during certain peak times.

Although I agree with giving the OHV crowd a place at the table, the elephant in the livigroom is the impact you make: - noise, ruts, gas engine smell, not to mention the danger hikers face having to dodge being hit when you come racing through. These are the main reasons the others don't embrace your inclusion. The DOI has the additional issue of manpower. Hikers and equestrains are easily caputured if any wrong-doing. Going after an OHV is difficult. You hit a hiker, and DOI is responsible for the cleanup. I'm guessing the wildlife isn't real happy about the noise and speed with which you travel either. Address these obstacles and you'll have an easier time getting others who will be willing to listen.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I totally agree with your assessment. This isn't about conservation, for if it was, we'd have more scientists weighing in with long term issues to consider that lay people have no clue. The other factor is \$\$\$\$\$. Money drives and has driven this country off a cliff. The BP oil spill is America's wake up call, but apparently, people still want to sleep through it. It is as if all the naughty children are having their way, to put it in lay terms, and there will be no punishment. We cannot continue with this standard operating procedure, nature will not survive, nature is not surviving. But as with all things in history and going forward, it will continue, nature zero, humans take all. Guess we better hope nature doesn't bite back.

I am not a hot air balloonist, hence I am not experienced in their use or environmental impact. Would think, however, hot air balloons would be better for the animals because people would not be using gas engines, degrading trails, or encroaching on their habitat. I was hoping some balloonist enthusiasts would jump in and comment. As for a historical event - not sure what you mean? I have not seen balloons used in any parks or forests, therefore, assume there may be a reason why, but again, I am not sure.

BLM lands and portions of National Park land are in the crosshairs of gas drilling rigs. Go to [www.SUWA.org](http://www.SUWA.org), and here is an article from AP. My advice too is, watch Gasland to get a taste for what I am talking about. We HAVE to look for other ways other than fossil fuel drilling madness. It is slowly killing all of us, just like tobacco, we need to ween ourselves off. I am passionate as is everyone else about our natural resources. To loose them forever is more than a tragedy, it is a crime. I'm not linking multiple sites to my comments . . . Flooding the voting with my point of view through my various associations with conservation, I HOPE that the Rangers and DOI personnel can ferret out voting preferences and comments, and am certain they will / can. Arches, Yellowstone, Yosemite and all the other parks can never be replaced. The needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few, or the one --- be that moneyed interests or special interests or individual interests. Big Picture -- As conservation chair for the desert, the echoing problem was the impact people were making on a fragile environment. This is the case for EVERY DOI initiative. Which begs the question, when is this country or any country for that matter going to begin focusing on this problem. We need to address the elephant in the living room - overpopulation. The greater the population, the more the stress on the land and environment namely -- the resources.

Good idea. I only hope Ken Salazar can see the forest ..... through the small engine exhaust and drilling rigs.

List the places and revenues brought in by foreign oil companies such as BP - England, and Shell - Dutch to the DOI Website. The Red Rock area of Utah is also up for grabs. If many Americans were aware of the give away to foreign interests, maybe they would be more reticent to allow them access.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Preserved Civil War battlefields are cultural and historic landscapes that serve as a constant reminder of the sacrifices our ancestors endured to make our nation what it is today. These historic landscapes are true American treasures as well as the last tangible links to our country's most tumultuous conflict. Preserved battlefields become outdoor classrooms for today's visitors and those of countless generations to come. They provide environmental benefits, including the protection of watersheds and wildlife habitats. Further, studies have repeatedly found that visitors to preserved battlefields help generate revenue for local communities by spending money on lodging, meals and other travel-related activities. The need to preserve these battlegrounds is immediate ? the Civil War Preservation Trust estimates that 30 acres of highly significant battlefield land are lost to development every day. Timing is especially critical in areas of the country experiencing rapid growth and development pressures. Time is running out and opportunities are dwindling to forever protect these hallowed grounds. With the Civil War Sesquicentennial just around the corner, now is the perfect time to take action to save our nation's treasured Civil War battlegrounds. The 150th anniversary commemoration is expected to stimulate renewed interest in the conflict and generate unprecedented tourism to Civil War sites. The protection of America's remaining Civil War battlefields will leave a legacy of national commitment to preservation and conservation. These lands will be open spaces for the public to enjoy, preserved in their natural and pristine state, allowing visitors to walk in the footsteps of their Civil War ancestors. This experience will be unlike anything they could have read in a book or watched on television about the conflict.

7-12-2010 The country's many Civil War Battlefields at this time are under extreme pressures from developers and need the immediate attention at all levels of government where they exist. Not only are these historic/cultural landscapes "economic assets" for the local communities and districts in which they are located, but they are also invaluable natural settings that work to enhance our quality of life in protecting precious open space, working farms, stream valleys and surrounding wetlands. Now, more than ever, the Department of the Interior needs to engage along with the Civil War Preservation Trust and other private non-profit Civil War battlefield preservation/friends groups to aggressively work to save the remaining unprotected land where so many sacrifices were made as the 150th anniversary of the War (2011-2015) approaches.

American youth need to have access to the real places where their forefathers fought and died for their ideals. The Civil War was the defining event of our emergence as a country. To understand modern America we need to preserve those deadly, sacred spaces. Slavery, States Rights in a Federal system, the Battle for the West, Industrialization were huge issues of the time, and they still are. You can't understand the present without knowing the past. You cannot counter wrong information, prejudice and deceitful statements without knowing the real history of our country. Support Battlefield Preservation!

Ski Trails and Wildlife samples on Amazon give a pretty good idea what the book is about. I think teachers especially need to learn more about the boreal forest, as it is impacted more by global warming than forests to the south.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ATV owners can install after market mufflers in addition to the stock muffler on an ATV. Manufacturers could solve a majority of the sound issue by manufacturing much quieter ATV's. There is no excuse for them to let this ongoing issue continue.

By all means this would be a positive step in reconnecting people to Americas Great Outdoors. It is not done nearly enough in my opinion. Most of all current living cultures such as Native Americans and even newly discovered living cultures such as Gladesmen Culture should be portrayed in a positive and uplifting manner. Often nowadays man within a natural landscape is portrayed in a negative manner by many agenda driven entities to suit their myopic narrow set of goals. That breeds hard feelings and contempt towards those entities and their goals. These backlashes can set conservation back years in attaining justifiable goals. Cultural respect and acknowledgement may well be the missing link in connecting Americans to Americas Great Outdoors. Google Gladesmen Culture to find out more.

Everyone should also know that in order for a highway to be designated the local elected officials with authority over the highway must give their authority to the Scenic Highway oversight group (Corridor Mg't. Entity) or whatever other name they use and adopt the Scenic Highway - Corridor Management Plan - for the highway segment being designated. That is how the Florida program functioned the last time I checked. This looks like a good idea until the bait of Federally funded amenities (boardwalks, scenic overlooks etc.) is swallowed and then the highway is reeled in under the control of the Scenic Highway group in charge. Elected officials in Florida have de-designated at least one National Scenic Byway after 8+ years in development after finding out they were having their authority removed. Suggestion - Be much more up front with elected officials in the beginning of the process and treat regular citizens that become involved with much more respect than what happened on the Tamiami Trail in So. Florida.

Federal and State agencies that provide services (e.g. primitive - RV camping) in locales where those same services are provided by private businesses need to be much more sensitive in seeing to it that their fee structure does not undercut a private businesses ability to at least compete with them on a level playing field. I have been witnessing for years a 2 generation family owned small campground in So. Fla. being financially devastated by a Federal agency's regulatory actions and camping operations at the Big Cypress National Preserve. NPS's fee structure is either free or well below cost. How would anyone here deal with that scenario? People need to understand receiving services for free or at below cost from a governmental entity can have some very financially destructive side effects upon their fellow citizens. I do agree that parking ones vehicle along side a road within public land and going on a hike should be not necessarily (free) but knowingly subsidized by other revenue generators so that everyone possible can experience nature thus drawing them possibly into supporting the place they're in or another similar place someday. Some here are concerned about overuse but many of the public feel that if they are taxed to pay for something called "public land" they should be entitled to enter that land. Without solid justification, limiting visitation should not be considered in my opinion.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Great idea but in these austere economic times it may not be feasible or advisable when so many more necessary programs are suffering for lack of funding. During this difficult economic period of our Nation's history Americas Great Outdoor program should always ask itself prior to funding its ideas "Will our action adversely impact more necessary National programs (e.g. health care, education, social security etc.)?"

Here is where the environmental communities hypocrisy is abundantly clear. Green folks want us off of oil but cry Crocodile tears when it begins to happen. Someone needs to grow up. We will never have our cake and eat it too. Life forms at ground level will adapt although birds may have a few more problems adapting but will over time. In fact cantilevered nesting platforms for threatened bird species might provide environmental mitigation for the windmills.

I did try to submit an idea on a different topic but the site did not accept it. The administrator said it was a site glitch and to try again. I may at some point but after wasting an hour and losing it I am shy to have a repeat of that. Upon rereading the idea I still see that DOI could determine the priority level and/or the Secretary would decide the targeted lands - that is a lot more power. Easements are not free either and the taxpayer unknowingly foots the bill for paying the landowner. Easements paid for with public funds are not but should be opened to public access proportionally to the easement payments relationship to gross value of the property. I must also admit that I do not accept all of the hoopla over bio-diversity and pending catastrophies predicted by folks like E.O. Wilson and his associates. I believe those involved are in it for money and control of others and I mean total control which I also believe will lead to a revolt in America. The tales of woe from loggers, ranchers and those desiring meaningful access to psuedo-public lands in the West tell that story. Private property rights and many freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution have been infringed upon by those seeking to supposedly protect our habitats. Most citizens outside these groups are not believing a word of that anymore. There is a backlash building within this Nation to what has been and is happening and I hope I am not here when it unloads.

I understand what everyone has said up to comment 7. It is all true but their is another side to this coin. Other tax payers must make up the difference for every tax exemption including a conservation easement. The President may be hearing from many tax payers that do not want to foot the higher bill put on them due to these type easements. He is probably trying to be sensitive to all sides or possibly just believes the government needs every dime it can get because of our wrecked economy. Many amenities available in good economic times are impossible during times such as the these.

I want to add my voice to those calling for increased OHV opportunities on public land. I hike, snowshoe, kayak, mountain bike AND ride an off road motorcycle. OHV's are a great way to enjoy the back country and explore the great outdoors. There are plenty of places on BLM and National Forest land to expand OHV opportunities in a sustainable way, while still addressing the needs of conservation and other outdoor enthusiasts.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I will go one step further. Non motorized 2 wheel vehicles should be allowed in wilderness areas on a case by case basis. My reasons for this are below: 1. Bicycles rarely do damage beyond what horses do, if ridden on trails designed appropriately. 2. Restrictions of travel to only hikers and equestrians cause hikers to congregate within short distances of the wilderness boundaries, concentrating impacts from their use in a few select areas. 3. Because of their greater range, equestrian enthusiasts enjoy the great majority of the wilderness to themselves. Horses are outside the budget of most citizens, limiting their ability to penetrate deeper into wilderness areas where human impacts can be spread over a larger area to reduce the effects of concentrated human use. 4. Allowing bicycles access to wilderness will allow more equitable use of the wilderness by citizens with limited means. Bicycles have a long daily travel range, and are relatively inexpensive, affording the possibility of a quality experience without the cost of owning or hiring horses. The public lands of the United States should be managed in a way that does not require great wealth to enjoy.

In Florida first the bicyclists had a strip paved for them all around the approx. 180 mile levee around Lake Okechobbee, then hikers came along and demanded a soft grass strip for their tender feet - at a combined cost of \$28,000,000 dollars to the taxpayer. I ask you - where does the waste of money stop for those who don't chip in but enjoy a free socialist ride off the labor of others. Those who canoe in Florida do not want to pay for a boat sticker as all motorized boats do yet they want specially designed and built canoe ramps. Who do you all think you are - the chosen ones. So called passive use sure as heck is not economically passive. I recommend that so called passive users of our American Great Outdoors begin to pay for what they get and stop being parasites as they currently are from what I've seen. The expenses caused by construction of designated trails is driven by those out to ban the ORV activities. I have never seen ORV or most consumptive users ask the gov't. for anything where I come from - So. Fla. Most if not all of us would prefer the gov't., outsiders and carpetbagging enviro-extremists to just leave us alone. As screwed up as our government is so far they have not caved completely to the enviro-extremists and use their extremism to create blue collar jobs for many that wind up increasing man's carbon footprint. Way to go environmental community and freeloaders.

Interesting concept but how do you get trees to grow in the deserts, oceans, mountain ranges and polar ice caps? It is innovative though and pretty common sensical.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is always good to be supplied accurate statistics that are understandable by persons of reasonable intellectual capacity. The problem with the data at the link provided by comment 11 is that the actual data gathered was manipulated by weighting in many directions. This weighting process allows those who controlled this study to also control the results of the study. Dropping all the results gathered in the South Appalachian focused study (Version 12 of a 13 version study) was very regrettable. Many of the categories of recreation reported upon overlap heavily and unless the reader of this study has access to the exact questions asked of the interviewees one is not capable of ascertaining the level of bias if any built into the study and its results. People may hike but what they love the most is camping. A person that uses an ATV might only use it to facilitate hunting and game removal post hunt. Depending how and what questions were presented to participants drastically impacts the results. Considering the minimal info available at this link I would recommend the good citizens taking the time to participate here putting little faith in this particular study. It would also be nice to be more precisely directed to the stats referred to by the author of this reasonable and positive idea to attain goals of the Great American Outdoors Initiative. We all must resist allowing personal bias, bigotry or prejudice to cause limitations in our ability of hearing what others are trying to say. I have caught myself in both ends of that spectrum on occasion. Seeing the other persons side is difficult but we must pry our minds open sometimes to really hear others.

It is quite accurate to deem this idea as "pretty extreme". No surprise since extremists have seized the opportunity provided here by Mr. Obama to promote many extreme ideas. The bad part is that Obama and his team will use the extreme enviro ideas as a basis to promote these anti-human access policies throughout the Federal agencies. I have actually linked one of the top 5 innovators to a Defenders of Wildlife contractor verifying to my satisfaction that a lot of coordination is going on here. I must admit I wish more of it was going on the other side of the issues. I will commend some very good comments from the OHV community. If nothing else this site is good for identifying the foes. Of course that works both ways. I saw the other day on a different web site a full report on one of the listening sessions associated with this program. They were said to be a sham, mainly providing high officials a speaking platform with little or no opportunity for real public input or interaction from the audience suckered into attending. Thank goodness there were none in my neighborhood since I probably would have gone.

It is sad that you have such a negative bias against humans. We humans are a species like all others and have evolved right along all of them. We have every bit as much right as any non-human species to be anywhere on this planet we choose to be including Wilderness. I'm very new to this forum and will do my best to be polite. All need to understand that the multi-use groups will not be kept entirely out of this process. They already are disgruntled due to Obama's shunning them previously. They will either be in on the front end or organizing opposition should they continue to be excluded. Take your pick.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many very serious albeit very (hidden)subtle problems are associated with the intermingling of environmental priorities within agencies who's name is indicative of a specific priority such as Transportation. A few worth mentioning here are that dollars collected from motorists through Federal gasoline taxes thought to be for improving Transportation are diverted into many projects having nothing to do with improving the efficiency or maintenance of our Nations transportation system and are spent on items such State Scenic Highway Programs which morph as quickly as their proponents can cause it into Federal scenic Byway programs. The sales pitch to sell these programs to an unsuspecting public are all of the freebies that come with the program (e.g. boardwalks, government visitor centers, wildlife underpasses etc. etc.) that contribute not one iota to the efficiency of getting people or goods from point A to point B. In fact these programs prohibit any of the dollars appropriated from motorist contributed tax dollars from even being spent on pre-existing necessary road repairs. If this isn't enough to bring question to programs such as these here is what happened on one Florida highway designated as a National Scenic Byway due the State's own Program Manual. The manual specified that authority over decision making on that segment of the highway was slated to be taken away from local elected officials and transferred to a group mostly comprised of Federal and State land managers along the highway. This was one of the State mandates controlling their program. Luckily in Florida when local elected officials found out 7 or 8 years late that this theft of their authority was imminent they quickly demanded that both the State and Federal designation be removed from the Tamiami Trail in South Florida. Elected officials were totally unaware of the onerous implications of such a nice sounding program they had supported years before. In the end the unimpeachable grassroots opinion was to retain the elected officials control rather than give it to a bunch of unelected folks in a back room called a Corridor Mg't. Entity (CME) with only environmental goals and looking to spend motorist contributed transportation dollars to attain them. Protecting the environment and bio-diversity is worthwhile but the funds to do that should be raised by up front programs rather than programs containing issues that are subtle to the point of being invisible to average citizens much less elected officials. In this particular locale attaining environmental initiatives was set back decades by the exposure of this programs real intentions in my opinion. From my experience with this intermingling of priorities I have witnessed it causing internal conflict at many levels within Departments of Transportation. What I have seen is that most folks go to work in a Tranportation Dept's. to build roads not boardwalks and visitor centers. That is very sad. I don't know how to put a link here but I would suggest participants to google the following topics to gain a better understanding what drives the idea here: The last 2 do not agree with the 1st 3 Agenda 21 Rio Summit The Wildlands Project Freedom 21 Sovereignty International Environmental Perspectives Inc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My experience with Wilderness in So. Fla. has lead me to believe serious harm can be done to natural areas by this designation. The lack of feasible access to Wilderness areas prevents public access except on foot and severely limits agency access for land management activities. The public are the eyes and ears of the environment and without them underfunded agencies don't have a chance of knowing what is taking place within the area as far as illegal activity goes. The lack of rapid access a Wilderness affords to agencies is very detrimental to fire supression as well as myriad other mg't. actions required. Considering that all the areas that truly met Wilderness criteria were designated many years ago, nowadays a new classification should be developed that would authorize off road vehicular access on limited prescribed multi-use trails for the public and land managers. That method would limit outlaw activities. Of course I'm speaking of large, not small land masses. One I know of now being considered as "W" is 147,000 acres. Without meaningful access this piece of land will have next to NO enforcement within its vast area.

One can demote this idea all day long but if the shoe fits the Feds need to wear them. On the other hand local folks with the most at stake must begin demanding exactly what they want in their comments to management plans - no more whining about how it used to be. That means when necessary the agencies must be supplied detailed maps of where desired trails should be located to facilitate hunting, fishing, OHV's, hiking etc. General statements to management plans do not tell agencies what they are looking for. The extremists know exactly how to work the comment system with precise comments demanding EXACTLY what they want and where they want it - LOCALS must do the same. Oh one more thing - don't waste time fighting the junk BS science citations touted by enviros since honest agency folks know it is BS. What the agencies can't do is give you anything you don't ask for specifically in comments because they can't prove you want it if it is not in their legal record of the NEPA process. Your comments are part of that record. We are doing this in Florida and it works. Good Luck.

One large source of the existing skepticism of myself and others is from witnessing the "precautionary principle" being used as some sort of scientific fact when it is exactly the opposite - the lack of facts. I have seen it used in many instances only to rid wild landscapes of many of the folks who actually fought to have those areas protected in the 1st place. In my mind the psuedo scientists that promoted those actions using spun citation sound-bytes are criminals of the highest order. Any education of impressionable youngsters must be balanced and speak of those who built this Nation utilizing its resources to do so, in a respectful tone at all times. If not the education is nothing more than brain washing propoganda. I did travel to the links above and noticed more of the sky is falling concerns over bio-d. I high school we learned of the Malthus theory claiming that we would all starve because the planet could not feed all that would inhabit the planet soon. In the meantime many very efficient methods of food production were developed so that we now have an overabundance of production capacity. Now getting it to those in need and starving is another problem. We could go on a road building campaign worldwide but Oh MY God that would fragment habitat and probably be prevented by those concerned about bio-d. Balance is what is needed in accessing Americas Great Outdoors and most other issues but bio-d promoters do not want any of that from where I sit. Balance and mutual acceptance of diverse desires could yield REAL hope. It is also maybe the most illusive of goals.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One question that might get a LOL. What happens when our solar power scientists and us start drawing so much power (btu's of energy) from the Sun that we upset whatever balance or equilibrium might currently be being maintained between Earth and the Sun? I wonder if anyone has done those calculations.

One should be sure to include all land management agencies inanimate objects such as fire fighting equipment, ranger vehicles and their guns, helicopters to patrol the vast Federal holdings etc. etc. Yes, let's keep all that bad anthropocentric junk out. Then the pot growers, poachers, illegal aliens and other outlaws can have the solitude, peace and quiet I am sure they long for. Really good idea. LOL

Our governmental system is setup to be run by elected officials assisted not led by minions in the bureaucracy. Attempting to avoid elected officials or fool them to attain an eco-goal will backfire very badly when discovered. Ask the enviro-bureaucrats with NPS, USFWS, FDEP and FDOT folks in Florida who conned elected officials in an attempt to remove their authority over a main highway segment designated as a Nat'l. Scenic Hiway (Tamiami Trail) what happened when the plot was exposed albeit 8 years late. Answer - Brown material hit the fan and road was de-designated after 9-10 years of deceit. Federal government has no role in States unless they bribe the State.

Possibly a nice idea but any new taxes in today's economy may be opposed strongly from many directions.

Possibly the author could ponder the concept of people accepting one another rather than supporting the separation of visitors of different persuasions which prevents them from ever understanding each other's desires and different physical abilities. Merely a thought to promote everyone being able to at least see all of the wonderful sights our public lands hold in store for us all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

SCORP data in Florida failed miserably to correctly guide the US Army Corp of Engineers(USACOE) with their development the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP)/Master Recreation Plan (MRP). CERP is the \$20,000,000,000 Billion dollar plan to supposedly fix the Everglades or as some claim create a lucrative jobs program. Hopefully the science data for CERP is more accurate and timely than the SCORP data was. I surely hope SCORP data is of higher quality in other areas of the nation than it is in Florida. They need to learn to include active land use not only passive. Excluding active use breeds opposition. Luckily Florida's Gladesmen cultural community members came to the rescue advising them as to the SCORP data integrity defects and how to get in compliance with the Nat Historic Preservation Act as amended 2000 and avoid possible lawsuits. The Corps taking that advise to heart lead to them seeking out more accurate recreation data and conducting a comprehensive ethnographic survey of the Gladesmen Culture and Traditional Cultural Properties related to them in the entire CERP region including at least 14 counties of So. Florida. This is an excellent example of how culture and a governmental entity can respectfully cooperate to address land management issues and at the same time build a coalition of support rather than being the impetus for opposition. I have assumed here that SCORP is a reference to a State's, Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP). Possibly government employees writing here could explain acronyms used here for the benefit of all. Maybe even include the name of the government agency one is employed by if that is the case.

Should be but won't be. Nowadays between the economic woes and environmental priorities trumping all else it will be a fight for money.

Thanks to poster #2 for citing Mr. Reed Noss, author of the land management strategy for "The Wildlands Project" designed to prohibit any human access to more than 50% of the land mass of the United States. I must question the credibility of anyone who would support anything conceived of by this man who possesses an unbridled hatred for most the human race except his associates. I suggest that folks here google Wildlands Project to see for themselves what it is really about. I'm sure that poster #2 knows about it and enthusiastically supports this subversive philosophy developed by David Foreman and Reed Noss of Earth First that has been injected like a drug into the brains of unsuspecting college students for years having brought us to current totally polarized situation we are all in. Thanks again poster #2 for opening this door.

Wonderful idea. We must do all we can to save those remaining ancient forests, and encourage others to become ancient forests. We have a lot to make up for, after all the destruction, but it must start grove by grove.

Careful that "thinning and logging" don't mean profit taking, destroying wetlands, and leaving the forests damaged...

We absolutely need full funding for historic preservation! We not only need to reconnect to the great outdoors but to our history and culture as well. It is the sum of all this that makes us as humans unique. It is unthinkable to separate our physical world from our historical and cultural experiences and values.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Being just a "manager wanna be" but a user of the forests I have NEVER seen a Forest Fire remove all of the fuel after it is gone. Not in a managed Forest, Not in a Wilderness Area, no where. So in the aftershock of a Forest Fire, many forest managers, the Real Ones, have begged local and federal authorities to allow them to remove this fuel, which by the way becomes a terrific breeding ground for insects that damage the forests later, and these forest managers have been told NO. So the Managers are left with..."just leaving well enough alone" creating an "oil slick" of forest fire fuel. No amount of that corporate stooge Smoky the Bear will stop a lightning strike, causing massive destruction of our Great Outdoors. So what is needed is need to place Forest Management in the hands of the trained and experienced Forest Managers on the ground in the local area. Let them use what they have learned to grow, just as a farmer does, a healthy forest. They need resources and the ability to control the destiny of their local forest. Federal Management of the Nations forest is only need to give a guideline, not dictate each and every move.

Locally our USFS has recieved 1.6 million dollars from the Stimulus package. These funds needed to be specifically designated in a short period of time. Our local Forest Service used their "deferred Maintenance" list as a guide to specifically designate these funds. By reading the stimulus bill I noted that there were more than just 1.6 million for the Forest Service, so other funds must have gone into your local forests budget. As it happened these funds were equally split between the campground deferred maintenance and the wilderness area deferred maintenance. All other recreational use budget items received zero, since the local forest service felt that these uses were fully funded by OHV sticker and other fees and the use of volunteers for that type of recreation.

Nationwide easements also include buried utilities such as gas pipelines and fiber optic lines. Both offer long corridors that are so hard to put together from scratch for trail development.

\_\_\_\_ and her NoCasino Gettysburg (or as we call it No Anything Gettysburg) group will try to gain sympathy through any organization she can. She claims that this "... is ripping our community apart..." Untrue - SHE is ripping the community apart with her moral campaign against gaming in PA. By using any and all manners of groups to rally behind her "mission", she will associate with just about anyone whom she believes will further her cause. For so many people who profess to have "Christian Values", they sure have strange ways of showing it. We have seen more hatred spewed by this group than anyone. Truth is not in their vocabulary, and omission or skewing of facts is one of their main tools. There are three sites where you can find the actual facts if you care to: [www.masondixongaming.com/](http://www.masondixongaming.com/) The official Resort Site { [Link](http://www.pcac2010.org/) } is the official Pro Casino Site [www.BoroughVENT.com](http://www.BoroughVENT.com) is a local Gettysburg Site run by me [Venter] (caution: REAL discussions and dialogue on this site... get quite dicey sometimes)



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wind energy is good. But big wind farms should go as close as possible to population centers that will use the energy. Large-scale commercial-industrial wind farms and transmission lines should not be built near special places like Montana's Rocky Mountain Front. They should be constructed far to the east of the mountain front, where transmission already is available and there is just as much wind. Do not put big wind farms near prime wildlife habitat or special scenic areas!

Agree with the concept, but I echo the "multi-user" comments that recreational trails should be built for all non-motorized users. As for "speed limits" or "add one, subtract one," nope, neither of those forward the goal of creating more mountain biking opportunities. The first - speed limits - completely discourages mountain biking on the trail - most riders climb faster than 5 mph (heck, most can walk their bike more than 5 mph), and the second - closing existing trails when new trails are built - does not create more opportunities for riding. The key here is NOT closing trails to one or more non-motorized uses. The key is cooperation, courtesy and sharing the trails. All non-motorized uses are compatible when people act with respect and courtesy and follow established rules of the trail. Closing trails to one use - especially to bikes - does not eliminate conflict.

I don't see how using loud, high-impact, fossil fuel burning, polluting vehicles is being "responsible for your footprint" or a way to connect with nature. This is just a way for Americans to preserve the technological bubble they float around in while avoiding exercise and having the illusion of enjoying the natural world while actually destroying it. For some reason our culture seems to fear nature and uses technology as a buffer between individuals and the world.

I don't think this is a good thing, When the government bought up what is now Big Cypress National Preserve, the people were supposed to have traditional use. There are so many rules and regulations. You need a special Big Cypress License to operate a vehicle. You need a ORV permit on the vehicle and that cost \$50. a year plus you must bring it to be weighed and inspected and photos taken. If you change vehicles you do this all over again. You must get in a drawing just for the privilege of buying this permit.

In the past, offroaders went wild by riding on unauthorized routes across federal lands. That has led to erosion, damage to fish and wildlife habitat, and destruction of archeological sites. The Forest Service and BLM are correct to restrict ORVs to designated routes that have been determined capable of handling the traffic without deterioration. In some areas, offroaders collaborated with the agencies to reach agreement. Too often there have been loud objections to reasonable closures.

The "no more wilderness" policy was unreasonable from the start because it told BLM that every resource and every public use could be considered in its planning, except wilderness. Let's put wilderness back into the planning mix, so BLM and public can consider all options. For every acre of publicly owned land, there are some uses that are more appropriate than others. BLM field managers have to decide which combination of uses serves the public best on each specific area of land.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The red rock canyon country of Utah needs wilderness designation. The Bureau of Land Management has found 6.6 million acres there to have wilderness characteristics under the definition in the Wilderness Act. Utah conservation groups think there's more than that. Whatever the acreage, it's a national treasure.

Those with the most at stake are the people of the United States, because these are national treasures. They don't belong to the counties. The 6,600 residents of Kane County (Utah) should not be calling the shots for federal lands that belong to all of us? I worked for BLM and saw how local influence warped the agency's management decisions. It's time to put the national interest first.

Oh so it's okay to have a 'thrill' bike ride or a 'thrill' hike but not a 'thrill' ATV ride? Multiple use law does require sustainability. Trail systems are sustainable and thousands of OHV registration dollars (in Colorado, for example) are going to provide that service every year. Pfffft....

How can you justify keeping one group from enjoying the same land as everyone else? There are millions of acres available to people who can't share the land. Is there no limit to your greed?  
Glenn

Since the government doesn't 'own' land, they can't grant it to special interest groups. If you happen not to fish and you happen not to be a radical environmentalist, it's just another governmental abuse of discretion. Even groups such as Trout Unlimited are now guided by anti-access enviros. Enough already!

Studying military campaigns such as those that occurred during the Civil War by reading a book is fine but you can only really learn about a battle by visiting the actual battlefield. Then the book becomes a visual. Too much original battle field land has already been lost to "progress". Once it's gone it's gone and we cannot bring it back. We must preserve our "visuals" so our youth can better understand our history.

The problem would be that children would be indoctrinated by teachers with an agenda that did not necessarily match up with science nor would they present a balanced picture of man's right to use the land.

If wilderness does not remain wild it will be an industrial park, not wilderness. I do not want to pay taxes for someone else's cattle or someone else's mine or oil rig.

Obviously, a huge profit opportunity exists for powering ships with waste plastic, tar, tires, roofing shingles, etc. However, with the right temperature and oxygen conditions, such fuels could be burned cleanly. The solution is to require a third-party certification of clean fuel burning from all cargo ships docking in U.S. ports. This would cause minimal expense, as it would be just another document required by customs agents of all ships from foreign nations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Actual reckless ohv use is so exaggerated by enviro-elitists on my home forest that their credibility is shot. Educational efforts by the land agencies to reduce impacts are miniscual by comparison to the money they spend on "Planners" leading many to believe that their goal is to throw their hands up and say, look we just can't manage this and close all roads. Law enforcement is also important, but how about some real balance?

Of course the Forest Service study is going to show a preference for hiking when first off, the survey is taken at hiking only trailhead parking lots and the questions are purposely skewed to get the answers the Forest wants. Hard to believe such a stumbling inept agency can actually achieve a closure agenda driven policy, but they do so with their unconscionably self serving use studies. The hypocrisy that hikers don't pollute and impact the environment just as much as the motorized community must stop. They climb in their SUVs and drive for hours from their suburban tract home, creating more carbon footprint than the folks who live near the Forest do when they simply wish to visit their Forest thru motorized means. If true to their ideals and visions, environmentalists would leave their cars parked and walk or ride a bike to the Forest they wish to visit and if that's not reasonable, then stay home and read their National Geographic for the next best experience.

The desire to preserve the Forest, as museums preserve art, is what is driving the Forest agenda and thereby their policies. what is conveniently forgotten is the Forest's original mandate was to manage the forests of this nation for reasonable resource extraction and public access. Environmentalists and their Forest associates, out of their fear of rampant Forest development (which will never happen thanks to protections already in place), have lumped motorized recreation into the drive to stop mining and timber harvest. Reasonable Americans realize that Forest resources are a very important commodity for the betterment of this country, so environmentalists prefer to attack motorized recreation to close roads, as recreation is seen as a luxury that they can make into their poster child for wilderness campaigns. The skewed unsupportable data used to attack motorized recreation make it blatantly obvious that the true agenda is merely to close the Forests to future resource extraction if the strategic needs arise. One look at the volatility in the world today and one can see that that strategic need will be upon us one day and we better not be stuck sitting on our hands!

This is pathetic sarcasm because if it weren't for those smokestacks you wouldn't have most of the products you progressives take for granted. The only reason you can drive your subaru from your urban guilt trip existence, to the mtns and strap on your skis while enjoying the heater in the lodge while you put on your plastic cross country ski boots and your fiber filled jacket is because of the energy and raw materials that our great country has graciously given up for your convenience. Are you all prepared to move back to the equator so we can survive without using any energy but the sun? If not then kindly sit down. Solar and wind have yet to prove themselves profitable and certainly we can't have nuclear power even tho it's been proven safe and your friends the French depend on it almost 100%.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

What is the principal reason someone would want to build a casino in or around Gettysburg? Is it due to the battleground and the millions of people who visit it. Gettysburg is an outdoor classroom, allowing visitors to walk in our American ancestors' footsteps... To me, those who would visit because they have a free minute from gambling .. will not show the respect due.....  
greg haugens(9 July 2010)

This type of thinking by Federal wildlife officials is typical. I have seen officials drive two miles over the beach in a big four wheel drive SUV to tell me that I am not allowed to stand next to my kayak at the low tide line on sand that will be underwater in another hour. I'm not disturbing any nesting birds and certainly not harming anything as much as they are with their heavy vehicle. Their only policy is to make it a hassle and unpleasant to be in the vicinity of the very place they seek to protect. If I can't ever see it or ever go to the area without a hassle even when I am not impacting the environment, why should I or anyone else ever give much support to their efforts? Aren't these the same people who stood by while millions of horse shoe crabs were chopped up for bait to catch eels, bringing a 80% reduction to the very bird populations they proclaim they are protecting? Pay attention to what counts and loosen up on the stupid inflexible rules that make any appreciation of the outdoors a Nazi experience. "If no one but Federal biologists are aware of the natural assets, don't be surprised if local officials propose developing the refuge site for commuter ferry landings, school bus parking lots, or other inappropriate uses." Don't be surprised if people vote to cut back on the budget that hires all these guys either.

Quoting a list is not an answer to the question I posed. Is there a stated reason these things are on the endangered list set by \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in the blank). Are you saying, in quoting that list, that OHV's, road use by modern methods, are what caused this list? How big was that list say 50 years ago, 100 years ago, 200 years ago? Were the same organisms on it then. Honestly, I am not a biologist nor do I pretend to be, however, common sense tells me making wilderness areas that keep wheels out, (bicycles included), or any motorized equipment out is not an answer to saving the whales or planet. This time I say whales due to the endangered sturgeon on that list, especially the gulf sturgeon. Colorado is not home to sturgeon, wilderness areas are not going to save them. Inappropriate wilderness designations do not mean that suddenly any endangered species will then flock to the new wilderness en masse, as if in a great rush to save themselves through the benevolent graces of the worthy all knowing self proclaimed saviors of the endangered.

I keep reading the same mantra, "save the plants, animals, land, planet, etc" - (leaving out whales here). Can anyone please inform us which of these specifically are being endangered? I am not asking for generalities, rather, refer to Colorado Wilderness endangered species. How are they endangered? Endangered from what? When I backpack in a 'Designated Wilderness Area' in Colorado, aside from roads, I see no difference in the forested area than the neighboring National Forest Lands. What and where are all these endangered things that suddenly move to the new 'protected lands'. I honestly do not see the destruction of lands, resources, sentient beings as some claim. There are rare, isolated cases, yes, but not nearly on the scale to match the great Wilderness Land Grab of late.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Makes me sick to see all the 'new' wilderness areas, as though this land is only now being discovered. Hogwash. The real wilderness areas are where our founding pioneers didn't tread with carts on roads because those lands are impossible to build roads through. Leave those lands alone, as is, period. The lands with roads, many in the designated so-called 'roadless areas' are not wilderness material. The wilderness areas are unique, we know which lands those are and have already set them aside. NO MORE Wilderness Area Designations, least we put up a sign at the Cities exit boundaries saying, "Wilderness Area - Stay on Pavement".

No more Government involvement in any issues related to public lands, thank you very much. Especially with catch phrases such as 'steering committee'. What is wrong with land use now, other than all the restrictions on it, much of which were put in place by our esteemed governor himself. If the economy, due to recreation is placed at \$10 billion a year from the SCORP summary, is the goal of a 'steering committee' to cut that amount in half? We are living the results of our esteemed elected official through curtailing a booming economy on the western slope with HIS idea of land use. Enough already with the agenda based BS catch phrases such as; Award Winning, SCORP and so on. Again, no thank you, please.

To quote, "All roadless areas protected under Clinton should be in this category." These 'roadless areas' set aside under Clinton are not ROAD LESS. It is a misnomer. There are many roads in these areas that should be used to our advantage for forest access and responsible recreation. Forest access NOW and for future generations, not when congress decides. It is not the Kings land, it is public land for public use. Keep open areas accessible for family's with children, grandparents, physically handicapped or mentally challenged, everyone should be allowed to enjoy the great outdoors.

Wetlands in the Praire Pothole Region (PPR) are being drained for farmland at an alarming rate. These wetlands are vital to waterfowl and reduce flooding. They provide a vital food source for waterfowl in the spring and provide brood rearing habitat. Wetlands reduce flooding by holding back the surge of water in the spring time. Since drain tiles have been implemented, water is drained straight into river and lake systems causing floods annually. It is time to put an end to wetland draining and preserve the PPR for future generations. Please visit this website for more information!! { <a href="http://www.epa.gov/owow/wetlands/types/pothole.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I have been privileged to tour three Civil War battlefields, Franklin in Tennessee, Vicksburg in Mississippi and Perryville in Kentucky. All three contributed greatly to my understanding of the Civil War. Without these sites being preserved, future generations will not be able to understand physically what happened in those four momentous years. I am strongly in favor of battlefield preservation so that they can truly have something more than books to understand the past history of the United States.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Designate the Long Path as a National Scenic Trail. The Long Path has been a work in progress for more than 75 years. It currently stretches almost 400 miles through New Jersey and New York, from New York City's George Washington Bridge to Altamont, NY (near Albany), where it abruptly ends at a stop sign on a street corner. Designation as a national scenic trail would give the Long Path necessary protection and would help efforts to extend the trail north to a permanent terminus in the Adirondacks (perhaps Whiteface Mountain, the northernmost point originally proposed by Vincent Schaefer in the 1930s). This idea was endorsed by the Schenectady (NY) Daily Gazette. The Long Path Trail Study Act, which would have create a study to determine the viability of this idea, was proposed in Congress in 2008 but never made it out of committee.

I don't think that's true, (I've never heard that claim before, and it doesn't seem like you can substantiate it either). Many local people don't know about the trail, let alone oppose it. A lot of people who I've spoken to near the current trail either didn't know the trail existed, or they did know about it and enjoyed hiking on it. Designation as a National Scenic Trail would give the Long Path more publicity, and the additional users of the trail would be supporting the local economies in upstate New York in towns near or on the trail. I agree that the glass is half full; but it would be great if we could fill the glass completely.

National dirt bike friendly singletrack trail system would be great! If dirt bikers were involved it would happy overnight and cost nothing.

The largest property owner pays no property taxes and increasingly does not contribute to the local economy. The Forest Service in Lassen National Forest (N. California) is crippling the local economy of Chester, CA by systematically reducing recreation, and timber harvesting. In Chester Ca the Forest Service has reduced several recreation opportunities.. -ripped out the local ski area -eliminated most off road riding through the Travel Management Plan... No single track. Off roaders can only ride on some dirt roads... Forest Management / Timber harvesting has been choked for fear of litigation. Management by across the board closure is not management

The idea of preserving more wilderness & historic areas is great except for one thing - the Federal government is BROKE. We cannot continue to borrow money and spend, spend, spend. The amount of Federal debt for every man, woman and child in this country already amounts to over \$30,000 per person. Why is the Federal government trying to financially break the US? What's the hidden agenda?

I live in an area surrounded by National Parks, wilderness, BLM, and Forest Service lands. That is why I am here. Keeping the people from lighting up the natural lands is hard. NPS has a good program, although it could be more extensive. NFS and BLM need to press their local supervisors to work with people and communities that want to control lighting and make the natural experience better. NFS and BLM should establish clear policies and develop practices for local supervisors so they know that it is part of their job, and know what to do about it.

The places where our ancestors fought. America is what it is today, for ALL Americans because of what they did. Hallowed ground that should be preserved.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to keep public lands open for all recreational use, and stop closing them off. Everyone deserves the right to enjoy the trails and take in all the spectacular wonders around them. We love to hike, bicycle and ride dirt bikes, but many of the areas are being roped off. We need to stop the environmentalist from shutting them down!

Section (d) (4) (2) of the Wilderness Act states: "the grazing of livestock where established prior to the effective date of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are deemed necessary by the Secretary of Agriculture." This also applies to BLM wilderness.

The spectacular landscapes of Utah's redrock country and other wild places throughout the West deserve permanent protection as designated wilderness. However, while Congress works on legislation, many of these proposed wilderness lands are at risk. In 2003, Bush Interior Secretary Gale Norton entered into a settlement agreement with the State of Utah in which the Interior Department adopted the novel and unprecedented legal position that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lacked power under the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) to designate new wilderness study areas (WSAs) on BLM lands. This "No More Wilderness" settlement dramatically curtailed existing and frequently used authority by previous secretaries (including Reagan Interior Secretary Jim Watt) to identify and designate wilderness-quality lands as WSAs. Instead, the settlement declared that the BLM's ability to designate new WSAs expired in 1991, when the separate provision authorizing the BLM's initial 15-year review of roadless BLM lands terminated. The "No More Wilderness" settlement opened the door for the BLM to essentially give away wilderness-caliber public lands to the oil and gas industry and motorized users in places the BLM itself recognizes as wilderness-quality. This includes 6 million acres in Utah; 650,000 acres in Colorado; over 5.5 million acres in Arizona and over 2 million acres in New Mexico. The settlement was inconsistent with every prior administration's interpretation of the BLM's obligation to designate new WSAs. However, even under the agreement's plain terms, the settlement did not bind future administrations to that faulty interpretation of the law. We urge the BLM to make sure the West's wild lands retain their wilderness character by overturning the "No More Wilderness" settlement and designating new wilderness study areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Every person who has commented on this idea has said something truly valuable. The importance of maintaining policies that reflect the diversity of lifestyles, spiritual and scientific values, and complicated recreation economics of rural communities is clear. However, that we may learn from each other, see first the possibility of a new friend before an old enemy, and use such policies pragmatically and for mutual benefit, is not so easy, is it? So what are the sticking points? I consider myself a member of wildlife conservation community that includes, rather than rejects, hunters and fishermen. I myself love to cast a line although I rarely do. Here are the aspects that make me uneasy, the things that make me think twice about promoting this idea: road access and OHV use; denial by some of scientific evidence that wolves benefit prey populations and 'run rampant' when they are not managed; and, most importantly, a tendency for us all to visualize a line drawn on the ground...us over here, and them over there. Irresponsible OHV use on public lands is not a hunter/non-hunter issue. It is a reverence issue. If, by some small chance, our policies and maps and access rules are indeed formed in the service of healthy habitats and wildlife, then everybody posting in this thread should be able to say, "No, it's not right that somebody decided to break their own trail on an ATV though that skunk cabbage patch in the dry season..." Ecosystem health. Science has never been about forming new and more insidious methods of arguing why hunter access to public lands should be restricted for the benefit of the leftist side of the conservation community. Science, for better or worse, serves itself. It's simply knowledge. It goes through a rigorous review process. It can sometimes be challenging to apply in real life. It is non-denominational. It can be incorporated by hunters, helping them to understand the impacts they are having on populations and anticipate the moment, if any, when those impacts become too severe for an ecosystem to endure. Likewise, the same science can attempt to confirm sustainable levels of harvest. It is reverent to seek knowledge that we may be better stewards, on either 'side.' It is terrible to contrive methods of twisting knowledge to support a preexisting ideological position. On the wolf question, there is no better book than Barry Lopez's, "Of Wolves and Men."

I went to Gettysburg for July 4th. What a magnificent Civil War battlefield experience. We honor those who fought by saving battlefield sites. Stop the developers and corporations (e.g, Walmart and Disney) who would impinge upon these sites. They are a legacy for future generations.

I believe many government agencies are trying to satisfy the public's need for more nature projects. However, I think the government should empower more people and organizations to steward lands beneficial to the public. For example, the BLM governs hundreds of thousands of acres and has little man power to improve these lands. "We the People," need to stop relying on the government to create these projects for our children and force the government to give us back our land. "We the People," can decide how best it should serve the public. We do this by land stewarding and land grants for non profits that benefit our communities. I am tired of seeing the government give more rights to big companies for drilling oil and natural gas, then using public lands for projects that could help our children.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe private land owners and non profits organizations have a better idea of the public wants and how best to suite its needs. We need to take back our lands and use them. I am tired of watching the government give big oil and gas companies full rein of public lands. I see a lot of OHV trails closed for rehabilitation with a natural gas tank sitting in the middle of it. I guess this means its okay for a tanker truck to run over habitation, but not a four wheeler?

Unfortunately, for every one path open to OHV, I find at least a dozen closed for habitat conservation. The government seems to think that land conservation is buying big chunks of land and limiting anyone access to use it for anything. I strongly believe that non profit organizations, with the help from the public, could do more to improve public lands.

".....how about simply equal access and a sustainable plan for our use." Well said! There are many of the "green" ilk who, for all intents and purposes, would like to see every area possible turned into wilderness. I saw a bumper sticker that I thought spoke volumes  
..... Wilderness --- Where NOBODY goes ! As for electric-powered vehicles, everyone should read the reports on the TRUE carbon footprint of a Prius or other such vehicle. See the spot in Canada that processes the nickle necessary for the batteries. Figure out the electricity necessary to charge said vehicle and realize that it is produced at coal or gas fired plants. Soon you will understand the "Law of Unintended Consequences"

Ban Off Road Vehicles (ORV or OHV) from National Forests near water. These vehicles are only used by a few but they destroy the trails and streams with mud and runoff. These noisy vehicles make quiet enjoyment of the outdoors impossible and should only be allowed in limited areas that do not have ecological significance.

I'm in favor of keeping designated wilderness wild, and identifying and protecting more wilderness. Designated wilderness still will be a small part of land owned by the taxpayers. Designating it was wilderness will make sure that it is (1) not developed and (2) kept for the protection of water supplies and wildlife habitat. Please note that hunting is allowed in DW if it is allowed in the lands from which the wilderness was designated. Which usually means yes for national forests and not for national parks, for example.

For 10 years my family and I camped in the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreational Area in our "second home" on the edge of the dunes. In 1994 Sen. Feinstein helped to pass S21 and now that area is Wilderness. Some of our best memories happened there and now we can't take our grandchildren there unless we hike in. We have plenty of Wilderness areas in my opinion. These areas are set aside for "future" generations but there is no time frame as to WHEN.

Here in CA the "Green Sticker" program does work when the state doesn't steal from it. They owe us now over 70 Million from our long term fund. And another 50 Million from years ago they never paid back.

Here in Iowa the state steals the money or sequesters it to show a balanced budget. Either way it is not used for the purposes it was collected to fund.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

HistoriCorps is an idea already in action. It's purpose is to save special places on public lands by teaming preservation experts with volunteers to work on the restoration of cabins, ranch houses, and other types buildings on or eligible for the National Register. Participants get to work on historically significant publicly-owned buildings on U.S. Forest Service lands with the purpose to returning them to productive use as rental facilities that can be enjoyed by hikers, equestrians, campers and others. Along the way, participants learn preservation and building trades job skills, get to work in the great outdoors, meet interesting people and have fun while making special places on our public lands more accessible and useful to anyone who wants to experience them. Colorado Preservation, Inc, the U.S. Forest Service and Volunteers for Outdoor Colorado began to pilot this new initiative in the Rocky Mountains in the Fall of 2009 (over one third of Colorado's lands are owned and managed by state and federal agencies). Mandated to preserve the historic resources under their control, our public land managing agencies, like the Forest Service, have core missions that often make it difficult to meet their legal obligation to safeguard our cultural resources. HistoriCorps is a solution to this problem that extends the capacity of our state and federal agencies to preserve historic resources while also reducing the costs, ultimately shouldered by the taxpayers, to get the work done. Although initiated in Colorado, HistoriCorps is an initiative that will work anywhere in the U.S. and with any agency (BLM, DOD, NPS, etc.). You can help by asking your public officials to learn more about HistoriCorps by going to [www.historicorps.com](http://www.historicorps.com) and/or contacting Colorado Preservation's HistoriCorp manager, Jonas Landes, at [jlandeshistoricorps.org](mailto:jlandeshistoricorps.org)

I like \_\_\_\_\_'s idea, and I agree with \_\_\_\_\_. Celebrities, more often than not, detract from the message. I would rather hear from the scientist or engineer.

It is very hard to change the public opinion of Off-Highway Vehicles (OHV). Our media does a wonderful job highlighting the 2% of idiots that give our recreation a bad name. Over a Thanksgiving weekend at the Imperial Sand Dunes will see over 150,000 visitors. The media will highlight the idiots, not the thousands of families that come together to have a fun time and respect the rules. It is not uncommon to see 3 or 4 generations of a family at the dunes, it isn't just about the OHV use, it is about the camping and being with nature. You can see much more in a day of our beautiful country on an OHV than hiking. We hike as well, ride bicycles over 50 miles a week and always leave an area cleaner than when we arrived. Pack it in, Pack it out!

Nothing can replace the educational and patriotic value of walking the ground over which Civil War soldiers fought. These precious lands must be saved before they are lost.

Public lands are FOR the people and not to be closed to the people. I am one of the people of this country and I want, demand, access to my public lands!

Stop that darned WalMart at the Wilderness. Good heavens, once it is paved it is gone forever. And that Casino at Gettysburg! What are we thinking! J.R. Reddig

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The American bison is largely listed as an agricultural species in most states. Usually, at best, it is listed as both a game and agricultural species. This idea is to have it listed as a game species only in all states, and therefore managed as such. Part of this idea is to euthanize ANY bison, private or public) that are not 100% pure in their DNA(basically, no bovine DNA allowed). Treatment as a game species, as it should be, would create the push for habitat to be set aside much as we do to any threatened species. As bison are a keystone species, protecting it, will protect and promote other threatened and endangered species. The estimates for pure bison population in the United States are shockingly low, and illustrate the need for protection.

The biggest challenge I am running into is pollution, and specifically a form of pollution that knows no boundaries: CO2 greenhouse gas pollution. You can draw whatever boundaries you want and say "This is a National Park" or "This is a Designated Wilderness Area" but CO2 will still go there and destroy the environment, and do so a rate which is so fast and so expensive to US citizens that any other effort you take Except real CO2 reductions will amount to vacuaous "Greenwashing." For example, environmental economists have done an inventory of the economic value of the Puget Sound environment to its residents and that value ends up being about \$1,000,000 per citizen. But climatologists are saying that our fossil fuel consumption is destroying the planet at a rate of about 1% a year. This means \$10,000 real economic loss per year per citizen of the Puget Sound Region due to CO2 pollution. Compared to about \$100 a year per citizen to get started with Cap and Trade. This means investments in reducing Fossil Fuel Consumption PAYS BACK to each citizen about \$100 in reduced environmental economic damages per each \$1 invested in cleaning up our act! Climatologists say the planet cannot wait any longer! Let's Go! Use the President's EXISTING Authority under sections 115 and 615 of the Clean Air Act and DO IT!

The Civil War battlefields bring history alive to the visitor and preserve the memory of the of the brave and valiant soldiers who fought in those many battles. In honor of those who sacrificed so much we need to preserve those battlefields.

The United Desert Gateway is a perfect example of a partnership between the local communities and the BLM at the Imperial Sand Dunes Recreational Area in CA. It recognized that the management of public lands in the region presented a significant opportunity to build collaborative stewardship that will allow participation by the local Gateway Communities, the off-highway vehicle community and other interest groups in public land management planning, stewardship/education/outreach programs and to respond to impacts of public use on public land. This works and works well. Read more here: { <a href="http://www.blm.gov/ca/news/newsbytes/2006\_partners/udg.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } We need more of these that let the local people decide how best to manage their backyard and not a one size fits all approach from Washington DC.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are many areas that are essentially ghost towns on the Great Plains, north to south, that could use such an economic boost. This would need to be implemented as several vast restored to pristine condition tracts of land, connected by migration corridors managed in a human co-existing fashion. In the end, the park size should salvage, and restore, the uniqueness, of the Great Plains, in all of its locations(north, south, east, to west). As our largest biome, the square miles of the parks and corridors should reflect that fact, and eclipse all other national parks in this aspect. To accomplish this, thinking outside the box of the national park constraint should be considered. For instance, restricted land use(no cattle, no non-native farming, wildlife friendly building) should be considered rather than eliminating human settlement. Allow Native American reservations to participate. Rather than just having land set aside in a park(there should be at least 1 park for nature preservation sake), allowing and working with private land owners to create environments for native wildlife to thrive and migrate in the plains should be part of the Great Plains Biological Conservation System. The goal should be to restore the plains to near pre-European occupation beauty, diversity, and wildlife population counts. In areas of co-existence, obviously this would be a compromise to gain migration corridors. Think of it in terms of preserving biology rather than just the land. Connecting the park land via non-park but restricted migration corridors.

There are millions of acres of designated wilderness lands that are already off-limits to "the oil and gas industry and motorized users". So can somebody explain why we need bills that seek to expand these areas thus further limiting public lands from benefiting the general public?

This sounded like a good idea until I read, "Our hope was to one day encourage the government to create a national program called Take Care of Your Share " Keep the government out of it and maybe it will work, let them get a hand-hold and it's a flop, worse than a flop, it will become detrimental to the cause and goals you are seeking.

We bike along the San Gabriel Riverbed. There are so many parks along the trail I can't see the need for any additional open space. We bike the whole trail too, from Seal Beach to the Angeles Forest. Would like to see a bike trail on Walnut Creek, that would be nice. We really don't see the need for the Duck Farm property plan, its only a couple miles to Whittier Narrows and Legg Lake parks.

We have plenty of areas now set aside that our government can't take care of and puts so many restrictions on. There is Threatened Species in the Imperial Sand Dunes, the Peirson's Milk-vetch, yet you can't water it, take seeds to grow them or transplant them. Does this help the plant survive?

You do a wonderful job \_\_\_\_\_, nice to have seen you at the LA listening session. And thanks for your hard work on the video that everyone should see. { <a href="http://www.trailsintrouble.org/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } We have members that can only explore our beautiful lands by vehicle. These folks can not enjoy any Wilderness areas due to there non-mechanical restrictions.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is probably one of the best ideas yet! The NPS and USFS have good programs that have languished because of a lack of funding for projects and personnel.

Since many years I take particular interest in the study of the American Civil War which gave birth to the Nation as it exists today. In remembering the Past, we of the present day can build a better future for generations to come. Therefore the preservation of the hallowed grounds of the Civil War is of paramount importance. It is our sacred duty to fulfill this obligation to those, both Blue and Gray who fell for the defense of the values and rights they were told to fight for.

The government is already encroaching in the San Juan Mountains. Over 120 forrest roads were closed last year. Barriers are up in the form of burms, huge boulders and barrier gates. All access roads off of Rock Creek, for example, in the eastern San Juan range are closed with barrier gates. No access allowed. The only access is via walking or horseback to maneuver around the blockades. The roads have become "cherry stems" with access on the main road, turn around and come back. Huge disappointment. The aging population and the younger population cannot access this magnificent area. What purpose is possibly served? Only those that are young & physically agile can have access. Logic is lost.

My family and I are avid campers and backpackers. Over the years, we have learned to avoid some of our previously favorite places as they have been opened to OHV use. OHVs turn previously pleasant trails into mud pits or dust wallows, depending on the weather. OHV noise makes it impossible to listen for wildlife, and negates the whole purpose of getting out into the quiet of nature. It is heartbreaking to hike out to a favorite meadow or creekside to find that some OHV user has been there mudding, turning patches of delicate wildflowers and pristine streambanks into a churned morass. OHV use disturbs wildlife, destroys trails, and spreads pollution and noxious weeds. It should be limited to already disturbed areas, not promoted as a viable use of our already limited wild lands.

The only problem with opening public lands to OHV use is that it makes it impossible for other users to enjoy them. OHVs scare horses, destroy hiking trails, and spread pollution and noxious weeds. Also, too many OHV users see no problem with riding through streams and delicate meadows, turning as much of the backcountry as they can reach into eroding disaster areas.

The good ideas are all here ... connect and finish the trails ... make them as urban population accessible as possible. I would add ... how about sections of the trails that are bike accessible and maybe some as motorized accessible if there were noise level restrictions?

"Experience on every continent has shown that only in strictly protected areas are the full fauna and flora of a region likely to persist for a long period of time." What is meant by strictly protected areas? "limited human access" From Noss, et al., *Continental Conservation*. This is why conservation proposals sometimes revolve around excluding certain types of access. We need other species for our own continued existence. Yet, we are quickly losing many of them because we are too often unwilling to limit our activity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Sadly, there are conflicts here that run deeper than what can be resolved in this forum. I think the point about the statistics, though, is that choosing numbers from different studies involving different methods, definitions, time frames, age groups, etc., doesn't lead to accurate conclusions. You have to look at each study one at a time, and see what conclusions the numbers in that study lead to. For example: The US Forest Service's study: { <a href="http://www.srs.fs.usda.gov/trends/Nsre/Rnd1t13weightrpt.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Scroll down to Table 2, which shows a comparison of the different types of recreation for ages 16 and up, revealing that 17.4% enjoy ORV, ATV or Motorcycle use, which is actually exceeded by hiking (32.7%), birding (31.8%), and a number of other outdoor activities. It's admirable that you want to share an activity you love with others, but I see no data that support your statements.

And why should the uses be exclusive? If someone enjoys birding and also enjoys motorized use, they check off both uses. If someone enjoys hiking, biking and motorized use, they check off all three. Therefore, the results should reflect ALL the people who enjoy motorized use, even those who enjoy other outdoor activities, and the 17.4% should be accurate. Capiisce? I never said that participation in motorized rec. is exclusive of non motorized rec. I'm not sure where you got that.

Dear Secretary Salazar, With the massive oil spill threatening to kill marine life across the Gulf of Mexico, please withdraw your approval of Shell's plan to begin exploratory drilling in the Beaufort Sea, off the coast of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. With the polar bear and other Arctic wildlife already suffering the terrible impacts of global warming, the last thing they need is a devastating oil spill that cannot be cleaned up in the ice-bound waters. The American public has voiced overwhelming opposition to oil development inside the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge--and we won't stand for a backdoor attack on its sensitive coastline. Please reject Shell's reckless scheme, which would endanger the spectacular wildlife of our greatest unspoiled Arctic wilderness and its coastal waters.

Do you really mean bring back recess, or would it be better to expand physical education? Middle and high schoolers often spend recess standing around socializing. Physical education on the other hand, involves a required, supervised activity. I would support expanding the latter, and incorporating more outdoor nature-type activities.

Euthanize ANY bison that is not 100% pure? Seems like a waste of DNA to me. There must be a better way to protect the bison.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Funding more NP and NF rangers, esp. backcountry rangers, would go a long way. It's great that people are eager to head out into the wilderness, but many do so without the knowledge or education of how to treat/respect the wilderness or even how to survive in it. The presence of rangers (w/o guns please! they shouldn't be cops!) helps to educate people and will help to preserve our lands. I see so much trash in the backcountry, tp under rocks, fire rings in meadows, people cutting down tree branches, food left out so bears & other critters can get at it, etc, etc, but there's no one around to explain why these behaviors are detrimental. In the past 10 years, I've seen a backcountry ranger maybe 2 or 3 times, but many many people being thoughtless and careless. President Obama -- you want people to get outdoors? Great! But please provide the support to maintain the outdoors at a level it deserves. The land needs to be managed, i.e. fuel reduction for decreased wildfires and trail maintenance, but why should that "management" include logging and grazing? How does that serve us or the land?

I agree. Some excellent ideas have been posted on this site, but teaching ecology is potentially much more far reaching than many of them, because it arms future generations with what they need to make informed decisions about resource use and management, to recognize that their own activities impact many other species, and to understand that we humans actually need those other species for survival. Ecology needs to be part of standard public school curricula. This can easily be incorporated into science classes, and even history, as \_\_\_\_ points out: How did past civilizations use resources, and how did that lead to their rise and/or decline? What did it have to do with the disease that wiped them out? Why did they thrive and then starve? And so forth. Go here, and promote, so future generations won't need a forum like this one: { [Link](http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/AF9E289C790DF2B68625772100497AE4?OpenDocument) }

I agree. Consumptive use does not equate with better stewardship. Much more effort to teach stewardship should accompany any effort to encourage consumptive use. In my neck of the woods, discarded pieces of fishing line are almost as common as blades of grass around any fishing area. During deer hunting season, you can find trash bags of decapitated deer on the side of the road, punctuating the collections of discarded beer cans. That said, I think encouraging fishing and hunting CAN be a great way to reconnect people with the outdoors.....BUT stewardship does not follow naturally for many people, and needs to be actively taught if the ultimate effects of fishing and hunting are to be positive.

I agree, also. I am constantly amazed at how many easy, EASY things we could do to reduce and recycle, yet we do not do them. Carry our own water in reusable containers. Bring our own reusable containers for restaurant leftovers. Reusable shopping bags. And so on...

I agree. We do not need to make OUR PUBLIC LANDS more restrictive.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am not a lawyer, but did a little reading on this issue of wilderness access for the disabled. It is a good point that wilderness areas are generally not accessible to people with certain disabilities. On the one hand the American with Disability Act requires access, yet the Wilderness Act requires wilderness preservation. From what I can gather, the consensus, to the point that there is one, seems to be that access should be made possible to the extent that it does NOT degrade wilderness. This can include widening trails, if that will make them wheel chair accessible. But, since motorized vehicles do degrade wilderness, they are generally not considered an acceptable solution to handicapped access. I hope people are aware by now that this argument of handicapped access to wilderness areas is an argument frequently used by able-bodied, ambulatory individuals who are simply seeking motorized access for their own use, not for disabled people. If motorized access is allowed in a wilderness area to accommodate the disabled, I would argue that ONLY the disabled and their traveling companions should be granted motorized access. If you can walk, you have no need for a vehicle in a wilderness area.

I am not a mountain biker, but this is too extreme even for me. (I am assuming you are talking about non-motorized bikes, by the way, so if not, please clarify.) "Any natural area" is too broad. Does that include, for example, even a several hundred acre piece of conservation land in a suburb? Surely we can accommodate mountain bikers in some natural areas. Yes, mountain biking is more harmful than hiking, but it is still small potatoes, relatively speaking. Let's devote our efforts to bigger battles, such as the more harmful vehicles. At least people get good exercise when mountain biking.

I don't know where those statistics come from, but I know many, many, many more people who regularly enjoy hiking, than OHV use. OHV use has negative environmental impacts. It's not what I would want to encourage young people to do, and should be limited or excluded in some locations.

I guess some of us are interpreting the great outdoors initiative more loosely than others. This idea certainly relates to protecting and respecting our environment, so it works for me, even though it doesn't address how to get people off the couch and out the door, or how to protect a piece of land.

I think Patricia went overboard in some of her statements and language, thereby alienating many people. This is unfortunate, because the thrust of it, especially what is enumerated in her second to last paragraph, is spot on. If we want to halt, or at least slow, the current extinction crisis, we DO need large core areas of wild land, far better connectivity, and a return of large predators in meaningful numbers. I also agree that wildlife should be managed with "general public funds". Try to get past her zeal and extreme language, and focus on what she actually suggests, before voting on this one. All of it will better protect biodiversity, a good thing for all of us and for future generations.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think some people like to reduce the how-much-wilderness-is-enough debate to a question of how much land hikers need. They avoid the question of how much wilderness is needed for wildlife to thrive, because the answer to that question is in conflict with their own desires for land use. An abundance of scientific data has shown beyond any reasonable doubt that large wilderness areas are necessary to maintain the full diversity of species. And by all accounts, the 5% of land in the US that has been designated as wilderness, is not enough, nor does it represent an adequate diversity of habitats.

I think we need to consider the use of land not just by people, but by other species as well. It is well documented that we are in the midst of an extinction crisis. It is also well documented that an ecosystem functions best when its full complement of species is present. Because we are dependent on healthy ecosystems for clean water, clean air, and food, it is in our own best interest if we limit access to land when it helps preserve other species. Some human activities cause more disturbance or damage to wildlife than other human activities. Generally, ORV use, mountain biking, and horse back riding cause more disturbance than hiking. That is why they should be restricted in some areas, not because one form of recreation is somehow superior than any other, or because one group prefers one type of recreation over others.

Incorporate ecology into public school core science curricula. Encouraging outdoor recreation is a great thing, but in the absence of environmental education, one's interest in the outdoors might be limited to his/her chosen form of recreation, and good stewardship is not a given. Further, not everyone enjoys outdoor activities, and many people see little or no intrinsic value to nature. But everyone has an interest in human health. People need to learn about the connection between biodiversity and human health. The public needs to be made aware of the link between habitat degradation and loss of ecosystem services, such as clean water, clean air, flood control, etc. They need to understand that many medical treatments were initially derived from plants or animals, and that species loss is a loss of opportunity for future medical innovation. They need to understand that our current food plants and animals, as will any future food plants and animals, ultimately derive from wildlife. They need to know that all over the world, habitat degradation has been linked to outbreaks of human infectious diseases. Those who have some knowledge of this will be more motivated to be good stewards. This information is already finding its way into public schools, but it needs to become more of a central focus, not limited to enrichment programs, extra credit projects, or aside activities. What could be more important for human survival?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No, not worried about the risks of showing reality. But this idea specifically addresses after school nature clubs, which are elective, voluntary programs. Bringing in rehabbers and other presenters simply does not attract many kids. Even if they bring in wild animals, maimed or intact, for show and tell. Any sort of humane education should be done during school hours, for all to experience. What you suggest would be only a small part of what needs to happen, but it would be a start -- more than what is currently done about it. Which, in most schools, is nothing. I totally agree that kids who respect the animals around them will better appreciate the big picture. For a great (in my opinion) educational video on treatment of farm animals:  
[http://www.ciwf.org.uk/resources/education/farm\\_animals\\_us.aspx](http://www.ciwf.org.uk/resources/education/farm_animals_us.aspx) If you are aware of anything similar to the above involving wild animals, please enlighten.

ORV users might argue that this contradicts the goal of "reconnecting" people with the outdoors. But I believe that, in addition to your point, Mark, about restoring calm and peace, this pushes people to understand that "connecting" also means recognizing that whatever you do affects other people and other species. That is, reconnecting is not merely about getting out the door, but also about acknowledging our interconnectedness with all other species.

Please note statement above: "I do not accept all of the hoopla over bio-diversity". There are still many Americans who believe this is not science, but some sort of conspiracy. Others don't even know what the word means. This is not their fault. Rather, it underlines the fact that this most important information, which is necessary for people to make informed decisions about resource utilization and management, has not been formally taught in schools. Let's change that and make Ecology a required part public school education so our kids will make better decisions than we have. And try to educate older folks yourself. Go to these ideas and promote: { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/E118891F73A7045D862577350048ACC8?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/AF9E289C790DF2B68625772100497AE4?opendocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Right on. Because part of the problem has been lack of role models. Kids no longer pursue outdoor adventures because the last few generations have become disengaged from nature, and there is no one to take them back packing or rafting, to teach them to hunt or fish, or to tell them how exciting all of that is.

Those were not "my" statistics, they are from a study by the US forest service. The idea author himself referenced a USFS study in support of his claim, and in a subsequent comment implied that we should trust a study by such an entity, since it is not an off road organization. But when we found that the numbers from the USFS study do NOT seem to support his claim, several of you actually turn around and discredit the study as misleading, biased, or hard to interpret! lol!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well heck, I'm not much for readin' books, but they tell me I can't use my skateboard in the public library. So let's close all the public libraries, too. If I can't use them for what I want, then no one else should be able to use them for anything. lol Quite honestly, it would be perfectly fine with me personally if designated wilderness areas were closed to everyone. I hike a lot, but almost always locally, and often on multi-use trails. My interest in restricting use is for biodiversity, which is somewhat selfish because it is ultimately good for people, but also because I think animals should have some space away from human activity. I think that's what they would tell us if they could. We've caused them enough pain and suffering, and driven enough of them to extinction. 5% of the land is not too much to give them, in my mind. We think of all the land as belonging to us, but it is their land, too. Call that selfish and greedy, if you like, but I see it differently. Such is life...

Yes, I agree. Further, while I think these programs sound absolutely wonderful, and love all of this enthusiasm, I am afraid that other equally valuable ideas are getting buried beneath the swamping of comments and repeated idea postings on the TMNP. Also, I wish more of the TMNP folks would take the time to vote on the other ideas, after posting their own comments. We get it. TMNP is an outstanding program, but I don't think continued swamping will be helpful to anyone.

Yes, ORV users should be held accountable for destructive behavior. But those who act badly are only a small portion of the numbers that enjoy OHV use. The answer is NOT TO RESTRICT the areas that can be used. What that does is concentrate the use to smaller areas, thus increasing the impact on the lands. Education and Penalties should be implemented, not closures and restrictions.

- The 150th anniversary commemoration is expected to stimulate renewed interest in the conflict and generate unprecedented tourism to Civil War sites.
- Protection of America's remaining War Between the States battlefields will leave a lasting legacy of national commitment to preservation and conservation.
- Battlefield preservation in Virginia, Georgia, and Mississippi where many significant sites are located, is also vital for protecting local waterways. Parkland created through battlefield preservation near growing population centers like Nashville, Vicksburg and Atlanta and elsewhere can benefit quality of life for residents.

There is already a push to set aside habitat for wild bison. This movement threatens our wild prairies because it ignores the other keystone species: humans. Humans kept the bison moving, which reduced overgrazing. Currently, ranchers prevent overgrazing by herding the cattle onto new grass several times a year. Humans controlled the bison population by hunting, just as ranchers control the cattle population by shipping calves to the feedlots each fall. There is little difference between bison grazing habits and cow grazing habits. The big difference is in how the herds are managed. By declaring all bison to be wild, you remove the tools that ranchers use to ensure that the land is grazed sustainably. The result would be an ecological catastrophe. The best way to preserve our remaining prairies is to preserve the cultures and land management practices that have protected them from the past century of development. To help prairies AND bison, find a way to make bison ranches more economically viable.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The smell of exhaust, the taste of dust and the noise of a motorcycle/ATV makes me crave a hike OHV land.

The State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) cannot effectively do their job of preserving and revitalizing the places of our past without full funding of the Historic Preservation Fund. Linkage with the Land and Conservation Fund only makes sense because cultural resources and natural resources are irreplaceable and part of our heritage and history.

Access carries with it a broad and dangerous definition. It doesn't mean by any means possible. It shouldn't mean "roads" or motorized access-this does nothing by change the definition of wild places into nothing more than motorized trails. Foot and horseback travel are the only two means of access that will keep our wilderness areas preserved. Roads that are being closed don't "close us out", they keep the wilderness areas wild, they give wildlife a chance to survive. You can still walk, hike, camp, ride and leave nothing but footprints. Motorized access is NOT the answer. Science has proven without any doubt that pollutants such as ATV's, Motor cycles, jet boats, snowmobiles and automobiles dismantle and change our pristine wild areas. If you believe motorized access is the answer, you are selfish and unconcerned about wilderness.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ATV's, motorized vehicles have NO PLACE in our Wilderness areas. There is NO NEED for roads as access. Access should not be used as a means for this sort of destruction, decimation and abuse. In southwest Montana, one of the greatest wilderness areas in the world near Yellowstone Park has seen a dramatic increase in ATV and motorized access. I've yet to hear one valid reason for this type of access. Fact is, as more motorized pollutants like ATV's enter our wilderness areas wildlife is displaced, gone, perhaps forever. The damage done by the people who ride these machines is a disaster. I've heard the arguments that these machines allow access to handicapped, older hunters, etc., -that's all CRAP and an appeal from scumbags who obviously don't care or even understand what it means NOT to hear these distractions when we're "out there". As an outfitter, I continually hear public land hunters complain that there's "no elk left"...one actually rode up to me on his atv and asked if I'd seen any elk. Misinformation, marketing to the lazy, that's how these companies continue to get their way. While reading through my "x-favorite" hunting magazine I came across an add for an ATV, the add showed two camo clad, helmet wearing wingnuts tearing through what looked like my favorite trout stream...there was no "designated trail". Anyone with an ounce of integrity should be feeling humiliated by this sort of marketing and write to any magazine editor who takes the money from the very machines that are taking away our wild places. When it comes to hunting from these machines...they use the "getting from point A to B" argument...once again, more CRAP. You aren't going to see, hear or smell anything wild as you gun through the hills and you can bet everything within 5 miles of "point A to B" is gone-you've also ruined hunting for how many other countless hunters who know what hunting means. If you need an atv to pack out your game, your fat and lazy, inconsiderate and misinformed-you're an idiot and I'll be the first to fight against you. I'm asking anyone who cares about wild places to re-think your thoughts on these machines, take a stand for what's right for wilderness, not for selfish interests. Keep riding and you'll keep losing what you never took the time or the first "step" with your own two feet to hear, see, and smell...to enjoy! Nuff Said!

Many of our battlefields are being swallowed up by development and urban sprawl. While I realize we can't halt progress, there must be a balance between new land use and preserving the past. The American Civil War battlefields are worth preserving. Building a casino at Gettysburg, or a WalMart within a stones throw of the Wilderness will bring down the historic value and solemnity of these historic places. Have you ever been to Arlington National Cemetery, which was started after the Civil War? It's on the flight path for one of Washington DC's major airports; it was disheartening to stand on that hallowed ground, trying to pay respects to the dead with the noise of a jet plane flying over! Flashy casino signs and WalMart sprawl have no place near these sacred fields.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In many urban environments (such as my hometown of Los Angeles), the problem is not only a lack of parks but equally importantly a lack of good bicycle connections to those parks that do exist. In an era of limited funding, bicycle infrastructure can be provided at a fraction of the cost of new parks. Not only do family-friendly bikeways improve access to parks, they can serve as recreational facilities in their own right. They improve access to schools and libraries. Unfortunately, they do not make good photo or naming opportunities for elected officials. We need a concerted effort by the federal government to require local governments to make bicycle improvements a required component of receiving federal funding.

Regardless of what one may feel about different recreational activities, it is certainly in my opinion a correct criticism that this Initiative did not start with inclusion of recreational groups as stakeholders invited to the table to speak about conservation from the recreationist viewpoint. The initial "recreation" representatives were institutionalized well established conservation groups whose openly primary, even secondary, missions had little to do with recreation. "Freedom to Roam" is not a recreation model as far as I know unless pronghorn migration corridors are considered a way to get young pronghorns in touch with the outdoors and exercise. It is not however the fault of preservationist organizations that the Administration considered "recreation" to be all about watchable wildlife and not about active or even semi-passive recreation other than the ever popular sloganism around "hunters and fishermen" (as long as they don't shoot or catch anything). Politicians need to know that there are citizens actually on their public lands, more than there are fighting them in their courts, and that those folks recreating on the lands have opinions worth listening to, and most are indeed good stewards and can be equally passionate about wildlife. They also pay lots of taxes and vote - you know, authentic Americans. I do know what some recreation representatives had to do to drum up an invitation to the start of this initiative in D.C.. Same is true for the USFS Forest Planning process. Clearly there is a target audience for both of these national efforts, and that audience has not been the recreation community, including all of those that have spent thousands of hours of volunteerism on stewarding public lands and maintaining the public lands trail systems. I just feel that if you want to debate things like motorized use on public lands, have the courtesy to debate it with motorized users (of which I'm not) - don't just stack the deck with identically minded folks. That isn't a conversation - just a monologue.

There are millions of acres of land out there and it's impossible to access most of it due to it being so remote, hard to get to. I completely agree with you! We need more dirt bike trails and jeep roads. Let's enjoy the land while preserving it.

This post illustrates the kind of lies and subterfuge we are up against. Fanatical radical greens want humans locked out of all land because they are selfish, elitist and misinformed.

Until policy changes are made to include fair practices for all use groups no further wilderness designations should be allowed. Period!

Civil War battlefield protection is a great way to honor our American history AND create more green spaces which families can visit and enjoy. It is a win-win proposition!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Invasive species are a threat to diversity. They colonize and create stands of mono-cultures. This not only decreases native plant diversity but also decreases natural resource values including water sources, grazing land, farmland, wildlife habitat, and recreation.

My husband and I are in our mid-fifties and we both have physical ailments that make most outdoor activities impossible. Off-roading in our Jeep allows us to see areas that would otherwise be completely cut off to us. We know many people who off-road and they, like us, never leave the trail or drive over vegetation. Also, there's a saying off-roaders go by, "Please take out more trash than you bring in". There are thousands of off-road clubs that maintain trails and educate people about responsible off-roading. There is a very small percentage of irresponsible and ignorant hikers, campers, and off-roaders out there. Please don't punish the majority because of a small percentage of the population. We love and respect nature, that's why we love off-roading.

This is an understatement. We have so many places where mining claims have never been cleaned up. Dangerous mine shaft abound in the desert, and suck up money that should have come from the miner who paid so little for the privilege of making the mess. Cattle grazing has also left costly damage, and continues to do so in many streams. Damage from off road vehicles is the new and most costly of all the current damage. Motorcycles rip up every hill destroying all vegetation, leaving scars seen for miles and that don't soon go away. People come in large groups to camp and denude the areas, creating dust bowls, killing vegetation, compacting the soils causing erosion, and destroying habitat necessary for wildlife. Some aggressive riders harrass wildlife, cattle, residents, trespass on private property and threaten government employees. With helmets to cover their faces, and no way of identification they feel immune to any type of control. They are out there to "conquer". That type of "off road enthusiast" leaves far more damage in far less time than many of the miners. This hidden cost must be adequately addressed and no longer subsidized.

I grew up riding in the outdoors with my family and friends and loved it. I just go back into the sport again. I am so sorry to see a lot of the riding areas closed that I used to enjoy. My wife has physical limitations that would keep her from seeing a lot of out great outdoors if it were not for our off road vehicle. Going off roading with family and friends always brings us closer. We always have left the areas we ride in better shape that when we got there. I always hear about all the bad apples but rarely see them. I think most people just want to have fun and enjoy themselves. Our taxes have payed for these areas so we should all be able to keep enjoy them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is stated by the environmental industry that the objectives of creating the Siskiyou Crest National Monument are: Protect the environment. Enhance wildlife habitat. Protect threatened and endangered species. Improve water quality. Increase salmon populations. Increase recreational use. Creating the Siskiyou Crest National Monument will favor none of these objectives. A major result of the creation of such a monument will be huge and intense wildland fires. By removing the existing roads in the area, fire suppression will be both expensive and inefficient. There will be no access for fire crews, fire tankers, water trucks, nor heavy equipment. They speak of restoring the fire regime; that will take a long time and will require road access. The fuel loading and extensive brush fields within this area is such that fires can't be constrained to the area and intensity of fires in the pre-settlement times. Such large and intense fires will degrade, not protect, the environment. Wildlife habitat will be grossly reduced with devastation of old growth habitats required by many threatened and endangered species. These fires will increase soil erosion, thus degrading water quality. The sedimentation of the creek beds within the monument area will prevent salmon from spawning decreasing salmon populations. By removing the roads, recreational use by children, the aged, and the disabled will be abolished. Experience has demonstrated that following these fires most of the land will revegetate to brush. There seldom are more than three species in these brush fields, so the biodiversity will be severely reduced. Yes, the brush provides cover for wildlife, but these brush fields are so extensive that food becomes the limiting factor. No, creation of the Siskiyou Crest National Monument will not accomplish any of these objectives. I would describe the creation of such monument as a "biodisaster."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Because land-use decisions are controlled by local government, too often these decisions favor well-connected financial interests over an interest in conserving the nation's cultural and natural heritage. Overcoming this challenge will require federal and state incentives, such as (i) fostering smart growth in an urban core (e.g., with mass transit dollars), in exchange for local officials' vacating their objections to preservation of deserving areas; (ii) exercising the little-used tool of permit denial when the secondary and cumulative impacts of development projects merit it; and (iii) ending subsidies to destructive development projects in sensitive areas like new highways, airport expansions, tech parks, and massive new town centers. Otherwise, we will leave future generations with little more than a degraded landscape overcome by development. A pointed example is western Charles County in Maryland. This area, bordered by the Potomac River and extending south of George Washington's Mt. Vernon located on the opposite shore, is remarkable for a dense array of historical and natural attributes. Among the natural assets are two globally rare Magnolia Bogs; wetlands of special state concern; a state Sentinel Site, with the greatest reptile and amphibian diversity in Maryland's coastal plain; a state Stronghold Watershed; Tier II streams; Audubon Society Important Bird Areas in Chapman Forest and the riparian forests of Mattawoman Creek; and Mattawoman Creek itself. For years, the Mattawoman has been documented as Maryland's most productive spawning and nursery ground for migratory fish in the Chesapeake Bay, but is now showing signs of a long-predicted decline that correlate with development of the watershed. Among the historic resources are rich archeological grounds predating the colonial era; Araby, the colonial home of George Mason's beloved first wife Ann Eilbeck; Mt. Aventine, a fine example of antebellum architecture and the manor house the Chapman family, who occupied their Potomac plantation and farm from 1750 to 1912; the brick shell of Marshall Hall, a mansion from the early 1700's; General Smallwood's retreat; and extensive land within view of Mt. Vernon across the river in Virginia. The need for additional preservation is widely recognized. On the federal level, the area is squarely within a Treasured Landscape designated through the Chesapeake Bay Executive Order. On the state level, past preservation efforts were admirable, but appear to have stalled when county officials declared intentions to urbanize the area as part of a "development district" 30% larger than Washington D.C. At the NGO level, the Smart Growth Alliance of Washington has, twice, designated the area as a conservation priority to preserve the historic viewshed from Mt. Vernon and to protect Mattawoman Creek. Mattawoman is at the heart of the area. In 2009, it was listed as the 4th most endangered river in the nation by American Rivers because of development pressures that would follow a proposed four-lane highway funded solely by Charles County. Mattawoman is also the focus of the Smarter Growth Alliance for Charles County, a consortium of 23 organizations including the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, Clean Water Action, 1000 Friends of Maryland, and the Sierra Club, who urge the denial of wetland permits for the highway in favor of smart growth alternatives focused on revitalizing the county's urban core in Waldorf. In spite of state and federal agencies recognizing the historical and environmental importance of western Charles County and the threats from over development, county land-use policy has aimed to jumpstart a new urban core here, 11 miles to the east of Waldorf. One aim is to instigate a new Potomac River bridge just south of Mattawoman Creek as part of the outer Beltway that would surely demolish the natural and cultural resources over a wide swath of southern Maryland and beyond. When the site of the massive Potomac-shoreline development



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

of Chapman's Landing was purchased as Chapman Forest (to protect Mt. Aventine and a cornucopia of biodiversity), county plans simply moved a mile north to Bryans Road, a one-stoplight town now proposed to become an even larger new town center of over 22,000. And that's just the beginning. Coupled to this proposal are intended growth magnets in the form of the new four-lane Cross County Connector, with its numerous proposed attached highway spurs, an industrial park on 268 forested acres that blanket one of Mattawoman Creeks finest tributaries, and an airport expansion intended to divert business jets from Reagan National Airport that would no doubt also divert investment from revitalizing the existing urban core in Waldorf. A major challenge to preserving this area are the federal funds directed toward subsidizing inappropriate development, despite the federal status as a Treasured Landscape. Maryland Airport, a small private airport is slated for expansion with 30 million federal dollars. The direct impacts are egregious, with hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of soil expected to be displaced over four years, in part to fill a stream valley. These impacts pale compared to those that would ensue if the airport were to become a reliever for Reagan National, one of the aims of the financial interests and their county government allies, because airports attract massive development. Yet this particular case is hemmed in by Mattawoman and located on a dead-end highway. Alternative sites nearer potential rail infrastructure were never considered—an example of how federal oversight is failing to promote the goal of preserving our heritage. The loss of Mattawoman Creek is assured if business as usual continues, according to a study by the Army Corps of Engineers. Yet Mattawoman's plight and charisma could be used to demonstrate smart growth solutions for the greater Chesapeake Bay. It is not too late to implement smart growth solutions that would preserve the majority-forested watershed by concentrating growth in the existing urban core of Waldorf instead of sprawl development into western Charles County. But federal leadership is needed. Rapid transit between Waldorf and Washington D.C. languishes as county officials steadfastly prioritize highways over mass transit on their list for state and federal funds—lobbying in particular for a Waldorf bypass, yet another new highway to open rural areas to development and part of long-range plans for an Outer Beltway. Federal transportation dollars should be used to leverage preservation and to upgrade the U.S. 301 through Waldorf, rather than be used for bypasses and airports in extremely sensitive area. Overcoming the challenge of local government's opposition to preservation, even as citizens favor it, could occur if federal agencies exercised existing tools. Federal transportation funds represent a powerful lever to implement smart growth principles, because roads and airports nucleate growth. And when considering permits for development, agencies should conduct a comprehensive examination of cumulative impacts that include costs of future restoration, loss of ecological services, climate change impacts, loss of historic authenticity, and a truly substantive alternatives analysis, and should be willing to deny unworthy permits for the sake of present and future generations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I disagree. To begin with, grazing on public land is allowed by a permit, not a lease. The grazing by permit is paid for at less than one tenth of its market value. Many of us have seen our "lifestyle," or occupation change radically, and perhaps adversely in recent years, why should the rancher be protected when the rest of us are not? Do I understand correctly that, we are being asked to sacrifice the productivity of public land for wildlife, watershed, and recreational values so that we can go to the grocery store and pay more than \$10 for one steak that weighs less than one pound? The public's cost in degradation of public land and the cost in water resources to raise beef is just too high in the arid West. Still, I sympathize with the ranch family to the extent of wanting to try to help prolong the viability of their operations by looking for ways to purchase easements, compensate for loss of grazing permits, and decrease subdivision of open landscapes.

I thought the rhetoric sounded familiar. For those that don't know, \_\_\_\_\_ for many years has determined that of all the problems on the planet, mountain bikers would get all the blame that he can possibly garner and throw on them. Discussing this with him is useless. Not sure what the end game is, but you can verify by doing a search on his name. When you look at both sides, someone is clearly "out of touch with reality"... Good comments were elicited though by many of you--to name a few!

It seems that some people want to shut people out of the forests and other outdoor recreation areas over that last few years. Gates are going up all over. Some companies that own parts of the forest are closing their section off unless you buy a \$35 or \$60 pass to get through their gate to access the forest. Rather than cut a tree up and get it off the road, a gate goes up and the road is closed. These National forests are our National forests; and we should have the right to use them responsibly, not be shut out or have to be rich so that we can pay \$35 or \$60 or what ever the cost is so that your family can go through a forest companies gate or paper companies gate to get to the National forest because they bought up the land around it. My family uses OHV to enjoy the outdoors. We go huckleberry picking. We just go for rides to see new areas of the forest that we have not seen. We check out the wildlife. One summer we rode to every fire look out on the map we had. Our children noticed real fast that they were all different, and that it was because of the surrounding area and the hill they were built on. My parents love to take the grandchildren on rides to show them the beauty of the forests, to see animals, and go berry picking. They have shown them many historical places, and old mining places dating back to the 1860's. They have seen where Wyatt Earp had his White Elephant Salloon and gone through ancient cedar groves. I also use my OHV to get to a base camp. Then go out on foot from there to hunt. I ride responsibly, and teach my kids to do the same. Every spring the OHV shop that I bought my OHV from holds a clean up ride. They make it fun for the whole family while everyone is out riding, cleaning up trails. This is all volunteer work. We should not be shut out of the forests, forest roads should not be closed because some one does not want to remove a fallen tree from the road, and we should not have to be rich to be able to have access to our National Forests and recreation areas. Furthermore, OHV allow people with disabilities to experience the great outdoors. I have a friend who got paralyzed falling off a two step ladder, with an OHV, he can experience more of the forests now rather than see just what he could wheel himself through or we could push him through.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHV use promotes economic growth and gives the American people a way to see and enjoy our National Forest lands. Wilderness promotes nothing....except the potential for more job loss as more area is locked up.

If you don't like the OHV, then please, go where we are not allowed, which is almost everywhere. There are fewer and fewer areas where OHV use is allowed and we are getting shut out of existing areas every day. Why is it that so-called "nature lovers" all come to OHV areas and try and recreate there when there are millions and millions of areas set aside where OHVs can not be, then they complain about OHVs being there? Well, it is because our areas are so clean, pristine and accessible that they are great places to get out and enjoy the outdoors. They are not the horrid places that "nature lovers" claim we create. Because we all love being outdoors and all strive for the same thing. Yet the few of you, your hobby is to get rid of us. Strange since we all want the same thing, great outdoors to play in.

Off Highway Recreation is a legitimate, sustainable use of appropriate public lands, particularly on National Forests and Bureau of Land Management Units. And once you drive your car on a dirt road, you are one of us, so don't write off OHV so quick. Because the perception of OHV use is often associated with irresponsible use and is not consistent with the majority, most casual users stereotype OHVs. The majority of OHVs are conservationists, who seek to preserve the same outdoor experiences they enjoy for children and grandchildren. We want the outdoor open spaces and we enjoy using them like everybody else, yet we are being herded into smaller and smaller areas while our numbers are growing. OHVs are volunteers. OHV clubs and organizations groom and maintain trails, trailheads and other facilities as well as adopt trails and provide the tools and experience needed for constructing and maintaining all sorts of recreational trails; not just OHV opportunities. Millions of Americans responsibly enjoy motorized recreation on public lands and you may be one of them who is going to have your recreation taken away from you don't realize how important having this opportunity is.

Thank you all for your comments. I am familiar with the Late Successional Reserves for the Northwest Forest Plan. A positive step, a fine goal, but most of those reserves are far from the population centers of our country. What do I tell my students in Salisbury Maryland when they want to see "old-growth"? Fly to Washington State? The Old-Growth Forest Network will identify an ancient forest (or ancient forest to be) in every county. Reachable by every school child. A drop in the bucket, yes, I agree. But I for one would like to try to put a few drops back into that bucket. If you would like a 5 page proposal of the idea please email me at: jemaloofsalisbury.edu

The BP oil fiasco will shine a spot light on the corporate pirating of minerals from our public lands and waters without adequate compensation. The exposed corruption of the Federal Minerals Management Service will also mean that the time when this can happen will be over soon. As for the farmers and ranchers currently camped out for several generations on Federal lands and paying 10 cent on the dollar to do so, they too will be in the spot light. That may or may not be fair or just, but it is on its way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Northern expansion of several tree killing insect species is a function of a shift in the climate belts to the North and is currently occurring in bands all the way to the Arctic. Yes, the trees should be removed so that they do not provide fuel for forest fires, but re-seeding with the same species is a waste of time. It would be much better to let the natural sequences now occur that will over time will lead to a new but different climax forest. Above all else we must resist corporate pressures to artificially create plantation forest.

"industrial development is hardly taking away any of Montana's heritage....." Sorry Mr. Pippin, but you should see "gasland" and how Dick Cheney allowed the gas co's to bypass the clean water act. Let the public use public land! The big corps already are.

Without conflict they can't gain more donations. They are in the business of creating and marketing ecological conflict! Which is contrary to your suggestion!

As a veteran and former ROTC instructor who took cadets to Gettysburg as part of their professional development I have to say that I've been disappointed in the amount of development that is already in place at Gettysburg (and several other Civil War sites). In several of the areas it's almost impossible to tell how/why the battle flowed because you can't "see" the terrain anymore. If the casino is going into an otherwise empty building I might be able to understand, but what else will be added? Billboards? Parking? additional lanes on the roads? I grew up in western PA. I know all about the need for jobs in the state. I'm just not convinced a casino in Gettysburg is THE answer.

Your argument is factually flawed. Elk are large herd animals subject to the same diseases and land use as bison, yet they are accorded game status. Bison do not "damage" the land in any substantive way, any more than any other large herbivore does. To say that the existence of brucellosis in bison is reason not to accord them game status and to push to protect their range is spurious. Brucellosis is a livestock disease that has spread to bison and elk, not the other way around. Unfortunately, there are only about 6000 genetically pure bison in North America. Managing the brucellosis problem is a major concern, but not reason to dismiss this idea.

Boasting a statement of "Even the OHV crowd should support this, greater habitat and animal populations means some areas now off limits can be opened up to you." is a wolf in sheep's clothing!

Connecting with America's Great Outdoors requires one key element - the ability to get "to America's Great Outdoors". That requires access to public lands. That access is being restricted. Enough wilderness. Manage lands to provide recreation opportunities - motorized touring, camping, hunting, fishing, hiking, and other activities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Cost should not be a barrier to spending time outside, yet it is cited time and again as a top reason for not getting out and spending time in the great outdoors. This is a very legitimate concern as a family of four may spend \$800 - \$2,500 for camping gear. For many that would like to try camping, but aren't sure how often they will camp in a year, this may be a prohibitive expense. Companies such as mountainsidegearrental.com or lowergear.com rent great gear for a fraction of buying gear and make it very easy for people to get out into the wilderness. Too bad more people aren't aware of these resources as they may finally get the family out on that camping trip.

I also had a bad audit experience with an IRS engineer who made false and erroneous statements in reviewing our conservation easement. We had to fight it up to the appeal level where they admitted that the engineer had made mistakes and they dropped the audit. There are certainly some landowners who have abused the conservation easement process with inflated appraisals, but that's no excuse for shoddy auditing. Sincere folks are getting punished along with the abusers. I hope it is not the intention of the IRS to discourage legitimate easements.

I question how another report will help. We already have cabinet level coverage that is responsible to do exactly what you propose. Adding more folks to the Federal level to create/manage the report will only take funds away from where they belong.

I think a fee based use for open space is appropriate. I use the trail so I should help support it. Everyone should pay a annual park permit to use the trails. Currently the only ones who pay are OHV.

I would gladly agree with this having used the PCT in the past for years. Now that I have the age and physical problems that often come with age I can no longer enjoy the trails. I now have to use off-road vehicles and ATV's. In these days of lower funding for recreational needs the government should give "more government recognition" and funding to these types of trails. But more importantly is to realize there is a stronger need by larger user groups than hikers in ATV'ers and Off-roading community. Create separate but very similar multi-use trails to be used and enjoyed in a responsible and environmentally sound way.

In the area we live we are under constant threat and loss of the multi-use off-road trails. There should be a stronger demand for creating safe, well managed, environmentally friendly riding areas for the largest user groups that now use our National Forest for recreation – the ATV and off-road community. With programs put into place along with better enforcement it will greatly reduce "the irresponsible users" on single use type of trails (hiking). Established hiking trails should be enforced and protected as such, but where the strong user need is for other than a single use trails – multi-use trails that all can use should be developed.

It is a win, win situation for preserving our Civil War Battlefields! Not only do we honor our heritage as a GREAT Nation, by preserving the battlefields of the very war that ultimately UNIFIED our nation, but we help the commerce and trade of the very towns that have this heritage. We don't need another casino, nor another Walmart, nor another housing development encroaching on these sacred grounds that must be preserved for our present and future generations!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Much of the cause of the increase in damage to public lands caused by reckless and criminal OHV use is due to lack of funds to patrol these areas and prosecute OHV riders who are where they shouldn't be. If we begin to throw some of these criminals behind bars, or take their OHVs away, then perhaps other riders will stop ignoring the law too. And if there is less destruction caused by OHV riders, then the rest of us will have less reason to object to the creation of new OHV routes. OHV users on this site claim that transgressors are a small minority of all users. This idea gives us all an opportunity to see whether they are being honest about that appraisal.

Not sure I want any more governmental licensing in my life. I know that most (if not) all manufactures' when selling an ATV offer a free course for proper and responsible use of the customers new vehicle. I do see abuse in the back country occasionally by ALL TYPES of users. Should we now require a license to hike, horseback ride, mountain bike or even picnicking? I understand your reasoning, but my denote of your idea is we have too much government in our lives now.

The concept is good, but the use is limited. A multi-use trail system serves the need to everyone that wish to use it, where a single track mountain bike only trail does not. Granted there will be fewer hikers on a multi-use trail. But a multi-use trail will be used by far more people to responsibly access the back country.

There are lots of hiker only trails but I have yet to see a mountainbike only trail.

These trails and the way they interconnect all of our country provide safe, wholesome, family friendly, affordable to every budget opportunities for every American to rediscover the natural world, explore the story of America, relax, get fit, shed complexities and develop a greater appreciation for life's simplier joys. These trails can truely provide solutions for so many of society's ills and short comings. When completed and recognized by the majority of our country's citizens their popularity will be unsurpassed and treasured by all. This is something we need to make happen now. The rapid change taking place today in America's landscapes means everyday we loose opportunities that would make the system even better. Let's not loose any more opportunities.

This idea is exactly wrong. To promote people's use of the great outdoors, we need to create more wilderness areas so that people can enjoy peace and quiet in an unspoiled setting. There are still many beautiful areas in the US that should be protected before they are ruined by ORV use, road building, oil and gas leasing, etc. etc. The threats to land preservation are many while options for adequate protection are few. And any motorcycle rider who says that his loud machine doesn't bother hikers has his head up his tailpipe.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I strongly promote the use of public lands for recreational purposes, we must be vigilant about avoiding an implied expectation that we should spend a lot of public money (that we don't have) to do so. We must stop spending public money like a drunken sailor. An important part of this is that we users must be good stewards of the public resources and clean up after ourselves. When we all use the resources respectfully there is really no need to spend public money. Our recreational use of public lands at no cost to the public is important to our continued use of public land. The cost of providing access (cleaning up after us) is the rationale that will be used to restrict access.

Why should "environmental non profits" voice be any stronger than my own or yours. This country is for the people, not the loud select few! I without question say we need the "environmental non profits" view point and expertise. But to say they are "much less likely to take bribes or trade off land rights for drugs and prostitutes" is a slap in the face of many which is so wrong to say. I have seen where groups pressing for wilderness areas have come right out a lied about facts. These are NOT groups, nor any group, should have a voice more important than the average citizen of this country.

Yes we need to stop draining every low spot for farming! That is how these corporate farms operate and push out the small farmer.

As Taxpayers in this country OHV users of anykind always get passed bye in the issues here. I being handicapped Cannot hike or ride a horse and most public lands are OFF Limits to me, because the only way I have access to these lands is an OHV. Why do us OHV enthusiasts always Lose in Issues like these talked about here? In the last 20 yrs in my area I've seen nothing but fences and Signs Prohibiting OHV's Our OHV Park ( Hungry Valley OHV Park) gets Smaller and Smaller each and every year. Statistics taken are always based on what the Enviromental Movement want the Public to hear, not the real facts! We all pay taxes and as The President says, There will be Change! In Who's Favor? Certainly not ours! By closing these OHV areas, Everyone Loses! From the OHV enthusiast to the Businesses that we Support, A.K.A, Hotels, Campgrounds, Motorcycle Shops, RV Businesses, AfterMarket Manufacturers, And You the Government in taxes Recieved! Open your Eyes To All Groups, Not just the ones Lobbying you!

California is Backed by Non OHV people who vote out everything to do with the OHV Comunity, We Lose More and More Each year to them or Stupid laws set forth by them. I say Vote on it and let both sides spend Equal amounts of \$\$ to do so if thats what it takes!

Wilderness is fine, the political Wilderness designation is not! Taking land that has been productively used by man since the end of the ice ages and restricting it to limited hiking and "controlled" burns just isn't responsible. Properly managed multiple use of our public land is needed.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I see federal managers compromising wilderness ecosystems when dealing with lightning ignited fire in wilderness. Locally, the forest service suppresses or modifies lightning ignited fire to isolate endangered species habitat. These modifications are contrary to the intent of the wilderness act and results in a slow degradation of the wilderness ecosystem over time. In addition, suppressing wildfires to protect threatened species is used as a justification to do prescribed burning, all at heavy cost to the wilderness ecosystem. What happened to ecosystem management as an approach to decision making rather than species management, i.e., doing what is best for the ecosystem rather than what we think is best for one of two species? I would like to see a wilderness stewardship plan for each wilderness that would guide actions to serve the wilderness ecosystem rather than a plan that forces actions to deal with one or two special status species. We have some large remote wilderness areas where we can truly let natural processes unfold including high intensity fires. When we modify wilderness ecosystems with a heavy handed approach to fire management we loose the opportunity to study and learn from nature. There seems to be a mind-set that wants to remove high intensity fires from wilderness ecosystems but high intensity fire is a part of natural processes. As much as possible, we need to let wilderness manage itself with our role as stewards of the process. We seemed to have lost the ethic of restraint embodied in the Wilderness Act. Lets get away from manipulation of nature in wilderness and instead empasize the safeguarding of natural conditions and ecological processes to the maximum extent possible.

Im onboard with preservation of these pristine and often sacred lands forever. Most of what mankind does is but a whish of dust in the air of geologic time... when mankind finally comes to in the future ... and realizes that we are the 'stewards' of this planet... not the 'users' .... then all attempts as preservation will be forever regarded as steps toward our future with the planet.. not our ultimate extinction against it... may God bless all impacted by the gulf of mexioc disaster.... which may change minds more than 3 mile island and cherynobel did.....

Preservation of Civil War battlefields saves a vital part of our national experience.

Walking battlefields with my son were some of the most enjoyable times of my life. A great environment to teach history, politics, life lessons, spatial analysis, geography, etc., and very healthy to be outside walking and climbing. Preserving battlefields is a very cost effective way to create tourism and promote healthy activities.

Grazing rights on lands overseen by BLM and the Forest Service are privately held pieces of property that DO NOT belong to the federal government or the general public. Ranchers legally purchased these grazing rights, thus making them a privately held asset. They are no different from surface rights, mineral rights, your car, home, or any other belongings. Taking them away would amount to stealing, end of story. The truth is most BLM and Forest Service land with privately held grazing rights are already being well taken care of by individuals with a vested interest in its well-being. We can't let a few folks who have probably spent a very limited amount of time on land with private grazing allotments skew the reality of the situation.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I can't speak for everyone else, but I can say why I voted against this idea. Non-profit conservation organizations have no place being the only members of the general public in a group like this. For starters, many of these organizations are largely funded by people from other countries. Any organization whose has most of its funding coming from outside the US should not have that much power in an American commission. Many of these organizations have a very radical point of view. While this is their right, radical opinions should be largely left out of a committee such as this, as they can often lead to more harm than good. I would not be opposed to a commission such as this if it included only neutral ecologists and biologists from many different areas of the country making logical and informed conclusions. I don't feel like this is "thinking only myself", but is instead avoiding putting radicals and non-Americans in charge of our greatest resource.

I have a huge problem with the government using eminent domain to perform land grabs. Presidential eminent domain was originally used by Teddy Roosevelt to save great American landmarks such as the Grand Canyon. Since then it has been used primarily by presidents at the 11th hour before their term has expired to conserve land they couldn't get public support for during their presidency. Remember, eminent domain has no checks and balances, no listening process, and almost no way of being revoked. If land is to be preserved, studies should be done and input should be taken by all those around it, including the landowners themselves. I am NOT against land preservation if it is done in a fair and reasonable manner. However, I would not call the big hand of government swooping in and removing private landowners (a.k.a. Eminent Domain) either fair or reasonable. Just think how you would feel if one day the government came knocking on your own door and said they were going to take your home whether you like it or not.

It is also a great example of wildlife population devastation. I'm not sure if you are a regular visitor of Yellowstone lately, but I am, and let me tell you it is not better off than it was before the wolf was introduced. Deer, antelope, moose, and elk numbers have been so greatly reduced that I seldomly see any of these animals anymore. Before the wolf was introduced, they were quite abundant. Now the only thing I am assured of seeing is a massive heard of buffalo and land that has been overgrazed by them, all because somebody got a wild hair to introduce a few wolves.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I think your view of many of these so called "non-profits" is a little off. Many of these organizations have gone the way of corporate giants such as Exxon, General Motors, and BP. They have lost all touch with reality and are only out for personal gains, posing as wildlife sympathizers. For instance, according to their 1998 tax form the Sierra Club spent about 50% of donations on actual preservation. The rest went to wining and dining the fat cats at the top of their corporate ladder. { <a href="http://www.sovereignty.net/p/ngo/sac-1.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Another example is the Nature Conservancy, who made nearly \$400 MILLION dollars after expenses in 2000 alone. Remember, because they are classified as a "non-profit", no income taxes were paid on any of this money. As of 2009 they had \$5,637,205,000 (that's over \$5.5 billion) in assets, a number I'm sure has only gone up since then. That is some serious cash, enough so that I have a tough time calling them anything but a corporate giant. { <a href="http://www.undueinfluence.com/nature\_conservancy.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://www.nature.org/aboutus/annualreport/files/fs\_fy2009.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I don't know about all of you, but I am tired of big business calling the shots. Don't let these companies pretend to care about the environment so they can line their pockets. If you want somebody on a federal committee, how about asking a neutral source such as an independent biologist. That way actual facts and figures would be heard by those in charge, not just extremest ramblings by environmental corporations looking to make a buck (or 400 million).

The clock is ticking... the "No More Wilderness" is terrible policy and does not mirror the desires of the American people. We can choose to protect these prestine outdoor spaces now for generations to come, or give them away and be destroyed forever. So many of our prized public lands are at risk, but what especially come to mind are the most unique canyonlands on Earth, the redrock country of southern Utah. Let's reverse "No More Wilderness" now and preserve what we have because it's disappearing faster than you think!

Older adults and persons less physically able also have the right to access our public lands. Motorized access is the only possible way I and my husband can continue to enjoy access to wild areas, to photograph wildflowers, and to fish in mountain creeks. We have been privileged to observe eagles, deer, pronghorn antelope, and wild horses while sitting quietly in our OHV and using our binoculars. We have been lifelong conservationists, birders, and are responsible users of our NFS and BLM lands. Do not deny us our rights and our access by removing motorized access to so much of our public land.

We seem to have ignored the fact that we are striving to be self sufficient in energy production. Tying historic preservation to oil leases may be lucrative, albeit it appears only one half the promised amount is delivered each year, but will funding of historic preservation with oil lease money hold this important work to ransom and delay that of conversion to alternative energy sources?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While it is important to educate and engage our youth as future stewards of our ecosystems, it is also important to educate and engage adults. Most adults will not go back to school, but with this program they can easily participate in a well-rounded education that covers many aspects of ecology and the connections of these fundamental concepts in our local ecosystems. The more we know, the more we care, the more we'll be engaged and active in managing our local resources. This program is adaptable to any ecosystem in any state and specifically promotes local participation, which in the long run has far reaching impacts on our natural resources.

An effort should be made to better engage young kids with wildlife in their areas. This can include textbooks on our nation's wildlife, organized trips to conservation areas, and customized learning programs to teach kids about the ecosystems within their specific region. I remember some of my best memories as a child were being outdoors, exploring nearby forests, finding frogs and strange insects – why do we tend to move away from this as we grow older? We learn so many things at an early age that do not seem to register with children, but perhaps if more effort was put in the schools to teach children about the local wildlife and natural environment, many of us today would get out of our cubicles and go explore America's Great Outdoors more frequently.

And the funding for these signs comes from???

As an office manager of a construction company I couldn't agree more! Tamarack Construction in Montana has been building energy efficient homes for more than 15 years, and continues to educate the public and clients about the "building science" of how buildings live and breathe and the importance of building and retrofitting for energy efficiency. Visit [tamarackconstruction.com](http://tamarackconstruction.com) for more information . . . sign up for our quarterly newsletter. Tamarack Construction is a Northwest ENERGY STAR partner, being 100% committed to building ENERGY STAR certified homes. To my knowledge, there are currently no educational or certification requirements to become a "builder" or "contractor" in Montana; just a fee and registration with the State buys you the right to build homes. Pity the customer seeking to build their dream home who doesn't check references!

Congratulations Lori J . . . you took the words right out of my mouth! I'm troubled by the fact that conservationists never seem to think of those who are handicapped and unable to hike into public lands. A physical handicap shouldn't prevent one from being able to enjoy what has been set aside for public enjoyment.

I'm waiting on a listening session to come to the Bitterroot Valley of Montana.

What? Obama can't print more money?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While it is true that geocaching is a great family activity, I don't feel it should be implemented by the USFS, or any other governmental agency. Local outdoor recreational clubs in many areas already provide this type of activity. I would much prefer to see those who are interested in geocaching to take the initiative in their area and make it happen! STOP the insanity of expecting the government and its agencies to entertain the likes of us!

Aquaculture fish farming started small with the best of intentions. Goliath bought them out. They pollute sensitive ecosystems, and threaten wild fish. Farmed salmon are fed several times their body weight fish based food. They need antibiotics because of the cramped living space. Herbicides are needed to control algae produced from their feces. Pesticides are used in a fatal attempt to control parasites. The wild smelt leave the river and pass the farms, they die from parasite infestations. Escaped farmed salmon can have a catastrophic effect on native fish, and could have irreversible consequences. Plus, would you really want to eat that? Please help preserve one of nature's most magnificent creatures, and perfect food! Wild Salmon!

I am the descendant of a Civil War soldier. I grew up on the stories that my grandmother told about her grandfather. Now that she's gone, I wish I had paid more attention. However, I live in Virginia now, and have had the opportunity and privilege to visit several nearby Civil War Battle sites. I can even look at my Great Grandfather's diaries and find out if he was stationed anywhere near these sites. I can actually walk where he may have walked. How could I do that if there was a WalMart or a casino built on top of the site. Even if these modern monuments to greed were built nearby, the traffic and noise and lights would do so much damage to the ability to visualize and understand what happened there not all that long ago.

I don't understand the practice of waiting until lame duck time. Save some now, in the middle and the end!

Many states already implement this. Michigan, for example, has a large trail system for OHV use. As an off road motorcyclist, I see the 'damage' done by OHVs as well as selective and clear cut areas of forest. Clearcutting and selective cutting erases any evidence of trail... trail that has been rerouted around for a year is nearly impossible to find. Deer and other wildlife utilize the trails. This 'damage' is not nearly as bad as some people would like you to believe. There are also many many volunteers who put in hours of their valuable time to maintain these trails... I'm sure the state ends up ahead from the ORV licenses it sells every year.

More people getting out is a good thing. More cars in the parks, not so great. California is proposing a bill that would put a park fee on our DMV. All CA cars would be pre paid for state parks. I hope if it passes they use some to fund mass transportation into parks. We should also find a way to keep pollution down in National Parks. Limiting personal vehicles, and having a convenient alternative will help in over crowding, and aid in enjoyment.

Planting native trees, ALWAYS good. A huge problem is, we and many other countries are cutting down way more trees than we could ever plant. Habitat needs to be protected. Alternative resources must be used.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I really like the idea of using these existing utility lines, but my experience tells me it would be very difficult to get all the utility companies to agree to the use of their lands for public recreation. There are liabilities involved and the right of way for the easement is routinely mowed and maintained so they would likely just mow over the gardens and trees. Utility companies typically require frequent mowing to prevent tree establishment so the root system does not grow into the pipeline.

Sustainable communities to me mean communities where people can create, grow, nurture and make the basic essentials needed for life; where people care for each other; where people support each other for instance by buying from their local farmer, the local store rather than Walmart, where schools are able to buy food from their local farmers so that students really receive wholesome meals. Where small scale industries such as a plant making solar panels makes such panels for local consumption; where others have businesses installing such panels and where ordinary people can afford to put such panels on their houses and barns. It would also be nice if people were able to grow flax and use it to make clothes and to grow hemp & use it to make paper.

These outdoor products are already expensive. Hunters take away "product" from their environment, so naturally the product has to be replenished. A hiker/camper is only taking away memories (hopefully!). Additionally, most "green" products, such as organic, energy efficient and sustainable are already significantly more expensive than standard products. I am afraid that taxing products that are used in "green" recreation will not encourage the people that have not discovered the outdoors and discourage current users. The small tax is a good idea, but it needs to encourage people to make "green" choices such as taxing fertilizers and insecticides. People toss these chemicals on their lawns and gardens. Both insecticides and fertilizers are bad for the environment by adding chemicals that pollute our waters and kill wildlife. Let's tax the stuff that destroys our environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe we need to stop maligning our urban wildlife to the point that we have created excessive, unjustified fear and demoted the animals closest to us as "nuisance" wildlife. We have become brainwashed about wildlife to the point that we do not value the animals as individuals, but as an entire "system" being left to the management of agencies who are operating much more as a business than of an agency originated to protect. Wildlife is not a "thing". It is not a renewable resource, but that is how the majority of our species are treated. Wildlife abuse is rampant, and we are ignoring it - IF we even know about it as it is hidden behind a veil. What is this telling our children, what does it say about our society? If we don't appreciate the wildlife closest to us, how much and for how long will we really care about wolves, whales, or polar bears? Or even environment? Our pesticides continue to create immune issues for our bees and now our bats. But what has changed? The meaning of "Ethical" has it's own definition now in the wildlife world. Non-sporting wildlife enthusiasts greatly outnumber sportsmen, but who has all the say in our policies? Which contingency makes up the staff of our decision makers? These "nature conservation" groups must do much more than preserve lands for ample hunting. Respecting and appreciating wildlife must begin closer to home. There are more than birds and butterflies in our yards and town parks, but what class is studying those animals and their value to our ecosystem? Meanwhile, blood "sports" like Penning, trap-n-shoots, steel jawed traps, and youtube videos depicting hoodlums drowning and crushing wild animals is setting a standard for our children to grow up with. This is NOT ok so long as hunters have "preserves" of deer conserved for their next season. There is a serious gap in all of this, and it falls between the butterflies and the polar bears.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

thank you for your reply. I appreciate your viewpoint. "Brainwashed" refers to the fact that our society today knows little about animals beyond domestic pets and livestock. Our grandparents lived with wildlife that we are continually told today is loaded with disease and parasites. Our ancestors helped distressed wildlife far more than they killed it simply due to overstated facts. We are told and thus we believe that culling of species is needed to control populations. It is not, it in fact has the opposite effect on most species. We are evolving. We ARE becoming more aware and compassionate. Less than a couple decades ago there was no abuse protection for animals at all. Now there is. Domestic animals have been accepted as sentient beings, capable of suffering and accepted as having emotions. Why do wild animals remain exempt? From that point begins a barrier, a veil deliberately kept between the public and urban wild animals via exaggerated risks, lack of education or appreciation classes. Why? Several state wildlife agencies are right now receiving an unprecedented amount of comments regarding outrage about wildlife penning. What the public did not know has incensed them now; that any state agency would allow OUR wildlife to be illegally transported around the world and placed, wounded and weak, into pens for hundreds of hound dogs to chase and shred alive, purely for sport. That young animals such as raccoons and opossums are placed into flimsy hamster cages and allowed to be torn apart by dogs... Dog and cock fighting being outlawed was a start. Why do we still allow these "hunting" activities that have nothing to do with hunting - and are not even predator control! What about "ethical" hunting practices? And what do these blood-sports have to do with anyone's survival in the USA? Perhaps some of us are a long way from viewing animals as more than a resource, but some of that is deliberate to maintain funding and recreation that WE as a society today would not approve of if we knew about it. Which is my point in regard to this original post - that we need to stop maligning and abusing certain species while believing we are truly teaching our children about conservation - when it is primarily the so called "conservation" that behooves an industry dependant on it for funding and recreation. We are not going to advance as a society, or towards genuine conservation, until we open our eyes to the suffering we allow and even promote. I am not opposed to ethical hunting. I am opposed to barbaric, inhumane, deliberate suffering we allow to continue. And I am opposed to what we are allowing our children to believe is ok, just focus on birds, bees, and climate issues....pay no mind to that truck full of starving coyotes and foxes on their way to be mauled, never mind steel jawed traps, or that 56% of bow-hunted prey is lost to die a slow, miserable death... All because there is a tiny percentage of people that enjoy blood sports, and are backed by special interest lobbying? We really want to do right by our children's conservation training? Then let's get real about it. Let's teach them about the politics behind the crises, lest they grow up and continue our mistakes. We created a monster, don't teach our children how to keep feeding it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Regarding #7 - competing with sports and programs children find more exciting? Bring in wildlife rehabilitators with a few wild animals, orphaned babies, animals wounded by fires set in chimneys to "exterminate" them, or poisoned by anti-freeze or bleach, that have a leg missing from a trap. Show our children firsthand what not having patience with the world around them causes. The struggles and pain that myths lead to. The mistakes that humans make, and the better ways to deal with conflicts in our natural world. Worried about the risks of doing this? Well, case-in-point! And voila, the fear is perpetuated, is it not? Rehabilitators and other wildlife workers are working with these animals every single day. We survive it! Let the realistic perspectives be taught. If children respect the animals living among them every single day they ARE GOING TO APPRECIATE the bigger picture faster, better, and more proactively (better than our generation has).

Is the issue with this idea the word "all"? The idea to promote renewable energy alternatives is important. Converting all facilities may not be advisable [for example historic structures including New Deal era].

In addition to the myriad imperative reasons for preserving and maintaining these crucial historic sites for future generations, it also makes good economic sense. History-related tourism can be a big revenue generator for local economies and would probably have more impact as a economic "stimulus" in the long term in creating than a lot of the short term public works / development projects being funded in the name of economic recovery.

I think one of the hardest parts about that is it's hard to get people to conserve and protect what they don't understand and can't touch. If you don't give people a chance to connect with a place, they might be less likely to want to protect it. That being said, I definitely think there are ways to manage access and use of lands, but it seems to be an interesting problem.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I recently attended the President's Great Outdoors listening session in Missoula, Montana. As a professional forester of over 40 years, I appreciate the emphasis on encouraging public use of our public lands; however, I remain dismayed by the lack of attention to the unhealthy nature of much of our national forestlands. Not unlike the BP oil spill that is currently spreading through the gulf waters... insects and disease has been spreading through western forests for over a decade: 18 million acres west-wide, and over 5 million acres in Montana. We are but a perfect storm away from a catastrophic wildfire that will devastate lives and property... yet, Congress and this administration remain ambivalent about this impending calamity. I lay the blame at the feet of Congress because they refuse to give federal land management agencies the financing and manpower they need... and I blame the Administration because they refuse to include adequate funding in their annual budget. Therefore, I recommend the following: 1. Direct the Chief of the United State Forest Service to send a letter to Congress acknowledging that federal land management agencies lack the manpower and financing to manage the threat of catastrophic wildfire near many local western communities. 2. Allow state and local governments to identify national forestland that are at significant risk from wildfire near local communities... and give them the authority to manage that risk through fuels-reduction projects. 3. Set up a fuels-reduction fund—similar to the BP reimbursement fund for the gulf area—adequate to allow state and local governments to address national at-risk forestlands that threaten their communities. I have grown weary of listening to members of Congress—most of which have no national forestland in their districts—refer to our national forests as “national treasures” that need to be managed for future generations... when in fact too many forested acres out west are a “national disgrace” that future generations will be denied beneficial use of. In states like Montana where the forest is largely owned by the US government, it is long past time that federal land management agencies became good and responsible neighbors... and the steps listed above are the best way to move towards that objective.

Right On!! Multiple use management is good for everyone. It helps sustain local economies tied to public natural resources as well as provide the direction for sustaining those natural resources into the future. Locking public lands in designated wilderness areas causes degradation of the natural resources proponents claim they want to protect. We have a God given responsibility to be good stewards of our lands. No management is mismanagement. I congratulate you on doing what you can to make our public lands accessible so all can enjoy them.

"so I have no sympathy for families of OHVers or their fond memories" I hope you can see that your comments are as arrogant as you claim OHV exhaust noise to be. If your issue is with noise then why support the closing of large riding areas? This only confines more people to a smaller area which in turn causes greater wear on trails and more "noise" for other recreationists. Also the large majority of these trails that are being "destroyed" were created and maintained for many years by OHV clubs. These same clubs have no issue sharing these trails with others who respectfully use them and are willing to help keep them around for future generations. Keep in mind an overtraveled trail will cause excessive wear regardless of whether an OHV, horse, mountain bike or hiker is the one using it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just like you cant ride a motorcycle into a museum you cant take pets. Why then can you take a dog into a Wilderness area or state park? Dou you think a wild animal is more scarred of the noise of an engine then of a predator? Public access is restricted for the use of many people in Wilderness areas. Many people chose to recreate in a different fashion then you. This is called diversity and should not be ruined by those clubs that have more influence to shut large amounts of users out of land that should be shared.

This forum is to help contribute ideas for reconnecting to the outdoors. What is stated above is a idea to ban those people who have been exercising their right to use public lands to provide food and recreation for themselves. Recreation is diverse in our parks and should continue to be this way. Take the time to consider how lucky we are and ask why we should not allow others to take part in this great resource.

America's historic places (whether sites, structures, landscapes) deserve all the support and funding we can give them. So many important sites, especially in rural regions, are in desperate need of protection/preservation if they're going to survive. Those places are part of our shared story, and are worth maintaining.

FLTFA is a dedicated funding source for federal land acquisition in the Western states, helping conserve BLM designated areas, National Forests, National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, Wild and Scenic Rivers, the National Trails System and other critical areas. FLTFA is a "land for land" conservation program, generating revenue through the sale of BLM lands identified for disposal through a public process to purchase priority lands for conservation. Since enactment in 2000, FLTFA has generated over \$113 million and the FLTFA account has provided funding for over 18,000 acres of strategic conservation projects, often complementing Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) support. Unfortunately, FLTFA expires July 24, 2010. We hope this successful and noncontroversial conservation program will be permanently reauthorized, in order to have funding to protect treasured lands for fish and wildlife conservation, cultural and historic preservation and outdoor recreation. See [www.fltfa.org](http://www.fltfa.org) for a brochure, maps, and more details.

Long overdue. We could have a major nationwide listening effort on this idea alone.

Public lands belong to all the public and should remain open to all the public. People in this century choose motorized transportation 100 to 1 over walking or horseback. This is the peoples choice, leave public land open to ATV, Snowmobiles and other of the publics chosen method of acces to public lands. Ken Dunn

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a disabled vet, OHV Instructor and father of 6, ATV riding has been every family vacation for the last 8 years. There is no way I could have walked to the places we have seen as a family. Most of my kids best memories of vacation revolves around riding. Look at the facebook pics. Yes we have done amusement parks, cruises, etc.. but all of them remember the ATV trips we have taken in CA, NV, CO and my favorite UT! Locking out certain groups of OUR public lands is a terrible idea. We can all share them doing what we all like to do-whatever it is. Its bad enough with the impending USFS travel management rule implementation, we will lose trails we will never get back. We in CA have been robbed of more than \$5 million of OHV funds to help others, not our trails. How many legislators have actually been out in the wilderness just exploring or walking around? The are just puppets of the lobbist in DC.

I agree. Most of the areas are not available to OHV's and the amount of available land for OHV is being taken away for Wilderness designations and expansions of National Monuments with bills by Barbara Boxer or others that sit in their ivory towers and take land away from people who've used them for generations. And, believe it or not, most OHV users are actually outdoor enthusiasts and support the leaving of open spaces actually open instead of being bulldozed over by the millions of acres for crackerbox houses. Think about the land lost due to OHV riding? It's insignificant, a small 4-8' swath of land throughout open space. This is a major difference in comparison to land being lost forever to development. It just floors me that there are extremists out there in Washington that can systematically shut major populations out of vast regions of land that belong to the people of the United States. Having land open for hiking only that is miles in the middle of nowhere and is not particularly spectacular realistically shuts it out for everybody. Lastly, if kids are not out recreating in the open lands, then they grow up not caring about the land and not appreciating it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Reserves needed where? NOAA reports show all west coast fish populations steadily re-building WITHOUT reserves, just based on good fisheries management NOAA recently published this report ... { <a href="http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/olo6th-edition.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Check out Unit 15: Pacific Coast Groundfish Fisheries ... { <a href="http://spo.nmfs.noaa.gov/olo6thedition/26--Unit%2015.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } excerpts: A number of dramatic changes have occurred in the Pacific Coast groundfish fishery since the last publication of Our Living Oceans (NMFS, 1999). Between 1999 and 2002, nine stocks were declared overfished, with spawning estimated to be below 25% of unfished levels. Rebuilding plans were implemented, reducing allowable fishing mortality for overfished and associated species throughout all sectors of the groundfish fishery and resulting in historically low allowable harvests. In addition to lower allowable harvest levels for overfished species and co-occurring species, major portions of the Continental Shelf off the U.S. West Coast have been closed to fishing since September 2003. Two of the overfished stocks, Pacific hake and lingcod, have since been rebuilt to target levels. Stock status has been estimated for nearly 30% of the groundfish stocks throughout at least a portion of their Pacific coast range. Of the assessed stocks, more than 70% are near or above target levels. However, many of the assessed stocks, whether currently below target levels or not, experienced declines in biomass throughout much of the 1980's and 1990's. These declines coincided with a period of reduced productivity of the California Current that lasted from 1977 into the late 1990's. It is likely that this decline in ocean productivity contributed to the decline in overall abundance, but the effect appears to have been variable across species and is not well understood at this time. In the most recent period of improved ocean productivity, increases in recruitment and abundance have been observed for many species. In addition to the role of ocean productivity, harvest levels have contributed to the current status of these species. In the 1980's and 1990's, harvest rates for many Pacific Coast groundfish species were based upon knowledge of the productivity of other, similar species. This was a reasonable approach in the absence of species-specific information and given the paucity of fishery-independent trend information, but many Pacific Coast rockfish species now appear to be less productive than originally thought. As a result, managers set harvest rates for many species at levels that, in hindsight, were too high. Harvest metrics were re-evaluated during the 1990's and again in 2000, resulting in lower harvest rates for most species. Not all rockfishes have declined in abundance over the past two decades. A number of species such as chilipepper, yellowtail rockfish, gopher rockfish, and blackgill rockfish are above their target levels, with estimated spawning biomass ranging from 52 to 97% of unfished levels (Figure 15-3). These rockfish inhabit a wide range of habitats which span nearshore, shelf, and slope depths. Although relatively abundant, landings for some of these species are near historical lows as a result of catch restrictions associated with rebuilding species that co-occur with these abundant stocks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The saving of our history should be of high priority even in this current economic conditions. This is an investment in ourselves. If the lands in question are able to be recovered in the future, and there will be questions on that (how do you knock down sub-divisions to bring a battlefield back to how it was? Even if you do you have ruined the ground from a historical/anthropological sense. Buy it before it is lost forever, or at least as cheap as possible. Every dollar we spend today saves us dollars tomorrow. I believe one of the best program is the type of matching grants so that there is both public and private cooperation on the issue. It has worked well in the past. We are willing to do our share too!

Too often there have been unreasonable closures.

Well here we are again and again and again. Everyone wants their own way. Typical of all our groups as well as I am to! Sure, I want to access everything on my motorcycle that the Hiker, Mountain Biker, Horse Rider, Naturalist, Environmentalist and every-other outdoor enthusiast thinks that it is their right to enjoy! Sorry but our life and world is not that way and if it stays that way it just breeds hate and discontent with our fellow Americans and friends. Until we are able to all sit down and come up with a plan that works for everyone, these land and conservation bills will never work Period!!! All I have seen in the past couple decades is either one group gets their way here and then another group gets their way there and so on and so on in fairness. Nothing changes. And the groups that have the most money to put in their representatives campaigns or political careers are the winners and it doesn't matter at what cost that it might be to thousands of people and economies, it was all about the triumph and again not the cost to all other parties involved. Here is my idea and solutions. All groups need to sit down at the local and state level, (Not Government Level), to decide what areas need to be looked at and then instead of just closing areas off we figure out how to set schedules of those areas for multiple use. Each week and each area would be set aside for the group or parties that could enjoy that area together in harmony for 52 weeks a year. Example: one area would have all groups that enjoyed the outdoors in the peace and quiet there way and another area for a week have all groups that enjoy motorized access to their outdoors there way. You could change weekly so that it just doesn't limit all groups to one location. We could set up different trail systems for all groups to use as their own and would have to be maintained by those groups. You could have a registration fee for all users to go into each groups funds to maintain their trails and routes. You could combine the fees if needed and there are all ready federal money's available every year to all states in keeping up these programs that we could tap into. There are many ways and ideas that could make this possible if we could all sit down! I know there still all the haters of all groups that are not in their way of thinking that say this would not work or do not want this to work, but it is time for all of us to change for a solution and not to stay the same. I agree that there are areas that do not need to be accessed not just by motorized vehicles but all people! I believe that if any human can be in any area then all users can be there to. What's fair is fair and not for the chosen few. That is how you bring americans back to the outdoors, Make the outdoors available to the americans in any form of outdoor activity they enjoy!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Without adequate, quality (easy and difficult) OHV trails illegal riding will increase. Wilderness closures cause more damage than they protect.

Historic Preservation is great. But isn't this IdeaJam supposed to emphasize "The Great Outdoors?"

Do State historic parks such as The Red Clay State Historic Park (area) sacred council grounds of the Cherokee Indian ever need to be reauthorized to be protected from annexation/rezoning occurring in the area, etc.? If mega substations, and other incompatible environmental attributes are added to an area that has been otherwise very backwoods and rural, and part of a scenic loop drive tour of this kind of historic area, can something be done to ensure preservation? Can there be new laws ensuring preservation of this area as a rural farming known for its Native American history and other civil war history also?

There needs to be more laws or ways to re establish this kind of important historic park and area and prevent rezoning and bigbox sprawl, etc. in the area the park is in on all levels.

In most communities, land use ordinances are outdated, requiring developers to build "cookie-cutter" style subdivisions that destroy water quality, natural areas, wildlife and working farmland. To help communities preserve natural areas and clean water, and update outdated land use ordinances, LandChoices ([www.LandChoices.org](http://www.LandChoices.org)) a national all volunteer nonprofit group I founded, is offering the free online guide, "Top 10 ways to preserve land and water in your community" at { [Link](http://www.landchoices.org/toptenways.htm.) } Tailored towards professional and volunteer citizen planners, it also includes a link to additional information for citizens interested in bringing land conservation to their communities. "Many communities make the huge mistake of requiring developers to submit detailed, expensive and so-called 'preliminary' plans as a first step in the development process," says noted planner Randall Arendt, considered the nation's expert on conservation subdivisions and a member of LandChoices' advisory group. "This is extremely premature, akin to bringing a diamond ring on a first date," says Arendt. "Instead, municipalities should require a simple inexpensive sketch plan, often drawn by hand but to scale, as an overlay on top of the base map showing the locations of all significant natural and cultural features. This way any deficiencies can be corrected prior to submission of the detailed, expensive preliminary plan," adds Arendt. To preserve land and water, LandChoices recommends that communities make the following 10 items mandatory for new developments: 1. Inexpensive Conceptual Preliminary Sketch Plan Prepared According to the Four Step Design Process for Creating Conservation Subdivisions 2. Site Walk on the Property 3. Involve a Qualified Landscape Architect and Physical Planner 4. Existing Features Site Analysis Map 5. Safer, Less-Wide Streets 6. Preserve a Minimum of 50% of the Buildable Land 7. Conservation Subdivisions 8. Conservation Subdivisions Designated as a "By-right Permitted Use" option 9. Create Interconnected Open Space Networks 10. Workshop on Conservation Subdivisions Learn more and a download a free checklist at [www.landchoices.org/toptenways.htm](http://www.landchoices.org/toptenways.htm) .

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Accountability is a huge problem. We are increasingly being asked to "pay to play" on public lands we already own and it's just about impossible to find out what they do with the money.

All of the land management agencies receive appropriated funding from Congress, and a portion of that is for managing recreation. These budgets have gone up steadily, the Forest Service for instance over 60% since 2000. There is plenty of funding to manage recreation. The problem is getting it to the ground. Far too much is sucked up into administrative overhead. The agencies have legal authority to charge for camping in developed campgrounds and for use of specialized and highly developed facilities and they can retain that revenue to manage the site where it was collected. I think those kinds of fees are appropriate. But to say, as one commenter did, "If you can't pay \$3-\$5 to spend a few hours outdoors, then your [sic] not really serious about it" that is so arrogant and elitist it just takes my breath away. There are plenty of people in this country who have to watch their pennies never mind their 5 dollar bills. You would deny them the chance to take a walk in the woods? If the agencies put half as much effort into enforcing the laws about trash, vandalism, and other misuse as they now dedicate to catching people who don't have the right "pass" to be there (Achtung! Papers please!), those problems would go away. In southern California they issue so many "Notices of Non-Compliance" to people without an Adventure Pass that they have had to set up a special website and contract with a private company to collect all the fines. This is a waste of effort that would be much better invested in education and resource protection.

Many popular areas have used permit systems since the 1970s to limit use to what the resource can support, and I am all in favor of that. However since 1997 almost all of these permits cost money, and I think that is wrong. Also permit systems are being put in place where they are not really needed, just to generate revenue. (Example: Cedar Mesa Utah, less than 10,000 visitors per year - brand new visitor center in the middle of the desert built with permit fee money they couldn't find any other use for since the actual land is managed for primitive recreation which doesn't cost much.) As to BWCA, you failed to mention the \$12 reservation fee to reserve a permit, which is for all practical purposes required because you won't get one without a reservation. The fee started out at \$10 but was raised to \$16 (60%) in 2007. If fees are the tool to be used to limit use, then we can expect the most popular places to soon become affordable only to the wealthy. Is that what we really want our public lands to be? The lands belong to all of us and we should all have reasonable access. Limiting use to what the resource can support is one thing, but using money to determine who gets to go and who doesn't is something else entirely. It's not whether any particular fee is "debilitating" or not, it's the basic idea of selling access to nature. If we want our young people to truly learn to love their public lands, we cannot allow them to be commercialized and privatized just like any other market commodity. It's like the difference between sex for love and sex for money. Do we really want our public lands to be whores?

When will we get to see the schedule of these town hall meetings and listening sessions? So far all the talk of public outreach has not been backed up by any visible action. The meeting in Washington was for only the chosen few. When will ordinary citizens get our chance to be heard?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Historic Preservation is sustainability: cultural, environmental, economic. The Historic Preservation Fund provides funding for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, which administer Federal programs that support cultural heritage efforts in their States. Every year \$150 million in off-shore oil and gas lease revenues (the same source as the larger sister-fund, the Land and Water Conservation Fund) is deposited in the HPF, but the full amount has NEVER been appropriated. In fact, the appropriation is usually less than one half of the amount available. Full, permanent funding of the HPF would make a dramatic, positive difference for local preservation, reaching every community in the country. The historic preservation movement has kept its promise to enhance, enrich, and inspire the American nation through preserving historic places of local, state, and national significance. Through enthusiastic and enduring efforts, preservationists have achieved near miracles in retaining historic places; but there is more, much more to be done. Full funding for the HPF is essential if we are going further the work already underway.

Historic Preservation is sustainability: cultural, environmental, economic. The Historic Preservation Fund provides funding for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, which administer Federal programs that support cultural heritage efforts in their States. Every year \$150 million in off-shore oil and gas lease revenues (the same source as the larger sister-fund, the Land and Water Conservation Fund) is deposited in the HPF, but the full amount has NEVER been appropriated. In fact, the appropriation is usually less than one half of the amount available. Full, permanent funding of the HPF would make a dramatic, positive difference for local preservation, reaching every community in the country. The historic preservation movement has kept its promise to enhance, enrich, and inspire the American nation through preserving historic places of local, state, and national significance. Through enthusiastic and enduring efforts, preservationists have achieved near miracles in retaining historic places; but there is more, much more to be done. Full funding for the HPF is essential if we are going further the work already underway.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In addition to full and dedicated funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, it's important to establish full and dedicated funding of the LWCF's smaller sister fund, the Historic Preservation Fund, which is drawn from revenue from the same source (Offshore Oil and Gas Leases) and authorized at \$150,000,000. Unlike the LWCF, the HPF has never been fully funded. The much smaller HPF complements the goals of the LWCF, promoting environmental, economic and cultural sustainability through investment in existing infrastructure, neighborhood and community revitalization. While the LWCF is largely a land acquisition fund, which requires federal investment in management and maintenance in perpetuity, the HPF works within the community to encourage private investment. Just one program supported by the HPF, the Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit, has been credited with creating 1.8 million jobs, \$71.7 billion in income, \$197 billion in spending, \$97.6 billion in GDP, and \$28.7 billion in Federal, State and Local taxes. All this with a cumulative expenditure of \$85 billion. Historic preservation programs, as supported by the HPF, encourage smart growth, promote land and water conservation measures, reinvest in older communities and offer a means to capitalize on embodied energy and carbon in existing buildings and on existing infrastructure. Reusing buildings reduces energy use and carbon emitted through building teardown and construction, and historic buildings can meet or exceed today's highest energy efficiency standards through simple installation of "green" technologies. In fact, buildings built before 1920 are MORE energy efficient than any building built between 1920 and 2000. The Brookings Institute projects that by 2030, America will have demolished and replaced 82 billion square feet from it's current building stock, which will create enough rubble to fill 2500 NFL stadiums. The energy saved by rehabbing just 10% of those 82 billion square feet would power the entire state of New York for more than a year. So fully funding the LWCF is important, without a doubt. But don't forget the HPF, which has it's own fullyfundhpf coalition, that I would encourage you to join.

So far, the Obama administration does not have an amazing track record for environmental protection. Please don't misunderstand, the emphasis on reducing global warming from the Obama administration has been excellent, but the emphasis on protecting endangered species and funding our national parks has been sadly lacking. While community parks, streams, and other natural areas are also very important, fully funding our national parks and fully protecting endangered species on a federal level is one of the most important roles the federal government must fulfill. I hope we will see better protections for our wild places now that preserving nature for future generations is high on the president's agenda.

This should include best practices for rehabilitating old houses, which is essential to mitigating climate change and energy uses. Houses built before 1920 are more energy efficient than houses built between 1920 and 2000. Helping builders to learn what builders of the past knew, while understanding how modern innovations can be integrated seamlessly into historic structures, would go a long way towards helping energy efficiency efforts. Consider promoting full funding of the historic preservation fund.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I work with a very large group of off roaders that volunteer thier time, money and strong backs to maintain remote areas of forest in the Los Angelese area. The forest service allows us to manage our respected areas with regards to hydrology, geology and safety. The Forest service has the final say in every aspect, but by allowing us to make decisions and suggestions based on our experience with the local area, it relieves them of some of the work involved in keeping back country areas open and accessable to the public. Because of this involvement, volunteers are proving every day both thier committment and dedication to the program, as well as exhibiting strong management skills within the related areas. By utilizing these volunteers as, say associate land managers, linked closely with the Forest Service, EPA and other agencies, land that is already accessable to the public can stay that way. By involving the public more in the decisions of how pulic lands are managed, the true spirit of land management can be realized. And the best part of this type of program is the very low dollar cost. All of the tools and people are mostly already on place and ready to be utilized. Public lands managed by the public. What a concept!

How much land do hikers need to themselves? Currently I have to drive 200 miles to ride my dirtbike on woods single track trails. The bay area is surrounded with hills and mountains that I can never set a tire on with my bike but hikers have full access. Give the ohv riders equal rights, a little diversity and more trail access.

The idea of Federal Wilderness is not a good idea as it prevents proper land management and public use is limited to only the rich and young.

I totally understand there are groups out there who want enjoy the great outdoors by having a nice peaceful walk in the woods. Me too! But, I also enjoy riding dirt bikes responsibly (quite 96 dB mufflers, spark arrestors, staying on designated trails) in the woods. There are a lot more places where you can hike and ride horses than you can ride a dirt bike responsibly. There our groups of people, and you know who you are, that would like to have ALL of the forests to themselves so they can enjoy it just the way they want. It is very selfish to impose their values on everybody else and take, take, take away. The OHV (dirt bikes, quads, 4x4's, etc.) community has been severely attacked in the past and much more so in the present, and it is not fair. Fourteen percent of the state of California has a registered OHV. If we don't have a place to recreate that is designated for OHV, then we will find a place to ride illegally. Keep that in mind next time you vote to band OHV on public land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The inefficiency of federal bureaucracy is a significant challenge. Disengaged or uninterested land management staff is also a challenge. The problem known as "analysis paralysis" is a major concern. It should be a priority to review the reasons the U.S. Forest Service is having problems writing Forest Plans. More and more land is being placed into protective designations. The increased focus on conservation in these areas lead to restrictive land use plans. In Wilderness for example, there are many restrictions including a group size limit. These group size limitations hurt scouting and other youth programs. There are two key challenges related to funding federal outdoor programs. One problem is that much too much money is being spent on overhead and infrastructure and not on recreational infrastructure. The initiative should find ways to focus agency budget spending on recreational infrastructure, including roads, trails and winter sports areas (including ski areas). The other problem is the lack of funding, especially appropriated funds. The initiative has ambitious goals but we must face the fact that federal budgets aren't going to be significantly increased, and may be decreased in coming years. The initiative must focus on locally based cooperative efforts to accomplish its goals. An excellent example is leveraging the various State off-highway vehicle programs. Many states benefit from millions of dollars made available for OHV trails and snowmobile areas via these "user pay" programs. The initiative should enhance these programs where they exist and encourage their formation in states where they lack an off-highway vehicle program.

The famous San Juan Trout fishery is an irreplaceable public resource that was once estimated to bring as much as \$40m a year to the regional economy. Much of the fishery is now smothered under sediment/silt caused by a combination of a new low-flow plan by the BOR and increased erosion from rampant oil and gas activities on the surrounding BLM lands. Unfortunately, the environmental impact studies for the low-flows were flawed and misleading and the mitigation goals of no net-loss of in-kind aquatic habitat established by the Fish&Wildlife Coordination Act Report (FWCAR) were ignored. The BOR now says that the fishery is not a priority and the BLM denies that any of the damage is caused by oil and gas operations. Nothing meaningful has been done to correct the problems and things are going to get much worse as the flows continue to be cut. This is an opportunity to show that we can protect these priceless places by practicing responsible water and oil/gas development. To properly address the problems on the San Juan river will require that environmental protection of the San Juan Basin lands, the river and the fishery is made a top priority for the BOR and BLM. And, they must seek federal funding to complete the fishery silt transport/deposition and habitat mapping studies necessary to develop long-term mitigation measures to meet the FWCAR goals. That would be a huge win for all including the sportsmen, state, federal agencies, and our unique natural resources.

Historic areas & Battlefields should be preserved and all WalMarts, Malls, Casinos and the like should be kept out of our historic areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The following is an idea posted on behalf on an e-mailer: --- This is an idea for conservation and to encourage Americans to use the outdoors but I do **\*NOT\*** want my name on any Web site: - Utilize the existing nationwide network of utility easements, particularly those linking all the highrise electric towers as a cross-country pedestrian pathway/network for walkers, hikers and cyclists (or at least mountain bikers since the existing trails underneath them are dirt). Then promote the trails. This would encourage Americans to walk more, as in Europe, because it would be a safe and fairly scenic, extensive network. These easements could also be used for community gardens and to plant orchards for public consumption, to feed our homeless citizens. Local garden clubs could even have contests to beautify these corridors (designing so they do not interfere with vehicle access to service the towers).

Conservation education is one of the most vital tools for shaping long-term conservation and enjoyment of fish and wildlife resources. With the profound impact of human populations on fish and wildlife and their habitat, Americans of all ages need to better understand and take responsibility for the health of the natural world around them. The North American Conservation Education Strategy was developed by state fish and wildlife agencies to help people of all ages understand the value of our precious natural resources and how they are conserved and managed; become stewards of nature; and learn outdoor skills so they know how to (lawfully) enjoy resource-related recreation like fishing, hunting, shooting sports, boating, bird watching and more. Each state fish and wildlife agency offers a variety of programs to educate children and adults about the conservation and of fish, wildlife and other natural resources. Some of these programs include instructions on how to participate in recreational activities; but, more and more, state agencies are focused on integrating conservation into K-12 education as a critical part of their efforts to develop an informed, involved and healthier citizenry. We recommend that the Administration: (1) Support the inclusion of natural resources agencies in the No Child Left Inside legislation and ensure they are eligible for funding or other resources. (2) Encourage educational agencies and schools to partner with state fish and wildlife agencies to achieve conservation and environmental literacy from grades K-12 - connecting students more closely with the natural world, while developing 21st-century learning skills and addressing academic standards across disciplines. (3) Support the inclusion of Outdoor Skills in the education process as a tool for team building, stewardship, personal health and life-long recreation. (4) Ensure every child have access to a natural area (no matter how small) within walking distance of his/her school; and educators acquire the skills, content knowledge and tools to use that area as an outdoor classroom for field investigations. When young people have the opportunity to experience direct contact with natural habitats on a regular basis in their formative years, they are far more likely to grow into adults who will value those environments and make informed decisions to help sustain them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Preservation of Civil War battlefields is vital as a reminder and link to our nation's past, that is all too quickly being forgotten. Honoring the struggles that America has gone through to become such a great nation and remembering our heritage can help to keep our current problems in perspective and knowing where we have come from can help us move forward as a nation. We must never let our national history, or the memory of so many who died, disappear and battlefields are a wonderful way to teach and "see" that history that must be passed along to future generations. Without a past, we have no future.

Sorry-- "How to Teach in your School Forest" workshops are impossible to do online. They need to take place outside in the actual School Forest (outdoor classroom).

Funding for historic preservation preserves our country's culture, educates youth about our nation's history and raises awareness of what it means to be a citizen in a democracy. Jobs are created to rehabilitate historic buildings. Even more important, historic preservation is green. By preserving existing buildings, construction debris is not added to landfills. By decreasing the amount of new construction, natural resources that would be used for building materials are conserved and energy consumption to manufacture and transport building materials is decreased.

don't we have enough meat in the markets of this country?, why must people continue to kill where there are food factories for this purpose.. it seems rather barbaric and some type of psychological problem

Hasn't the American bison been desecrated enough for their skins and tongues? Why must we continue to kill off natural animals in this country? I think we have enough "game" animals for those who continue killing other life forms for their skin, head trophies and whatever other abstract issues they have within their mentality.

Nature is perfect within itself..why must mankind inflict their unnatural conditions? Look at Yosemite and the Grand Canyon,,they are perfection

Recently the National Forest Service has allowed logging in the national forest directly behind my home..Pike Natl Forest in Colorado.. It had closed the 2 sections of the park where logging was established and recently reopened the sites.. but one in particular i went to see recently and it is a mess with logs, and pieces of wood from the choppers, all over the ground..should there ever be a forest fire in this area, there certainly would be enough fuel for it all over the 5 acres where they logged.. why didn't they accommodate cleaning up? They had given reasoning for it, due to forest fire prevention or beetle kill..which there is little of in this area. Better to use manpower to cut down the infected trees (which are few and far between) as the wood can be used for flooring, walls, furniture etc. as the beetle kill has a very beautiful blue tinge in areas of the wood. I think it is just plain desecration of our standing forests and i have been in this area 14 years and never seen a forest fire here..In addition, living trees roots provide storage for water in rainfall and run off.. Must everything be destroyed for profit which it seems was the reason truckloads of the logs went over the roads twice a day(2 lane country roads already potholed) and the heavy trucks making the roads worse than nature does. Decisions like this we could live without.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well said. The same is true at Yellowstone National Park. The park is overrun with bison which causes them to become easily infected with brucellosis. This in turn affects the ranchers whose herds must be vaccinated with the very expensive vaccine. The park service cannot and will not control their herd and are unable to effectively vaccinate for this disease which is running rampant through their herds. Ranchers would not be able to remain in business and would be turned in for animal abuse if they ran their cattle the same way the park service is running their bison herds.

No topic is more prevalent in hunting and fishing circles than the problem of access – to both private and public land. Even though some of the good ol' days of healthy wildlife populations, wild trout fisheries, and unfettered landscapes are still here today, thAT means less and less if the pubic cannot get to them. Recreational access is exponentially becoming more endangered. The seriousness of the situation is obvious to even the casual observer. As population grows, hunting, fishing, and recreating on private land will become rarer and the demand for access on our public lands will explode. The solutions to these conflicts will be difficult and many questions must be answered. How many access points to a national forest and public lands are necessary? Do we pay landowners to allow an easement across the property? What is a public road? If the public cannot access a large parcel of land managed by our state or national entities, should a private landowner be granted that privilege? Should he or she be allowed to benefit commercially, by guiding hunters or selling them access to it? Should the public through government assert public trust property rights? The Forest Service (and other government agencies) need to get far more involved with illegal and unreasonable closures of back country roads leading to public land. Here are some things they, congress, and the administration can do: 1/ Generally mandate Federal Land management agencies the mission of increasing access to boundaries of public land. 2/ The agencies need to step up and be party to litigation when roads historically used by the public are closed by private action. As it is now, the burden of litigation is often placed on private parties. (A \$15 padlock can trigger a \$150,000 lawsuit to correct.) 3/ The Forest Service and other agencies must rigorously research and enforce easements for public access across private land. 4/ Roads on public land should be open to everyone or closed to all - no private access roads on public land. 5/ Provide special funds to assist land management agencies in the construction of short new access roads to public land that will circumvent private land which blocks access. 6/ Use Eminent Domain to acquire access to public land when other options are exhausted. This is important for firefighting as well as access and conservation. Landowners often paint the conflict as an attack on private land rights. Even though I am a proponent of upholding private land rights, it is difficult to side with the landowners in many cases. Public property rights and the public trust doctrine of resource management are equally important. The Forest Service and other agencies need to be the point of the effort to enforce and expand those rights. ( This is not a one sided plea for more OHV access. That is a separate issue to be resolved after we get folks ON to the public land. )

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A casino next to a national battlefield - you have got to be kidding! That is like putting a casino right next to cemetery. Why is it the promoters can't find another property in the area? I have been to Gettysburg and I feel that there is way too much commercial development as it is. If Gov. Rendel and the legislature wishes to aid economic development in Adams county they should help find another property a significant distance from the battlefield.

Much of the legislation proposed is by big city legislators who have never even seen the areas that they are trying to regulate. The citizens of each state should have more say in how there public lands are managed. States with small populations like Wyoming and Montana get run over by legislators from heavily populated states back East.

Somebody has to pay for it. NPS doesn't even have enough money to complete routine maintenance.

Please help us preserve our CW Battlefields > They are our heritage and > besides > my ancestors fought and died there !

My family of 8 includes 4 boys and 2 girls. The age spread is 14 years. Dirt biking proved to be a GREAT family activity that appealed to all 6 kids -- and still does. It provided wonderful teaching moments, ranging from astronomy, map reading, and navigation to self worth and teamwork. Our kids learned to appreciate and respect the great outdoors. Dirt biking allowed us to spend many hours of quality time together. As OHV activities increase in popularity we need more approved riding areas. Reducing riding areas concentrates users into smaller and smaller spaces that ultimately does unnecessary damage to the environment.

I agree. There's way too much conflict of interest in DOI and DOA!

I agree with the idea that controlling invasive species is imperative if we are to keep our native species thriving. I would also like to extend the definition of "invasive" to include rogue GMO seeds that wind up where they are not intended (usually carried by the wind or on tires, etc.), resulting in theft lawsuits against the property owner (who had no idea they were even there) by the seed company.

I agree with the lack of real oversight where the Dept. of Interior is concerned. I do think certain areas need more funding and they would have to be held accountable with full transparency or give the land back to the states so we can attend hearings in person and have a voice. Otherwise, can we make the financial institutions and the car manufacturers pay back the money and funnel some into the DOI? Sorry, I'm bitter.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I take exception to #5- banning ranching on public land. Here in New Mexico, ranchers have used what are now "federal" lands since long before this was even a U.S. territory. I know many seventh and eighth generation ranchers with small herds who, for them, this is a way of life. They are the ones who, year after year preserve the land so it can sustain them. If they couldn't ranch on public land, their way of life would end. They do more to take care of the forest, even to the extent of putting out other people's campfires on a weekly basis, than anyone I know. I suggest we not paint everyone with such a broad brush that we miss the people that we would like to hold up as good examples of responsible stewardship.

Riders might need to take responsibility for their image here. Manufacturers love to advertise their vehicles mudbogging, riding through streams, spraying dirt, etc. Riders could stop other rogue riders by agreeing to licenses that are readable from a distance, making sure they and their friends register each vehicle (with \$\$ going to repair trails and enforcement), and finally, holding those accountable who ride off the trail or misbehave. If you don't want the black eye, you will have to do more to prevent it. Meanwhile, I guess it just doesn't make sense for the Forest Service or BLM or any land mgt. agency to dedicate more trails than they can maintain or enforce.

Wonderful yet incomplete idea. Where does the money come from? Who administers it, etc.?

YES! YES! YES! We are KILLING this planet with plastic! I always use my canvas bags for EVERYTHING! I just believe it makes sense to not waste anything or put more stuff into the garbage (I have to haul mine to the dump- no garbage pick-up) and the landfills than I have to! Now what do we do about that plastic island in the Pacific? { <a href="http://www.independent.co.uk/environment/the-worlds-rubbish-dump-a-garbage-tip-that-stretches-from-hawaii-to-japan-778016.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Many of our National Park units and other public spaces that Congress authorized years and decades ago are still incomplete. This is because Land & Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) appropriations have been pitifully low and unpredictable over the years. Developments that might occur in the unprotected private inholdings could seriously harm the units as a whole. The inholdings must be acquired and the areas completed as intended. The LWCF must make available the intended \$900 million each year without having to go through the appropriations process.

Many people think that since they are not hikers, or bicyclists that trails don't matter to them. The National Trail System is important for everyone as one way to remember our heritage, our history, and to connect important places in our history and eco-diversity, every bit as much as it is important to hikers and other trail users. Most of the work done on any national trail is done by volunteers who care about their place in America. I would also ask our legislators to continue to support and fully fund the purchase of land from willing sellers to work toward completion of all the national trails.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree that opportunities for all to enjoy our public lands must be provided; that includes opportunities for people to enjoy a quiet, natural, non-motorized experience. For some, that's what "refreshes" -- not the sound of motorized vehicles. As for grazing on our public lands, in Southern Utah we've seen the effects of that in broken down soils that invite invasion of things such as cheatgrass, which combined with dry, hot summers promote a fuel for fast burning, destructive fires. Grazing also destroys riparian areas critical to healthy streams and rivers. The damage caused by grazing has to be remedied by dollars that don't come from those who are able to graze these lands since they pay so little for that opportunity. I have no problem with local economies benefitting from multiple management policies, but the grazing fees need to be addressed to help support these areas.

I can't imagine why anyone would demote this idea, unless it's due to the fear that protecting biodiversity would force that person to think about something other than themselves. It's amazing that in this day and age, humans still have a hard time acknowledging that their economy and way of life is built upon the health of the natural world. Civilization cannot prosper if the natural world is falling apart. Protecting biodiversity ensures the health and strength of the natural world -- and yes, the human world as well. If individual Americans can't understand this fact, then it needs to be taken to the highest levels of government for consideration and action.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to suggest that anyone who is making this suggestion come out to Montana and learn what you're talking about. Just drive the 150 miles between Roundup and Malta and see what it's like to go past one town -- Grass Range that has maybe 25 homes there and then not be able to see more than 10 houses in that drive. Look out and realize that in some places for 70-100 miles on either side of the road, there is nothing but open landscape to the casual observer, but actually know that there are ranches producing beef and farmers producing wheat that may have been part of your meal this last week. You don't need to waste government money taking our ranches to "preserve it" -- we've done it for a 100 years already. Years ago, when I was living in Missoula I had a roommate who was working on a masters in wildlife management. She was from New Jersey and her boyfriend was from back east. She was a nice girl but she got her masters by doing a study on what kind of animals are predators of duck eggs. When she told me she was going to do a study like that I asked her what it was going to prove. "Everyone knows what kind of animals eat duck eggs -- racoons, skunks, coyotes... And what will you do with that -- you can't teach ducks to build their nests in different places?" I asked her. I wasn't upset, but I just thought that if you were at a masters level program that you should be working on figuring out something new not just coming up with something that a 5th grader could tell you. Well, she blew out the insides of 144 eggs, filled them with wax and even "duck scent" to make them real. She thought that when the animal bit into the egg, it would leave a tooth mark and from the tooth mark she would know what animal was preying on the nests. See anything wrong with that idea? Think you're going to learn something that most native Montanans who lived on a ranch didn't already know? Well, first of all those of us who know animal behavior know that if you've got a mouth full of wax, you're not going to carefully extract the wax egg from your teeth and gently set it back in the nest. Nope - you're going to break it up and do whatever you can to get rid of the wax. I asked her what her results were after she had carefully planted these nests of fake eggs all over the state in a variety of reseviors (using grant money of course). The answer: She couldn't get any valid results because the wax was too broken up to tell what it was. (My suggestion would have been to look at the tracks of the animals but that evidently didn't occur to her) . But she's now probably one of these idealistic geniuses who want to play in someone else's backyard and take over their ranch and do nothing more productive than sit on a ranger station with a nice salary and benefits to "watch over the buffalo". Her boyfriend's study was about some kind of ferret that he wanted to transplant to Montana. So he went out to MN, spent 3 mos. living in a cabin and cross country skiing and finally came up with 6 little critters to bring out to the Yaak. Well, he got to stay in a beautiful 3 story cabin and outfitted them with radio collars to see how they'd do. Do you think a radio collar slows down a little animal? Well, one by one in short order they were all eaten before spring -- but he still got a masters degree out of it and is now qualified to make decisions like this. I asked her one time if any of the wildlife majors were Native Montanans and she thought about it and said no. It explained everything to me then -- and it explains why we're having this conversation today. People from back east come from places where development is guaranteed -- populations grow and stay there. But in a ranching area, most ranches don't support more than 2 families. They support the family who started it -- and then the one son or daughter who's going to take it over in the next generation. Those people don't get it -- our growth is limited by the ability of a ranch to sustain a family. And as for wanting to come enjoy it -- well come out during hunting season and you can enjoy our

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

hospitality. I doubt any of them would let strangers onto their land to walk around fairly freely for hours on end. So here are my questions when you're examining feasibility. 1. Exactly how many people do you think are really going to come out here to watch these buffalo? And how long would you actually spend watching these herds? 5 minutes, 10 minutes, maybe 20? My cousin had buffalo on his farm in Illinois for years -- right next to a highway with 10,000 cars a day going by. Less than 10 cars a year ever pulled in to simply watch the buffalo. 2. Did you know that some of the Indian reservations have buffalo herds. Why not offer your money to those tribes to develop and increase their herds. Wouldn't it be nice to give them back the staple of their diet that was taken away when the white man came? I think it'd be cool to see them use a buffalo jump the way they did a couple hundred years ago -- if they wanted to. If the tribes were open to it and were allowed to hunt them and money was given to them to vaccinate them, build fences, even process the meat -- this would become a win/win/win situation. Frankly, I think this is an idea that's used to con people out of their money and then scam our government out of more money. It makes a really cushy job for someone to sit on a foundation, pull down a good salary and benefits and work people up into a lather about a romantic idea of buffalo running on the plains. But if you took those same people out to a buffalo herd, I doubt they'd stay entertained for more than half an hour -- and maybe 3-4 hours for the truly hardcore -- provided they were sitting on the back of their camper, or maybe hiking on a groomed trail looking at some of the great scenery in Yellowstone Park. You can't justify destroying an entire county or two for that.

If we want to connect Americans to our outdoors, our cultural landscapes, our diverse cultures, and our history, we must not forget preserving the places that make us special. These places include not only the cultural landscape, special landscape features such as stone walls, but also the built environment that tells the story of who we were and where we've come from. Historic preservation, preserving the built environment, should be an integral part of reconnecting with our culture and history.

Our community has used historic preservation funds in many ways to promote, preserve and educate the public about our historic neighborhoods, architecture, downtown and other resources that make living here a quality experience. Let's not forget the lesson of "urban renewal" where large swathes of neighborhoods and downtown were bulldozed into oblivion and never recovered. Historic preservation makes for thriving communities.

Our experience in Southern Utah counters this. The grazing on our public lands breaks down soils that promote a healthy, stable soil and instead invite invasion of things such as cheatgrass, which combined with dry, hot summers promote a fuel for fast burning, destructive fires. Grazing also destroys riparian areas critical to healthy streams and rivers. The damage caused by grazing has to be remedied by dollars that don't come from those who are able to graze these lands since they pay so little for that opportunity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The government should be paying what's due. Our public lands are critical to the tourism dollars in many areas, so that needs to be considered when chastising the govt for public lands. In places where there are few public lands and most property is in private hands, the tax dollars on that property may be coming into the local govt, but what opportunities have been lost for many people to enjoy open areas for fishing, hunting, hiking, etc., without having to pay exorbitant fees to private land owners?

There are many challenges to preservation of Civil War battlefields. The most critical challenge is urban creep and expansion. Much of this land is being purchased by real estate developers for both commercial and residential projects. Once we lose the land to these developers, it most probably can never be regained. So, time is of the essence, we must act now to preserve these outdoor classrooms for future generations. These outdoor classrooms are an important tool for explaining the sacrifices free men made to uphold our union and defend freedom in America. Let us not lose these national treasures to urban sprawl, let's act now to preserve our heritage.

Agreed, too many of the "conservation" proposals revolve around excluding certain types of access. Our aging citizens should not be excluded from enjoying Our Lands because they require the use of modern conveniences such as ATV's or other motorized vehicles. Why is it that discrimination is only acceptable if it is disguised as an "environmental initiative"?

The study in the link from comment 11 concerns outdoor activities in ALL settings including urban, suburban, rural, etc. Therefore, the statics comment 11 cites are misleading: "Scroll down to Table 2, which shows a comparison of the different types of recreation for ages 16 and up, revealing that 17.4% enjoy ORV, ATV or Motorcycle use, which is actually exceeded by hiking (32.7%), birding (31.8%), and a number of other outdoor activities." Of course the percentage of all participants was higher for hiking, the study did not limit what locations were considered for the activities. Hiking is available basically EVERYWHERE from city sidewalks, city parks, and all the way out to Wilderness trails. So hiking participants in ALL locations would outnumber OHV participants who are extremely limited on where they are allowed to ride. The same idea applies to birding - you can go birding in any environment. I am an avid motorcyclist but if I count how many miles I walk, it far outnumbers the number of miles I ride because I walk everywhere and only ride where I am allowed to.

There is already an overabundance of Wilderness compared to the number of people that are willing or able to visit said Wilderness. We do not need more Wilderness, we need more accessible open areas for more people to enjoy their preferred form of recreation in a dispersed fashion. More Wilderness simply eliminates vast areas of land from use by a majority of American's. Less Wilderness would allow more Americans that enjoy motorized access a more dispersed recreational opportunity thereby decreasing the impact of overcrowding on the lands available. Wilderness is simply another way for the Fit American's to discriminate against those of us that are aging and losing their ability to enjoy the lands of America the only way we can.

Why is this separate from "Protect Wildlife Migration corridors"??

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

“We have met the enemy and he is us.” This popular quote came from the comic strip “Pogo” by Walt Kelly published on Earth Day in 1971. Since then this comic has been quoted and misquoted by many a teacher, politician, and cocktail party comedian. I remember hearing the Pogo quote in an environmental studies class in the seventies. It was a time of great environmental concern; a discouraging time of burning rivers, oil spills, and an unpopular war. It is hard for me to believe that was 40 years ago. As we look ahead to the next 40 years, I would like to propose a new quote to guide our efforts to get along on this earth: “We have found the solution and it is us.”

I believe this country's public lands can be used to produce the food that people need, as well as providing wildlife habitat and watershed protection. Beef production can be balanced with other goals for public lands. I would like us to manage our public lands in a way that allows for food production and also protects the natural resources on which we all depend. Recreation is another use of the public land that can be very valuable, but it is also not without impacts. Let's look at the long-term health of the land and work to balance the human uses of the land. I don't want to destroy the mother who provides us with food and shelter.

If states truly want to work with ranchers and farmers on private land conservation, which can also benefit wildlife, states need to implement programs that work for the farmers and ranchers. These landowners need to be able to continue to make a living from their property by producing food for our country. If the programs are not tailored to the needs of working ranches and farms, I foresee two outcomes. Either the "protected" lands will no longer be available for food production, or the only landowners who will participate will be wealthy individuals who do not earn a living from agricultural production. I believe it is possible to design such a program, but farmers and ranchers need to be involved in the design and the details of each project.

Many ranchers in our area of Colorado have protected their private land with conservation easements, but they are still dependent on grazing permits on BLM and US Forest Service land to produce food and to make a living. If the federal government wants to protect productive agricultural lands, they also need to support the continued use of federal lands for livestock grazing. The two issues are connected. There are ranchers in the region who are concerned that if federal grazing leases are further curtailed or eliminated, they will not be able to continue to make a living. These landowners are reluctant to place conservation easements on their land because of this fear of losing their grazing permits.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many state's are looking at closing their parks, eliminating naturalists and programs and deferring maintenance just at a time when we need to connect people to the land. There needs to be a national impetus on nature learning and fostering an understanding of ecosystems and their relation to humans. State and National Parks are the ideal place to interpret nature and teach how we are all connected but for years they have suffered from reduction of staffing and budget cuts. These are special places set aside to give people a chance to connect with nature but there are so few opportunities for people to learn about what they are looking at and many of these places are now shabby and unattractive. Full funding of the LWCF would go along way in bringing these palces back to what they should be and additional funding for environmental educationa and interpretation would give those who visit an understanding of what they see. People will not value what they don't love and they won't love all of nature unless they understand it. We need to understand more than the warm and fuzzy to preserve the whole of an ecosystem. WEeare coming up on the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service. What a great opportunity to engage a nation in reviving our parks.

Parks both national and state/local have suffered from substantial budget cuts over the last decade and most are now at a critical point where deferred maintenance is resulting in loss of facilities or park closures. LWCF needs to be fully funded for both national programs and for stateside programs. With the 100th anniversary of the National Park Service rapidly appraoching we need to put the emphasis back on what we as a nation have preserved and conserved for future generations and we need to expand our recreational opportunities so every citizen has a near his home. You can't expect the public to get outdoors if there is no place nearby to go or the place is not safe or functional.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A couple thoughts come to mind some of these thoughts may have been mentioned in one manner or another... • Education and Re education - I believe the future of conservation will rely within the will of the people, but unfortunately large aspects of our society are disconnected from the land value of open space/wilderness. There needs to be constant/consistent reminders about the positive values of land/open space/wilderness. People need to understand the linkage between riparian buffers and water quality. I would think that the government could partner with the talent of colleges and university programs to educate the masses. There needs to be a more organized/aggressive effort to encourage people to embrace the outdoors and to support the land/sustainability of the land. • Government organizations/restructuring/promoting cohesiveness – I think there should be some heart to heart discussion about creating teamwork/vision between the Forest Service, the Park Services, the Land Management Bureau, and Fish and Wildlife Services. If there is going to be a national dialogue about conservation in America, the individuals within these departments need to be willing to work together. It seems that the visions of the Forest Service could sometimes go against visions of the Fish and Wildlife Services. One groups "vision/role" could hamper/take away from another departments. If these groups are unable to work together in a fruitful manner, why have these discussions? • Continue to Reward individuals/companies who choose easements. We face the reality that in order to encourage conservation - the private landowner plays an enormous role. I think that greater opportunities/creative economic & tax incentives should be given for small farmers, companies, individuals willing to put their land into an easement. With this said, I believe the government should make sure that organizations caring for easements meet national/state regulations. I would even suggest that open space easements should be encouraged within urbanized regions/near wilderness & national/state parks. Easements provide a great opportunity to buffer between open space and developed regions. • I would encourage the president to expand the national parks and designated wilderness areas. • Eco regionalism and wilderness corridors should be a priority within the focus of conservation/wilderness expansion. Within this topic, I would even suggest finding ways to create conservation routes to link different areas nationally. This will require compromise and willingness to work together. If government organizations are willing to work together, if easements are encouraged, if there are aggressive education efforts, and a variety of organizations like The Nature Conservancy can assist with data...I think there can be great progress towards conservation within America.

According to the "organic Act" and the Supreme Court (Sierra Club v. Hardin) the purposes of the National Forests are: 1) to insure "a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessities of United States citizens"; and 2) to secure favorable conditions of water flows. The Forest should also consider the economic well-being of the citizens of a state wherein timber is located in administering national forest lands "for the use and necessities of citizens of the United States.") In U.S. v. New Mexico, SCOTUS specifically rejected assertions that the Act established a third purpose for which forests could be created - "to improve and protect the forest within the boundaries.") So why have carved out giant sectors of the Forest for non-use or restricted use. Why have we stopped harvesting trees and now use fire as a principal management strategy. If we return to multiple use, sustained yield, we will have much healthier forests and communities.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I like your idea for promoting managed land use with real outdoor careers. The problem is that what the government promises it refuses to do for political reasons. Look at Anwar - bought to provide the country with oil and other resources. Those activities are supported by the people (both indigenous and new arrivals) yet the federal government won't allow the use for the purpose the land was bought. This is true in CO, WY and other states. Look at the promise of water to the farmers in CA - cut off for a guppy they don't even know if it's a native fish. Look at the 80 mile stretch of about 6800 acres along the AZ border that's supposed to be federal land for camping, hiking and vacations. It's posted with something like: enter at your own risk bandits/drug gangs control the area. You cannot believe in the promises of the federal government. And it's alot harder to take the land back from the federal government than from a state government. The best way to conserve land is through Nature's Conservancy. The land is privately held and cared for. It's traded and used to encourage habitat and common usage. Federal acquisition is not a good idea.

When the Forest ceases to be actively managed, it burns. My district saw in excess of 200,000 acres burn in 2008. Now those lands are acres of dead sticks waiting for the next lightning strike to set them off. Not a pretty sight for tourists. My communities live in terror of fire and smoke. Tourists don't come. The way it is being managed today, the Forest is not a good neighbor. In fact, our County has declared local Forest lands to constitute a public nuisance in the way they are being managed.

Limiting the use of excessive light which causes light pollution is central to almost every goal in the environmentalists' lists. It endangers many species because of the unnatural diurnal cycle. It endangers humans with research on breast and prostate cancer now full underway. It steals our dreams by limiting our vision to the day time and robbing us of the stars which have been an inspiration throughout our history as humans. It also puts excess pollution in the air which does not need to be there for any reason (one 250 W light puts one ton of carbon dioxide in the air per year). Generally it is simply wasteful and dangerous. It also has a fairly easy fix - turn it off or if necessary cap it so that it illuminates the area that is necessary and doesn't stray into the sky.

Global warming is not man made and it is extremely fat-headed for humans to believe they can have significant influence on a system so much bigger than mankind. The hoax is over. Get over it!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If we want to address the "dredging of human minds" we need to take on the teaching unions so that you can fire teachers who do not teach. We also need to get away from the model that teaches to the level of the masses, thereby shortchanging the very brightest and those most in need of help. Also, focus should be redirected to the basics instead of promoting so many "community action" activities... I send my daughter to school to learn how to read, write, compute, and investigate -- not to raise money to buy livestock for those less fortunate or dig wells for people in countries who's governments are too corrupt or inept to take care of their own citizenry. I prefer to address charitable giving (and sex education) at home. I submit that's MY RIGHT! Incidentally, my daughter watches TV and plays computerized games, but she also plays outside with her friends or dogs, goes swimming, climbs trees, swings, rides her bike and scooter, and swims regularly. We'd spend more time doing such things if I didn't have to spend so much time correcting the misinformation she gets at school.

"what our history of economic development has gotten us is the security and economic ability to even have arguments about how our resources should or should not be used." I'm having difficulty seeing the truth of this statement. I generally agree, that economic development has been harmful to both wildlife and nature (seen in farming practices and development of our communities as well as logging, mining and other methods of "extracting" resources) and doesn't necessarily benefit a significant number of Americans. When you're homeless, jobless or incarcerated it's difficult to participate in or contribute to our economy. It seems to me that our constitution and government allow the debate about how resources should/should not be used. Help me understand the statement quoted above. Thank you!

"The negative environmental impacts of your machines just need to be added into the equation for there to be real fairness (along with the negative impacts of ANY type of use)." Seems to me this is the crux of the matter. the small number of OHV riders who don't obey the rules can do a lot of damage to land that is supposed to be around for future generations to enjoy. I agree with Anthony that a sensible solution is needed, and don't want to outlaw an activity that some enjoy responsibly. I'm not sure what that solution might be, except that some land -- it seems MORE land -- needs to be designated for OHV use. If what's said in these comments is true, there area enough responsible folks in the OHV community to take responsibility for the upkeep of land set aside for OHV use.

Light pollution control is very much needed for the following reasons: 1. It wastes energy, all the light that does not go where intended (such as up into the sky), is wasted energy. 2. wasted energy contributes to greenhouse gasses, and global warming 3. wasted enrgy is wasted tax dollars 4. light trespass onto neighbors is rude and unwanted 5. Glare from badly designed lights is a safety problem, blinding drivers, and this gets worse the older you are. The AMA supports such LP control for this reason 6. excessive nighttime lighting is bad for the environment and many species, such as birds. 7. there is no reason to have so much sky glow, and that sickly orange glow over most towns and cities. Lets bring back the real sky. Mario Motta, MD

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Can you provide some background for your claim that "There is 900,000 sq miles of desert in the US western states. Currently less than 1/10 of 1 percent of that area is available for any type of OHV use in any form." Its an interesting statistic.

Full appropriation of the Historic Preservation Fund would mean more resources into rehabilitation and conservation of America's prehistoric and historic sites, districts, buildings, structures and objects. Historic Preservation funding is jobs funding. Every dollar spent on historic preservation leverages private dollars to stabilize and rebuild America's infrastructure. Historic Preservation is labor intensive and promotes re-cycling of useful materials. Full funding of the Historic Preservation Fund does not increase taxes, it provides incentives for property owners to maintain property and in the process create good jobs for trades, crafts and businesses located in sound historic buildings.

great comments here. Wilderness is too restrictive a designation. Unfortunately, wilderness activists fight fiercely against any more reasonable tool to protect lands. Candidly, they will admit the reason is because they want to close trails to bicycles and motorcycles.

Historic preservation has consistently not just been a "giveaway" program. It has sought to provide matching funds where needed, often \$2 or \$3 (if not more) for every dollar provided in grant funds. The HPF should be funded at \$150 million, and local communities and NGOs will add many hundreds of millions in private funds to restore nationally important landmarks. This has worked successfully with the Preserve America and Save America's Treasures programs, and would enable HPF to be even more successful than its been in the past. I've been disappointed in the Obama Administration's level of support for preservation, and this is one place they can step up. With HPF funds originating from oil leases, and the mess BP is making of our country, Mr. Obama should see this is a consolation prize for our nation's communities.

I believe that all public land is to be accessible to the citizens of the United States of America and special interest groups should not be allowed to force there agenda on others.

i see the same 4 or 5 people making anti OHV complaints on every idea. Let us have our areas to connect with the outdoors the way we see fit. There will always be disagreements about this stuff....best way to build a better future is to co-exsist, not alienate a group of people.

I would like to see hikers have the same restrictions placed on them.

If you had the choice to keep riding for the rest of your life but at the cost of making a single species extinct, would you?

Lest we forget: The ground on these battlefields was soaked with American blood!!! Would you build a McDonalds on the cliffs overlooking Omaha Beach??? How about a Walmart??? What kind of American would even propose developing land on which American soldiers and civilians fought and died??? It is unfathomable! Yet it is happening now. Please protect this hallowed ground.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lets call them what they are, Feral horses or strays? Why support an invasive non-native species? Their natural habitat is europe and asia, not america.

We have been going to southern Utah for over twenty years. I don't feel that the trail system that exists today is unreasonable and should be protected. It allows the public to access and see some of the most stunning scenery without degrading that very experience. The trails exist and should not be closed. I don't believe in wilderness just for the sake of wilderness. But also do not believe there should be any new trails, whether for hikers, bicycles, motorcycles or 4-wheel drives.

We must stop digging up our past under the guise of making way for the future. Remaining civil War sites MUST be preserved!

Yes, it is OK to be the "hypocritical, rabid environmentalist" when it suits your needs, i.e., from your statement above: "... 80% of open space land ..... and if such a place exists I would surely like to go there and even live there when I retire." It's OK for you, Robert Redford (with his huge ranch where he built his home), Barbara Streisand (with her huge air conditioned garage and water bill in the thousands per month), and Al Gore (with his redwood lined office), but not for anyone from the general public to enjoy this same luxury. The difference between a developer and an environmentalist is the environmentalist already has his home in the woods and doesn't want you to have the same.

5% is hardly marginal and would likely put many manufacturers and retailers out of business. Most of us in this country already see half or more of our annual income sucked up by some form of taxation. More is not the answer. As another example, look at the effects of of using increased cigarette taxes for health care funding. Every time the tax rate goes up, revenue decreases as more people give up the habit. Taxes are an excellent way of discouraging a particular activity.

the areas like those you describe above are far more worthy of designation than many of the areas currently under consideration that are roaded, have been mined or logged in the past. Concentrating efforts on these types of places is much more in keeping with the wilderness act than is trying to designate areas that don't meet the statutory definition of wilderness.

An excellent idea. The federal government wields entirely too much power and influence. Reducing that in all aspects is a good thing. Public land planning should be carried out as much as possible by those who are most affected by it--the ones who live closest to a particular place.

Beautiful website with wonderful photographs. It's good to see someone using black and white imaging, it is so much more dramatic. I'm lucky to be living in Central Arizona where so much history and pre-history is still accessible. Shameful that so much of it was bulldozed in the 70's by BLM and USFS, like the old towns of Cordes and Venezia. I hope you got a chance to get a meal at the Cow Palace on your visit to Amado.

By and large this is a good idea, so long as eminent domain is not abused and there is a recognition of the difference between legal and physical access.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Collaborative efforts can be effective. The problems arise when individuals are unwilling to see past what could be termed as their own "recreational prejudices". There are many who can't seem to see that people who choose to do different things or may have different goals in mind than they do still have a significant role to play in planning processes and should not be ignored.

point is an all too common problem. His is only one example of the federal government closing trails and areas despite the presence of organized maintenance efforts. There have also been numerous instances of the federal government blocking these efforts, often due to the onerous requirements placed by the courts and those higher up the chain of command in the executive branch, (and not just the current one) who are often completely out of touch with reality on the ground. In principal, I support the idea, but without significant changes, there can't be anything resembling a partnership.

For the most part, I agree with you here. The problem I have is that it sounds like you are advocating that government be given the authority to regulate what people watch on TV or what games they play, if they are allowed to. That's the only part I really don't like. And since I believe that government's role should be strictly limited, that issue alone overrides everything else.

Good and well, but keep in mind that some of this land contains large reserves of oil, coal, other energy sources and minerals. We need to be able to access these things for the foreseeable future. Additionally, many of the areas in question, (I'm guessing that the lands being referred to are those potentially slated to surreptitiously being designated as national monuments and similarly protected areas by executive fiat) are highly valued as recreational areas by hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians and OHV users and others. Most notable the areas in Southern Utah and Arizona. Locking away resources that will likely be needed and further reducing recreational access is foolish. There are clearly areas within the area described that are suitable for wilderness, but not all of it is. Nor should all of it be barred from mineral and energy extraction. Like it or not, we need these things. One does not plant crops, maintain them and then let them rot in the fields while people starve.

Good ideas. A lot of it comes down to what people's priorities are, too. Most of us can probably afford more than we think if we prioritize our spending better.

I don't know what kind of ATVs people use in your area, but I have yet to find an area that was passable by ATV and not on foot. I have, however seen the converse of this many times. Be that as it may, I agree with most of what you're suggesting. Many times damage occurs because of a combination of irresponsible use and lax enforcement. It's also possible that the place you live does not have a statutory provision for the destruction of roads. My state does. A person can be arrested for criminal damage for causing damage to a muddy road surface, for instance. Try getting in touch with your local OHV groups and see if there can be some agreement and then approach the land management agency with your mutual concerns. Most OHV operators realize that the type of damage you refer to is what causes problems for us and will be willing to work with making repairs and working on ways to prevent future damage.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I don't see anything wrong with ballooning, and it can be a good way to get a look at a wide area. The only issue I have is that, like every other group, there are some balloonists who are not considerate. Near where I live, a private landowner had to fence his property off to prevent a balloon operator from using it as a launch point. I understand that they may not always be able to control precisely where they come down, but like everyone else, they need to act responsibly.

I don't think that we need a new designation, I think that we need to use current designations properly. There are many areas that have been declared wilderness that do not fit the statutory definition of it. Many wilderness areas contain such features as man made stock tanks, existing roads and trails, mines, and other cultural features. Areas such as this do not fit with the definition of a wilderness.

I hike trails, bike trails, and use my OHV on trails. No one is suggesting we turn anyplace into a theme park. Clearly there are some here who simply refuse to engage in any meaningful discussion about land use if the use suggested does not fit within their narrow views. If someone wishes to further restrict access to a particular area I suggest that they purchase the land fence it off, and do so without using my tax dollars to fund it.

I think that many of you are missing the point here. I don't see the author suggesting that we create a paved pathway up your favorite canyon. My understanding is that the whole point of this initiative is to find ways to bring people back to having an understanding and appreciation of the natural world around them. For some, it is different than others. Not everyone is capable of, or desires a 5 day pack trip into the Hell's Gate Wilderness, or wherever happens to be your favorite place. What I am seeing is someone who has some ideas about using widespread technologies as a means of increasing knowledge, visitorship and stewardship. From what I have seen here, however, there appears to be a strong contingent of individuals who believe that their way of enjoying the outdoors is the only way that is correct and permissible. This type of attitude will not lead to anything productive.

I think that these types of operations could succeed on their own through the use of cooperative slaughterhouses and packing facilities that could serve several of these operations. As a matter of personal preference, I prefer grass fed beef. This type of operation also allows for less standardization in the breed of cattle and allows for more consumer choice. An additional selling point of beef raised in this manner is the availability of beef that has not been given steroids or growth hormones. It is also typically a healthier choice as it is leaner and lower in cholesterol. They may need some assistance in the beginning, but I think they can ultimately succeed on their own.

I would actually go a step farther and eliminate it altogether. There's no reason a group of people cannot get money together, either on their own or through donations by like-minded individuals.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I wouldn't say that just because someone who wants to preserve preserve wildlife habitat or primeval areas that they are anti access. Unfortunately, many groups who seek to preserve what could be considered primeval areas are also actively attempting to remove OHV users from public lands that have been historically used for this purpose. These actions, along with a failure to recognize that vehicle use and wildlife habitat can co-exist, have co-existed and currently do co-exist in many areas leads to the anti-access label. As far as profit making, the BRC is one of very few multiple use advocacy groups that has been successful in getting a foothold in lobbying efforts. To call them profitable, I think denies reality. If you want to see profit motive, take a look at groups like the CBD and PEER. These are some of the groups who have made a living at taxpayer expense by suing the federal government under provisions of the ESA that require we the taxpayers to foot the bill for their lawsuits, even when they are proven wrong. As for \_\_\_\_\_'s idea, I have no idea where she stands on OHVs or anything else. But, I completely agree that the current planning process is severely broken and outdated. It should not be as difficult as it seems to be to integrate real or near time data into the planning process. Often, the current methods rely on outdated or incomplete information about all aspects related to conditions on the ground in and around whatever area plans are being made for. This doesn't serve anyone. I would, however, add that the economic impacts of planning decisions, both to the federal and local budgets, and to local economies needs to be considered in the planning process as well.

If you were actually paying attention instead of of spouting the typical anti OHV rhetoric, you would note that no one has suggested OHV access to protected wilderness, parks and similar areas. Rather, what we are asking for is the cessation of the continuing loss of access to areas that have been enjoyed by OHV enthusiasts and others for decades.

Intentional or not, it has and does happen, although over the past ten years things have definitely improved in this area . I would also agree that most planners, regardless of their personal stance on things, make substantial efforts to elicit comments from all (who should be) involved. Unfortunately, this is not always the case. The reasons behind this happening, are less important to me that the actual outcome. While I don't expect a personal phone call from the XXXX National Forest Headquarters, there needs to be improvement in noticing the public.

It is time for overreach by the federal government to end. For too long, the federal government has imposed its will on the states and local governments, often through what amounts to legalized bribery. States, local governments and individuals must no longer allow the federal government to dictate the terms of their existence.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Keep in mind that the 96dB limit applies to measurements taken at 20 inches from the exhaust outlet. Reductions in noise are also something that is already happening due to market forces. Many currently manufactured OHVs produce sound in the area of 85dB. Manufacturers have also been able to tune motors to the exhaust to maximize power and efficiency and many newer ATVs are using electronic fuel injection which further decreases fuel consumption and emissions. In my state, a street legal OHV must meet the same emission standards as passenger cars. The reduction is already taking place without additional government interference. I have a friend who does dyno work on ATVs. He has found that many of the louder aftermarket pipes actually reduce power output. OHV clubs and advocacy groups also encourage their members to at least meet the standard. Most clubs won't allow you to ride with them if you're not in compliance. Organizations like quietbike.org also provide information and encouragement to comply with the regulations.

Let's define some terms. You cannot "make" an entity donate anything. The proper term for that is robbery, unless of course you are a government, in which case it is called taxation. At least have the courtesy to call it what it is. In January, the largest tax increase in the history of our nation is set to take place. This along with the impending mess created by an unconstitutional health care scheme will likely cause severe economic hardship for everyone. Adding to the potential disaster is beyond unwise.

Local land use policies are exactly that and they should remain so. State and local governments have the right to administer their lands in the way they see fit. The practice of federal intrusion in to the arena of state, local and most especially private land management needs to come to an end. If you are in area where your local elected officials are not doing what you think they should, address the issues with them. You have far more control over them than you do anyone at the federal level and they are the ones who should be making decisions about these issues in the first place. There is sometimes a lack of federal leadership in this arena because that is how our constitution was written. It's supposed to be that way. Federal bureaucracies are detached and generally lack knowledge of local issues.

Many of these groups already receive entirely too much federal money and support. I can think of no other arena in which the federal government actually pays attorneys fees so that these groups can sue them, causing of course, the government to have to spend even more of our money to defend itself. All organizations and people, including corporations and other businesses should have a voice, but that voice shouldn't be subsidized by taxpayers.

Many of us who hike, bike, or ride horses also enjoy riding or driving our OHVs. When used responsibly, OHVs can be a great way to explore, especially in the western US where we have vast and varied open spaces, old mines, ghost towns and the like. An OHV can also make a great way to access remote trailheads that may be difficult or too time consuming for most to reach if done in other ways. The reality is that most of us have to work during the week and have limited weekend and vacation time to get out. An OHV can be another tool for accessing the places we want to go, even though it may be only part of what we are doing.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Much of the "roadless" areas declared by the Clinton Administration were actually "roaded", and do not qualify for wilderness designation per the statute. The same is true of many areas of the land mentioned in Southern Utah. The only portion of ANWR not currently protected due to its status is the less than 1% that was supposed to have been available for energy exploration. As has been suggested before, if you wish areas to be designated as wilderness, carefully select them based on the statutory criteria and lobby your elected representatives to make it so. This is the only LAWFUL means of designating wilderness. Why not use it, instead attempting to create unlawful designations via executive fiat?

NEPA and ESA need serious reform. A good start would be to bring an end to the trial lawyer welfare system created by the provisions that require taxpayers to cover legal expenses for litigation under the ESA, even in situations where the plaintiff loses. We as taxpayers should not be forced to finance lawsuits against ourselves, which is the general effect of these provisions. If an organization wishes to sue the federal government, they should foot their own bill. The lawsuit problem is at the root of many other difficulties in land management. Imagine being the BLM, in the process of writing a RAMP. The DRAMP is released, comments accepted, RAMP produced. Then it's reviewed by the USFWS who issues a no jeopardy opinion in reference to a listed plant species that is actually in the process of being delisted. Along comes Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility and the Center for Biological Diversity. Their attorneys file a lawsuit at our expense. The BLM defends its position at our expense. A temporary settlement is reached and 8 years later, we have a new DRAMP and the same threats of lawsuits. This cycle has to end. The endless raft of lawsuits paid for by taxpayers, who very often disagree with their premise, is not a responsible or effective means of land management.

we're talking about OHVs here, not pick ups. The amount of fuel consumed by OHVs is negligible when compared with the amount used by other vehicles. They typically get between 40 and 60 miles per gallon, and their numbers pale in comparison to standard cars and trucks. I add the street legal because there are relatively few areas in my state where you can legally ride without carrying registration and insurance. I'm not obscuring the noise issue. I'm pointing out the facts that appeared to be unaware of. More area? No.. I've never asked for that. I've asked for a cessation in reduction of area and mitigation for what is taken away. There's a difference.

what our history of economic development has gotten us is the security and economic ability to even have arguments about how our resources should or should not be used. It is easy to claim anyone's argument is invalid, but it doesn't say much. I also do not see where I said anything about developing and strip-mining everything in sight, regardless of consequence as you seem to want to suggest I have. All I'm saying is that we need to proceed in a way that does not limit access to resources in such a way that it endangers the ability be able to make those decisions. Simply blindly closing everything to any kind of development will ultimately lead to the inability to protect anything. My voting record reflects my beliefs in individual liberties and a government that lives within its financial and constitutional limits.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

you have clearly never participated in a clean up of an area off limits to OHV users. Fossil Creek in Central Arizona was completely trashed by hikers and other non-motorized visitors AFTER the area was closed to motorized travel. Prior to that, clean-up efforts were rarely necessary. Every group has its problem individuals, but I don't hold you accountable for what other non-motorized recreationists do. Being in both camps, so to speak, I can sympathize with some of your concerns. But, placing blame on OHV users for everything that has gone wrong is logically flawed and counterproductive.

On the other hand, a lightweight sleeping bag with a silk liner and a bivy sack will keep you plenty warm and dry if you're smart about it. And as an added bonus, you don't have to carry around 50 pounds of gear. Even Colorado has deserts, which can make for great winter camping experiences if you can't afford what you think you need for cold weather, or just don't like it. Hanging out where the wind blows at 40 knots all night and it gets down to -5 is not mandatory. There are other options.

One of the biggest problems in land use planning has been the exclusion of and animosity toward certain user groups in planning processes. I have seen this problem in the transportation management planning process in various national forests. In some instances, it appears that the exclusion of OHV users, mountain bikers and even equestrians and other groups has even been intentional. The public notice of planning and scoping meetings has sometimes been tailored to attract only those who participate in certain types of recreational activities, even though other users were severely effected by the outcome. There have been numerous instances of areas historically used for motorized travel being closed to that purpose without input from the users. The inclusion of ALL user groups is absolutely necessary in public land planning. Those who are engaging in planning should be required to ensure that all groups are represented and an end put to the elitism that seems to exist in this area. The land belongs to all of us, every taxpayer bears a portion of the cost. Excluding any one group from planning processes is not acceptable.

Our elected officials already know what the general public thinks. They and their massive campaigns keep track of this. Unfortunately, of late they have not been paying attention to this. The last 18 months should be very illustrative of the fact that roughly 60% of the US Senate and a similar portion of the House of Representatives has not a care in the world what you or I think. The best answer is, as always, to make sure that those whom you believe support your views are elected or re-elected and that those who do not, are not.

Please point out specific instances where OHV trail systems have been expanded where it was not the result of agreed upon mitigation for lost trail miles elsewhere.

Remember that we need to be able to access our natural resources in order to survive and prosper as a nation. Part of the job of the BLM is to make sure that activities like mining, drilling and now setting aside areas for other sources of energy like geothermal and solar, and to make sure that these are carried out in a responsible manner. This is on top of their duty to preserve unique landscapes and habitats, as well as recreational access. While the BLM is not always stellar at what they do, and at times outright fails, putting economic development in the back seat is dangerous and a mistake.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

you have a clear misunderstanding about what most OHV operators do, apparently. Both of my machines being street legal are required to undergo an emissions test every year and are subject to the same emissions and sound requirements as any other vehicle operated on a public road. In my state an operator of a vehicle can be arrested for criminal damage for driving on a wet road and can face similar criminal and civil sanctions for any activity that damages roads, water crossings, as well as speeding, etc. (yes, traffic laws apply on many FRs) Wilderness Areas, by their very definitions are not supposed to contain roads, nor are motor vehicles permitted within them. You have created a straw-man. I also defy you to do 200+ miles off-road on a motorcycle or ATV or even in a buggy for that matter, and claim laziness. I typically find myself more physically and mentally tired after a 150-200 mile ride than I do after a 2 day, 30 mile hike. Again, you guys seem to be missing the point. We're merely asking that areas that have historical use of a certain type be allowed to continue to be used in the same manner. That's all. Nowhere is anyone advocating opening up wilderness and previously roadless areas to new roads and trails. You hit the nail on the head. The fix is in and everyone knows it is, but only some are willing to admit it. The time has come for honesty, openness and reasonableness in the TMP process.

Thank you. The other problem that I would like to point out, is statement about how little power the UN has. While this is generally the case, it has been clearly demonstrated that every once in a while officials are elected who seem more than willing to give away out national sovereignty. This is why all of us must always be watchful regarding ideas that may be out there. This topic could just as easily be about someone's plan to lease the areas in question to ARAMCO. Perhaps equally unlikely, but also equally bad. Do not trust that every elected official has our national interests in mind. This has been proven time and again and in many ways.

That sounds like an excellent idea. This is an opportunity that is overlooked by many states. You will need the cooperation of several different agencies, including the jurisdictions responsible for the roads, leadership in the cities and towns, the state agency responsible for motor vehicle regulations, and quite possibly the state legislature. If you can get the local people behind the idea, none of this is insurmountable. Utah has a similar program. As you have probably already seen, you will see numerous specious arguments presented against your plan and much in the way of false and irrelevant claims and misinformation from those who think that OHVs are the root of everything evil. Programs like this have had good success in other places, there is no reason Nebraska should be any different.

The ending of the unlawful designation of wilderness by executive fiat was a good thing. If you wish wilderness to be designated, lobby your elected representatives for it. You may have more support than you think if it's done the right way and in the right places.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The goal of this blog, for lack of a better term, is not banter about ideas that will lead to the economic devastation of our nation by addressing problems such as health care, which are none of the federal government's business, nor to attempt to find ways to address what is in all likelihood a natural phenomenon. I do not expect that everyone here will agree on everything, but I would expect that most would agree that preserving access to our nations outdoor treasures is equally important as preserving the treasures themselves. Without the ability of people to responsibly use and enjoy public lands in a multiple use and access paradigm, I would not expect any large scale initiative in this arena to be successful.

The issue as I see it is that most OHV folks tend to think that if a spot can be reached by mechanized means then it should remain open OR be opened for their use. This completely disregards the major impacts that ORV's have on the land. There is ample scientific research that shows that the vast majority of wildlife species benefit when their habitat is not crisscrossed by roads, where they have ample room to roam. Soil compaction, noise, degradation of water quality and quantity, erosion, poaching, and increased looting of archeological and historic sites are all impacts that increase when ORV use opens up an area to motorized access. I do a fair amount of camping, hiking and backpacking in the national forests, on BLM land, and in national parks and the negative impact of ORV's on the public lands has noticeably increased in the last 20+ years. There are far more ORV's and their capabilities to access very rugged country have increased and areas that were formerly roadless have now been "claimed" by ORV's. I was in the Coconino National Forest north of Phoenix, AZ last summer and was astonished at the major increase in "roads" that have been created compared to 10 or 15 years ago. There are just so many more miles of these routes than there used to be. It's created such a spider's web of unmarked roads that in many cases it has gotten difficult in some cases to follow the correct forest service road that appears on the map. They get driven on in the spring and become rutted and torn up. The Forest Service tries to close some of them and they get illegally reopened by ORV drivers soon after. There are over 300,000 miles of designated Forest Roads (8 times bigger than the interstate highway system!) and probably a like amount on BLM land. How on earth is this not enough for ORV users? I drive a 4 wheel drive truck and use it to access trailheads and dispersed camping sites but I stick to the roads on the forest service map. Even if the USFS closes some of those roads for natural resource protection there are still more miles to drive on than one person could hope to drive in a lifetime. I don't begrudge ORV users from enjoying the forest but when "roads" are closed by the federal agencies or wilderness areas created by Congress it has NOTHING to do with creating playgrounds for the tree huggers and everything to do with erosion control, habitat protection, endangered species protection, watershed preservation (kind of important in the arid west), archeological and historic preservation, and myriad other natural resource reasons. It's our playground but it's the wildlife's home.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The primary cause of damage to roads is actually lack of preventive maintenance and overuse to salt for road clearing in areas that are plowed. Typically some settling of roadbeds occurs, after construction, usually due to inadequate preparation and compaction, which seems to be rampant on many park roads, probably to save on initial cost. Once a small crack develops in pavement, it allows water (and in some cases salt) to infiltrate. A few freeze-thaw cycles later and you start developing significant problems. Add in salt crystallization within the paved surface and another destructive process begins. Proper surface preparation, appropriate materials and the sealing of any cracks or defects that develop will go a long way toward increasing road and parking area longevity. The average interstate highway may go 30 or more years without much in the way of damage, especially if salt use is limited. They experience a far greater volume of heavier traffic than is typically seen in a park setting. Now, I will agree that once the process of pavement breakup has begun, a heavier vehicle will accelerate that process more than a lighter one. But, placing the blame solely on a larger vehicle will not in reality solve the problem.

The problem with these fees is that the money collected often does not go back into facilities and maintenance. I don't have an issue with the concept of pay to play, but these programs are often poorly managed and seem to have little oversight. There are some areas, however where the programs have worked well, providing additional facilities, construction of a new road to access camping areas that became inaccessible when a private landowner closed the existing access, and other needed infrastructure. Rather than entirely eliminating this, I think an examination of where the money goes and putting appropriate rules for spending in place would be a better solution.

The problem with this bill is it that it appears to have become part of an omnibus land bill. Omnibus bills are tools used in the legislative process that may force elected representatives to support bills that contain both good and bad ideas. Many of the places in this bill under consideration for wilderness designation are areas currently open to OHV use and in some areas snow mobiles. Other areas, are better suited to status as wilderness as they do not contain roaded areas, or areas that have historically been accessed by motor vehicles. The NCA proposed in New Mexico is part of the legislation that makes more sense as it is a different type of designation that allows for route planning and public input once it is implemented. Issues like this need to be considered on a case by case basis, under their own, individual bills, instead of being lumped into an omnibus package that may contain things that no one wants.

The right to own private property is one of the founding principles of our nation. Eminent domain is something that all too often abused by government, be it local or national. If anything, legislation needs to be passed limiting this practice. When an individual owns a piece of property, it belongs to them. If an preservation organization wishes to purchase property, and can come to an agreement with the owner, this is fine. But it is never okay for a government to commit what often amounts to nothing more than legalized robbery of its citizens.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are actually numerous incentives already in place for solar. In addition to federal tax credits, some states also offer similar credits. While adding solar to a business or residence can have a significant up front expense, much of the cost is defrayed through these credits. Additionally, depending on the system, electricity can be sold back to the utility during times you are generating it but not using all of it, resulting in a decreased power bill. Unfortunately, while solar has made strides in efficiency, it still remains a rather inefficient way to generate electricity. This will no doubt improve over time. Using deserts for giant solar and wind farms has been suggested. This has created concerns, however, from those of us who live in or near these areas or recreate in these areas. Just because it's a desert does not mean it's devoid of life or usefulness. Dispersed generation at individual residences and businesses may be a better solution. As for carbon, keep in mind that during the late ordivician period, there was an ice age. At that time, CO2 levels in the earth's atmosphere were roughly 12 times higher than they are now. That aside, there are plenty of other good reasons to reduce fossil fuel emmissions. Unfortunately, until something that gives equal bang for the buck comes along, it's the best thing there is. Aside from nuclear, at least.

There are similar groups in Arizona and at various designated OHV recreation areas in Southern California. It often makes a good partnership with the managing agency that goes beyond enforcing the rules in to areas like maintenance and administrative improvements. The fines collected should should be used to help fund OHV enforcement and rider education.

There are three conditions: Growth, stagnation or decline. Anything else denies global economic realities. Security and stability require growth. The United States is not the only nation in the world and as such must be in a position to protect itself and its vital interests. Without growth, our natural resources would be being pilfered by China, or some other nation while our population served whatever their interests happened to be. Happiness is not a government function, other than to the extent government leaves me alone so that I may pursue whatever happens to bring me happiness. The number of children I have, or do not have is none of the government's business, so long as they are properly taken care of.

This is one of the issues at the root of some of the OHV community's problems in getting organized. Most of us are by nature, not the type of individuals prone to joining groups. Finger-pointing at other, similar users is not going to help us. I can point to examples of irresponsible use and abuse is every group ranging from hikers and equestrians to 4wd users. What we need to be doing is making sure that we educate everyone in the off road community to be responsible users and standing together when groups seek to lock us out.

This so-called federal supremacy is at the root of many of our nation's current problems and goes against many protections in our constitution. A government's first job is to protect the liberties of the people it governs. This is not accomplished by using the over reaching authority of the federal government to force decisions and management schemes on the locals. Kudos to those fighting the good fight in Utah, and elsewhere.

This would be a great program if it did not stipulate that only a few, hand-picked individuals know what is best for the rest of us.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Twenty years ago in one of my geology classes, the professor lectured about this. He cautioned that yes, climate change is absolutely real, but disputed our influence on it. The greenhouse effect is very real and Earth would be like Mercury without it. But, all greenhouse gasses put together make up less than 1% of atmospheric gasses. The big, evil CO2 makes up less than .04% of our atmosphere and more CO2 is produced by wetlands than all manmade activities combined. Looking at the geologic record, a sound argument can be made that Earth is currently CO2 impoverished. Keep in mind that during the late Ordovician Period an ice age took place. Atmospheric CO2 was 12 times higher than it is now. This is one of two points in geologic history when global average temperature was cooler than it is now. CO2 also has a relatively low specific heat, especially when compared with water. Water vapor is by far the biggest contributor to the greenhouse effect. What you will not hear is that orbital eccentricities of Earth around The Sun and variations in the Sun's output are the most likely culprits. Although, I might buy into the idea that releasing millions of years of solar energy as heat over the last few hundred years has had some effect. As has the placement of temperature sensors used to monitor ground temperatures as they are often near urban areas that have become heat islands over the last hundred years. Not that 100 years can provide any kind of accurate measurement of anything for a system that is billions of years old. Regardless, average global temperature has risen less than 1 degree C over the last 100 years or so. Those facts combined with what appears to me to be a deliberate loss, or at minimum sloppy record keeping by those who promote the idea that CO2 is what's doing it, make me very suspicious. Records don't just disappear in scientific research projects. For that matter, I don't lose the inane emails on my home computer. It's all backed up off-site. Surely any reputable project would do at least that to preserve their data. Unless they didn't want you to know about or were just plain ignorant.

Unfortunately, running off the regulars really isn't the goal. We just want to make sure that our interests and concerns are not ignored. The fact is that most of us who ride also hike, mountain bike and engage in other forms of outdoor recreation, too. None of us wants to see our wild places destroyed, but we also have concerns about standing by and watching as one of our passions is relegated to less and less space. For the most part we are not asking for more. Just seeking to make sure that the access we all have now will always be there.

Very good idea. We need to make sure that important historic and cultural sites are preserved and properly researched. There is so much history in this country that we don't even notice, sometimes even when it's right under our noses. It's important that our heritage remains preserved and accessible to all.

We also need to make sure the right kinds of trees are planted. Planting high-water use species in desert areas is probably not the best of ideas, however there are numerous native trees that could serve this purpose. I'm inclined to agree with Devlin as it relates to funding. Why not make a way for people to donate money and/or trees, as well as labor to help defray costs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We could easily go very far afield from what's intended here, so I'm going to do my best to make this my last comment on this issue. The government often has a role in drawing attention to things. The problem I see with this, though is where does it end. Smoking is a great example. In my state it is unlawful to smoke in business establishments. My problem with this is that it infringes on private property rights. If I own a business and desire to smoke in it, others are free to avoid buying things from me and free to not work for me. If I own the building, I shouldn't have to kow-tow to the desires of others when they can avoid the situation entirely. That's a fictional example. I enjoy a good cigar now and again, but I also find it refreshing to go into an establishment and not have to deal with cigarette smoke. It just makes me nervous about where this type of intrusion ends. At what point does someone else get to control my television, reading material and anything else. I understand what you are saying about bringing attention to the issue, but what happens when the issue being attended to is something that you feel differently about? I just think that areas like this are best left to parents, families and private organizations. People making poor life choices is one of the hazards of living in a free society. But, I still think it beats the alternative.

Well, Rebecca, that is why this idea also advocates an enforcement and education component. My primary disagreement with wilderness designations is that it restricts access to something that belongs to all of us. This is the kind of idea that can be successfully implemented as it does not seek to lock out certain groups or seek to force everyone to recreate according one group's narrow idea of what that should consist of.

While I can understand where you are coming from and know that there are times when professionals in a variety of fields need to be consulted, additional mandates are not the answer. There are already too many hoops to jump through with any project like this. Adding another layer of regulation and bureaucracy to an already overly complex and overly regulated arena does not strike me as a good solution.

While its good to promote these things, I think this idea addresses the symptoms more than the problems. It's no wonder we all have a hard time saving both time and money when half of what we make is siphoned off through state, federal and local taxes. I know that this goes beyond the scope of this project, but hacking at the leaves will not have long term effects on the roots of some of our problems.

Yes, by all means, endorse the theft of private property by the federal government. This is exactly the kind of extremist rhetoric that undermines reasonable efforts to curb habitat destruction and sprawl. I also take issue with the statement that wildlife and residential development cannot coexist. Being one of the individuals in an area "around a large urban area", from whom some people would apparently like to steal, I can tell you that dispersed residential development in my area has had little impact on wildlife. The deer, coyotes, bobcats, etc., that were here before are still here. In some cases, they are here in larger numbers than before.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A core challenge for all educators is to promote a sense of ownership for common property resources of any kind. Another challenge gaining access to wild places during the school day. Another challenge is to create opportunities for immersion (either long-term or multiple opportunities over time) in wild areas for the purpose of the promotion of a lasting sense of connection to wild places and a sense of belonging.

I am a member of the off road community and my local enduro club. We have a long term relationship with the USFS to use USFS land for an annual event in the SE USA. The big push in the western US to shut down OHV use is moving east and it needs to be stopped. People that never use USFS land are influencing politicians to close land. The off road community in the SE is alive and well and contributes millions of \$\$\$\$ to the economy. It is also a great family builder and keeps young people out of trouble and in excellent physical shape. There is enough land for everyone to have a place to enjoy their sport. Please don't tread on us.

So many businesses, especially in urban fringe areas, own vast lawns which are mowed and fertilized and generally unattractive. Could they be encouraged to convert these wastelands into natural prairies? Landscape services need to be educated wilderness management.

The Federal Historic site near Washington, Ks about the Pawnee Indian encampment and story from the past tells how the Pawnee Indians lived and hunted the Great Plains for Buffalo. They hunted in Western Kansas for Buffalo. I believe Kansas is a place to include as part of the Great Plains National Park. Most people think Kansas is flat because of driving only on Interstate 70 through Kansas and not stopping to enjoy the Plains for the beauty it really has.

Historic Preservation is very important the preserve all historic buildings to keep history alive and funding is extremely hard to come by. Please help make funds available to everyone including small museums.

To All It May Concern: A battlefield is a sacred place. It should never be forgotten about, and thrown away like garbage. I think not just battlefields, but all historical places should be cherished and preserved for generations of eager, learning minds to be able to reflect, learn, and enjoy. It seems like this world is being built upon greed, which money can only buy. I think it is time that we all stood together, and finally did away with the notion of developing every single piece of land that exists. That we are not going to take it anymore. Send a message to all those greedy developers out there, that every piece of our land doesn't have to be developed, and won't be. It is a shame that some people have no respect for the past, and what it has meant to so many Americans.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To All It May Concern~ Hasn't enough damage been done in the Gulf and in other places in past years? This planet is so crucial to our survival. It was made for us so we would have a place to take care of and to enjoy. We have got to find a different way to get our resources from the land. We must find a way to make the best of our resources, but at the same time take care of our land, as well as sea, and all that lies within it. This drilling, I think is unnecessary, and has gone far enough. It is about time we stand up for what is right and give up what is wrong. That we stand for preserving life and livelihoods, and give up on all the greed money has to offer. Please reject Shells plan to drill for more oil in the Artic. This would be even more of a great tragedy for a place that has been relatively untouched before now.

As Secretary Salazar, Secretary Vilscak, Administrator Jackson, and Chair Sutley hold town hall meetings and listening sessions across America, I hope one of them will consider hosting an event in Georgia. As we start a national dialogue on the twenty-first century conservation agenda, Georgia has an important role to play.

How about if we look for people to head our agencies who have character and are not out to promote an agenda. I don't want a leader of either the Sierra Club or Weyerhaeuser Corp placed in an agency to promote an agenda.

I actually find my self in agreement with a lot of what says on this one. I think he would take it more to extremes than I would, but we are a wasteful people.

I fully support accountability as long as it does not turn into a witch-hunt. Many government entities suffer from lack of funding and, as a result, lack of qualified personnel. If accountability is to be examined perhaps we should also look at funding levels and determine how best to maximize every taxpayer dollar.

I may not know what I'm talking about here, but don't companies that use resources from federal lands pay for those resources? I know my company paid competitive market prices for the timber I have bought from the national forests, Corp of Engineers, and US Fish and Wildlife Service. The problem then becomes that the funds all go to some black hole in Washington. The federal budgeting process then determines where it is used.

I share the frustration of this post's author. As Americans, we own and have a right to access publicly-owned land. However, the problem of overuse and misuse is a significant one. I very much like Andree Herbert's comment about a refundable deposit fee. Encouraging people to contribute to the maintenance and upkeep of natural resources in exchange for free access is a great proposal. This is also a great way for someone to feel real ownership of a natural resource. Sure, we technically "own" the land as a taxpaying American. However, if someone actually devotes their own time and energy to its preservation then that ownership becomes more tangible.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think this is an excellent idea. Anything that gets young people interested in nature and healthy eating is a good thing. Food Deserts are a real problem in urban areas and I think a program like this could go a long way towards combating this problem. Is anyone aware of organizations that focus primarily on urban/community gardens?

Jobs in logging and mining are "green jobs"? The writer is delusional and probably watches Faux News a lot. Their motto is "it doesn't have to be factual- if we say it enough times, it becomes accepted as truth."

Just as prior generations saved land for our benefit and enjoyment, we need to preserve battlefield sites while we can. We created the world's first national park and we should maintain sites of our heritage for the benefit of our citizens.

Leave the dams in place. Stop trying to turn the Klamath River into something it never was. Klamath means stinking water. The very first explorers described the river as a stinking fecid trickle. It has been a "hot" oxygen deprived nutrient rich river. It is in the best shape it has ever been in! The salmon are not imperiled by water quality nor habitat loss. They are imperiled by by unregulated over fishing by native american indians!

Logging doesn't make land go away. You can't save trees. They all fall some day. You can make responsible choices about when, where and how much to log, which include consideration of species that live in and around timber stands.

Lots of other people enjoy (or should enjoy) the outdoor opportunities that logging areas provide. Anyone who has actually visited and spent time in a well-managed forest through the various stages of cutting and regrowth should know the great bounty of nature. Throughout the stages there are fantastic opportunities for wildlife observers, hikers, hunters, botanists, ecologists, OHVs, and myriad other groups. Literally a perpetual wealth of natural, recreational, and economic potential. Read between the lines, here. Again is proposing shutting huge groups of people out of public land, and denigrating huge tracts of valuable natural resource to narrow or non use. Again, the goal of this initiative is to connect people to the outdoors. We need constructive ideas in that vein, not counterproductive drivel.

OHV enthusiasts...watch out, this is a trap of reverse psychology being set by. Designate 10 million acres as OPEN to OHVs...by all means. Designate them ONLY for OHVs as is proposing...no way...that would shut out a vast number of people from a spectacular expanse of our public land. Exactly the opposite of what this whole initiative is about. We need to get more people outdoors, not less. your absolute opposition to the use of OHVs is obvious from so many of your other postings. Pushing your agenda of shutting certain groups out of our public lands is not being productive towards the goal of conserving our outdoor heritage and wealth. I am demoting this idea, as it is destructive to the common good and conservation of our outdoor spaces.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Preserving historic land, especially Civil War sites is crucial to helping future generations to understand our national character and history. The conflict tore our nation apart and helped to build the country we know today. These sites are disappearing every day because of suburban expansion and development. We can never recover a piece of developed land or a Civil War site that has been destroyed. Finally, a battlefield is a classroom for every American to learn about the carnage, devastation and horror that ultimately led to the creation of the America we each live in today. To allow these and other sites to disappear without an effort to save them is a tragedy from which we can never recover. We owe our children and their children the chance to learn about these places by visiting these places. Our President, leaders and our government must surely understand this....

Preserving the Great Outdoors is about preserving what naturally occurs in the Great Outdoors--our heritage of native biodiversity. The impact of invasive species must be stopped and reversed if we are to preserve what makes this land our land.

Are you for real? If I want to recreate on my ATV then I should take up the cause of overpopulation? Please. Most OHV trails in that 80% open space west of the Mississippi desert. There isn't much in the way of water displacement. And, where ATV's go through water, it does cause more impact, but it doesn't pollute the water. Much has been made of this; but I've never seen the claim backed up. The manufacturers build these vehicles to hold the gasoline and oil in the tank and motor. Even if I fell over in the stream, I won't lose oil or coolant. You could lose some gasoline but the bike would have to be upside down awhile, and even then you might lose what? One or two ounces. Look at a public pool with all those kids in them. The bears pee in the river while waiting for salmon to come up river. You've made some contentious statements to another posting; something about all watercraft and OHV's should be made illegal. It's terrible. Some of us like going deep, deep enough that hiking isn't practical. Should we stay out of the great outdoors until we have a week, rather than just a couple of days?

That's funny, I've been riding motorcycles all my life, and I've yet to scare a horse. Seen quite a few of them, too. And, no one riding their horse has ever expressed the attitude that I was wrecking their day. And I've come across some hikers, too, and no one has ever expressed a negative attitude, either.

The federal government used to use funds from oil revenues from drilling on federal lands to buy and protect lands for conservation and recreation. This was stopped by Republicans in Congress and the White House-- even though it maintained a very conservative principal. If we are taking resources from our future generations, we should preserve something for them in return. The writer is correct that parklands do not have adequate funding. This should be corrected by directing more federal funds to the parks.

The textbook definition of conservation is "wise use". As a forester, my role is to determine what constitutes wise use and to carry it out. Interference by people who don't know what they are talking about is preventing wise use of public lands. Much valuable resource is being wasted under the guise of "conservation".

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The writer overlooks the fact that our management practices have led to "un-natural" buildup of fuels, which in turn, leads to un-natural devastation if fire is allowed to roam free. What research has proven that suppressing or modifying fire has led to "degradation"?

This is a great idea. I'd really like to see more school programs such as this.

This is a very interesting idea which I had not considered until now. I like the idea of making our natural resources (and specifically our affect on them) relatable to average people. In lieu of a physical sign in front of or near a natural resource, do you think alternatives could be as effective? For instance, a podcast that could be downloaded and listened to while on a nature walk that gives the listener the information you describe as they walk through the site. Or perhaps a map or a simple diorama in a visitor's center or an information booth that depicts the location of the resources you wish to highlight with corresponding text boxes. I propose these alternatives because my concern is that we could end up having too much signage in our parks or other natural resources.

This problem - of disease and diminution of wild salmon where fish farms are near wild populations, is an international problem. Serious losses are occurring in British Columbia and Chile due to parasites deadly to young salmon entering the sea. Salmon are endangered in Contiguous US areas because of water diversion, pollution, damming of historically rich salmon rivers. 2/3 of the world's agricultural lands (cleared and taken from natural ecosystems) are rangelands, used for cattle, sheep, and other livestock. Reforestation of much of this land is vital for biodiversity and to combat atmospheric greenhouse gas additions made by human activity.

This would be fine if the billion dollars came from taxes on ATV's.

We as a nation must preserve our historical places. If we forget about our past, how can we have a future. We must expand our Civil war battlefields and protect them from development. These fields are sacred places and hallowed ground were past generations spilled their blood. They must not be forgotten. We must put aside the greed of the almighty dollar and protect our nation's past, present and most certainly our future.

What you are referring to as "multiple use" is actually multiple abuse. Wilderness is true multiple use and allows grazing, fishing, hunting, hiking, snowshoeing, rafting while minimizing the negative impacts.

You have some very good ideas. I particularly like paragraph two. Attracting young, skilled, and educated people to rural areas where they can "put down roots" and contribute to the community for a significant period of time is very important. Regarding paragraph one, I agree, in principle. My only concern is that one community's access to water or mineral rights can have an effect (sometimes negatively) on surrounding communities. I live in Georgia and have seen the difficulties that can be caused when one state feels they have a stronger claim to water than a neighboring state.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Texas Master Naturalist Program: A program model for developing a corps of natural resource volunteers aiding in the conservation, education, management and research of our local public lands. The short supply of dedicated and well-informed citizens and volunteers is often cited as a limiting factor for community-based conservation efforts. The Texas Master Naturalist™ program works to address this need by developing local corps of “master volunteers” to provide service dedicated to the beneficial management of natural resources and natural areas within the volunteers' own communities for the State." Communities and organizations across the state rely on these skilled volunteers for implementing youth outreach programs; for operating parks, nature centers, and natural areas; and for providing leadership in local natural resource conservation efforts. In addition, private landowners depend on the expertise of these volunteers to help them gain a broader scientific understanding of the ecology and management of their biological resources. This partnership among the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, Texas AgriLife Extension Service and over 300 local partners has resulted in a unique master volunteer organization. At the state level, the organization is directed by two program coordinators and a steering committee responsible for providing training guidelines, program marketing and promotion, curriculum resources, and advanced training opportunities for the chapters and their volunteers. At the local level, chapters consist of our trained volunteers aided by personnel from the partnering agencies as advisors and partnerships with additional community organizations sharing our mission. For an individual to gain the certification and designation as a “Texas Master Naturalist,” he or she must participate in an approved training program with a minimum of 40 hours of combined field and classroom instruction, obtain 8 contact hours of approved advanced training, and complete 40 hours of natural resource-related volunteer service—all of which is provided through local Master Naturalist chapters using guidelines of the state program. Upon enrollment into the initial training program, trainees have a maximum of one year in which to complete their 40 hours of volunteer service and 8 hours of advanced training. To retain the Texas Master Naturalist title during each subsequent year, volunteers must complete 8 additional hours of advanced training and provide an additional 40 hours of volunteer service coordinated through their local chapter. Founded with the first Master Naturalist chapter in 1997 and officially established as a statewide program in 1998, the Texas Master Naturalist™ program was the first of its kind. Since then, the program has grown from just four chapters and 150 volunteers in 1998 to 42 chapters and over 6,300 volunteers serving Texas' diverse communities across the state. To date, Texas Master Naturalist Volunteers have provided over 1.22 Million hours of service valued at more than \$25.6 Million. TMN volunteers have impacted more than 135,000 acres of habitat; developed and/or maintained some 1,100 miles of trails; and reach more than 200,000 youth adults and private landowners annually with outreach and education efforts. The Texas Master Natrualist Program has become a model program by which 25 other states have come to develop. Just think of the national impacts if agencies had the ability to implement these programs in every state of the nation!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Champion the following clarifying notions! I. We don't have "economics" we have a suicidal chrematistics pillaging life-support systems. CHREMATISTICS The branch of political economy relating to the manipulation of property and wealth so as to maximize short-term monetary exchange value to the owner. Despite our use of the word "economy," industrial societies currently practice chrematistics, without understanding what it means to manage the household. OIKONOMIA The management of the household so as to increase its value to all members of the household over the long run. If we expand the scope of household to include the larger community of the land, of shared values, resources, biomes\*, institutions, language, and history, then we have a good definition of "economics for community." \*Biomes: a major ecological community type (as tropical rain forest, grassland, or desert). In Merriam-Webster online, 30 July 2008. Page 59, The Ecology of Commerce--A Declaration of Sustainability, by Paul Hawken, HarperBusiness (c) 1993 II. The sane option is to raise the consciousness of humans about the first-order rules of environmental sustainability and develop them into our shared "rules of the road" for living on planet "Eearth" (Earth is gone!). Go to [www.thenaturalstep.org](http://www.thenaturalstep.org) and [www.350.org](http://www.350.org) for plenty of detail....

Although I do believe the system in place now is 'manipulated by special interests' and 'fails to use valid science', the remedy is not to allow everyone until it is proven limits on public access is needed. The remedy is just as arbitrary as the problem. As I biker, I agree open more land for MY purpose, regardless of what hikers have to say. However, I would like to have some places to ride without OHVs or Horses. As an angler, I prefer rivers without motorized watercraft or paddlers; but as a PWC rider, I want all rivers open to all users. As a wildlife advocate....I believe we need some places that does not allow any access. Public resource visiting should remain a privilege not a 'right' or 'mandate'. However, the justification for access restrictions should be more transparent.

Local area politicians usually speak for local citizens, and local citizens should be given more weight as to how federal lands in their area are managed. Too often national lobbies organize a public comment campaign designed to alter park policy. These organizations usually distort or misrepresent facts in order to get members to write the majority of the public comments favor their position. What is needed is balance! Local authorities should never have the only voice,, but they should be weighted more heavily since they better understand local needs and concerns.

1 for 1 staring today is not a fair solution as a generality. I would wager to say that most western states already have far more wilderness on "public" lands than all the OHV areas combined in there respective states and nobody is opening up wilderness they are just closing down access to ALL users little by little. Just my \$.02 I am sure I will get some change from some... In most places in my state hikers, bikers, and horseback riders do not have to pay a fee to access these areas in the form of registration like OHVers do yet they look down on the ones who pay for the maintenance and are often members of groups and clubs that privately go out and take care of the trails everyone uses. I would think everyone would appreciate that.

is trying hard to creat a diversion from his true beliefs. I do agree the idea is to make more land available for more people not less. You Loose! Try again.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area. They are inanimate objects and have no rights. There is also no right to mountain bike. That was settled in federal court in 1994: { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/mtb10" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }. It's dishonest of mountain bikers to say that they don't have access to trails closed to bikes. They have EXACTLY the same access as everyone else -- ON FOOT! Why isn't that good enough for mountain bikers? They are all capable of walking.... A favorite myth of mountain bikers is that mountain biking is no more harmful to wildlife, people, and the environment than hiking, and that science supports that view. Of course, it's not true. To settle the matter once and for all, I read all of the research they cited, and wrote a review of the research on mountain biking impacts (see { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/scb7" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ). I found that of the seven studies they cited, (1) all were written by mountain bikers, and (2) in every case, the authors misinterpreted their own data, in order to come to the conclusion that they favored. They also studiously avoided mentioning another scientific study (Wisdom et al) which did not favor mountain biking, and came to the opposite conclusions. Those were all experimental studies. Two other studies used a survey design, which is inherently incapable of answering that question (comparing hiking with mountain biking). I only mention them because mountain bikers often cite them, but scientifically, they are worthless. Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals and plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and, worst of all, teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (it's NOT!). What's good about THAT? For more information: { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/mtbfaq" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } .

Did you get the reaction you wanted? The National Monument designation is going to do what for you? What would it do for any of us? Nothing!

Great idea but it needs to have a way of grading the need to cost ratio of a project. This could be a big stumbling block for a government run project. Preseving our NPS is a must.

He and I both are of the same thought that we need to keep in touch with the outdoors. This means we have access to it and lots of it. When we have a chance to break away from our urban, make life easy to survive homes and neighborhoods we need to remind ourselves and teach our children the basic needs to survive and enjoy life. If that means getting 100miles from a cell site and others in the woods than that should be able for us to do. In the Our great country we have worked, died and fought for We should be able to access the land We own.Restoration should not mean shutting us out.

I agree if your collectin a check from us then you should go work to benefit us. I would like to think that would happen but it won't, so if they are going to spend "OUR" money anyway it should at least go towards something worthwhile like a revised CCC type program, or maybe somehow insentivise private industry to take on the task....govenrment always spends too much to get too little done.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live on the west coast. I take multiple trips every year to visit Civil War Battlefields. I would rather go to places such as Gettysburg than anywhere else. This is sacred ground. North and South these were all Americans who fought for a cause that they thought was just. We must remember their sacrifice and teach these lessons to future generations. Not only do these battlefields teach history they also are great open areas for hiking, bird watching, etc. How many Walmarts, Casinos, and shopping centers do we need. We need to do everything in our power to save these places and to limit encroachment. There is a saying, for those who don't learn from history are bound to repeat it.

I recently visited Wilderness Battlefield and Spotsylvania Court House in Virginia. Both are battlefields where my g-g-grandfather fought. It was an incredibly moving, informative and personal experience for me to walk across the battlefields, re-tracing his steps as I read from his regimental history. Because the NPS has been able to preserve these battlefields and their surrounding viewsheds, I was able to connect with a part of my family's personal history, and the collective history that I share with all Americans, without the interference of modern American life. Now, the Wilderness Battlefield is threatened with commercial development led by Walmart. Other battlefields from this and other wars face similar threats. There is plenty of space for commercial development located at a distance from these battlefields. Once these battlefields and their immediate surroundings are developed they are forever lost. The landscape will be devastated, archaeological resources will be destroyed, historic buildings will be minimized, and our chance to develop further understanding of these battles and educate our populace about the significance and sacrifice of our ancestors will be squandered. The President's initiative to preserve America's Great Outdoors must include battlefield preservation as a significant portion of its scope. These open spaces are incredibly important to the country – particularly as our population becomes increasingly heterogeneous. We need to remember what it means to be American – and historic battlefields help us do that.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In response to comment #8: I agree that hikers are responsible for some of the multi-use trail problems. I am a hiker, x-country biker that spent years riding a dirt-bike. I think each activity has it's place an because of the variation in speeds at which they travel are better suited to designated single-purpose trails. This will likely result in fewer hike, bike and Off-road trails, but a safer and better experience for each user type. I do not agree that because an activity move more quickly, it deserves a larger area. Numerous ways Off-roaders and mountain bikers can improve trail use is by improving the traffic on exisisting trails. A: One-way trails (especial down hills single track) would greatly limit trail near-misses. B: Maximum speed areas and unlimited speed areas could improve multi-use trails, especially near access areas. C: Trail design associated with curves, steps and banks can physically limit access for some activities; these are most effective when located near the trail head. Each activity should have a place in the outdoors, but only by limiting access to foot-travel only areas Less controversial to those on this sight is the idea that water trails require limitations. Certainly limiting PWCs from fishing areas would benefit fishing. Also keeping paddlers from swimming areas might be less dangerous to those using a rope swing. This all comes back to allocation of use for various uses. From timber harvests to nature preserves, the agency is mandated to provide recreation, conservation and sustainable natural resources. These multi-uses can only be provided by allocating the resources to a variety of uses with a variety of use patterns.

Instead of trying to create even more wilderness areas and national monuments the Federal government should spend their time and our money to staff the parks and rebuild the sagging infrastructure that has existed since FDR. My recent visits to area parks and forests have shown that the Government is seriously neglecting the maintenance of these national treasures. Stop trying to grab more without taking care of what you have! Also, let's develop ANWR so we can at least attempt to stay solvent with our oil supply now that the administration has seen fit to ban off-shore drilling. We can develop our resources and still provide for improved habitat for wildlife and protection for the environment. The wildlife are so much better at adapting than we humans are.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Natural areas are wildlife's home. Wildlife should be given our top priority, because they can't protect themselves from us. In particular: Bicycles should not be allowed in any natural area. They are inanimate objects and have no rights. There is also no right to mountain bike. That was settled in federal court in 1994: { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/mtb10" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }. It's dishonest of mountain bikers to say that they don't have access to trails closed to bikes. They have EXACTLY the same access as everyone else -- ON FOOT! Why isn't that good enough for mountain bikers? They are all capable of walking.... A favorite myth of mountain bikers is that mountain biking is no more harmful to wildlife, people, and the environment than hiking, and that science supports that view. Of course, it's not true. To settle the matter once and for all, I read all of the research they cited, and wrote a review of the research on mountain biking impacts (see { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/scb7" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }). I found that of the seven studies they cited, (1) all were written by mountain bikers, and (2) in every case, the authors misinterpreted their own data, in order to come to the conclusion that they favored. They also studiously avoided mentioning another scientific study (Wisdom et al) which did not favor mountain biking, and came to the opposite conclusions. Those were all experimental studies. Two other studies (by White et al and by Jeff Marion) used a survey design, which is inherently incapable of answering that question (comparing hiking with mountain biking). I only mention them because mountain bikers often cite them, but scientifically, they are worthless. Mountain biking accelerates erosion, creates V-shaped ruts, kills small animals and plants on and next to the trail, drives wildlife and other trail users out of the area, and, worst of all, teaches kids that the rough treatment of nature is okay (it's NOT!). What's good about THAT? For more information: { <a href="http://home.pacbell.net/mjvande/mtbfaq" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } .

People use water and the more people you have the less potable water you are going to have. isn't it time to have a "0" population groth and no more immigrants to this country or the good water will be gone

Providing an atmosphere at home, school, and in the community that fosters a connection to the outdoors is a place to begin. Supporting existing youth groups such as scouting and wilderness 4-H, and church programs with a bent towards back country experiences, is a place to begin. People are so busy making ends meet the necessary adult leadership to actualize the experiences is getting fewer and further apart. If the federal and state government would implement volunteer tax incentives (beyond the current mileage and expense deductions), more people could afford to not work second jobs or cut back on overtime motivations, or even take time off.

Require agencies to publicize the demographics of an area along with the number of acres -and trail miles- to the various types of activities within a geographical area during every planning process. IF 2% of the public land acres is available to the 2% of the population that enjoy motorized recreation, the agency is likely managing the area correctly. Use similar formulas for hiking, equestrian and bike trails. Use similar formulas for river access limitations where motorized, paddling, swimming, fishing and wildlife needs are likely to conflict with one another.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

That sounds great and all but the cost of a project needs to be relative to the available funds you have or in the savings it will create. If it was your money and you had to pay for the work being done and the money spent to run a facility would you be able to provide fiscal responsibility to your auditor (wife) or anyone else that would like to see that it was worthy of doing what was done. In most cases it's not there yet. In some it is. You can't just say that all facilities should be done because the tech is available. It has to make money sense.

The gray area is not explored. All OHV use 'near" all waters, need NOT be closed down. 1st: Off-road Vehicles 'near' water could be OK if the trails are well designed and bridges allow for crossing. 2nd: Not only motorized but most all recreational activities near sensitive ecosystems need greater limitations. Some areas should be closed from Paddlers overuse of riverbeds and banks, especially during lower water conditions. Many riparian trails that encourage hiking, bikes and horses also create erosion near streams especially after heavy rain fall. ORV should not be the only activity restricted from sensitive eco-systems.

The wording here 'next to' the park tells everything. If it is not IN the Park, not in violation of the clean air or water act. Why would this be discussed in the context of park management. This is a local zoning issue. Turn this ridiculous argument around...What if a Casino complained the NPS was planning to build a parking lot on NPS land because it offered free parking? Should they be allowed to stop the park from building a parking area?

There was a lot of environmentalist that pushed the plastic bag. paper or plastic is a question still asked. if we had stayed with paper there would be over 1,000 good paying jobs left in SW washington and the trees that were replanted when this started would just about ready to harvest. We need to use our renewable resourses. this is an area where it has cost familys alot.

Under 3% of the population participates in ORV riding on public lands. Therefore no more than 3% of the available space should dedicated to OHV use. A 1:1 ratio is excessive

What percentage of the population use ORVs? hike? mountain bike? ride horses? want no access for preservation? After that is determined, the agencies should restrict and allow access to areas accordingly. What percentage of river recreationalists, swim? fish? paddle? jet-ski? view-wildlife? hike the area? ..allocate access and zoning restrictions to rivers according to the demographics and interest. There should be places for ORVs, but not everywhere. Sharing trails with ORVs while hiking or biking is a miserable experience. The idea that 'access for everyone everywhere' is the 'best policy' is usually a selfish argument from the more aggressive/loudest/quickest types of visitors. We need Balanced management of our resources.

What will all the people who are for shutting down these areas do when the electric motorcycles and atvs become more popular in the next 5 to10 years. I plan on going electric in less then 5 years. With no noise issues they will only have erosion issues.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

You bring a tear to my eye with the info you have written. I too enjoy sharing the outdoors with my family in that very same way. There is not a better way to bond a family together and to learn so much about them and our country. Great Job!! Now if we could only get others to have the same experience we have been blessed to have had.

It is essential that the stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund be increased and dedicated so Americans will continue to have access to outdoor recreation close to home. With child obesity a national problem and young and old suffering from stress related problems, Americans need to be able to connect to nature more than ever before.

Millions of people visit Gettysburg for the historic value of the park. The park is a National Park, which means it belongs to the American people, not just the residents and developers in and around Gettysburg. All National Parks were meant to be protected--none of them should have casinos right at their doorstep--especially one that is a memorial to lives lost. We need to protect what we have and we can't keep using the economy as an excuse for development. Our National Parks need funding and they are a great place to add jobs that can help a community--that would be a much wiser way to solve the economy problem.

Our American public lands belong to every American equally. But, most Americans have no voice or choice in land use decisions! Instead, federal agencies rely on "Collaborative Groups," or "RACs" to advise on and initiate land use planning. The privileged people who are on these committees are called the "Stakeholders." But they are almost all people who happen to live close to the land in question, and who have been making money off our land for decades. And they want to have the rules set to allow them to continue to do so, whatever the damage they may be causing. They don't want the rest of us to be heard. BUT, EVERY AMERICAN IS A STAKEHOLDER. Who speaks for the rest of us? LET OUR VOICES BE HEARD FROM THE START in planning for our land!!

This is an excellent idea! We MUST protect our wildlife. I hope our grandchildren and beyond don't say "Why didn't they save our animals when they could?" It's up to us to do something about this.

Problem is: The FS needs to spend time and money to maintain and patrol these extra roads.

Regulate Exhaust systems!!

This is a tough problem, reservations quickly fill up and it's always a gamble in finding a first come first serve site. I use the, ditch the camper trailer and use a high clearance vehicle method, in getting back into remote sites to ensure availability.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness designations are far too restrictive. We already have enough wilderness. The National Forest service does well managing our open land. The existing network of trails and roads needs to be protected, and some that have been shut down need to be revisited. The money that is being wasted on law suits could be better used to protect, and maintain the avenues that we use to enjoy the great outdoors. All forest users need to be educated on stewardship, and as the owners of the land, we need to enforce good practices, and educate those who don't follow them. Please stop further wilderness, National Park, and National Monument designations.

I was interested until I read your last comment. There will always be a need for protected areas, with more to come as the population grows. Clearly, reading your last paragraph suggests to me that your agenda is less about multiple use and more about returning to a time before conservation became a priority for the people and for the government. And, as long as you bring it up, I wonder how those lifetime appointments for judges worked before conservation became a consideration in the way our public lands were being used. Sorry - I can't support this idea.

Under Section 319 of the Clean Water Act, states have access to Clean Water State Revolving Funds (CWSRF's) that may be used to upgrade local water systems but also to reduce nonpoint source (NPS) pollution. Low-interest loans are available to local governments, water systems, and qualified nonprofit borrowers such as land trusts. In some cases there have been 0% loans, and in other cases state agencies have obligations to provide "additionally subsidized" loans; this means that some portion of the loan is, in effect, a grant. For example, in Maryland loan applicants "undertaking an eligible non-point source, green infrastructure, water or energy efficiency improvement or environmental innovation project that does not have a dedicated source of revenue, such as a user charge system to repay a loan are eligible to receive up to 50% of the project costs as grant." (MDE) In other states, the rules may be different (?) Data on this is hard to come by, but it would appear that very little of the CWSRF funds are being spent on land conservation and restoration projects to reduce or prevent NPS pollution. On the front end, private entities, such as land trusts and watershed organizations, do not receive a formal mail solicitation to apply for CWSRF loans - as local governments do. In Maryland a few such loan transactions have been successfully completed, helping to protect the waters of the Chesapeake Bay and restore wildlife habitat lands, but such projects are little known. State agencies need to hear from land trusts and other conservation groups who can bring project proposals to their doors. We need to demonstrate demand for NPS project funding, shine a light on this resource, sit down with the agencies that have the Section 319 money, and work out some land conservation deals.

The 'NATURE' is now becoming aggressive than ever by showing her anger to us in her way of Cyclones, Tornadoes, Floods, etc. The first reason for this situation is global warming which is mainly caused by great reduction of green shade through out the world day by day by human being. The time has come to improve the green shade by at least doubling the shade. Every possible single square inch of the earth has to be covered by green ... BECAUSE ONLY GREEN CAN CONVERT THE ENERGY OF SUN IN TO A DIFFERENT MEDIA AND THEN CAN REDUCE THE NATURAL DISASTERS BY REDUCING THE NATURAL HEATING BY THE POWER OF SUN. So the green the global airconditioning is the only answer for the global worming

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Blue Ribbon Coalition, Stewards of the Sequoia, and Save the Trails are one in the same. Destroy all habitat and the reason many people go to the forest for peace and quiet. You may be loud and powerful on your motorcycles, but pretending that closing the illegal trails created by your organization members is not locking you out. There are many, many more kind courteous motorcyclists who ride where they are permitted and do so lawfully. Their trails will always remain open, unless those who believe they have the sole right to every square inch of the forest. The 37,000 acre Piute Fire in the Sequoia National Forest was started by a motorcyclist and then the Stewards had the audacity to blame environmentalists for the fire because they did not want the rest of the fire-retardant old growth trees to be cut down by the forest service.

ohv is a sustainable way to enjoy the outdoors. closing trails to ohv use is only making criminals out of innocent people. motorcycle's and atv's are here and people are going to ride them, so we need places to ride. my local trail riding club helps the forest service in building and maintaining trails. not just multi-use trails but all types of trails. i consider myself a conservationist and i don't like to see land destroyed by irresponsible ohv use. however that is not the majority of our community and most ohv users are not destructive. i think this could problem could be solved easily through education. riding dirt bikes is a very healthy form of exercise. i'm tired after every ride. there is plenty of room for everybody. no one group should be left out of their hobbies. this may require splitting groups up in seperate areas and require more work or construction, but i think its very necessary. i put recreation on the top of my priority list. i think most people do.

An tremendous waste of our tax dollars. Many non-profit groups have absolutely ABUSED this loophole and left organized recreation groups unable to defend ourselves using FEDERAL money because they do not have non-profit status! Many of these groups are under 10 people and formed with the SOLE intent of continually filing lawsuit after lawsuit using FEDERAL funding! Let them pay for their own frivolous lawsuits and see how quickly this ridiculous and irresponsible behavior stops!!

As an aging American that has been a hiker, horseback rider, cyclist, canoe and kayaker I can no longer continue these activities to enjoy our great outdoors. BUT what I can still do is 4x4 recreation to get out and see our spectacular country. Denying access is discriminatory and should not be allowed to continue! Please keep our public lands open and accessible to all who wish to recreate! We are the people and we are responsible for our land! Thank you for listening!

Keep public lands Public! The environmental movement has helped raise awareness and consciousness of land stewardship. Now it is time for recreational groups to demonstrate how far we've come and allow us to be active stewards and teach others how to preserve our land! Denying access goes against our rights as Americans! Thank you for listening!

Keep public lands Public! The environmental movement has helped raise awareness and consciousness of land stewardship. Now it is time for us 4x4's to demonstrate how far we've come and allow us to be active stewards and teach others how to preserve our trails. Denying access goes against our rights as Americans! Thank you for listening!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Large animals such as elk, bears, antelope, and bison generally have natural ranges larger than the protected area in which they may be located. We need to provide corridors between natural areas to permit large animals to migrate between such areas without crossing highways or disrupting or endangering human activities. Solutions such as passages over or under highways and keeping natural migration routes free from obstacles are available. We just need to make the effort before too many obstacles are erected.

"Don't mindlessly transmit your chosen faction's talking points, but use your actual experience to mold your opinion." I do use personal experience to mold my opinion and I would venture to guess so do most others here. I have seen first hand trails rendered impassable to hikers because of OHV use, seen animals I was watching run away as a motorbike buzzed by, seen streams and meadows torn apart by 4wd vehicles and motorbikes alike, seen trails off limits to motorized vehicles with motorbike tracks on them and have many times picked up and carted out trash left behind by OHV users. Seeing all these things personally it is not hard to imagine others stories or pictures that show the damage OHVs do. That is why I oppose giving more access to the OHV crowd not some sound bite or "political buzz word". As far as not going to places where ohvs have access that may be easy on the west coast but here on the east coast between the lack of wild places remaining, the amount of access given to ohvs and the fact so many bikes go where they are not supposed to go it is hard to find places to hike where you do not have to share the area with an ohv. This forum has also been very enlightening in terms of exposing the ohv crowd. To give credit where credit is due a few have tried to come up with common sense ideas to help out and minimize the damage they do plus have expressed and shown a desire to protect and preserve nature but the overwhelming majority have proven that they not only do not respect or love nature but that they are just as or even more happy to see it drilled into, mined on or driven over as seen it preserved and would just as soon see all wildlife extinct as saved. How do you support someones ideas when they are so ignorant and totally opposite your own views? To be fair though I will say I have picked up trash obviously left behind by hikers and have once seen a meadow that was been damaged by a camp site and even though I have never seen a trail degraded anywhere near the extent of OHV trails I suppose it could happen if there were enough people using the trail over many, many years. That is why I have stated time and time again, as someone who loves and respects nature and sees it's importance far beyond my own self centered enjoyment, that there should be areas that are off limits to all human recreation and encroachment and I do not need a "political buzz word" to tell me that is one true way to go.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I guess you missed my point and sarcasm? Money, that's what it all comes down to with you people right? It is not what's right, it is not what best for the people or the planet or the animals that call our wild lands their home it is what brings the most profit right? As long as it brings a profit who cares if every last tree is cut down, every last river poisoned and every last animal killed right? Since you asked though I will tell you my interests bring something a whole lot more important than money. They bring clean water, clean air, a healthy eco system and a sense of well being and peacefulness in an other wise cruel and inhumane world. They do that and bring a small amount of money to my local economy in the form of people who come to my town to hike or enjoy the peace of nature and then visit the local stores, pubs or restaurants afterward. You have a nice day too and trust me I would like nothing more than to run into you on a trail someday, I really, really would.

Charging such a small fee would not even put a dent into the amount of damage allowing OHVs on trails and then others would be responsible for paying for the repairs. Maybe if you made the fee \$1000 it would even out but even then the loss of wildlife and habitat is not worth any amount a fee would bring in.

I did not say you do not deserve some areas to enjoy your hobby. You do but what you do not deserve is more areas and especially not areas designated as wilderness areas which are made to preserve a species in decline. There are literally dozens of ideas just like this one that want more and more and more and do not care what becomes of the land or the animals that live on it. Since you voted to recommend this idea I have to think you are one of those people so answer my question. Is it that you are just too ignorant to realize how important these lands and animal species are or do you just not care? You are right I have never had to participate in clean up efforts on hiking trails mainly because the trails in my area are clean. Yes I have picked up things like water bottles, soda cans and candy wrappers along trails but other than the occasional litter nothing else. On the other hand as a member and volunteer of a local land trust I have gone to OHV trails and cleaned up bags worth of garbage. I have also had to restore trails and streams damaged by OHVs. I have also witnessed things like refrigerators, dryers and tvs dumped along side of OHV trails and I gaurantee you that was not a hiker doing that unless he were inhumanly strong. I do realize there are some idiots posing as hikers out there that are just as bad as OHV users if not worse and that is why I wholly agree that many areas should be off limits to ALL HUMANS!! That being said that does not change the fact that no matter how responsible a OHV user is the very nature of his hobby is damaging to the environment and a downright nuisance to wildlife and others that enjoy the outdoors. Maybe you are a responsible off roader and that is great but why is it you people want so much? Why is it you cannot understand that just by the very nature of your vehicles (the weight, engine noise, emissions, etc.) that you damage the land you claim to love or that some areas of land need to be protected from all people including OHVs? Why is it so many of you people are so greedy and uncaring?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I see the destruction everywhere I go where OHVs are allowed. Just this past weekend I was hiking with my wife and we had to hike a little over half a mile on a shared trail before turning onto a protected wilderness area where only hikers were allowed. In that half mile I saw dozens of large ruts carved out, a few very deep puddles where rain water had collected in even deeper ruts that made the trail impassable on foot, rocks dislodged, beer cans and plastic cups strewn about (which I picked up and carried out on my way out of the forest by the way) and 1 dead deer which had either been hit by a OHV or shot by someone driving a OHV. Once I turned onto the trail I could plainly hear the motorcycles and atvs as I hiked into the protected area and could continue to hear them till I was over a mile into the woods. In my time I have seen entire parks ruined by OHV use and while I am sure there are some hikers who do not respect nature and fellow nature lovers that number is dwarfed by the number of OHV users who do not. I have seen full trash bags, tvs, old refrigerators and dryers discarded on trails used by OHVs and unless Lee Haney was around I highly doubt it was a hiker doing that. I have yet in my 40 years of hiking seen a trail used exclusively by hikers that ever had the destruction, noise or pollution that trails shared by OHV users has and that is plain fact. It is just a blatant lie, and a foolish one at that, you would say hikers damage trails as much as OHVs. If off roaders do spend more time outdoors than environmentalists it is only because they can continue their laziness sitting and driving around while hikers like myself actually have to expend energy moving about the forest and dealing with the elements. Plus we have to deal with the ignorant OHV users who think they own the trails and the outdoors which is never fun.

I would not call it unfair at all. OHV use ruins trails and wildlife habitat not to mention promotes the use of fossil fuels and increases pollution in forests and wild areas. Any price they pay for the destruction they cause is not enough if you ask me so if I have to pay a flat tax for my backpack or wag bag then they should have to pay the same flat tax for their noise making, pollution spewing, habitat destroying monstrosities.

I have news for you. The wild horse round ups ARE being paid for by tax payer money as is the upkeep of the horses in the pens. I would much rather have my tax dollars going to preserve these animals and their habitat than having them round up and sold to the highest bidder and then killed or tortured wouldn't you? Maybe you should learn a little something about these things before you open your mouth and show your ignorance to the world.

Devlon- Sure its a win-win situation for ohv users. Not so much for the townspeople who have to traverse the degraded roads on a daily basis and listen to the increased noise and deal with the increased pollution. Not really a win-win for tax payers responsible for paying the increased taxes for road maintenance either.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You have got to be kidding me that a hiker watching a deer, elk, bison, moose, bear or any other animal by standing still and being quiet scares it more than a loud, polluting motorized vehicle. I have watched literally hundreds of animals in my lifetime from the solitude of a hiking trail and I can count on one hand the number I have seen run away because of the noise I made or my mere presence and I would guess most of them do so because of experiences with human hunters more than my presence scaring them. Yet I have many times seen animals run once the noise of a motorized ORV has spoiled the quiet and peaceful sounds of nature. I once watched a moose for nearly 15 minutes as it ate grass near a pond, with it knowing full well of my presence I might add, only to have it run away as a motor bike drove by. I can also recount sightings of elk and black bear where the same thing has happened. As for the ruts breaking animals legs, no I have not seen it myself but I have read accounts of it and since I have tripped in ruts myself and nearly turned my ankle more than once I can plainly see that this could easily happen if an animal were running at fast speeds which happens often in nature. Sadly running from an ORV many times. I would gladly go where ORVs are not allowed the problem is they are invading all the trails. I had two trails I loved to go to with my dog but both were destroyed by ORV users and if you think ORV users are lovers of the outdoors you could not tell from these places. Within a couple years of opening it to ORVs the trails became almost impassable because of ruts, the wildlife had all but disappeared and the amount of litter and trash strewn about was nothing short of sickening. It indeed was a "horrid" place and hikers stopped going there. In fact it became so bad that while I was still going there I would have to carry my dog across some parts of the trail because of broken glass from smashed beer bottles. If this is an example of ORV use and what you call "pristine" and "clean" then I would hate to "horrid". It saddens me to this day to know those trails I enjoyed so much are destroyed forever but it does my heart well to know the ORV use is being restricted. You have only yourself to blame for destroying what you had! NOTHING good would come of increased ORV trails as this proposal states. Not only would it destroy wildlife habitat and drive away the animals it would destroy the outdoors experience for the hikers and campers which far outnumber ORV users. As I said before if you are too lazy to actually get off your butt and walk it then maybe the outdoors is not for you and you would be better off staying to the ORV parks that have been built, the wildlife areas already destroyed by oil drilling, logging, mining and your presence or the city streets. Plenty of two legged animals to see there and they do not run away from your noisy, polluting vehicles either.

Exactly what I was saying. We need to save our public lands not destroy them for mere pennies.

Forget getting any support from the ohv crowd or the right wingers that have invaded this site. They think wildlife is a nuisance and an obstacle in their pursuit of getting access for their machines into wilderness areas and everywhere else for that matter.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think a couple of your tea bags have broken. You must have had to look real hard to find an environmentalist on an environmental forum. It would be like being surprised if you went to a site dedicated to the Red Sox and then were surprised to see people from Boston posting on it. I guess you thought this site would be full of fellow tea baggers and right wing wackos like yourself? Obviously this site is going to be full of people who love the outdoors for something other than profit or the destruction by man's hand. If there are any "extremists" here or any "coordination" it is by the OHV crowd who has all but ruined this forum and has demoted every idea that does not include greater access to OHVs. I have seen actual ideas (very poor ones) from OHV organizations and links to their sites posted here. I have yet to see one from the Defenders of Wildlife, Sierra Club or NRDC though. Our public lands, national parks and wildlife refuges were not made so people could build more roads and drive through and over them. They were made so some wild places would survive no matter how bad man's greed got and it has gotten pretty bad. While OHVs do deserve some areas they DO NOT deserve every last inch of wild space. I am fine as a hiker and backpacker that some areas are off limits to me so why is that not okay with you that OHVs are not allowed everywhere? YOU are the "extremist" here not others!

Haven't we seen enough of what deregulation can do to a wilderness area with the Gulf oil disaster? If there was a no fishing sign in Yellowstone NP you can be certain it was there for good reason. Maybe a certain species that is endangered or threatened lives there, with over 40% of fish species now either threatened or endangered that is not hard to imagine. There are hundreds of streams, rivers, lakes and ponds in Yellowstone so if you "simply gave up" after not being able to fish in the first stream you went to you obviously were not trying very hard so do not blame the government for not being able to fish. Regulations are fine and if anything we need more and stricter enforcement as well!

I agree 100% with this. Ranchers for years have killed endangered species like Grizzlies and Wolves. Have shot Buffalo for grazing on their land and left the carcass to rot only to have Eagles and other animals die from eating the meat which has been poisoned by the lead bullets used to kill the poor animal. They have run off or rounded up wild horses and sent to "containment areas" which is nothing more than a nice word for slaughter house. They have clear cut forest to turn into pasture and polluted streams and ponds with run off from fertilizer and manure. Loggers have built roads through pristine areas and clear cut entire forests while Miners have polluted streams and destroyed entire mountains in the search for coal. It is time all these people paid and paid dearly for their destruction of habitat and wildlife. Penalize them enough so they never even think of doing the destruction they do again.

I agree. Hunting for food is one thing but hunting so some idiot can get his jollies shooting a defenseless animal is just a cowardly act no matter how you look at it and hunting threatened or endangered species should NEVER be allowed no matter what. Sadly though as we have seen with our other governmental agencies, money far outweighs what their agency was intended to do. The only thing that could help is transparency and greater penalties such as extended jail time for people within governmental agencies found guilty of dereliction of duty, fraud or accepting bribes.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am demoting this idea for the same reason and that is because of the bird deaths. I would think making them appear like the background would cause even more deaths. Someone should do some research to see if a certain color would be easier for the birds to see making it easier for them to avoid the turbines.

I believe the map noted would be the Coffman map, produced several years ago. It's still in circulation, but there are many federal efforts that are catching up with it. For instance, we have the US Fish and Wildlife Service entering early implementation stages of the corridor and buffers program outlined in their 2009 Climate Strategy and Climate Action Plan. Their problem is that they are way out on a limb without adequate statutory authority to support their implementation. The authorizing language for the wildlife corridors information systems program is contained in Section 481 of HR 2454, the Waxman-Markey climate bill. Very similar language is included in Section 6009 of the Kerry-Lieberman draft climate bill. The language is again included in HR 5101, the Wildlife Corridors Act of 2010, which was introduced in April . . . Now awaiting calendaring in the House Natural Resources Committee. This bill extends from the information systems provisions and into implementation authority. The Wildlands Project has become the Wildlands Network, and in their versioning, wildlife corridors are now to be known as "wildways". Their overview map remains largely unchanged from the days before TWP moved to Vermont, the primary difference being branding. The Y2Y corridor and buffer system already exists, and is shopping for state or provincial formalization. What I'm curious about is the fact that Mr. Sutherland is so darn sure that the Coffman map is "completely and 100% false", or that it was made intentionally alarming in order to stir up some "lunatic fringe" . . . When he can't even articulate the map's source or presence in current discourse. How can he know it's BS when he can't even tell us who prepared the map and for what particular purpose? I ask this in the full knowledge that corridors visioning has moved well beyond where it was in the TWP days of concentrating on keystone predators to the point where we are now discussing entire suites of species, nearly an entire food chain, as needing the extensive corridor and buffer systems reflected in the continental-scale system vision. We are now immersed in the creation of corridors and buffers at all scales to the point where the Coffman map appears to be increasingly prescient.

I could not have said it better myself Ron. The survival of our dwindling forests far outweighs the need for a group of lazy americans to get their jollies by destroying wilderness areas. When will you people grow up?

I do not see how destroying forests and prairies is connecting anyone to the outdoors. If anything it would seem to disconnect people to nature because all they will see it as is another area to be used for profit, although that is not much different than how it is seen today sadly.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I love idea of using volunteers to clean and maintain a park in exchange for a free yearly pass. I would take it one step further and say that take one week a year and do this gathering volunteers and assigning them a specific duty such as trail maintenance, rubbish removal, roadside maintenance, etc, etc, This would be a great way for people with a love for the parks to not only enjoy the beauty of it but to relish in the knowledge they are taking care of something they love and will be rewarded for such. In my town we had a very nice park right on the river and it was free but teenagers and adults alike ruined it by leaving their trash behind from their picnics and beer parties. The loud noises from their radios and drunken mouth's scared both the animals and hikers away. At first I would take a bag and pick up cans and rubbish but over time there became so much litter it was useless. Even the trails I loved to walk with my dog became treacherous from all the broken glass and with no money to fund clean up the mess remained and I left to find another park to enjoy. Because of things like this I hope there is always a fee to use the parks. Those who love the outdoors will gladly pay the small cost to enjoy it because they know it takes money to maintain such beauty while those who only want to use the park with little to no regard to its natural beauty will just have to fork over the fees or find someplace else to ruin. To just let anyone in without paying will lead to overuse and in time the park will become destroyed by those who do not love the land as we do.

I think presently there are more than enough trails for people but what we do not have is enough land and protected habitat for our wildlife population to survive never mind thrive. For that reason I cannot promote this idea. I am all for protecting as much land as possible but nothing good ever comes from introducing man to areas that have been off limits for a reason.

I totally agree. Some areas need to be off limits to ALL HUMAN CONTACT!! That includes hikers, backpackers, campers, ohvs, mountain bikes and anyone else. Rangers can be allowed in to monitor for poachers and biologists can be allowed in to monitor wildlife and of course in case of emergencies like wildfires or plane crashes exceptions would have to be made but otherwise no human contact at all. You missed the entire point of this idea. The importance of nature is not to "bring in \$\$" but to be preserved for future generations at all cost. A very daunting task considering the rampant, needless and senseless amount of development going on. Nature does not need our help to sustain it with logging and burnings, it survived and flourished very well without mans help for millions of years but it does need man to stop destroying it if it is to survive.

If the government would close all the tax loopholes for the rich and the corporations and begin charging big oil, gas, coal and the logging industry appropriately for the destruction they do and the obscene profits they make there would be no problem coming up with the money needed to fund our parks and protect our land and wildlife. Education is important too but sadly it is one of the first things republicans like to cut when they are in power.

If we did that it would mean american parents would actually have to become parents instead of plopping their child in front of the tv or video game counsel. Shame on you for even suggesting the thought that parents might actually have to do something with their children or teach them something.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If you open "minimum maintenance roads" to OHV use they will not be minimum maintenance for long. OHVs tear huge pieces of earth out of dirt roads and trails, without monthly maintenance these roads would become impassable to normal car use. Plus inspiring more people to move to farming towns and small villages will only destroy the places you hope to help. Increased population bring increased traffic which brings paved roads, increased crime and drug use, increased taxes and the farms you speak of will be bought out and turned into big box stores and strip malls. An all to common occurrence here in CT where I live. Leave Nebraskas small villages and farming communities alone, sometimes you do not know how good something is until it is gone. Lets not make the same mistake here as other states have

If YOUR idea of preservation includes protecting land and wildlife then I am with you but looking at your voting record it seems like you are only interested in YOUR OWN self centered pleasures.

It is a true shame that the ORV lobbyists are so active on this forum. This started out as a great idea on how to improve the great outdoors for people to enjoy but it has turned into anything but. Driving heavy, fossil fuel burning, emissions spewing, loud noise making machines over dirt paths which at times and in many areas are wet damages the outdoors and you do not need a scientist to tell you that, ask any hiker or backpacker, or anyone with eyes and common sense, and he will gladly tell you so. Obviously you do not need a scientist to tell you loud noises scare animals either or that continued loud noises will chase animals from that habitat. Leave the outdoors for people who love it and respect it, the animals that need it for survival and keep your loud, polluting machines at home!!!

It makes me sick to read so many idea centering around ORV use. I thought this was supposed to be ideas on how to save americas wild places not ruin them? ORV use does NO good for the environment, the forest, the animals or the people that actually enjoy the peace and solitude of the outdoors. Why must the laziest americans always make the most noise?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As far as I know I am not doing much damage to the human race, certainly less than most but maybe I am. Lets see, I drive a high millage vehicle with low emissions so I pollute the air as little as possible. I recycle everything so my garbage does not end up in some landfill, ocean or incinerator further polluting the environment which would cause even more harm to mankind, I have high efficiency products in my home and regulate my energy consumption plus have signed up to get my energy from wind and solar even though it costs more so my carbon foot print is much smaller than most which again will cause less air pollution which will decrease lung disease, I am a vegetarian/vegan so I do not promote further green house gas buildup from factory farms. I could go on but that seems like enough for now, is that enough for you? Please though tell me how you help mankind since you are such an upstanding and obviously intelligent member of society. As far as me being injured in a wilderness area, if the area is off limits to everyone how would I be there to get injured in the first place unless I were an irresponsible person going where I was to supposed to be? Plus I never said emergency vehicles should not be allowed into wilderness areas, of course they should. I would venture to guess more animals are harmed and killed by habitat degradation caused by ohv use than wildfires but I would have to look that up to confirm it. The goal for everyone here who claims to be a "responsible" person who enjoys the outdoors no matter what their choice of recreation is, is to enjoy the outdoors WITHOUT DOING ANY HARM TO CREATURES otherwise it pretty much makes your argument of being "responsible" moot! I have seen many a child smile at the sight of an owl in a tree, turtle in a pond or rabbit in a meadow, all things that are pretty tough to do on a noisy, speeding ohv. But maybe those smiles are not as important since they come from kids who walk to enjoy nature? No I have never ridden a ohv nor do I want to. My enjoyment of the outdoors is to hear the wind in the trees or the babbling of brook, the call of a bird or elk, the sound of a moose or buck cleaning his rack on a shrub or tree or the noise a black bear makes as he eats blueberries. All things I could not do from a noisy ohv. Who exactly is "a lot of you" anyway? What group do you want to label me in? I will make multiple choice since I know you must be busy. A)environmentalist B)animal lover C)democrat D)educated and intelligent american E)all of thee above Why is it you ohv people come up with the same ludicrous arguments? Is it really all you can come up with or do you get it from the same book? I never said we should ban ohv use altogether, go ahead and look up my comments before putting words in my mouth. You have your areas so enjoy them but you, nor anyone else, deserves to go into wilderness lands, disrupt and possibly end the lives of endangered species. If that is too much for you to give up then it is you that is self centered, greedy and just plain stupid. PS-the answer is E, cannot get any easier than that for you



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have said time and time again but I guess for you I will have to say it one more time. If an area of forest is put off limits to me as a hiker and backpacker because it is deemed to be an area that houses a threatened or endangered species I AM FINE WITH IT!! Is that clear enough for you? Above all else I am a lover of nature and wildlife and I would like to see it survive as long as possible and I personally feel that is much more important than my own self centered desires. As has clearly stated there are literally hundreds if not thousands of animal and plant species that are now endangered. Do you not feel like their survival is just a little more important than your desire to ride your ohv everywhere? Your protests as far as elderly and kids is a very weak one as well. I do not know any elderly person that want to ride a motorbike or 4wd nor do I know any that could handle the rough ride but I do know a few that like to hike and do as often as me. As far as kids go they have more energy and more spirit of adventure than I do so I see no problem with them hiking either. Yes it is a problem for disabled people but there are more than enough places now for them to go so I see no need to add more.

Nobody is trying to force their views on you. They are just stating plain and simple fact. We are losing more and more open space every day, to the tune of 5000 acres a day, and more and more species are becoming threatened or endangered every day. That is just plain and simple FACT not someones opinion. You can bury your head in the sand and pretend nature is doing fine or maybe you do not care one way or the other if nature survives past your lifetime (that would be my guess) but if we do not start preserving what little nature is left all you and your family will be riding your precious ohvs by and through is clear cuts, oil rigs and strip mines. Is that what you want?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I failed to mention it because it does not exist. While it does mention wolves killing each other nowhere in the article does it state that the MAIN reason is wolves killing each other. Read again and tell me WHERE in that article you read that the main reason is wolves killing themselves? Here is the quote from the article that proves it is YOU that only reads what he wants to read.. "While parvovirus and mange continue to reduce the population, part of this year's decline can be traced to the fact that wolves lost protection in the Northern Rockies under the Endangered Species Act in 2008. Wolves, like all wildlife, are protected inside the park, but when they roam beyond the borders, they fall into the state's wildlife management practices. Idaho and Montana, which border Yellowstone, permitted hunting of wolves this fall. Idaho recently extended its hunt until March. The Yellowstone pack hardest hit by the hunt is nicknamed Cottonwood. Hunters killed four members of the pack, including the breeding female, her mate and her daughter in a Montana wilderness area bordering the park." The article also clearly states the plans to increase hunting to wipe out 1,200 wolves... "The group faults the states' management plans to reduce wolves from 1,650 to 450. State officials state the need to balance the wolves with the habitat and other wildlife." How come you do not mention that? Let me guess, because it proves you wrong? Also the article plainly states that hunting and extreme weather (brought on by climate change no doubt) is a large contributor to the decline in elk. Here is the quote to prove you wrong ONCE AGAIN... "The winter elk numbers in the park have dropped from 17,000 to 6,800 since the wolves were reintroduced. Hunting and weather factors have also taken a toll, Smith says." No mention of the Buffalo slaughter from you? Gee, I wonder why? Thank you for proving my point on just how much we DO need environmental non profit voices in the government because extremists like yourself either cannot understand or choose not to understand what is going on out there and would rather just use nature for your own self centered enjoyment regardless of the damage it does.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I was not talking about you, I was talking about the author of this who obviously did something which is why every idea promoting conservation has been heavily demoted while every idea promoting ohv use or development has been heavily promoted. Since you stated how you feel about protection of wilderness areas how do you feel about the supreme court ruling that says government can seize private property if it can prove it is for economic development? This causes people to "pick up the pieces and in many cases move" as well. I highly doubt that is what our founding fathers wanted either would you not agree? As far as Americas private land rights being the cornerstone to what made the country great tell that to the Indians who we killed and stole the land from. Sorry to hear about your wife. Most people who oppose ohv use, myself included, are not saying we should ban use altogether but restrict it to areas where there impact will not cause harm to threatened wildlife and plant species. You have a right to enjoy your hobby as much as anyone but you do not have the right to go everywhere and you shouldn't. If you are looking for someone to blame do not blame me for being closed minded. Blame it on the rampant over development that is pushing animal species into smaller and smaller areas and causing many to become threatened or endangered. Do you not want to have your children and grandchildren to have the opportunity to see a bear, wolf, buffalo or eagle in the wild someday? Hopefully with land restrictions not just to ohv users but hikers and backpackers as well they will. I am more than happy to give up some of my access for the greater good, aren't you? I agree our founders are turning in their grave but it is more because of how ignorant, self centered and destructive our society has become than any other reason.

Joshua- In 2008 1,600 buffalo were slaughtered outside of Yellowstone NP and plans exist to reduce the wolf population by 1,200. In fact the hunting of wolves is so rampant that Yellowstone has seen their wolf population reduced from 174 to 114, the smallest in over 10 years, because of killings outside the park of females and pups. Of course we all know of Sarah Palins disgusting aerial hunts and who knows how many of those poor animals were brutally gunned down. If you want to read about it you can go to the USA Today web site and find it.

Joshua- It takes a lot more than some moron linking this site onto his facebook page or ohv site and getting all his "friends" to come here and promote ideas to destroy forest and wilderness areas to get the president to all of sudden open designated areas to ohv use, oil drilling, mining and logging. Tell me though since you are so hot and bothered to see wilderness designations go away where will you ride your precious ohv when all the forests are destroyed or developed on?

Just about everyone on the road has a license but how many have respect and courtesy for other drivers not to mention follow the laws at all? It is nice you are trying to find a common ground but it is just not there. The very nature of a large, heavy, polluting vehicle on a soft dirt trail, loose rock stream, tall grass prairie or wild flower laden meadow means destruction for the trail, stream, prairie or meadow no matter what. Still I will give you a promote for at least trying.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Margret- So global warming is a hoax? Okay lets say for minute that the planets highest temperatures have not been occurring over the last 14 years with this year the highest ever recorded. Lets say for a minute that the storms are not getting worse despite the massive loss of lives across the globe from the record number and severity of tornadoes, typhoons, hurricanes and heat waves. Lets pretend areas are not having record droughts while other areas are having record floods and lets ignore the fact that small island countries are being swallowed up by the oceans. Lets pretend all of that does not exist. Does that still mean we should continue to trash the planet the way we are or should we look to other avenues to preserve and protect the only world we have?

I disagree! For too long america has put economic development first and foremost and what has it gotten us? We have more oil drilling, coal mining and gas extraction than every before yet prices remain high and corporations scream for more and more access to public lands and wilderness areas everyday despite the fact hundreds of wells lie capped since the recession . Millions of homes lie abandoned or foreclosed on yet developers want more and more public lands everyday. Pristine forest is cut and road less areas are developed on so resorts can be built for millionaires. Who does this benefit? No one except the developer and the rich who can afford to stay there. Even with the huge push for development of all kinds the last 8 years under Bush we see huge jobless numbers and more and more people becoming homeless everyday. I know what the duties of the BLM are so I do not need a history lesson from you thanks. I also know that the BLM totally ignores existing laws to grant access to our lands and that benefits very few while harming many and completely destroying the ecosystem, biodiversity and beauty the country once had. Many animal species are down to their last 1 or 2% of their range and many, many more are either threatened or endanger of becoming extinct yet time and time again the BLM ignores scientists recommendations and gives the land away. You talk about responsibility but does that sound like responsibility to you? Corporations have more access to our lands than ever before and yet we are in the midst of what truly is a depression, a quickly dwindling middle class, record numbers of homeless, near record numbers of jobless, deflating wages, increasing energy costs, etc. etc. so how exactly are we prospering now that we have put economic development so high and preservation of land and wildlife so low? Looking at your voting record I can plainly see you are no fan of nature, wildlife or the preservation of either so I am not surprised by you comments but the least you could do is provide a valid argument.

The reason why these groups sue the government is because the government does not follow the rules and break the laws set up to protect our wildlands and wildlife. If you actually loved nature you would agree that is a worthwhile cause but of course you think our wilderness is something that should be drilled through, mined on and driven over and our wildlife should be gunned down or run out of the country. Funny how you have no problem with our tax dollars subsidizing oil, coal and logging companies, roundups of wild horses and the execution of thousands of buffalo and wolves but you have a problem with tax dollars going to help environmental groups protect or wilderness and wildlife. Want to try and tell me how you love and respect nature again?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When I see many animal species down to their last 1 or 2% of their range and hundreds listed as either threatened or endangered while many have already gone extinct it pretty much tells me that not a whole lot of thought or action has gone to preservation. We have given away more and more land and access and we have gotten nothing in return so maybe it is time to start thinking of other ways to stimulate our economy. In many states including my own it is nearly impossible to find a backwoods hiking spot without hiking across a road or through a neighborhood after only a couple hours. We are losing more and more of our public lands to development everyday and nobody but a few corrupt politicians, a few corporations, a few developers and few energy producers are benefiting. We are losing our forests, streams, lakes, parries and now even our oceans with the Gulf oil disaster and it is all because our governmental agencies refuse to do the job they are supposed to do. Even if you think you do not support "developing and strip mining everything in sight" you actually do because there is not much land left that is not developed. There are millions of homes sitting empty, hundreds if not thousands of wells sitting capped and millions of square miles of industrial areas sitting in decay yet time and time again pristine forest and land is cut down and bulldozed for more roads, more drilling, more homes or more industry? It is time for the stupidity to end! This country worked pretty well before Regan came in and started giving everything away to the corporations. It is time for this country to once again start preserving the things that matter and the things that made it great and that includes our public lands, our national forest, parks and our wildlife!

Maybe if wild horses were not being round up so ranchers can use the land for their cattle, maybe if threatened and endangered species like Wolves, Grizzlies and Buffalo were not being gunned down by the dozens if not hundreds by and for ranchers I would have more sympathy for their plight but as it stands as much as I am an environmentalist I share nothing with these so called environmentalists as you like to call them other than a love for their land. Sadly though I see their land as something of beauty for not only humans to enjoy but animals as well and all they see it as is a way to make money. Protect the land sure but let the ranchers, or at least those who practice the rounding up and killing of other animal species, fend for themselves.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Maybe the roads would be more chaotic but still it comes down to the individual and sadly there are more "self absorbed jerks" on the road everyday and most have licenses. I agree with you that a responsible person like you seem to be will do much less damage than the "self absorbed jerk" but still that does not change the fact that no matter how responsible you are you are still operation a heavy, noisy, polluting, gas burning machine into wilderness areas and in the majority of cases that has a detrimental effect on the environment in many areas. You are right also that a dirtbike will not have the damaging effects of a suv or 4x4 pickup truck but again it is the operator to keep his damage to a minimum or to stay on designated trails which all too often is not the case and I have several times seen hiking trails and areas restricted to motorized access damaged by dirt bikes. To be fair I have seen damage done in the form of litter or a camp made in a meadow that has obviously been a self absorbed jerk hiker or backpacker and it makes me sick. I pick it up, cart it out and hope that some day I run into the jerk who did it so I can show him how a responsible hiker treats someone who has no respect for nature but overall I have never seen anything close the trail and habitat destruction I have seen by OHVs. There is bad everywhere and if we hikers can be no better stewards of our precious remaining wildlands then maybe access should be taken away from us as well. Again I give you a lot of credit for trying but I have seen first hand trails, habitat and wilderness areas I loved to hike on totally destroyed by OHV use after they were opened up to them and I have see trails I enjoyed damaged even though they were restricted areas to dirt bikes and atvs. I am not a jerk or uncompassionate to your plight but until something can be done about the weight, noise and pollution levels of your vehicles and somethign done about the irresponsible members of your community I could never promote an idea that grants more access to OHV users.

I have NO desire to go to YOUR park. There are plenty of places I can go to see strip mining, logging and oil drilling or have my enjoyment ruined by the noise of an ohv. I do not need a lesson from you on what public lands are for either but the overwhelming desire for this country to develop on those lands has created a tremendous loss and destruction to those lands causing a severe imbalance between nature, preservation and development. While this may be fine to someone who does not respect or love nature like yourself that is not fine with me. I have said time and time again on this site that if hikers and backpackers are not better at preserving the environment then they should be banned from areas just like ohv users so get your facts straight before opening your mouth and proving your ignorance. How is my wanting to protect lands and wildlife self centered anyway? I get no money from that and I am willing to accept restrictions and regulations that affect me unlike yourself. If anyone is self centered here it is obviously you. Finally this is not my 1,340th post so I have no idea where you get that number from. I may have a few dozen comments, maybe 300 or so votes and a half dozen ideas or so but nothing near 1,340. That is what happens when you love nature, you actively try to save it, something you obviously know nothing about.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Forgot to mention I live in New England as well. CT to be exact and we have not exactly had "a new climate everyday" have we? Pretty much been one heat wave after another. Streams dried up on the trails I hike, waterfalls nothing more than a trickle while rivers have more grass growing on them than water flowing through them. When it does rain it is torrential downpours accompanied by high winds that down power lines, uproot trees and tear roofs off houses. We have had 3 or 4 reported tornadoes already and something like 20 days of over 90 degree weather when the avg. is under 11. And it's not even August yet! You're right though, everything other than that is normal. No worries.

Yeah, yeah, yeah. I know, Al Gore is the devil and Obama is Hitler. Heard it all before. If you do not mind though I will take the word of the worlds greatest scientists and what I see with my own two eyes over what you say. Still you have not answered the question that whether global warming is man made or not the trashing of the planet is definitely man made so should we continue to do it or no? In case you have not noticed there are more and more areas unable to grow crops or raise cattle these days. I guess that is Al Gores fault also, or maybe Obamas?

Which is why I said that we need stricter enforcement. Sign off on the Deepwater Horizon project came in 2007, long before Obama took office and it was Bush's non stop push for more and more drilling and his non stop gutting of regulations that made it possible. While Obama must share some of the blame for not cleaning up the MMS quicker this disaster is just more proof of the how big a disaster Bush was as president.

More ignorance on the part of you, not exactly surprising reading many of your other statements. Many of the horses round up are auctioned off to slaughter houses and then "turned into dog food". Again, some of you really need to learn your facts before you open your mouths and prove your stupidity. I am not going "racial" either. I happen to be white but unless you are a native american you can not call this country your native home and that is just fact. As far as having "firepower" what a idiotic statement. I would love to see you try to survive in the elements the wild horses do even with your precious gun. You would not last a month. They are not "feral" either, they are wild horses that have been born free living off the land for hundreds of years. I suppose next you are going to say wild elephants, tigers and bears are feral because they are not in zoos or circuses. Wildlife should not be killed just because they do not have "firepower", you are the most ignorant person on this site or certainly among the top 3. Typical of so many of you tea baggers, scared to even venture from your home with the safety blanket of your precious "firepower". Here's a new flash for you, a gun does not make you a man! Why are you even here if you hate wildlife and nature so much. Oh let me guess, to skew the votes because you are a bitter republican who hates Obama.?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No, the fact that some animals live in areas where ohv use is does nothing to my argument. The argument is can a threatened or endangered species survive in an area with ohv use. They cannot, ohv use chases them from areas of food, it destroys their habitat, pollutes their water supply, changes reproductive rates and can cause them injury by falling into holes and ruts created by ohv tires. None of this is an opinion either, it is fact and you can read all about it if you like. The reason why I do not support the reopening of land for ohv usage is because it has been closed for a reason. Either the preservation of a species or because you have already degraded it to the extent they had to close it. I guess you have a problem with comprehension or did not read my post entirely because if you had you would plainly see I said ohvs deserve areas but not areas that are protected for wildlife habitat or have been set aside for hikers. You have enough land, you do not need or deserve more.

OHV use in wilderness areas or the Gulf Oil Disaster....Which is worse? I would lean towards the Gulf Disaster but it is close!

People certainly are selfish. Ignorant and stupid too. Just look at the majority of the OHV crowd on here. While a few have tried to come up with legitimate ideas most are just promoting everything that includes greater access to them regardless of whether it is habitat for an endangered species or not. They have little care if all of nature is destroyed as long as they can drive over the remains. Then you have the right wing loons who think this is another conspiracy by a president they hate because he is black and think we are all enviro-elitist or some other word they do not understand. Sadly much like religion and politics in this country this forum has become everything it was not intended it to be and for that we all have to thank the selfish and ignorant people of this once great country.

Since \_\_\_ is gaining nothing but protecting something she believes in and you two stand to profit from the building of a casino I think it is \_\_\_ that is telling the truth. If money is involved you are sure corruption and lies are not far behind. Economic development is just another word for destruction of public lands in most cases.

That is a start but it is a very small step forward. What can you do about the weight of the vehicles that tear up the trails? How do you stop OHVs from degrading habitat, food sources and the beauty of a meadow or stream when the very nature of the vehicle does that? How do you change the fact OHVs burn fossil fuels not only deepening our dependance on them but polluting the air and water in the forest? OHV users and non users cannot co exist period. One loves the solitude and beauty of nature and one likes to drive over and through it, the two are just complete opposites.

The problem is one certain group, OHV users, are responsible for most of the destruction. Next to energy extraction OHV use is the next largest contributor to destroyed open space. Protected space is dwindling away at such a rapid pace most animal species cannot cope and are becoming more and more threatened by extinction every day. Opening up vast areas of protected space to OHV use will certainly tip this even more towards extinction and away from any hope the animals and forests have to survive.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem with your argument Bryan is that less than 1% of this country is remaining wild and that is with either a capital W or small case w. The problem with ORV users is they want it all. They are not happy with the millions of acres designated for them or the hundreds of miles of trails, they want more and more and more. Developers are not happy with what they have access to and neither is the oil companies, coal companies, loggers, etc. etc. Hunters want higher yields and limits while poachers kill indiscriminately. What you and the author of this proposal are forgetting here is that animal species NEED this land to survive. We have cut, bulldozed, driven and built many species to the brink of extinction and many to extinction. Would you like to send the rest to extinction just so you can ride a dirtbike or drive a 4x4 on land they need to survive? As a hiker, backpacker and environmentalist I wholly understand the need to keep ALL HUMANS out of certain areas so animal species can live an undisturbed life and that includes keeping me and my fellow hikers out. Just because you fought in a war or live in this country does not give you the right to destroy the last wild places in this country for your personal enjoyment!

The same could be said for our factory farmed beef, chicken, pork and turkey not to mention most of our dairy products. I became a vegetarian and largely vegan (I do eat yogurt from a local farm that uses pasture grazing cows) because of the deplorable conditions the animals are kept in. Fish is no different. Will america ever stop putting profits ahead of doing what is right and what is best for the animals, the people and the planet?

The UN and the Wildlands Network do not have sovereign power in the United States. A key point to be aware of, though, is that the wildlife corridors program is provisioned for in sections of the House and Senate climate bills, as well as in HR-5101, The Wildlife Corridors Conservation Act of 2010. I am aware of the Coffman map. Simple awareness of that map does not necessarily infer subscription to Coffman's or anyone else's use of that map in their individual advocacy. Derision of either end of the advocacy spectrum really does not do much in terms of advancing the conversation, though, does it? Coffman's map appears generally to be a compilation of the several corridor-based conservation programs around the nation. It represents something of a summary of visions and plans that have been made known to the public. It does not include additional programs, such as the Baja to Bering Initiative put forward through the Marine Conservation Biology Institute, et. al. As an aside, a larger-scale version of Coffman's map accurately depicts the small-scale corridors established by the local land trust and municipality where I live. While the concept of the UNEP and other UN organizations "mandating" these programs is a leap, we cannot say that these organizations and others more local to the United States and down to the locally-based advocacy groups have not been "visioning" these things . . . because they have been and continue to do so. Everyone's mileage varies according to whether we think this is a good thing or not. Simply talking about these things does not imply hard and fast attitudes toward any of them. The discussion is important to have. Ridicule toward others who hold contrasting views is not useful.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are already several excellent organizations devoted to getting young people into the outdoors, and they are providing outdoor and environmental education without dipping into the public purse. While there are many others, Scouting, Campfire, 4-H, and YMCA spring immediately to mind as organizations that operate programs year-round. One of the problems with recruitment into these programs, though, is the peer pressure coming from the cool kids deriding them as being so totally uncool. We would have a lot more of our youth in these programs if there was a concerted effort toward dealing with that peer pressure element. How about we work harder on what we've already got in place before we go running around inventing new programs that are beholden to the public purse and all of the strings that come firmly attached?

This is pure stupidity. Have any of you ever even been to a national park? The wildlife is abundant there and one of the greatest pleasures is seeing the wildlife. If hunting were allowed this would not only cause a huge decrease in the number of animals it would cause the animals to fear humans and avoid any contact what so ever making it very hard if not impossible to see wildlife. Why are ideas focusing on the destruction of our great outdoors through increased ORV use or ideas as ludicrous as this even accepted? This is a forum on ideas on how to improve our great outdoors for the majority of people not ruin them for the enjoyment of a very small and ignorant minority!

This is the way development should go. There are millions of degraded acres out there that can and should be developed on but all too often it is pristine areas that are destroyed for drilling, mining and now even renewable energy source development.

Those are some pretty scary stats about kids. I am glad I never had any and never will. Is it the laziness of the parents or the laziness of the kids I wonder. I am sure the OHV crowd will chime in and complain that they cannot take their kids outside because their access to the outdoors is being taken away by the evil government but in reality is driving your kid around in a SUV or pick up truck really connecting him to nature? I say no which is why an idea like this is so well thought out. It actually gets them outdoors and into nature where they can see it, hear it and touch it!

I beg your pardon it is obvious that you have no idea anything about ATVers in America most are families out to enjoy the forest and not to destroy nature. Grant there are those bad apples as in Your Greeny side but at the last time I went as a ATVer to a community input about the destruction of our forest it was found that the damage was not from ATV but Vehicles. The most destructive words did not come from ATVers BUT GREEN Tree huggers. Such as Snare lines to cut our heads off, bobby traps to disable us. So get a clue we all want to enjoy the woods.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would gladly leave OHV people alone if they would stop trying to destroy nature. I never said OHV use should be completely stopped. I have said though that wilderness lands should be off limits and if the land is considered so vulnerable that hikers need to be restricted then so be it. I am first and foremost an environmentalist that wants to see nature survive as long and as healthy as possible. So many of you people want more and more access including protected lands and national parks. This should never be allowed and that is what I say. You have your areas, enjoy them, take care of them and stop asking for more and more. Once again you totally miss the point. Having your OHV have the same emission standards and mileage means nothing. Our mileage and emission standards are a joke. 15 mpg (or worse) suvs, pickups and jeeps are still burning tremendous amounts of gas furthering our dependence on fossil fuels and further polluting our water and air. Then you add on "street legal", how about those that are not street legal? What are their standards? Trying to obscure the noise facts does nothing either. The machines are noisy period as clearly pointed out. I give you credit for recognizing problems and trying to find solutions and common ground but as long as you have people acting as the voice of the OHV community and making excuses and asking for more and more access even to the extent of destroying habitat and further causing our wildlife population to suffer all your efforts are for naught. You may be one of the 10% or so of honorable, responsible OHV users but sadly too many of your fellow OHV users do not care about nature (check their voting records and you can plainly see they demote most ideas on wildlife and land preservation) and only want to use it for their own self absorbed enjoyment regardless of the laws and the restrictions which all too often causes destruction and brings a bad light on people like yourself. Maybe someday the OHV crowd will be weened out and more will be like you and then we can discuss more land but until that happens you should only have the areas you have and if you destroy those they should be taken away as well. To be fair I want to state for the record that this includes hikers and backpackers too, if we cannot care for our land any better than the OHV community then our access should be restricted as well!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are on a path of destruction of our own making. Americas lifestyle is unsustainable. We use over 20% of the worlds oil despite our relatively low population, we are the worlds worst polluters, while other nations strive for zero waste we recycle a disgustingly low percentage of our garbage, while other nations take measures to combat climate change we in america cannot even agree it exists and is a problem, european nations have cars that get 60mpg but in america we have more vehicles that get less than 20mpg than get 30, we are responsible for the loss of 110,000,000 trees every year much of which goes to junk mail. Our education system is broken, our governmental system at the local, state and federal levels are either corrupt, uncaring or both. These are just a few of the problems at the core of everything that is wrong with the country and we can blame our government for it all but we really have to look in the mirror and realize that we as a society can do much, much better. We are an obese, lazy, stupid and ignorant society but it does not have to be this way. Wanting our government to follow and enforce the laws while listening to our pleas is fine but we need to get past the ideological differences, the right wing controlled air waves, the endless political firestorm between republican and democrat and realize that this is OUR country and if we want it to survive and remain beautiful WE have to do a better job as a society to take care of it. Right wing extremists will scream socialist or communist while tea baggers will wrap themselves in the constitution they cannot understand and left wingers will just complain but if they do really love america and want it to stay beautiful we all have to change our lifestyles. Drive smaller cars, have less kids, regulate your heating in the winter and your cooling in the summer, recycle everything you can from the smallest bottle cap to the largest cardboard box, carpool if you can, forget the huge 5 bedroom McMansion and buy a house you can live in without going broke, conserve as much as you can like your life depends on it because not only does YOUR life depend on it so does the air we breathe, the water we drink and the forests and wildlife we love. If we want to reunite people with nature the most important thing is there needs to be nature to reunite with and that responsibility falls to us all!!

Welcome back. I support your idea and I agree with what you are saying but I do think a balance can be found. It will take a LOT of sacrifice on americans behalf but it can be achieved. My wife has made great strides since we got married as has other members of my family so it can be done. Sadly though I do not believe americans have the will power or the intelligence to make those sacrifices until it is too late.

Well Said Jana, very well said and all too true. OHV users like to say they are "responsible" yet they take no responsibility in any of the things you mentioned or the many, many more they are responsible for. They have all the access they need or deserve and no more should be given until they do learn to be responsible for something other than destruction of wild places.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What a dumb idea. ORVs ruin the landscape not improve it. The noise from the vehicles scare animals and ruin the solitude of being in the outdoors, the ruts produced by the tires cause deer, elk and other animals to break their legs which results in death in most cases and ruins trails for hikers. The fumes and odors from the exhaust spoil the air quality for everyone from the smallest chipmunk to the biggest bear. If you are the type of person that only enjoys the outdoors from a motorized vehicle or does not want to see wildlife then maybe the great outdoors is not for you. I am not looking to build walking paths down the middle of a highway so nobody should be looking to ruin what little wild lands remain with more ORV use.

What a greedy proposal and so typical of the lets ruin americas wildlands OHV crowd. And why pray tell do you deserve to destroy americas last wild places and send many more species of animals to the brink of extinction or beyond? Simply because you are an american? Because you can since riding in a 4x4 takes no effort at all? Some areas are better of protected from ALL human interaction (including hikers and backpackers like myself) and some proposals (and their author) are better off ignored or this case demoted!

Whether it be the larger, more devastating wildfires, the surge in beetle populations or drought, just to name a few, our public lands, forests, national parks and our wildlife are being ravaged by climate change/global warming. Anyone with a brain can see that climate change/global warming is happening now and is getting worse every year we do nothing about it. Do something now or pretty soon there will be no nature left to connect with and pretty soon after that there will be no human population left to worry about!

While this sounds like a good idea how do you decide who gets what? If 10 hikers, 5 mountain bikers and 1 ORV user helps clear a trail does that mean everyone gets to use it? It only takes one ORV user to ruin a trail but does that mean everyone else has to pay the price for it? Maybe it is just my bad experiences with ORVs destroying trails, scaring away wildlife, creating noise pollution in the forest and in general trashing the entire area with litter and broken glass but if there is such a thing as a "responsible" ORV user I have yet to meet him.

While this sounds like a sensible plan it does not include all the damage that will be done to the forest. Roads will have to be built to accommodate the heavy machinery and trucks to enter the forest and of course the noise will disrupt wildlife. For every acre of forest cleared dozens will be damaged. Of course the OHV crowd loves this idea since it will give them more roads to drive on and further their access into wilderness lands at the peril of the forest and wildlife they care nothing about. If a sensible plan to limit the destruction done to the forest could be implemented I could vote for this idea but since I see none I have to demote it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wild horses are a beautiful and majestic animal. They are also part of Americas heritage and they need further protections and a place of permanent protection to keep them safe from the ranchers and developers that are running them off their land. Madeline Pickens has proposed buying a large area of land and rescuing a large number of wild horses to set up a sanctuary for the animals that are now being held in BLM pens awaiting auction. This needs to be allowed immediately as does the government setting up guidelines to stop the roundups and land grabs. Also land should be set aside as sanctuary and refuges in states that wild horses now live, money can be charged to visitors with the money going to purchase more land and maintain the roads and trails. Rangers should also be hired with the money to protect the land and the animals. Upon a recent trip to Yellowstone and Grand Teton my wife and I went to see the wild horses in the Green River section of Wyoming but there were no information booths, no rangers and no one there to collect money. We also saw people racing around in ORVs scaring the horses, damaging the landscape and trails. This is a waste of what could be a huge money maker and tourism attraction to the area.

Yes things are being done globally to combat climate change/global warming but sadly in America little is being done. President Obama has taken some bold moves to get the country moving but with the republicans obstructing everything and still throwing out the same old arguments that are so false and ludicrous but believed by the idiot sector or our country baby steps are the best we ever do and then when republicans take charge they move the country 10 years behind again. WE need to do more and we need to start now! Remember when this country actually used to lead the world in things like this? Now we are nothing more than a laughing stock to the rest of the world and a scourge to those that do not think our over consumption of everything and wanton destruction of the environment is funny.

You are right and right now most areas are available to everyone but sadly ORV users are not happy with that. They want access to protected wilderness areas, land set aside for endangered species, national parks, trails set aside for hikers and everywhere else for that matter. While most outdoors lovers, hikers and environmentalists like myself included, are more than happy to put aside their desires for the betterment of animal species, forests and open spaces ORV users greedily want it all and more and really do not care if every trail is ruined, forest destroyed, stream dammed up, or every species goes extinct. How do you make a group of people like that happy with compromise? You simply cannot without ruining it for everyone else and for most animal species as well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You cannot totally blame politicians for this. Open space is disappearing for everyone and for every animal species in the world not just for OHVs. Urban sprawl, over-development and energy extraction has ruined what once was a beautiful country with room for everyone's hobbies. Now open space is very limited as is areas for animals to survive. Everyone must make sacrifices for the better of the planet not just OHV users. Secondly you have only yourselves to blame. Your machines get bigger and bigger, heavier and heavier and ruin more trails and open space everyday. If you were more responsible, littered less, destroyed less and actually respected nature maybe you would not have so much area taken away from you. Start showing some responsibility and some respect for nature and maybe you will get the politicians to start paying attention to you again.

You made some good points and I agree a couple extra bucks on a product would not drive me away, especially since I ignore cost for the most part and buy products from companies that use environmentally safe practices and give a percentage of their profits to environmentally sound causes. You have changed my mind I will change my vote.

You OHV people really need to stop whining about access, you are starting to sound like oil executives. If a trail you used or worked on in the past is turned into a Wilderness area and becomes protected because a species of plant or animal is on the verge of extinction then too bad. It is good for the planet and you need to accept that. As a hiker I get it so why is it so hard for you people to understand that? You want to experience frustration? Try lugging a chainsaw 3 miles on foot through moderately hard terrain to clear brush and fallen trees on a hiking trail and then return a month or so later to see the trail ruined by a group of idiots on motorbikes.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You OHV users must have brain damage from bouncing around too much. Your ideas are really puzzling. This is supposed to be a forum aimed at having more people enjoy the outdoors yet every idea you people have is one to either destroy the outdoors, take away protections that insure in some way that nature remains for future generations or one that destroys wild life habitat which in turn will surely make that species chances of survival that much less. Just to make it clear to you....Nature, the outdoors and wildlife are not only for OHV users to enjoy. It is for a great many people like hikers, backpackers, campers, photographers, fishermen, etc. etc. who also enjoy the outdoors and do not enjoy having trails ruined, peace ruined, clean air ruined, meadows ruined, streams ruined and polluted and in general have the entire reason for heading outdoors and into nature ruined by OHV users. More importantly it is for animal species that need those forests, streams, lakes and meadows for survival! Wildlife does not enjoy having their habitat ruined either, being driven away from a food source by constant noise, they do not enjoy wading through trash left behind by a OHV party or drinking from a stream that has become polluted from OHV use. Wilderness needs to be protected because it is disappearing at an alarming rate. The protections are put in place because a certain species has become either threatened or endangered and that space needs to be preserved as pristine as possible so the species may survive. As a hiker and backpacker I am fine with losing space so a species may survive and exist for future generations so why is it so hard for your OHV users to do the same? Are you that ignorant or is it that you just do not care about anything but your own personal enjoyment? Just because you are an american and can drive a vehicle does not give you the right to destroy nature and wildlife not to mention other peoples enjoyment of both.

Generally speaking, economic development - important as it is - poses the most significant and consistent challenges to wilderness conservation. Subsequently, public policies that promote low-impact, responsible and sustainable natural resource exploration and recreational land uses are needed now more than ever. A common challenge to these types of progressive policies is the general mindset that we have to continue doing things in the same outdated ways that we've done them for years. Nothing could be farther from the truth. High quality wilderness conservation makes for more pristine lands, higher real-estate values, and better recreational opportunities. Off-road vehicle use, hunting, and natural resource exploration do not necessarily have to take place in the hearts of wild places, but can rather happen in designated areas on their outskirts. Some examples include: directional drilling, sustainable (closed loop) logging, off-roading on low productivity tracts of land, and regulated seasonal hunts. In addition, ecotourism and agrotourism present limitless opportunities to promote conservation and low-impact economic growth in rural communities across the entire country. In short, wilderness conservation and economic development are still primarily at odds because of old ways of thinking. If we promote a civil, intelligent dialogue that includes multiple stakeholders and a focus on innovation, Americans can continue to both enjoy and benefit from their public lands.

There must be a middle ground, between destroying everything in sight and building a fence around an area to keep the human race out. There are zealots and bad people on both sides for this argument. Education of the ramifications of our own actions is the best policy.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

the savings in energy, health care (lungs, skin cancer), reduction in crime, longer pavement life, added property value, water retention, soil erosion prevention..... i am sure there will be funding....we will pay for it somehow. combine all that with bicycling infrastructure and of course... "the right tree in the right spot" .....who said money did not grow on trees.

Should focus on small rural and urban areas where there is less access; to often they are forgotten. If you want to decrease obesity, health problems; these are the places that should be focused on; where there is a deficit in knowledge, healthcare and parks, walking trails and other recreation for the community

We enjoy spending time in our great outdoors with our RV trailer. However, the variety of websites and terminology used in researching and making reservations has been cumbersome. We need a uniform style of website and reservation system, ideally for all campgrounds: city, county, state and federal. At least all the federal sites should be consistent in the website signup procedure. This same concern applies to other outdoor opportunities as well, such as hiking trails. With our current technology available, we could significantly improve our "advertising" and communication to outdoor connection opportunities.

Light Pollution or Skyglow or Light at Night (LAN) is the wasteful lighting of the night sky due to poorly shielded and and inefficient light fixtures that shed light horizontally causing glare and above the horizontal causing the very air and clouds to glow. In addition to lighting up the undersides of Clouds, Birds and Aircraft, it also causes the needless death of Birds and can cause sea turtle hatchlings to die because they turn towards beach lights and not to the light reflecting surf. In human beings it can cause cancer by hindering the production of the hormone Melatonin which prohibits cancer.

Green sticker vehicles need good places to ride. Those places should be provided by the benefactors of the profits gained by the vehicle sales, accessories, RVs, trailers---. These smart entrepreneurs get rich and don't have to provide a place to ride! Privately run CONTAINED parks should be affordable and safe. Public land is not suitable to this destructive and noisy fun.

thanks for the comments. Yes, it was a confusing comment, lumping the 2 together. The only thing ORVs and feral animals (domestics gone wild) is that they both have a propensity for water sources, washes and sensitive habitats and can be destructive. As of now, certain locales have experienced damage from wild horses and burros, pigs, and to some extent wild turkeys and hatchery-raised trout (a few examples). Humans have placed these animals in places that are not suitable for them and they can suffer or compete with native wildlife. The idea of preserves for the wild horses and burros where they can live a healthy life is a good solution. As for ORVs, they need their own space too. I would love to donate for wildlife preserves. ORV sites should be paid for by the users, since the vehicles are destructive, sometimes driven unsafely and create a nuisance to other public land users. Touring at low speeds is the only public land use that should occur.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our public lands are being destroyed as the natural resources, native wildlife and cultural sites are being trampled. Equines are beautiful domestic and feral animals that deserve to live in appropriate habitats where they can survive without a struggle. Private lands should be set aside for these creatures where water, forage and shelter are available. Special interest groups need to foot the bill and the lands can be given special easement status. Recreational off-road parks should be placed in similar places and sponsored by the users and vendors that should be supporting them. Touring off-road areas should be the only recreational vehicle use allowed on public lands.

Please remember that grazing on public lands is an important management tool and must continue to be part of the equation. Here in the west, the fuel load has become a significant problem, particularly with the massive beetle kill now occurring. Western forests are a very different beast than those in the east and a one-size-fits-all approach will not work throughout our country. Also, because of the settlement patterns and land uses with which our western states evolved, many of the most productive lands in the here west are private lands that serve as base properties for grazing permits on federal and state lands. If those permits go away, or are reduced to the extent the ag operation is no longer profitable, those private lands have no ag value and are extremely susceptible to development. Let's value grazing and logging for the important tools that they are.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The 2012 Farm Bill will be challenged to continue funding at current levels, especially for private lands conservation programs like FRPP and GRP. These programs provide excellent return on federal investment through private and state match.

- Private lands are the most productive throughout the US - agriculturally as well as from a broader biological perspective as they typically encompass riparian areas, migration corridors and provide winter range and breeding grounds for many species. For these same reasons, they are also highly sought after for development.
- Ranchers and farmers are hit hard with regulatory programs – voluntary, incentive programs like FRPP and GRP have the potential to do far more good in the long run, at less cost.
- These programs ensure unfragmented landscapes into the future, at a one-time cost to the tax-payer.
- Purchased conservation easements provide landowners with capital without liquidating acreage and keep ranches and farms intact, and at ag values, for future generations of producers. These dollars get turned into local economies, too, as willing landowners use funding to pay down bank notes, purchase additional acreage, improve breeding stock, develop water supplies, or improve infrastructure.
- FRPP and GRP funds help private land trusts ensure that community needs and values are also conserved. The cost of conserving private lands costs taxpayers just a fraction of the cost of federal land purchase and administration.

How we can make these funds go even further:

1. Allow for an increased percentage of landowners' contribution of value. Many landowners are willing to increase their in-kind contribution of 25% of the value of an easement or more. Cash match is much harder to come by.
2. Consider funding the transaction costs for donated easements. Many landowners would be in the position of donating a conservation easement to a qualified organization if the cost of the appraisal, minerals report, attorney fees and stewardship contribution could be covered. Local land trusts would be able to make dollars go even further if this opportunity could be realized.

Every minute, two acres of farm and ranch land are lost to development. The average age of American farmers and ranchers continues to increase, leaving many working lands open to fragmentation and uncertainty. FRPP and GRP help conserve our working farms and ranches and the food, fiber and natural resources for the stewardship of future ranchers and farmers -- and the benefit of us all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The United Nations 2006 agricultural report states that ANIMAL agriculture (the production of slaughterhouse animals) produces more global warming than ALL transportation. In fact, cattle growing is the scourge of the earth and is destroying our water systems, desertifying the land, and ranchers are destroying wildlife and wildlife habitat to proliferate MEAT for heart disease, obesity and diabetes, kidney failure and a host of excess protein and animal fat human health problems. The subsidized hamburger is not only totally suspect for prions and Mad Cow disease, but it would cost about \$30+ per pound if the government did not give megabucks to those who destroy our land to produce it. The Taylor Grazing Act back in the 1930's gave out massive leases on our PUBLIC lands, 10 cents on the dollar in perpetuity to western ranchers who hung wolves and coyotes along fence posts, have brought groundhogs and small mammals near extinction (mistaking them as they come out of their holes because you cannot have a hole dug that might cause a cow to break its leg), and generally destroyed biodiversity massively to monoculture production of unlucky "farm" animals. We are killing a million farm animals an hour in slaughterhouses for our unhealthy lifestyle and that is not enough for the obesity and heart disease of this public. We continue to import millions of TONS of dead carcasses out of rain forest countries in Central and South America for the cheap (subsidized) hamburger. We are destroying the lungs of the planet, the last remnants of biodiversity that support all of us, and contributing massively to global warming. We need to move to a plant based diet. Please read the Declaration of the Rights of Mother Earth and All Beings - ALL BEINGS, not just humans have the right to exist, to not be harmed, and to fulfill their role in the ecosystem. This was put together by indigenous people in Cochabamba, Bolivia this year at their Climate Conference (since Copenhagen failed) with input by people from all over the world. It is revolutionary in its reverence for all life, sadly needed in this time of human overtake. We are presently using 1.4 earths every year. It is unsustainable and raising animals for slaughter is the biggest part of the abuse. Link: { <a href="http://pwccc.wordpress.com/2010/02/07/draft-universal-declaration-of-the-rights-of-mother-earth-2/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Create a public stock exchange for watersheds. The number of shares issued would equal the number of acres in the watershed, e.g. USGS 4th code HUC. Share values would increase or decrease depending on how well the watershed was managed. Activities that tended to conserve resources while profiting the communities would tend to drive share values up. Activities that degraded resources or communities would tend to drive shares down. A mechanism would need to be in place to discourage share values from increasing in response to watershed degradation. Watershed groups would be the issuers of the stock. They would have to give up non-profit status, but would likely achieve a more stable source of funding than from short-term grants. Why would anyone buy stock in a "corporation" that does not produce anything? To make money from a system that promotes the protection of resources and communities within a watershed. An effective watershed council would tend to increase community prosperity and ecosystem health, thereby increasing the value of the finite capacity of a watershed to sustain ecosystem services. I am not a lawyer, economist, or business person, so I can't provide much more detail on the financial aspect or whether this idea is even legal.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Create more public campgrounds and rental cabins/yurts. The demand for campground space during the summer months, especially in national parks, significantly exceeds the supply. This discourages people from "Reconnecting with the Great Outdoors." Campgrounds and cabins should be strategically developed in order to alleviate this problem.

I have been around hundreds of ranchers for 20+ years and have never witnessed or heard stories from ranchers of them doing the following things: 1.) Rancher killing a wild buffalo 2.) Rancher killing a wolf (outside a designated and legal hunting season) 3.) Rancher killing a grizzly bear 4.) Rancher "rounding up" wild horses like John Wayne for slaughter (horse slaughter for human consumption is illegal in the US, this article discusses the law { <a href="http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/09/07/politics/main1982770.shtml" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) 5.) Rancher clear cutting a forest 6.) A stream or river polluted enough by manure that it could be considered detrimental to other animals (wild animals poop in streams too, remember) 7.) A dead eagle (or any other scavenging bird) found with a consumed lead bullet in its remains If you have knowledge of a rancher performing numbers 1, 2, or 3 above you should contact the proper authorities, as they are not legal activities for anyone, let alone a rancher, to do. You may even be committing a crime yourself by not making these activities known to the police. While I'm sure some of these things have happened in the past, saying they have been happening for years is absolutely absurd. Many regrettable things have happened in the distant past: using African-Americans as slaves, placing Native Americans on reservations, not allowing women to vote, etc. But to blame people living now for those acts makes no sense. This is exactly what you are trying to do to ranchers. Ranchers do not wish to destroy wildlife or pollute the land they live on, it would be counterproductive. If you did find your information from a credible source, I would like you to direct me to it. I would be interested to read about where ranchers are being able to get away with these things.

I'm totally against this federal land grab. This is my home this lands is full of people that depend on farming and ranching, good stewards of the land. Why do you want this land if it is so abused by us? The way you make it sound. You people with your big idea's of forcing all people from the land so you can have your big wildlife playground so you rich people can fly out and say "look at wht we've done, removed all the people from the land so we could run buffalo, deer, elk, wolves, and antelope." Take all land out of agriculture so we can have our wild kingdom just like it was when Lewis and Clark was here. You people are going backwards, this land is settled. There's many jobs her in a time when there are not so many jobs. Just because there is a lot of BLM grazing here you think you have the right to take it away. What public good are you doing? How many people are you going to feed? How many jobs are you going to make? You can make many lies about it, I'm sure. How many people visit all your wildernesses you have now? Not very many. I'm sure somebody's going to put a backpack on and hike in 30 miles and say this is really great. The people that live here now are the ones that truely love the land and the wildlife that we take care of.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Mr. Moffatt, by your logic farmers and ranchers should then be compensated for "public" animals such as deer, antelope, and moose consuming crops or grass on their private land. Fair is fair, and if farmers and ranchers are expected to pay the public for wildlife habitat damage, then the public should pay ranchers and farmers when "public" animals graze private land and affect their livestock's habitat. If that were to be implemented, I would be willing to bet farmers and ranchers would come out ahead. As to how logging and mining effect public land I cannot comment, as I have little knowledge in this area and am unwilling to make assumptions. As for ranching, though, I can guarantee the land is not being damaged in most cases. Often times wildlife habitat is improved though such additions as reservoirs and ranching practices like cyclical grazing. Please do not assume ranchers and farmers are destroying rented public land when you have not witnessed it yourself.

"Lets be sure living things are protected so they can flourish into the future,..." Um, well, people are living things and require intellectual depth to flourish into the future. Maybe a better understanding of how they have developed - as the lessons of history provide them and cultural sites amply illustrate - is something that is not out of context with conservation. Eco-centrism can be as damaging as ignorance of the web of life. Without comprehensive conservation we leave gaps that result in future damage that we then scramble to correct. Better try to keep things now than bemoan their loss later.

As a history teacher, I know the difference between reading about or talking about a historical place, and actually going to see it. Every spring I take my 8th graders to visit over 15 battlefields in Virginia, Maryland and Pennsylvania, in order to show them the places where Americans gave the last full measure to protect what they thought was worth dying for. Some of those battlefields become a little smaller every year. Our nation has so little history compared to the world, and we need to save what we can. Obviously we cannot save every house where Lee slept, or every road that Washington rode on, but we can dedicate and memorialize those crucial places where men gave all that they had so America could continue.

I agree that America's public lands should be available for a wide variety of recreational uses including OHV use within reason. OHVs can have a significant impact to the land especially if people are not acting responsibly, and the noise from OHV use certainly does affect wildlife and the opportunities to interact with it. So I think careful designation of OHV-use trails is very important. Many people like me prefer to enjoy wilderness with as much wild character as possible. I want to get unplugged, away from motorized vehicles, and in a setting where I can encounter wildlife in a peaceful setting, and I don't think I'm in the minority here. So to me the important factors are minimizing impacts to wildlife and designating OHV trails that don't compromise the experience for non-OHV folks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am new to this discussion but just want to add my two cents worth. To begin with I am not a "tree hugger" but I do sympathize with the point of view expressed by some who have been labeled as a TH. I live in a rural area that is being spoiled by the increasing use of ATV's to cut across the fields and ride the trails through the woods. I don't need to itemize what this does to the quality of life of us who live here, (noise, ruts in trails, trash left behind, etc.) If you want to explore the "wilderness" do so on your own two feet or on the back of a horse! Why do you need to move about motorized? I don't believe other countries have a problem with their citizens who are so sedentary that they have to get their outdoor adventures on the back of a motorized vehicle. If you feel the need to ride about, wait until the mall in your suburban locale closes and the cars are all gone...then you can ride all night on your ATV in the parking lot. Lets keep the outdoors for people who truly appreciate nature and keep the so called OHV vehicles on concrete. Who knows, it won't be long before they have concreted over the wilderness areas with the mentality running this country today.

It is very difficult for young people like me (a 22 year old recent college graduate) to obtain jobs in government organizations like the National Park Service and the Forest Service. Due to a strict point system, veterans consistently outcompete other (potentially more qualified) applicants. The point system makes it difficult for young people to enter the government work force for environmental jobs. I think that they should either do away with the point system, or think of a way to award points to people for things like work experience. Particularly, I think points should be awarded to people who participate in organizations like the Student Conservation Association and Americorps.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It seems to me that we are going from one extreme to another where we give a section of land the status of wilderness or national monument or it is open for public mining or industrial use. Somehow Mountain Bike and OHV use has been lumped into the mining and industrial use category. In Utah we have a lot of land that is simply too large and environmentally unfriendly to hike (Remember, Mountain Bikes cannot be used on a Wilderness designated tract of land). The San Rafael Swell area has been promoted as Wilderness status worthy, but for anyone remotely familiar with this area knows that only 5% of the population is in good enough shape to explore it. Let alone get to see all of it's beauty. That doesn't seem very accessible to the public and only fits the needs of a small percentage of the population. It also needs to be noted that the most beautiful places in this area are not even remotely accessible to motorized vehicles. My point is let's create a new designation that fits the needs of most people, especially tax payers. This designation could be called a general public access area. The goals of this area are to... 1. Preserve the natural environment with designated motorized use. 2. Promote public clubs/groups in maintaining trails. There are more OHV volunteers preserving trails than any other group. 3. Allow no mining or industrial use of the lands, except for tourism. 4. Promote responsible riding through clubs and state laws. 5. Managed access leads through the majority of these lands, so restrictions are not so heavy that a small portion of the land is accessible with motorized vehicles. The whole point is to get out and see the land, not wonder what's on the other side of the sign. I love the outdoors and don't want to destroy the environment and OHV use is the means to be able to explore and enjoy a lot of beautiful land. Let's face it, we need moderate laws to fulfill the rights and needs of the majority of the public. Just say "no" to extremism and pass laws that make sense.

OHV recreation is a very positive family activity BUT it MUST be done properly in order to not create conflicts with non-motorized recreationists and also to keep speed-related safety problems from occurring. To the first point, keep noise levels down is ABSOLUTELY essential because nothing upsets a "posey plucker" more than hearing the ominous buzz-saw cacophony long before they even see the vehicle. It just completely ruins their day. Just as a smoker has rights to puff away, he or she does NOT have the right to blow smoke over everyone else in public places. So must the OHV user be as quiet as possible and not increase the sound levels of his or her OHV above the manufacturer's stock exhaust. Regarding speed, too many OHV users consider the trails on public lands to be their private race track. Speeds on mixed-use forest or BLM roads must be kept to a reasonable level not only to enhance safety but also to keep dust down.

Presently, federal funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund supply the money to federal and state agencies to acquire land (and at the state level create recreation facilities). Fully funding LWCF to it's \$900 million authorization is a first priority, but LWCF should also be opened up to qualified conservation organizations (land trusts) to fund projects that achieve the mission of LWCF. Land trusts have a proven track record of protecting important lands, and a grant program similar to the current Stateside LWCF program (that funds municipal, county and state projects) should be established for competitive grants to land trusts. These could be matching grants that would encourage land trusts to leverage private and non-federal funds toward the protection of critical wetland, riparian, agricultural, forest and recreational resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Young people have little connection to the food that they eat. It is no wonder that obesity is an issue when what is most affordable and available is low nutrient, high caloric foods. Bringing back school gardens makes sense from every angle: nutrition, academic standards, hands on, kinesthetic learning, empowering young people, building community, beautifying and greening our campuses, etc... Students need opportunities to foster land stewardship and why not on their very own campus. My first hand experience is that gardens bring something very alive in the heart of young people and teachers alike. Fund and support agricultural, horticultural and gardening programs in all of our schools!

Dirt bike riding on SOME public lands should exist, of course. But, NOT in wilderness areas or areas that could be designated wilderness. Dirt bikes are incredibly destructive, especially in desert areas. Luckily, there's plenty of land to go around.

I live in south central California and have been kayaking the Kern River for most of my life. A couple of years ago the Sequoia National Forest proposed requiring entrance fees for most of the public lands surrounding the town where I live, including all access to the Kern River. The local reaction to this was summed up well by the local paper in their front page article "Mob Scene at Forest Service Fee Workshop." What most everyone was disturbed about at this meeting was the complete lack of accountability, financial and otherwise, on the part of the US Forest Service. Googling "GAO" and "Forest Service" will yield multiple reports to Congress documenting this. What about government accountability?

It should be noted that wilderness-quality land is still usable for non-motorized recreational use--designating land as wilderness does not mean it is no longer for human use. Hikers, bikers, equestrians and others still have access. The mandate of the BLM is to manage public land for industrial AND recreational use. The simple presence of minerals does not and should not mean that land should automatically be slated for exploration and extraction. Considering that extractive industry irreparably damages wilderness areas when that land is put into production, good policy would dictate setting aside some of this land for future generations' use. We will be glad we did.

OHV use should happen on some public lands, yes. However, as everyone knows motorized vehicles are incredibly destructive on the land, especially desert habitats. Hence, a lot of public lands--lands that are wilderness quality--should be off-limits to OHV use. Period. Fortunately, there is enough land to allow motorized vehicles to have some land and allow others to remain wilder--with only human-powered transport. I'm thinking especially about the millions of acres in southern Utah that desperately need wilderness designation and are at risk from irresponsible ATV, OHV users.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Students at all levels need to be taken out of the classroom and into their environment by their biology teachers. Nothing is more inspirational than finding a new creature that you have not seen before, photographing it, identifying it, and teaching others about what makes it interesting. Everybody should know the common local plants and animals in their neighborhood, and be able to recognize a healthy ecosystem and distinguish it from one that is depleted of native species and/or contaminated with exotic species. Numerous non-profit groups are working hard on monitoring and restoration of habitats, as well as education and research.

This is the second time that promoters of the casino have attempted to gain access to the Gettysburg battlefield area. It was a bad idea the first time and it remains a bad idea. The notion that this location will provide jobs is a red herring. A casino at this location is NOT the right answer.

Yes, not only should wilderness quality land be managed as such, the amount of wilderness should be dramatically expanded. In addition to ANWR, there are approximately 9 million acres of wilderness quality lands in southern and central Utah that desperately deserve--need--protection. If Congress won't pass the America Redrock Wilderness Act, then pieces of it should be designated wilderness, as occurred with Grand Staircase-Escalante and Washington Co. II that passed last year.

A Great Plains National Park? OK... lets put it in Central Park in New York City or maybe the Mall in Washington DC. I'm sure you wouldn't mind having a few Wolves or Grizzly Bears in your back yard, since you want to put them in ours! You have got to be kidding!! There are people living out here in the Great Plains, descendants of the Settlers who first Homesteaded this Great Land. We have historically fed America and much of the World. When these Homesteaders saw a Wolf, they stopped what they were doing and all the neighbors hunted that Wolf until it was dead. Not because they hated Wolves, but because Wolves and Livestock are incompatible. This is obviously the Brain Child of someone who doesn't understand Where their Food comes from, nor Appreciates the Hard Work and Sacrifices made by the Farmers and Ranchers of the Great Plains to ensure Top Quality Food is available in your Local Grocery Store. By the way... there already is a National Park that has Bison, Wolves and Grizzly Bears. Its called Yellowstone National Park. A Great Place to see all of these creatures, not to mention Old Faithful and many other Wondrous Sites! Thanks!

For our own health and vibrancy, for our communities and culture, for our offspring, we need wild areas. This needs is surely as important as any other natural resource, but the areas with potential to provide wildness are diminishing. The Wilderness Act, and it's potential in designating new Wilderness areas are the best way to assure these benefits continue and should be fully realized and implemented across the remaining landscape suitable for Wilderness. This administration has the opportunity to do that.

Think locally, act nationally - locally, designate the Scotchman Peaks as Wilderness.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I haven't heard a single statement on this thread (or site for that matter) from an OHV enthusiast or supporter asking to take non-OHV designated land away from hikers/campers. I can, however, think of dozens of places to hike/camp near my home but I have to drive over 2 hours to the nearest OHV designated area which is currently at risk of closure.

It's always so frustrating to read through these comments spouting that OHV enthusiasts are reckless, polluting, land-hungry caveman mentalities trying to take over the world's public land. I get it, you've had a bad experience with some a-holes somewhere down the line and put the other 99% in the same category. Please wake up. Your campaign is more likely to hurt your cause in the long run. You are trying to shut out one of the largest groups of folks that has respect and offers care to the lands you are trying to close access to. All we want is access to the same public lands we and our past generations have had access to and the same for our/your future generations to come. We are not the partying, drag-racing, gang-banging inner-city thugs with toys tearing it up having some drunken' booze-fest in the middle of nowhere. We are the "tread-lightly-so-we-can keep-enjoying-the-peace-and-beauty-of-what-we-have-been-treading-on-for-generations" folks. Now. Go lobby against illegal dumpers and factories destroying our ozone for a change! Fight a REAL threat for once!

The so called 5% of inconsiderable bikers aren't damaging the natural planet. Get your facts straight. We as a whole human population are the real threat. As a matter of fact, considering the vast majority of our public land as a whole, the irresponsible few could only leave a microscopic scar which quickly fades away with natural erosion and plant growth. I can personally testify seeing with my own eyes, what used to be OHV trails (now abandoned), completely wiped of any traces from the hills near my home. If you are an advocate in preserving the land, you need to realize restricting the access will only promote illegal and more irresponsible abuse. Additionally, it is typically the designated areas that are maintained and enforced, without these areas, the restricted land is an open invitation for the mindset you and I are so strongly against.

Yeah, I must admit, I get angry and fired up and sometimes lash out. That's not saying I don't choose my words wisely. I don't think anything or anyone can change your mind. Your anger for OHVers is now blinding. Additionally, I think this has turned into a hobby for you. It's simple, if you're not going to give us our trails back (previously OHV allowed), at least stop taking away what we already have. If you got issues with the noise, go elsewhere...how about the MILLIONS upon MILLIONS of designated non-OHV trail systems where the only motorized noise that can be heard is from the parking lots and roads you need to access them. There are far greater ecological threats to our public lands than OHVs, go wage war on them please. B.Meyer - Sounds like you are open minded and a reasonable thinker, thank you for sharing your thoughts and opinions that I do believe have had and will impact OHVers reading this thread. I think many will walk away with a level of responsibility for nature and an understanding of common courtesy on the trails. I see the point on the noise, but then again...you have many, many more choices of where go than we do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you so much Sally, for providing all this valuable information and thoughts. This might be our last chance (across all the nation) to protect wilderness areas. This a huge step in American History and we can be an example to other communities facing the same type of issues.

I am glad to hear of one family of ORV riders that is responsible. All off road enthusiasts I have ever met drive anywhere they want. Getting a "high" experience is all they are after. Sure, the wilderness quality land is beautiful. But, they are there to have fun and since that means tearing up the landscape, destroying precious petroglyphs, pouring hazardous waste into water, oh well, they had fun. I have not yet seen an ORV rider be responsible for the destruction his/her vehicle does to the air, water and land. Wilderness quality lands/water and air need protections. Lands that are sensitive need more restricted recreational activities. There are many places that provide a person who likes to ride ORV's opportunities to see the landscape. ORV riders, is it the thrill of the ride or appreciation of the land/water/birds and others. They also put noxious fumes into the air which adds air pollution and makes the views much more difficult to see. I expect it is the thrill of the ride the ORV riders want.

Preserve soft trails. Too many trails are being converted to OHV or paved trails. There are aesthetics of natural soft trails that are destroyed when trails are converted to OHV or paved trails. However, the dept. of transportation seems to push for OHV and paved trails in order to charge access fees. Hikers need to come together to protect soft trails before they disappear.

We do need some places of just wilderness lands. This type of thinking above, will only allow the corporations to overrun the wild places. It will also take humanity further away from the land, water and air. The human needs places to touch the land, breathe clean air and drink clean water. People need to experience a plant, a tree, a rock. Too much of this is taken away by our city and suburban lives. There are less and less places these days. Compromises in the past have just watered down an action leaving us with dirty water to drink. What does it mean to be a steward of the earth?

"Wild" horses are not wild, they are feral. They are not native to North America. I like horses and burros, but we should not close our eyes to the damage they can do to wildlands, and how fast they breed. They are not all adoptable, it is expensive to keep feeding them. Just because they are pretty doesn't mean they should given "sacred cow" status.

Agree with some of this statement- Solar development is very land intensive, will be hard on a delicate desert landscape- and uses too much water (even the "low water" versions) in areas that have very little water. Should our demand for "renewable" energy ignore use of nonrenewable water aquifers? should people who own land and homes already have to drill ever deeper wells to subsidize solar developments? That said, solar is not the answer in some places due to weather, etc limiting the output. Why not biomass energy? Cogen plants create electricity through burning ag waste and small trees. No new tech needed- just need to deal with air quality crazies that prefer to burn non renewable natural gas because "it's cleaner." How about producing methane from dairies, landfill, and sewage plants (one farmer tried doing that in CA, again bureaucracy did not allow him to burn methane to produce electricity- he's only allowed to pile the manure so the methane is wasted.)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

although there is waste in our system, the United States feed many other nations- I guess we could tell them no more food...the reality is that we can't produce enough food for the world with our current footprint without using modern methods even if we all went vegetarian. Unless you insist on buying feedlot animals, beef is usually raised on land that can't be used to produce rice or potatoes- not all land is equivalent. I buy grass fed meat which is raised on open range. Vegetarianism is not a healthy option for anyone of Native American or northern extraction (diabetes etc). I would argue that rice and potatoes are NOT a substitute for meat, and wishful thinking is not a substitute for realistic planning. Why is logging bad? It's better to use wood products than strip mine for metal. If we don't want to use petroleum, we will have to use some form of biofuel- wood gasification is a method that already exists, as does chipping small trees to feed cogen plants. Solar only works during the day, wind is hit or miss (and think of the impact to birds) you sound like a laundry list of group think environmentalist religious belief (logging bad, farming bad, must suffer to be good) personally I believe that we need less people, but I'm not sure how we do it in an ethical way- pay people to not have kids?

why stop at vandalism? Let's shoot kids if they play video games- that way they won't be around to go psycho from all the damage video games are doing to their brains....will that make you happy? After all the Taliban banned kites, didn't it? while we're at it, let's force them to eat their broccoli at gunpoint too! Please, we have enough serious problems with meth labs, invasive weeds, and more, without forcing unwilling kids to participate in activities by banning games.

Although I do not agree with the initial statement, I DO think there should be limits on speed. Please can we at least have a speed limit? 10 mph perhaps? The problem is not with slow pedaling along, it is with folks bombing downhill, braking hard, who are more interested in going fast than in being polite. There are trails in my area that are officially multi-use, but because they are heavily used as "downhill" bike trails, they are no longer usable by adult hikers, much less small children, equines or dogs. I have found that some mountain bikers do not realize just how frightening and unpleasant it is to have someone come up fast and quiet behind them then come to a screeching stop just a couple of feet away when you fail to jump out of the way. Think how frightening it is to an animal who does not understand that you are not trying to attack them. I am hard of hearing, and I DO NOT like sharing a trail with someone who is going 30 mph or more downhill. I really don't like rude cusswords or eye rolling, heavy sighs, because I can't get my animals off the trail fast enough. I try to stay on trails where bikes are not allowed, yet even there, I often find bike riders who claim they "didn't know" after passing many signs....We need both trails for fast bike riders AND slow hikers, and they really don't mix.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Although your idea is sweet, there are some problems with sharing between some uses. Fast bike riders are NOT compatible with equines due to the problem of spooking animals. If bike riders were willing to go slow, we could share safely, but, as it is, I stay away from heavy bike use areas due to the excessive speeds of many mountain bikers. Even if I don't have my animals with me, I don't like having to jump off the trail as bikes zoom by (not very peaceful). It is actually safely to share the trail with motorized bikes as they don't "surprise" you, and usually are more "animal aware" so stay back and don't spook the pack animals. I don't want to tell anyone not to ride their bike, I just want some trails and the wilderness to remain off limits to them, so I can safely recreate the way I want to. Unless they would be willing to slow down?

Can we focus on making engines quieter? I don't mind hearing quiet ATV's, trail bikes, etc. when I am close by, but the whine of 2 cycle engines from long distances is annoying and not peaceful. I think many folks are like me- don't want to stop anyone from having responsible fun, just don't think they have to disturb the peace for miles around. Some OHV's are quieter than others- is it possible to enforce a decibel limit that is meaningful? Is there a current limit that is not being enforced?

I absolutely agree that single track mountain bike trails should be built (not wildcatted, please) BUT if they are, the existing trails should be off limits or have a 5 mph speed limit so hikers and equestrians don't have to dodge speeding bikes. I know it must be annoying to have to stop or slow down for us non-wheeled folks, but high speeds don't mix with little kids, horses, burros, llamas, dogs, etc. Multi-use is a great idea until uses are not compatible.

I agree- I'm paying them to stay home right now- why shouldn't they help out? Why limit them to state land- there's plenty of litter in National Parks that needs to be cleaned up.

I am not a "rider", i just like to get out and camp on dirt roads, some of them rougher than others. That said- I don't like camping in noisy spots. I'm not sure why trail bikes and ATVs have to be loud. I would like to see some folks slow down, as I believe speed is correlated with trail damage. This is true of mountain bikers too. I don't want to shut off more ground - I think we should focus more on getting everyone to be polite, and tread lightly. I think 1% of folks ruin things for the other 99% by not following rules and being rude. I use pack animals and hope that others will not try to shut off my use of natural areas, therefore I don't want to run around telling other people to go away either!

In general I agree you on with the need to avoid political buzz words, but take exception to your phrase "truly disabled" I have a severe immune system disease resulting in arthritis and other problems. Thank God, I am not in a wheelchair, and hope not to be. However, I can't walk as far as I used to, and need more gear to survive. I now have pack animals to go into the back country because I can't carry what I need to function (my medicine bag alone weighs a pound, and don't ask about the extra warm sleeping bag and super thick pad, and large utensils that I can use with my clumsy hands). I do not look "disabled", I still walk, but am I therefore supposed to not use my "service animals?" Similarly, I do not want to tell others that they are not "truly disabled" enough to need help to get out and about. Of course, responsible riding education, quieter machines, and slower speeds would also help.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Lotterys are voluntary taxation- and they usually work if people keep their eye on them and don't allow money to be diverted for "emergencies." on the the other hand, raising taxes during a depression is unlikely to produce the desired result. Yup, tax until they leave, then we'll have lots of money. It is futile to impose punitive taxes- whatever your thoughts about an industry, they will not pay more taxes than they want to. If you raise taxes too high, they will just leave or go out of business and put their money in some other country. Whether you think it's fair or not, it's just the way it is.

Many people here want to spend tax dollars on recreation projects. (I promoted a few of these ideas myself) Although I truly enjoy a good trail, I know how much many of these ideas could cost. Given the budget crisis in many towns, is it reasonable to increase recreation spending, instead of supporting hospitals, fire stations, police, schools, etc? I would like to hear other folks opinions!

OK 10 mph? what would be a reasonable speed limit? just because you can ride faster than everyone else doesn't mean you should- it would be grossly irresponsible horse riders to gallop down a trail at full speed but yet again today I had bike riders whiz past me- they clearly saw me riding my animal, yet did not slow down, and to add to the fun, their dog was running behind. The riders did not control their dog until I demanded they keep it from running toward us- they didn't even realize what was happening (probably due to speed) So how do we make people behave? I am getting tired of dangerous behavior on the part of one community. believe it or not ATV and motorized trail bike riders are generally politer than mountain bikers.

OK so we're "privileged" - let's see - 90% of the land in our county is held by federal gov which pays no taxes. Our average income is much lower than state average. Our unemployment is much higher than state or national average. The RAC money is a trickle compared to what the tax base would be if the land was private. YOU on the other hand, live where there is a tax base, you are allowed to build offices, restaurants, industrial parks, hospitals, whatever. WE can't step out of our houses without being told what not to do. Our schools are barely scraping by, we have NO hospital in our county, our roads our full of potholes, and people like you want us to have NO Control over the pittance allowed to us out of the tax dollars we give annually to the government. YOU are allowed to appeal on environmental documents for projects on federal ground, whether or not you have ever been here. YOU are not here, YOU do not know what happens here, so YOU must be the expert, right?

if we don't log or mine, how will you be able to send your thoughts out over the internet from your comfortable home? There are no easy answers. "logging" is not all the same, some is not good (1000 acre clearcuts) some is more appropriate (thinning, group cuts, etc.) Mining also has different types with different impacts. Planning careful projects to provide goods for people is not a bad thing. We all eat, we all like a roof over our heads, we all like modern conveniences like computers, and insulting the people who provide those things to us is not productive. ("destroying forests"? Really ?) Discouraging smart kids from entering land management careers is a bad way to reduce impacts from producing all the things you use.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Up until we developed modern methods of agriculture, including pesticides, famine was common in Europe and other "first world" nations. (Irish potato blight, anyone?) We are using LESS land to produce more food because of the modern methods. This has allowed us to reforest old farms on the East Coast and great lakes. We now have vastly more people than we did before WWII. If we go to all organic, we will need to clear land again to feed the number of people we now have. Although I am worried about the number of people we have, limiting our agricultural and technical tools, is likely to increase hunger- hunger leads to chaos, chaos leads to environmental damage (starving folks in Africa will do anything to feed their kids, including killing rare animals- wouldn't you?). "environmentally friendly" is in the eye of the beholder, and often found to have trade offs that some folks don't want to admit. BTW, I am very low footprint, but not by following the expensive hybrid car, solar panel, method advocated.

We are growing way more trees than we are cutting in CA. We are using way more wood than we are cutting in CA. Is this sustainable? Meanwhile, housing and lawns are spreading. Is it the limited logging that affects salmon, or runoff from increased population? How about every time we burn off another 100,000 acres? does that affect the fisheries? Demanding that we import our wood products from other states or countries is selfish and unnecessary. Buy locally grown - both food AND wood!

would like to see quieter OHV's. Responsible riding will cut down damage to a minimum.

We don't need wolves here. These coyotes are bad enough. Can't let a little dog out at night without staying with it.

\$128 million per day is what the Gulf of Mexico provides to the US economy. Without it our economy will collapse even sooner than Progressives plan. So far Obama has driven off a couple deep sea platforms with his prolonged drilling embargo, one to Egypt, another to West Africa. Each platform represents hundreds of union jobs. "Require 'voluntary' action"??? What part of voluntary do you derive from 'require'?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Problem: Federal agency officials continue to resist the idea that easements and other alternatives are effective cost-saving alternatives to fee acquisition of lands. They talk about using alternatives but rarely try to implement them. The Solution: Incentives need to be established for officials to use easements and other cost-saving alternatives. Penalties need to be created for buying more than the interest necessary to achieve project objectives. Federal officials have often, and inaccurately, misrepresented the cost of easements. A popular notion is that easements cost 80% or more of fee title. The key is to buy easements early when development is far away. Easements increase in cost as development gets closer. However, officials have made little or no attempt to use easements or other alternatives, and instead go to great lengths to avoid them. Inholders have actually been scared out of using easements because of very restrictive terms and negative statements from federal officials. For example, the State of Minnesota successfully used easements on a cost effective basis on the Kettle River. The Park Service was unable or unwilling to use easements on the nearby St. Croix to the degree suggested by Congress. The result was costs much higher than necessary on the St. Croix and poor landowner relations. The Fish and Wildlife Service has also successfully used easements to protect wildlife habitat at costs approximately 40% or less of what the fee title would have cost. The inability of the federal agencies to use alternatives to fee title has actually slowed the protection of some areas and wasted funds. The result is that there is now a huge backlog of unprotected lands. Some landowners want to sell but can't because of the shortage of money. In addition, relocation and human costs associated with fee acquisition are not considered by agency officials. Nor do they consider the project benefits when inholder communities are left intact. There may, in fact, be lower long term management and maintenance cost, especially when landowners remain in areas where significant cultural and historical values exist. An example is the Buffalo River. Local landowners were so mad at the Park Service that they would not even show the agency how to run a historic grist mill. How much better it would have been to have kept the grist mill in the hands of the original owners so visitors could have seen living history. There needs to be better training of land managers and acquisition officers and more information for landowners, so that all parties can understand the benefits of using reasonable alternatives and avoiding unnecessary conflict. The bottom line from the federal agency viewpoint must be to acquire only the interest in land necessary to meet the intent of Congress. This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

42% of all federal spending is with borrowed money. We're broke guys! The CCC requires money we DON'T HAVE. Putting people on the government payroll doesn't reduce debt, it increases it, and increases the future liabilities. We need to incentivize private companies to employ people so as to increase the tax revenue, not taxpayer funded government.

42% of all government spending now is with borrowed money. America has \$114 trillion in debt and unfunded liabilities and the debt is growing fast. This idea perpetrates the myth that government has money of its own - it doesn't. The money either is taken from taxpayers, or borrowed (repaid with interest). Government must spend less, and this proposal doesn't rise to the a level of criticality. America is fast approaching a downgrading of its debt. While honoring our fallen comrades, we must remember that the land is for the living.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Both the Forest Service and Park Service have ignored the intent of Congress while implementing new park and recreation areas. While Congress intended more public use in some areas, the Park Service manages all areas the same way. The results have been: far more land acquisition than anticipated by Congress; greater cost; and almost no use of alternative means of land protection. As a result, local land owners and communities have turned against federal recreation schemes. The Solution: A clear understanding of the intent of Congress by the federal agency before it begins to develop new parks and recreation areas. Require all land planning, acquisition and management personnel to read and be familiar with all legislative histories for their areas. Require land protection plans in each area before acquisition begins. The Government Accountability Office (GAO) (formerly the General Accounting Office), the investigative arm of Congress, has been extremely critical of federal land acquisition programs, particularly those of the Park Service. It suggested in a series of reports that the Park Service had gone so far beyond congressional intent, that it should sell much of the land it purchased back to the original owners because it was not needed to meet the requirements of Congress. The GAO suggested that the Park Service managed most of its areas the same way, regardless of congressional priorities. Examples:

- Lake Chelan National Recreation Area – GAO said that Park Service land acquisition had actually cut overnight lodging in half. Other Park Service actions cut available recreation activities. Far more land was acquired than was intended by Congress. This turning point report recommended that the agency sell the land back to private owners.
- Buffalo River – Land acquisition destroyed the unique farming culture that existed along the river. It was so special it was featured in National Geographic. Almost no easements were used, although they were recommended by Congress. The Park Service is now trying to re-establish the culture and rent the farms back to private owners, yet is continuing to make the same mistakes in other areas.
- St. Croix River – GAO found in 1978 that the Park Service had purchased over 21,000 acres when they were only supposed to buy 1,000. Again, in 1979, GAO found more people facing condemnation than the agency was legally able to condemn. The State of Minnesota was able to protect as much land as the Park Service, but for far less cost, using easements.
- Mt. Rogers NRA – In 1980 the Forest Service published a master plan indicating many more condemnations. A review of the legislative history showed that Congress specified 39,500 acres as the amount of land to purchase, 40% in scenic easements. At that time the agency had purchased 26,000 acres in fee with no easements. After intervention by the local congressman and American Land Rights, the Forest Service curtailed their plans.
- Many other examples exist. In one report, the GAO only found one area out of 21 examined where the agency was managing it consistent with the intent of Congress. Each agency should be required to have a complete copy of the legislative history, including congressional debates, House and Senate Committee Reports, Conference Reports and other important documents in the park or recreation area available for inspection. All personnel associated with management, planning, and land acquisition should be required to be familiar with this information. Other oversight procedures should be set up to make sure the agency is obeying the law... and the intent of Congress. Part of the problem is that the Park Service rotates its personnel often. As a result, Park Service personnel begin to manage all areas the same regardless of what Congress intended. This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Downed timber creates an opportunity and a cost to National Parks. Excessive fallen timber has considerable market value that could bolster the revenue of the park, and provide work opportunities for local loggers and sawmills. If not removed, the timber can create an extreme fire hazard, such as was created in Yellowstone before their devastating fire. A similar potential exists now in the Olympic National Park which has millions of board feet of timber that was blown down in the 2007 and 2008 storms. Referred to as the 'Asbestos Forest', it burns only once in about every 300 years, but when it does, the accumulated fuel will incinerate even the buried seeds. That condition exists right now. The locals, including the local Indian nation, BEGGED to allow logging to remove the excessive fallen timber but federal managers refused to budge. Of course now the timber is no longer good for prime lumber and much of the value is lost but perhaps someone in the government actually is imbued with common sense and can reverse this terrible policy.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Forest Service recreation residence program is under threat of gradual phase out. Poor appraisals and high fees could make cabin sites only available to the affluent. Agency termination policy has led to the loss of hundreds of cabins and loss of visitor morale. Several thousand cabins have been lost to fire and termination over time. The Solution: Recognize recreation residences as a valuable part of multiple use in the forests. They provide the highest income per acre of any recreation use in the forests and allow access and a valuable recreation experience for many people who otherwise might not be able to use the forests. This is especially true for the handicapped, elderly and children. Cabin owners are good stewards of the forest who provide many valuable services. Private investment by permittees often makes up for the lack of federal funding. Ever since the 1962 Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission there has been an unwritten Forest Service policy to gradually eliminate the now reduced to around 14,000 "recreation residences" and "isolated cabins." This has led to years of conflict between permittees and the US Forest Service that damaged a previously successful program and partnership. The agency terminated 1,300 "isolated cabins". The present policy is to remove all isolated cabin uses. This policy is costly, brings many appeals, and leads to the loss of valuable human resources that could help make up for agency funding shortfalls through private investment in roads, fire protection, and other services. Poor appraisals and uneven application of appraisal standards has led to large variations in permit fees. Some permittees have been paying fees in excess of \$20,000 in some areas for a single lot for one year, often only accessible two or three months out of the year. In other areas of the country, a similar lot is charged only \$600 a year. The recent faulty appraisal process has increased fees so much that many cabin owners are being forced to consider selling, if they can sell at all. Many cabin sites in existing tracts are unfilled due to present policies. These sites could provide recreation to thousands of families and others who use their facilities. The Forest Service has failed to recognize permittees as assets. Gradually, many permittees have been turned from friends into enemies. Agency policy must be changed to encourage the recreation residence program to continue. Fees must be fair and equitable to prevent cabins from being only available to the rich. Appraisals should recognize the existing private investment and previous investments in water, sewer, roads and power service. In addition, appraisals should recognize the reduced value of the permit because of extreme limitations included in the permit the permittee must sign. Agency personnel should be encouraged to look at the benefits of recreation cabins, both in tracts and in isolated areas, and take advantage of the private stewardship and cost benefits possible with a better relationship with permittees. This idea was submitted on behalf of the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Grazing rights are threatened. Grazing is a long-term, legally established economic use of the federal lands. Grazing rights and water rights are privately owned property rights established in a recent Hage Case in the US Court of Claims. Agencies and some special interest groups are attempting to take these rights or legislate grazing out of existence. The resulting threat is causing ranchers, normally friends of recreation, to close access to private land, as well as public land where access requires going through private land for recreational purposes. The Solution: Grazing must be recognized as an activity that subsidizes recreation. The investments by ranchers in grazing permits, roads, water development and range improvements on federal land help wildlife and subsidize recreation. These investments must be recognized and compensated, or traded for, when a conflict over recreation develops. Continuous attempts have been made to eliminate grazing from federal areas with the idea that it is an activity that conflicts with public purposes and diminishes recreational opportunities. In reality, ranchers invest large sums of money in roads, fences, and water improvements that enhance wildlife propagation. Wildlife often feed on private land at lower elevations in the Winter as well as Summer. This advances and subsidizes such recreation as fishing and hunting. Failure to acknowledge the existence of privately held water, grazing, and range rights, and the possessory interest in federal land they generate, has led to unending conflict. The solution is to recognize grazing and water rights as private property rights. In addition, we should acknowledge the economic benefits other segments of society receive from privately funded range improvements. Grazing on public lands lowers the overall cost of food for America, and increases the economic activity of local communities. Efforts have been made by the federal agencies, as well as special interest groups, to regulate out of existence, or legislate the removal, of grazing without recognition of or compensation for the huge investment by most stockmen in range improvements. These activities are gradually turning stockmen away from their traditional support for recreation activities. In large areas of grazing land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service, there is so much private investment and so many private rights, that the area is actually not public land, but split estate land, with the stockmen owning a significant percentage of the bundle of rights to the land. In some cases, the percentage owned by the stockmen is so large, and the government's percentage so small, that the land title should be conveyed to cut management costs and get land on the tax rolls. Recreation conflict resolution and allocation of recreation resources would be easier if the investments by stockmen were recognized and they were compensated for their economic loss in the event of a conflict over a recreation use. Grazing should be recognized as a positive contribution to recreation. This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org).

It's scary enough that someone promoted forced re-education of our youth without advocating work camps, de-development of America, and increasing our energy dependence to dictators.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

National Parks don't allow volunteers to use chainsaws in clearing trails. This inhibits volunteers helping out the parks after storm damage closes the trails. Many volunteers are just as experienced in the use of chainsaws as park employees, and have their own health insurance, yet Park officials won't permit it. The consequences of a ban on chainsaw use is that park trails remain closed for extended periods, labor cost for park maintenance goes up, local volunteer spirit declines because they aren't allowed to help.

Not all designated wilderness decisions are to protect nature, some are political. Clinton put Staircase Escalante off-limits to protect his Chinese campaign contributors. There is as much as \$1 trillion in very clean coal buried there, but it competed with the Lippo Group's plans. When I worked there as a supervisor, the Port of Long Beach canceled part of its expansions when the possibility of exporting the coal to China evaporated. Along with those plans went thousands of union jobs, and the potential boost US exports. So now China burns dirtier coal, the effluence of which gets delivered to us a few days later.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Resource managers have been taught that inholders are a threat to recreation areas and should be removed. This perception has become policy in most federal agencies. It has turned supporters into adversaries. The result is constant bureaucratic pressure against inholders, more land acquisition than necessary, higher cost, loss of volunteer stewardship, and the loss of unique rural cultures which add to the visitor experience. The sale of easements by companies who own a large portion of a township can damage or destroy the future tax base of that township. The Solution: Co-Management. Make inholders an asset. Involve them in land planning and turn them into allies. The country cannot afford to buy out all the nice places that need conservation. Private stewardship, in cooperation with land planning agencies and elected officials, is the answer. It would reduce land conservation costs through the use of easements and alternatives and make landowners part of the solution instead of enemies. Inholders are people who own land or other equity interests such as grazing permits, recreation cabins, mining claims, and water rights within the boundaries of federally managed areas or adjacent to those areas, or who are impacted by the management, regulation of, or access to those areas. Over one million people are inholders. They own: land in National Parks; private land; recreation permits; special use permits; grazing permits and other rights in National Forests and areas managed by the Bureau of Land Management. They include a variety of privately owned uses in areas managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Corps of Engineers, and Bureau of Reclamation. Easements are a two edged sword. They can be useful in some circumstances. But often they are a threat to the landowner and the local community. For example, in Maine, land trusts are buying easements from forestry companies that often own a large portion of a township. The local community or elected officials are not involved in the negotiations. The town officials wake up one morning to find out that a huge portion of their tax base is gone. That means the town and the future of the town are largely destroyed or severely damaged. Any negotiation for easements must involve local elected officials to protect the future of the township. When Congress creates a federally designated area, there is sometimes considerable public support by residents and those living on adjacent lands. Often that is based on promises made by environmental groups and government officials. However, the record shows, as in the Cuyahoga Valley National Park, that the promises made to them to gain their support are often broken. The traditional federal method for dealing with conflicts, real or perceived, between private ownership, federal management and recreation objectives has been to remove the private interest. Gradually, private users that were promised the ability to continue are driven from the scene. Often, recreation opportunities are also driven out. Landowners and others begin to fight any federal involvement because of the agencies failure to honor their promises. This process often leads to more conflict and less recreation. A variety of methods are used by the federal agencies to gain control. The use of condemnation or eminent domain to acquire private land, homes and farms has had a devastating impact on the rural culture of America. Numerous films, television shows, magazine and newspaper articles document the abuses. Regulation of inholders is also an enormous problem. The federal agency gradually takes over an area designated for special management through an ever-increasing series of regulations. Private uses and access are reduced. It becomes uneconomic for private interests to continue. Co-management of these areas could change this. Secretary of the Interior Donald Hodel was quoted in the "Daily Oklahoman," Friday, December 6th, 1985, about the proposed Tallgrass Prairie Preserve: "Any obstacle to drilling or grazing would depend on the

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

legislation that creates the park. But there is a trap in that. If legislation says grazing and drilling is permitted, as soon as the park is created, there will be an enormous push to prevent it by banning it outright or raising so much red tape that it could become impossible. Like night follows day, it's an unwavering principle of park development. There's a constituency that would oppose any development. Within five years, anyone carrying on commercial activity in or near the park could find it difficult if not impossible to operate." There is a finite amount of resources available for recreation. Many chances exist for truly cooperative relationships that encourage multiple-use while creating recreation opportunities. The secret is encouraging cooperation between the owners of private rights and those wishing to develop an area for recreation – whether government or private. Traditionally the government doesn't have to cooperate. It can simply take (and sometimes pay) for what it wants which creates enemies and opposition. By treating inholders or private interests as allies in the effort to expand recreation, a wide vista of new opportunities would come into focus. Private investment, secure with long-term leases or permits and a friendly neighbor in the federal government, would increase. Inholders who are already there, and who own portions of the checker boarded lands intermixed with federal land, can provide the best and least expensive way to expand recreation if they are brought into the process and treated fairly. There are indications that vandalism and costs for management and maintenance of campgrounds and other facilities are reduced when adjacent to inholdings. Inholders often provide living examples of special cultures that should be protected, not destroyed. Communities on the Buffalo River in Northwest Arkansas are an example. These communities were lauded by National Geographic but later destroyed by the Park Service. This leads to the loss of future parks because of the fear that the Buffalo River example will be repeated. That means less recreation. The American's Great Outdoors Initiative should recommend that due to the scarcity of funds, private land, recreation residence permits, and other uses be integrated into the long term recreation plan. Also, that management of federal lands should encourage opportunities for co-management with private interests which would reduce costs, provide more recreation, and build a spirit of cooperation. -----The "Expansion, Modification and Intensification" idea led to States "acquiring" recreational lands by condemnation and seizure of private property in thousands of cases. -----The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation has become a costly political football bounced from one form to another. -----The "Grant-in-Aid" idea led to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1964, which has been the instrument of private land takings too vast to comprehend. And all that is from one little Commission, the Outdoor Recreation and Review Commission of 1962. We are likely to get much worse from the current American's Great Outdoors Initiative. We haven't learned a thing from history. What's most instructive – and dangerous – is how these seemingly innocuous recommendations by well-meaning commissioners in 1962 turned into such devastating laws. In many cases it was sheer accident. For example, the Land and Water Conservation Fund – an instrument of destruction to thousands of property owners – gained support in 1963 from development-friendly Rep. Wayne Aspinall (D-Wyoming), chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Aspinall looked upon the Fund as a way to reduce pressure for more Wilderness by purchasing alternative sites for outdoor recreation. He let it through his committee in 1964, but never intended the Fund as the instrument of destruction it became. If a friend of private property in 1964 could help pass a seemingly innocent measure that went so

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

bad, what is today's Congress likely to do with the American's Great Outdoors Initiative recommendations? It's like George Santayana said: "Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it", and Edmund Burke who said: "Those who don't know history are destined to repeat it." This idea was submitted on behalf of the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org).

Some horses panic at the sight of a bicycle. If you allow mountain bikes on all horse trails, you threaten the safety of equestrians.

Something along these lines are needed. N.E. Ohio has no place to ride with more than 10 miles of trails. Sure Wayne National forest has what 28 miles of trails but for us we have to drive 8 hours away (to WV) to ride trails that have any worth while lengths to them. We have hundreds of miles of horse trails & vacant railway beds that are never use, why not convert some of those to OHV trails? Why not help us open trails here in N.E. Ohio too? We pay taxes just the same as everyone else.....



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The GAO (Government Accountability Office), has been critical over the years of the National Park Service and other agencies with respect to land acquisition. The Federal Agencies, Congress and recreation advocates have largely ignored the GAO findings and recommendations. The Solution: Congress and the Agencies should review these GAO reports and begin implementing the recommendations. The result would be substantial cost savings, better landowner relations, and improved land conservation. Today's readers would benefit greatly from reading these reports. They are as contemporary as if they were written yesterday. In one report, the President's Commission on American's Outdoors was severely criticized for failing to follow the law and the Federal Advisory Committee Act. It is hoped that the America's Great Outdoors Initiative follow in the PCAO's footsteps and will not make these same or similar mistakes. It appears it already is by largely only notifying the environmental groups about Great Outdoors meetings while failing to notify a broad section of landowners, recreation and community groups. In six earlier reports, the GAO heavily criticized the Park Service and other agencies for: (1) not following the intent of Congress; (2) failing to consider cost effective alternatives; (3) buying more land than was intended by Congress or needed to manage the area; (4) failing to prioritize land purchases; and (5) failing to pay attention to the needs of local government, landowners, or local communities. Three of the GAO reports recommended that the Park Service sell back land they had needlessly purchased. The GAO is the investigative arm of the Congress. Their reports, together with the Interior Department Inspector General's reports, are critical of agency activities and clearly indicate that something is wrong with the system. These reports need to be reviewed and their recommendations implemented. A recent GAO report reviewing the Land Protection Planning Process of the National Park Service indicated that in most cases the plans themselves were not consistent with Park Service or Interior Department Policy. It is likely that when a review is made of the implementation of the Land Protection Policy plans, the Park Service will be found not to have followed their own plans, much less Department Policy. They will be found to have failed to update the plans or involve the public. The result is lip service to creative land protection alternatives. "Federal Protection of Wild and Scenic Rivers Has Been Slow and Costly" (CED-78-96) (May 22, 1978) "The Federal Drive To Acquire Private Lands Should be Reassessed" (CED-80-14) (December 14, 1979) "Federal Land Acquisitions By Condemnation – Opportunities to Reduce Delays and Costs" (CED-80-54) (May 14, 1980) "Lands In The Lake Chelan National Recreation Area Should Be Returned to Private Ownership" (CED-81-10) (January 22, 1981) "The National Park Service Should Improve Its Land Acquisition and Management at Fire Island" (CED-81-78) (May 8, 1981) "Federal Land Acquisition and Management Practices" (CED-81-135) (September 11, 1981) "New Rules For Protecting Land In The National Park System – Consistent Compliance Needed" (RCED-86-16) (October 31, 1985) The scanned 1988 GAO report on the Commission on Americans Outdoors, Interior Did Not Comply with Legal Requirements for the Outdoors Commission, GAO/RCED-88-65, March 1988, is at { <a href="http://moosecove.com/propertyrights/NPCA/docs/GAO-OutdoorsCommission\_1988-03.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } (17.6 MB). This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The LWCF has become a tool for some special interests to destroy the fabric of rural communities and reduce recreational opportunities for large segments of society at unnecessary cost to the taxpayers. In 2000 there was a proposal, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, to give the land buying agencies over \$3 billion per year, off budget and automatically. If that had passed it would have meant the end of rural America over time. The Solution: Any future fund of this type must have tight controls and effective and continuous oversight. Any new funds including the LWCF must go through the appropriations process each year and compete with other Federal funding needs. The new direction must be to purchase only sufficient interests in lands necessary to meet the intent of Congress for the area. According to the Government Accountability Office, formerly the General Accounting Office (GAO), to a large extent, no effective priority system has been used with this fund. Lands have been purchased in fee title without considering the need for such purchases, alternatives to fee acquisition or cost-effectiveness of such purchases. For too many years, the federal government has supported the philosophy that we need to buy in fee as much land as possible within dedicated boundaries regardless of: (1) cost; (2) whether the purchase is necessary; (3) whether alternatives exist; (4) the rights of the landowners; and (5) the socio-cultural effects of large-scale purchases of land on local communities and land use patterns. Robert Herbst, former Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks described the result at the 1980 National Park Service Advisory Board meeting as a land acquisition backlog exceeding three billion dollars. Others have suggested that the figure may be much higher. Each federal project must have a limited amount of funding for fee title purchases for public use areas with adequate provisions for alternatives. Each federal area should have an approved Land Protection Plan along with a General Management Plan prior to beginning acquisition. Priorities should be established after full public participation. Only the interests necessary to manage the area and meet the intent of Congress should be purchased. Public involvement must take place at least every two years to update the Land Protection Plan. Without these safeguards, area managers won't know which land to buy or what interest will suit the need of the project. Any increases in the price of land caused by waiting until the plans are complete would be more than offset by the lower total expenditures since only the correct interests and amount of land required to fulfill congressional objectives would be purchased. In other words, will conservation easements satisfy the legislation or could a lesser interest be purchased. Or should the land be purchased in fee title. As of now, the agencies just assume they will buy it all in fee title so why bother with a priority system. If these guidelines were followed, substantial savings would result without the huge cost overruns and needless acquisitions of the past. The cost of management would be reduced. No new funding system should be created without a carefully crafted oversight system that makes sure the funds are spent properly and consistent with the intent of Congress. In addition, any future funds should be available for maintenance as well as acquisition. That way the agency can set its own management priorities. It may be reasonable to move away from dedicated funds of this type and allow competition for funds with other national priorities. This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I agree to having more localized processing facilities, I don't want government subsidizing it. I only have a few head of cattle, but when I take beef to the butcher, I expect to bear the full cost, and not pass it along to the taxpayer. Similarly, I don't want to be subsidizing other industries either. The free market is the most efficient allocator of resources.

Why exclude 'for profit' companies from participating in promoting scenic byways? Why does this administration so hate free enterprise? A privately run company generally provides superior service at lower cost than a government run or 'non-profit' organization that doesn't have cost efficiency in mind.

Preservation of the important Civil War battlefields where Americans fought in a war of ideals. Preservation and interpretation of these grounds is important to understanding our Nation's history.

Absolutely spot on with this one. We will probably lose upward to 75 % of our flora and fauna as that belt moves north. It is going to be a drastically different world. The stripping of biosystems to only grow one thing, whether it be a food crop or a single species forest, is just downright idiotic.

I agree with you entirely. I think part of the problem is that in today's world some humans expect a one size, fits all solution. That just isn't going to happen because we aren't all that. We need a multiple of approaches. But, because we think we're all that, we have put some very strange people in charge of things and then those strange people get to pick the next level of strange ones and on it goes until you have that theatrical, political, stupidized system. Knowledge and common sense have been left to wither. Just a federal mandating that no outside lights should run on fossil fuels during daylight hours would save tremendous amounts of wasted energy resources and since most of our electricity is generated via coal...that would help with our air pollution. A one page congressional bill could take care of that. Heck, let the citizens patrol those 'daylight burners' for cash bonuses and see how fast we could change habits. I think the political right has finally achieved its aims, though I can't quite get my head around their goal. We have dumbed down the population, made money the end all of living and raped the very planet, upon which we owe our survival, until it is self destructing and then have blamed it all on the very Creator and the same citizens that continue the fight to stop the madness. Anyway, exact and strategic plans most definitely should have already been in place to exercise on a moment's notice and that oil should have never seen landfall. We are really something, huh?

It isn't just sound, though the constant droning is annoying. It is the desire to cut new trails that runs in the blood of riders. It's just a human thing. I feel, they need to ride on private property. I'm sure there are plenty of biker parks, too. In fact, look at what a biker park looks like. I don't want natural forests to look like that. They wouldn't be forests anymore, would they?

OHV brings trampled earth. Opposite of natural beauty. OHV brings fuel stations, fumes and ground pollution. Opposite again. One for one isn't smart or fair.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

People do need to think, balance and respect but they don't. I say no to mechanized vehicles in wilderness areas unless a ranger is behind the wheel. There is no way to police ignorance in the wilderness; it's just too vast.

The 5 % of environmentally considerate people won't damage the natural planet. The 5% of inconsiderate bikers will.

Unfortunately many bike users get bored with designated trails or think their rights to freedom are being trampled. They decide where to cut new ones that will then be expanded by others. I say no to mechanized travel through wilderness areas unless a ranger is behind the wheel.

You are right on. We are following the plans with which the Global Elite (World Bank, etc) have already raped 3rd world countries(Haiti, great example). Theory is if people can't feed themselves - whoever controls the food controls them. And, they are absolutely correct. And, we are absolutely letting it happen. Shame on us. Great idea you put forth. I'd throw my tax dollars there, if I had a choice. Visiting a farm can be as much fun as hiking a trail.

I live in the Seattle metro area. For having so much Wilderness in the area, it is becoming harder and harder for me to find trails the take my Jeep on locally. As I have learned, with a new child there is little I can do to get out and enjoy the wilderness. This is one of the few recreational activities that can accommodate the whole family. Being outdoors is big part of our family's recreational activities. I really would like to see more Wilderness in the Seattle area (cascade foothills) opened up for ORV activities. In lieu of this "treading lightly" must be publicized/taught, and enforcement of that mantra should take place with more rigor. Potentially a Federal or State Fund could be created to help pay for the land purchases, maintenance and enforcement of regulations in the areas deems as ORV areas. As a tax paying citizen, and a law abiding citizen, I would be willing to pay a voluntary tax to utilize and pay for such areas. A great example are the "Sno Park" permits and "Wilderness" permits that are required when parking at wilderness trail heads. Don't get me wrong, I am an advocate for saving wilderness for hiking, climbing and backcountry skiing. I do all of those as well. In fact I have climbed every volcano in WA state. But, there has to be a good balance of ORV and Non-ORV wilderness.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Currently each National Forest is writing a Plan to reduce the use of National Forest Roads and Trails by OHV and 4WD vehicle use. Their plans have been four years in development. Their plans are being completed using the NEPA Process and most of them are nearly completed. They are all required to include Public Input during their Scoping Process. These plans have been being written for about 4 years and should be nearly completed. The outcome of most of the draft Plans (DEIS) is to reduce the number of miles of roads and trails that currently exist. This will reduce the public's use of national forests for fishing, dispersed camping, hunting, mining, firewood cutting. Many uses of the National Forests which you as the public have participated in for years will not be permitted, I am asking that each of you contact the National Forest Office that you visit and request a copy of their Forest Road Management Plan. Review this plan to see how it will affect your recreational activities. Then ask them how you can provide comments to change their plans. This may require an appeal (a written letter or map) be submitted to the Forest. The Forest's are required to follow the NEPA process. If they are in the final stage of writing their plan, your comment may be submitted as an Appeal. If there is a group of OHV users that is contesting the Forest Plan of working on and alternative to their Plan, contact them and consider joining them to protect your use of the National Forest road and trails. I live on the Plumas National Forest in the Northern portion of the Sierra Nevada Mts. I belong to a group called the Sierra Access Coalition (SAC). You can log on to our web page at [www.sierraaccess.com](http://www.sierraaccess.com). There is no charge to join the group and we welcome new members. We currently have +1,000 members from all over the US. We are attempting to keep roads and trails open in the Forest Plan and we are working with the USFS to maintain trails and roads and to clean up areas to make them environmentally sound.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Currently, Internal Revenue Code section 2031(c) provides an estate tax exclusion of 40% of the value of land protected by a conservation easement. Unfortunately, this exclusion is capped at \$500,000. In the context of rising farm values this exclusion is woefully inadequate. The American Family Farm and Ranchland Protection Act, H.R. 3050, would increase this existing exclusion to 50% and raise the cap to \$5 million – providing a powerful incentive for owners of high-value agricultural, forest, and natural habitat lands to protect these properties in perpetuity. More than 70 percent of wildlife gets food and shelter from our working farm, ranch and forest lands, and the greatest value for wildlife and other public benefits comes from the large, contiguous properties where estate taxes frequently force families to subdivide and sell their land for development. In fact, due to high land values, farmers and ranchers are disproportionately subject to an estate tax at a rate of approximately 4 times that of the general public. On private forest land, the U.S. Forest Service has invested heavily to promote sustainable forestry. As second home development pushes deeper into our forests, inflated tax values make it increasingly difficult for forest owners to hold on to the timberland they've stewarded for generations. In fact, a 2006 study indicates that approximately 2.4 million acres of forest land are harvested and 1.3 million acres are sold annually to pay the federal estate tax. These outcomes are no way to reward a good deed and good stewardship. We can avoid them by expanding the estate tax benefits for landowners who have permanently protected their land. The Joint Committee on Taxation has scored H.R. 3050 as costing just \$132 million over ten years, but its impact would be enormous, encouraging thousands of landowners to work with land trusts in their community to ensure that lands with important conservation values for the public are never lost to development. This provision works well with a deferral of estate taxes on family farmland (H.R. 3524) and we expect new House and Senate legislation in the coming weeks that will combine these provisions. This provision also works well with the enhanced income tax deduction for conservation easements (H.R. 1831) setting up the opportunity for America's Great Outdoors to promote a conservation tax package. For more information please visit: [www.lta.org/estatetax](http://www.lta.org/estatetax).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe that the National Forests should be open to the public's use and not restricted to the use of specific groups. Their Motto is the Care for the Land and Serve the People. But over the last decade or more their activities and policies restricting the uses of their lands to the general public has changed their Motto to Ignore the Land and Control the People. Instead of allowing the Public to use their roads and trails outside of Wilderness Areas and Roadless Areas with OHV's (atv's, single tracks motorcycles, 4WD pickups, their are finalizing plans for each National Forest in the USA that will greatly restrict and reduce the miles of roads and trails that we all have used for years. Dispersed camping, fishing, hunting, firewood cutting, mining, sightseeing, driving for the enjoyment of viewing of the National Forests will be, in many cases, a memory and unavailable in the future. I would encourage everyone who has not heard of these plans, to contact their National Forest immediately for information on their plans. If you are affected, find out how to submit a comment, or an appeal of the portion of the plan that adversely affects you. I am a member of a local group of about a 1,000 members that is working to keep as many of the existing roads and trails open on the Plumas National Forest. The Plumas National Forest is located in the northern Sierra Nevada Range (Feather River watershed) east of Chico, California. If there is a group in your area that is attempting to keep the roads and trails open in your National Forest contact them for information and join them. If you are interested in our efforts here, log on to [www.sierraaccess.com](http://www.sierraaccess.com) and learn about the Sierra Access Coalition. The Forest Service is aware of our numbers and is listening to our comments and statements. Join our group if you are interested. There is no fee, and you can join by logging on to the web page and clicking on the "JOIN" block. We welcome your support and the more members we have the more power we will have in keeping the access into the National Forest open to the Public and to work cooperatively with the USFS to maintain and repair the roads and trails for future use...

Certainly people are part of the equation, but just as the federal lands in my region produced great wealth and many good jobs in the past, opening up our forests to the activities of the past will not bring back those jobs. Our mills are highly mechanized, and there is way too much competition for workers to be paid the high wages of the past. We have also, I hope, learned about the impacts of our old ways, and are improving our methods and management techniques. We long ago stopped allowing logs to be yarded through streams, and we now see fire and selective cutting as good management tools. Our past is a good base for the future, but we have to look forward, not backwards.

Despite years of effort, a very small fraction of the wild land that European settlers saw has been preserved for the future. Even if we protect all of what is left, the vast majority of the United States will be available to provide for our material needs. If we cannot live on that, our descendants will have ample cause to judge us greedy.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe that Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) groups and riders can and should do much more to cultivate a responsible environmental ethic among all OHV riders through strong personal contact and peer pressure. I have lived in rural southern Utah for the past eight years, in a small community virtually surrounded by BLM and Forest Service lands. I've witnessed first-hand a number of OHV related adverse environmental impacts and user conflicts. Illegal route proliferation is the most serious and ongoing problem. I've hiked on many of the same trails over the years, and I am constantly finding new pioneered OHV routes or new or additional braiding of existing routes. I've watched as these illegal OHV routes greatly facilitated the colonization and spread of several invasive and noxious weed species, especially cheatgrass and Sahara mustard. In turn, these weeds have created unnatural or excessive fuel loads when they dry out in the summer. Now native habitats are increasingly at great risk from potentially catastrophic wildfires. This is especially scary in non-fire-adapted habitats like Mojave desert creosote, home for the threatened Mojave desert tortoise. From large fires in recent years, there are now several large areas around where I live where much of the native vegetation is gone, the Mojave desert tortoise population is declining, and further fires are likely to kill off what's left of the natural vegetation and soil seed source. This process is transforming beautiful, natural wildlife-rich habitats into a largely sterile, alien annual grasslands. It is a tragedy of immense and increasing size that few people seem to know or care about, including those whose irresponsible conduct contributes to the problem. I recognize that many OHV riders are generally responsible and want to follow the rules. However, I have seen incidents where irresponsible OHV use was occurring but other OHV riders, to the best of my knowledge, did not intervene to educate or admonish the offender. This is disappointing, because I think that the best hope for improvement is through strong peer pressure. All OHV groups and riders tend to talk about the importance of legal compliance and environmental responsibility. I am now asking them to have the courage and foresight to walk that talk out on the ground where and when it matters most.

I don't understand why we can't provide incentives for solar energy production throughout the country. Disincentives should be applied to coal burning plants, as coal allows too much carbon to enter the atmosphere. Places that people don't use as much, such as deserts and browfields could be excellent places to site these solar fields.

I recognize that not everybody is able-bodied, but for anyone who is, I don't understand how ohvs help people connect with the outdoors. I am regarded as a bit of a "gear-head" by those who know me, but people, and especially kids, need to be encouraged to walk through, hike in, smell, feel, and appreciate nature. Riding on a self-propelled vehicle just seems contrary to the concept, especially for kids.

The Clean Water Act was designed to make our water swimmable, fishable and drinkable, but it has not done so. We need to upgrade our sewer treatment plants, and reduced toxic runoff into our streams. Currently most storm drains go directly into streams untreated and we wonder why our fisheries are declining. Our water treatment plants are unable to treat personal care products, prescriptions, and other chemicals, and they go into streams and the ocean. We need clean water and the Clean Water Act was supposed to accomplish this by 1985. Has it worked? No, so why aren't we doing more?



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

The quality waters of the San Juan River over the past ten years has been an important place to spend time in the outdoors. The river meets many needs which includes quality fly fishing, water for local communities, the safeguard of endangered species, and future long range Native American needs. A study revealed that the Quality Waters brings in an annual revenue of \$40 million dollars, primarily to the hospitality industry as 64% of the fishers are from out of state. Regretably, today the river's health has deteriorated and now requires dynamic stewardship to return it to its "crown jewel status" days. River silting and inappropriate water releases create endless harm. Cooperation between BOR/BLM and New Mexico state agencies for a comprehensive study and long range plan is crucial for its health.

There are many, many examples of multiple-use groups cooperating/collaborating with government agencies (such as the BLM) to maintain and even restore public land with great success. Unfortunately, these stories are generally ignored by the mainstream media. It's a shame, because the public needs to see the positive results of government agencies working hand in hand with recreational vehicle enthusiasts, mountain bikers, hunting and fishing enthusiasts, and even loggers. Bringing together representatives from all stakeholder groups is a common sense approach that balances access and responsible land use with conservation and sustainable land management. These interests are not mutually exclusive. I'm very concerned with this administration's land management approach as detailed in the Great Outdoors initiative. There is something intrinsically wrong with a government arbitrarily restricting access to our public lands without listening to the voice of the users of that land. If President Obama truly wants a long-term solution, then each stakeholder group must be invited to the table with an equal share in the decision making process.

All these 'YES' votes; How many of you live in the area ? Do you try to make a living here? Have you ever been in the area and talked to the people it will really effect ? I don't think so. A MONUMENT WILL ONLY HURT THE AREA. TALK TO THE FOLKS IN UTAH BUSSINESS OWNERS "I HAVE" ABOUT LOSS OF BUSINESS; TALK TO THE SCHOOLS WHO HAVE LOSS KIDS DUE TO THE FACT PARENTS HAD TO MOVE TO SUPPORT THEIR FAMILIES BECAUCE JOBS DON'T EXIST ANY MORE. NO MONUMENT

Can someone tell me how OHV use "promotes physical fitness"?

I've been involved in battlefield preservation for many years. I also understand the myriad of issues confronting the government today and I understand that somethings must be pushed to the back to allow for more pressing matters to be dealt with. Having said that, I would add that our history is the single thing that defines us as a nation and to allow the second most important era (the period of the revolution being the most important) of our history to fade in obscurity would be a crime against our descendents. How can we ever hope to know where we are going as a nation if we do not know where we have been? As Americans we all owe so much to the men and women who gave so much during the era of the civil war. Everything we are today can be linked back to the people who survived the fires of the war. The civil war was both our greatest tragedy and our supreme triumph as a nation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As many as a quarter of our Federal Class 1 Areas have lost the ability to see the Milky Way due to light pollution. The National Park Service has estimated that by 2025, we will no longer have an unpolluted night sky in the lower 48 states. { <a href="http://www.nature.nps.gov/air/lightscapes/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Please put together best practices and recommendations for protecting our public lands from light pollution. Sincerely, Robert Wagner President Board of Directors International Dark-Sky Association

Civil War historical sites are endangered national assets. Once they have been paved over, built upon, or otherwise disturbed, they cannot be retrieved. Perhaps the most bitter chapter in our national history is enshrined at these sites, which should be preserved for future generations to visit, study, and contemplate. Concerned individuals, government officials and agencies, and foundations, working together, have already saved many sites, but much remains to be done. Every day more of these historic sites disappear forever, and the window for preserving them closes a bit more. Join CWPT and contribute to the ongoing process of battlefield preservation.

Invasive species threaten our public lands in many ways and the response to the threat is totally inadequate. We need significant new resources dedicated to controlling weeds and aquatic invaders. We especially need funding and programs that promote actions that reduce the risk of spreading invasives. Invasive species threaten all users of our public lands. They will damage the environment and can destroy recreation. They offer no benefits in any way. Lets keep them from spreading on our public lands.

Major wind and solar projects are being proposed on BLM lands in the Mohave Desert region. People need to realize that the BLM is a multiple use agency, meaning that wild farms, wildlife, recreation, water, etc are analyzed in tandem to come up with a way to satisfy the larger whole. Now whether this concept is possible or whether satisfaction of big-business precludes satisfaction for wildlife and water quality is the larger question.

Mr. Harris, I gladly host the very creatures you speak of on my acreage, do not whine nor complain about your agenda and do not want every acre of the beautiful land God created and graciously allows us to exist upon. I merely desire equity! Since the OHV community does not have the likes of Ted Turner or Warren Buffet providing financial backing for the hijacking of the lands I served OUR Country to preserve for ALL, nor the high dollar Lobbyists influencing OUR Public Servants every move with regard to this issue like you folks do, I spoke my piece here instead. If I felt like it, I would make this an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) issue and drag this through the courts like your crew does.

My son is a downhill mountain biker, they use many of the same trails that the snow skiers do, are we now banning snow skiing? Love the comments, can't we all just get along? Just because I am opposed to tree huggers does not mean I think we should cut down all of the trees. Like someone said, there are many forms of people enjoying the great outdoors, I do believe there is enough room for ALL of us. And by the way, we ALL pay taxes right?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Non-point source pollution and stormwater runoff regulations requiring limited sediment deposition to waterways have the potential to conflict with recreation (OHV, camping, hiking, swimming) on public lands. Dirt roads on national forests have numerous water crossings that are not hardened or bridged; numerous campsites and trails are next to water with runoff and stream degradation; user created dams in rivers alter wildlife habitat and put pollution in rivers. Clean Water Act requirements could be used to limit access to recreation sites, require closure of recreation sites, or require altering the natural flowpaths to capture stormwater runoff and treatment. It is unlikely that the Forest Service will choose to limit recreation greatly without the forceful arm of EPA, but that puts two sectors of the government at odds, when the President recognized both agencies as being involved in the initiative. Partnerships and funding will be needed to specify the consequences of designating water quality as a priority. How much will people be willing to give up on the recreation side when they know that water treatment plants can protect their drinking water sources?

One thing I have always noticed when my family, friends and I are at an off-road riding area is the vast amount of land that lies between the trails. I believe that the OHV opponents have painted a picture of a flattened landscape associated with OHV's and that is simply not true. In fact, it's quite far from the truth. When I hike and mountainbike in areas shared with OHV's, I rarely hear them until they are within 100 feet of me and encounters are far and few between. A ban would be extremely unfair when the overall impact is so small. A shared use management plan is the right thing to do.

Our young people deserve opportunities to know, understand and appreciate the exceptional history of our country. First-hand experiences, enhanced by outstanding explanatory comments, at the actual places that are important in our history are essential tools for providing or enhancing this understanding and appreciation. Visiting a site is far superior to reading about it or even watching a video or television program, and the older generations have a moral and cultural obligation to insure the preservation and accessibility of such sites for all people, but especially for the young. Actions that degrade these sites and the experiences they offer should be permitted only if the benefits from such actions, viewed honestly and objectively, clearly, unequivocally and substantially outweigh the damages, often irreparable, that such actions will cause or promote.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The initial "Wilderness Act of 1964" envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where Public Access is restricted to non-mechanized means, excepting the use of wheel chairs meeting "Hospital Specifications" which are of no use to Americans who are confined to them but still want to enjoy OUR Public Lands. This also severely limits the activities and hence effectiveness of various Government agencies who are responsible for maintaining these lands. The majority of recreating Americans have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness given studies which have concluded that only approximately five percent of recreating Americans use them. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the Great Outdoors we do not need more "Wilderness", "Wilderness Study Areas" or "National Monuments". If the President were truly interested in local involvement in his plan, multiple use groups would have been included or invited to the various "Listening" sessions taking place around OUR Nation, often with little prior scheduling notification. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to OUR Public Lands. My family, friends and fellow OHV enthusiasts spend many enjoyable hours recreating in our National Forests, National Parks and on BLM lands taking in the wonders of nature. My family travels to our chosen destination via a four wheel drive vehicle as it allows us to get away from paved roads and into areas we could not otherwise reach by other means due to our age and an injury I incurred while serving OUR Country. I served OUR Country in part to protect access to these lands for all Americans, not just the five percent who are able to walk into "Wilderness", "Wilderness Study Area" or OUR "National Monuments". As an owner of many acres of private property for decades and an OHV enthusiast for forty years I can say that the cougar, bear, deer, raccoon, possum, rabbit, squirrel, birds and other animals who call my property their home are welcomed, thrive here and coexist just fine with my OHV use and that of my friends and neighbors. The land does not suffer from the OHV use, my woods are properly thinned, healthy and clear of standing and fallen dead trees unlike our National Forests and BLM managed lands. Locking OHV users out of OUR Public Lands (yes, they belong to everyone) via "Wilderness", "Wilderness Study Area" or the "National Monument" designations being implemented Nation Wide, many times in direct violation of the "1964 Wilderness Act" implemented by Congress is not the answer to protecting animals, nature or OUR Public Lands. Only Congress can designate "Wilderness"! The "National Monument" designation has been and is currently being used unlawfully against the letter of the law as spelled out by the "Antiquities Act" to bypass Congressional scrutiny and hence We The People to lock up Public Lands without public debate as are "Wilderness Study Areas". Much of the land being designated as "Wilderness", "National Monuments" and "Wilderness Study Areas" does not meet the criteria set forth in the "1964 Wilderness Act". Many of these Federal lands include roads, bridges, campgrounds, trails, etc. This contradicts the intent of the original "1964 Wilderness Act", which essentially defines "Wilderness Areas" as lands that show "little or no signs of human involvement". These areas are not National Parks, they are lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service and should be managed as such. Most importantly, the President and Congress should honor the established protocol of respecting State and local rights by not imposing "Wilderness", "National Monument" or "Wilderness Study Area" designations on people whose elected Congressional delegation are not in full support of the designations. The OHV community supports conservation efforts including support of the

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

“travel limited to designated roads, trails and areas” paradigm as outlined in the Forest Service travel management regulations and BLM’s planning directives. The OHV community also supports conservation through environmental review and analysis in route designation processes, as well as ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the OHV infrastructure. The OHV community supports conservation efforts by contributing substantial funds to implement OHV management and volunteers tens of thousands of man hours in volunteer work projects. Much of this funding is made available to federal land managers via state OHV programs. These programs exist today because years ago motorized recreationists voluntarily “taxed ourselves” via state OHV registration programs. Some of these funds are used to supplement the agencies’ law enforcement efforts. Recently, Governors of many States have raided these funds in ill fated attempts to fix the budgets that OUR Public Servants failed to balance and in doing so have removed this important funding source from the agencies responsible for managing OUR Public Lands. The majority of we OHV users are motorized environmentalists and good stewards of our Public Lands. The failure of the BLM and National Forest Service to maintain public lands in the manner they are charged to is the problem not the OHV Community. This is in part due to a lack of will, the theft of the OHV funds previously mentioned and the absence of Congressional budgetary support for these land management agencies. Back in the 60s development of America’s wild lands and backcountry was a threat. Now the threats are the Wilderness Act, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and many other environmental protection laws passed by Congress due to the way they are being used by Wilderness lobbies to lock recreationalists out of our public lands via “Wilderness”, “National Monument” and “Wilderness Study Area” designations. Public lands are important recreational opportunities; there are other alternatives such as “National Conservation Areas” or “National Recreation Areas” which would provide the same level of protection from development that these various designations carry while still preserving a diverse array of opportunities for recreation. While I understand that non-controversial bills can be lumped together to make the legislative process easier, Omnibus initiatives like the “America’s Great Outdoors” are far from non-controversial. I am concerned that any Omnibus initiative such as this would include measures that are both controversial and will not received a hearing or proper vetting in one or both Houses of Congress. Public lands bills and initiatives have a significant impact on economic development, recreational opportunities and the day-to-day lives of people who live and work near the areas in question. As a result, it is imperative those most affected have sufficient opportunities to provide input on any Public Lands legislation. The “America’s Great Outdoors” initiative process should allow for Congressional review, State, local government and public input before any designations take place.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas, we need less. If the President were truly interested in local involvement in his plan, multiple use groups would have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. Private Property owners like me are normally better care takers of our land than the government is with OUR Public Lands due to fewer regulations and private interest involvement, so in my opinion it is counter productive to have the government involved in Landscape Wide Planning. This will degrade private property, reduce Landscape Health and infringe on my private property rights while encouraging others to do the same. As an OHV enthusiast I believe that the President needs to include this form of recreation as a priority in his plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors and allow folks like me who were injured while serving OUR County and cannot walk into or near by "Wilderness" to access and enjoy them too.

The United States would be quite different if the Civil War had never been fought. Slavery would undoubtedly have been phased out but would an American apartheid have taken its place? Would it still exist? It should go without saying that our Civil War is what has made us what we are today. Many people today, however, have an alarming lack of understanding of our nation's central cataclysmic event. What better way to reinvigorate interest in American history than the preservation of historic sites related to the Civil War. Such preservation not only serves to educate. It also serves to provide an economic basis for local communities in the form of tourism dollars. Education and a bonus of tourism dollars....what better argument is there for the push for historic preservation?

The vision shown by those who wrote and enacted the National Trails System Act should not go unfulfilled. Many of the resources necessary to complete the system are in danger, either from neglect or urban expansion. If these resources are not protected now, future generations will surely and rightfully ask "why didn't they do something about that?" This is the time, while money is flowing to "infrastructure" to acknowledge that the National Trails System is part of that infrastructure, a non-renewable part of it, too. Be it to purchase trail corridors, protect historic sites, or simply maintain what we have worked so hard to build and preserve, this will be money well spent now and far into the future. The opportunity is now. Let's not dillydally around until all the money is gone to other programs or projects. Agencies and their not-for-profit partners can and should fulfill the vision by the 50th Anniversary of the National Trails System Act in 2018. This is the decade for more action and fewer words.

There are similar ideas like mine, but anyone can sign up for this. I believe this would be worth while in the sense that "we would truly be part of what is already very important". We would then be completely responsible for our actions and "we" the riders would be doing what is right to do....but with initiative. Some may think that the trails do not need upkeep....because they are trails. But this could be the correct way to show responsibility and respect to our government and green friends. I say "Trail Tax Off Initiative" Rob

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

what chris said, big tent vs small tent ... if you start cutting out groups you don't like instead of working with them you will lose votes and elections....

Wow you sure cover a lot of territory Mr. Moffatt. Must be lonely sitting in that tree all by yourself. Civil wars and rioting are due to the Muslim Socialist President we currently have in the White House that has no clue how to run a country, stop spending and actually do what he says. Never held a "real" job so can't say I'm surprised. This world is big enough for everyone to have some place to enjoy what they do. I'm so tired of the greenies thinking just their way is right. Many of our environmental issues are caused by the green legislation. We wouldn't have the gulf issue if the oil companies were allowed to drill on land. Don't you think it would be easier to contain a spill on land instead of a mile down in the ocean - the environ"mental"ists can be thanked for that mess - they didn't want to see the rigs off shore. We enjoy riding dirt bikes with family and friends, and we always leave the area we stage in cleaner than we found it.

You guys need to slow it down a bit. Liberals aren't so good with numbers. To say only 3% of the public use OHVs and not give the percentage that use wilderness areas is unfair. The idea is that wilderness areas are growing and OHV areas are shrinking, and that is unfair. To convert current multiple use areas to wilderness and call it preservation when many of these areas were ravaged by logging and mining already is unfair. That's restoration not preservation. We need to share, and that means not taking from one group to give more to another.

"The problem with religion, is that it really is a conversation stopper. Faith is a <b>declaration of immunity to the powers of conversation.</b> It is a <i>reason</i>, why you do not <i>have</i> to give reasons, for what you believe." - Sam Harris Our ground rules here are: "Our Terms of Participation is intended to support open discussion while ensuring a respectful exchange of ideas." Is this posting supportive of this goal? Clearly not.

(To offer a concrete suggestion, the NPS administers but cannot maintain some of the most valuable real estate in the US. For example, Governor's Island and Floyd Bennett Field could both be transferred to the city or state of NY, or auctioned and proceeds invested in reducing the huge deferred maintenance backlog of our real national parks.)

claims "It is expected that about 40 percent of species will become endangered over the next 40 years." Please provide a citation relevant to the Pacific Crest ecosystem? Are most endangered species migratory, or stationary? For those that are migratory, how would merely drawing a line on a map change their migration patterns? As any PCT thru-hiker knows, there are major barriers to N-S migration... the Columbia River, Interstate highways... would the proposed "PCNP" remove these?



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

may I commend to your attention the "Sustainable Funding" section of the executive summary of the NPS Second Century Commission report? At this link { [Link](http://www.npsa.org/commission/pdf/Commission_Report.PDF) } (3 MB pdf) scroll down to PDF page 40 (text page 38) for an overview. To me, one sentence best summarizes it "Our financial commitment to the parks matches neither their importance to society nor the enormous franchise they have with the American people." I volunteer in a Park which loses, on average, one structure listed on the National Register of Historic Places every year. The current NPS annual operating deficit is ~\$750 million/year. This shows up directly as a growing deferred maintenance backlog and loss of staff. The distinction between expanding vs diluting the NPS mission is to first secure adequate funding for its current mission, before expanding its mission. That's why I feel you have put the cart before the horse.

As a nation, we spend more on **potato chips** than on our National Parks, more on **pet grooming** services than on our National Parks, more on **cosmetics**... Although the NPS is less than 1/1000th of the Federal budget, it is being cut { [Link](http://home.nps.gov/applications/digest/headline.cfm?type=Announcements&id=8814) } *"Our financial commitment to the parks matches neither their importance to society nor the enormous franchise they have with the American people."* National Parks Second Century Commission { [Link](http://www.npsa.org/commission/) }

Backcountry Horsemen are the most active (per person) volunteer group in the Northwest's national parks, helping to maintain hundreds of miles of wilderness trails. I don't know what is talking about (although I've seen "damage" to wet meadows, it's from bull elk in rut, who just love to dig wallows). Pursuant to 36 CFR 2.16, Park Superintendents set Park- and site- specific regulations on stock use, so that "wet meadows", or more to the point, sensitive alpine meadows and lakeshores, are not affected. Each Park has these regulations, and a significant portion of Park trails are not open to stock (even though they were originally built by and for stock!).

Campsites are largely funded through fees, which are already higher for larger RV sites and fund power and sewer hookups (actually, there are few except in our largest NPs such as Yellowstone; there are only 12 such sites within all of Yosemite; RVs mostly stay outside NPs). Further, many of the most scenic National Park roads are closed to RVs (Going to the Sun road in Glacier, Trail Ridge Road in RMNP, Denali Park Road, Mineral King in Sequoia, and hundreds of secondary Park roads). Who is subsidizing who? Please support the Park Service by not proposing to burden it with whatever pet political peeve might stike your fancy. NPS needs broad public support from everyone. Keep politics out of our National Parks.

Economics are dubious, potential is real but limited (&lt;1% of US electricity, 0.1% of total US energy use) even with incentives (substantial taxpayer or electric ratepayer subsidies). Subject is peripheral to the land management & preservation focus of this forum.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Even for us hikers, the loss of roads that provide access to trailheads is a major issue. When this loss of access to campgrounds, trailheads and ranger stations is not due to nature's storms but to deliberate advocacy and threats of lawsuits from activist groups, that is particularly sad. { [Link](http://www.peninsuladailynews.com/article/20090617/news/306179993) }

Habitat will be moving up in elevation (~300 m) or equivalently to higher latitude (~440 km) in the 21st century (for mean predicted warming 3 C, { [Link](http://cses.washington.edu/cig/pnwc/cc.shtml) } ). There are significant barriers to long-distance N-S migration, compared to short distance elevation gain. This is particularly true for plants and all species in their ecosystem, from mycorrhizal fungi to butterflies. To put a finer point on it: can redwoods establish seedlings 300 m higher in elevation, or miraculously leap 440 km north into Washington state, within only one century? The "crunch" comes in the isolated Great Basin mountain ranges of Nevada, which simply don't have higher elevations or latitudes into which species might, even theoretically, move. Extinction will challenge some unique endemic species, but your proposal does not address these areas. Further, it does not address unique ecosystems such as the Siskiyou, which are founded upon local serpentine soils, nor thousands of unique local species from salmon to salamanders. Drawing a line on a map does not move mountains nor rivers. The ecological merit in this proposal... well, it escapes me. I'm a pragmatist. How would drawing an "NPS Boundary" line on a map actually mitigate climate change? Could NPS even manage such a 2000 km long Park? Is this realistic? Does it actually work? Dreams are great. In the virtual reality of "Second Life", this is a wonderful Pacific Crest NP with rangers moving redwoods north 4 km each year. In reality, we need to get a lot more serious about mitigating and limiting climate change than drawing fanciful lines on a map. This is far bigger issue than NPS land management can solve.

\_\_\_ asks "Do you know how many acres it would take to support 1,000,000 buffalo, along with all the elk, and grizzlies you are proposing?!" Based on the largest Great Plains bison rancher { [Link](http://www.tedturner.com/enterprises/ranches_Template.asp?page=ranches_faq.html,) } roughly 40 million acres, or 18 times the area of Yellowstone, or equal to, say, the entire state of South Dakota. As the author says, "where even the biggest imagination can run wild"... as if it hasn't already ;-)

Having worked to organize National Park outings with a local school, I know that it is now much more difficult for schools to find time (let alone money) in their programs for field trips. The primary reason is the intense focus on test scores, initiated by states in response to "No Child Left Behind" mandates. However, extra-curricular programs can still be accomplished outside of school hours, on weekends or vacations for example. The logistics (transport, liability) are more complex than for school field trips, unless parents are directly involved.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hunting is allowed in National Parks. And Wildlife Refuges. And Marine Sanctuaries. Even hunting and fishing of endangered and protected species, from elk to salmon to whales. Certain restrictions nominally apply: { <a href="http://www.animallaw.info/cases/causfd443us658.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I ask the author to research this question: When President Jefferson commissioned the Lewis and Clark expedition, he described its purpose with one word { <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lewis\_and\_Clark\_Expedition" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } What word did he choose? Please take time to ponder that, as if one is to have a world view consonant with reality, mustn't that be a significant part of it? Each year, I invest a hundred days digging dirt, cutting a couple hundred windfall logs, building a half dozen footbridges, maintaining a few dozen miles of wilderness trails... and yes, from the mountain tops, one can see the Pacific Ocean and Seattle, so it is by the author's lights it is but small and whimpy, but at least it is something concrete... not a mere pointless rant dismissing the significance of all National Parks.

I maintain 14 miles of popular multi-use trail as a USFS volunteer. Properly built trails are not damaged by bikes. There is damage from windfall rootball tipouts, floods at stream crossings, slides on unstable terrain, and cuts at heavily used game trail crossings. But not from bikes. Fewer than 10% of the trails in this national forest are open to bikes. Why you wish to bar them from the few remaining escapes me. Our trails need public interest and support from all. p.s. I'm not a mountain biker. But when a helping hand is needed on trail work, I find they are far more likely to pitch in than my fellow hikers are!

If you could cite specific examples, that would be appreciated. I'm not aware of any development on a wilderness inholding within the past 20 years. There were proposals (Mineral King ski area adjacent to wilderness, for example) that were killed on NEPA or access issues. Not aware of any that actually occurred. Cite one? National Park inholdings (all of them that I'm aware of) receive little or no investment from their owners, because they realize that eventually they will go to the NPS. I'd welcome citation of counter-examples. I agree it makes eminent good sense to acquire inholdings sooner, as land values generally rise faster than inflation over time. But it's a matter of priorities, and Congress sets these. So it only has to make political sense, not fiscal nor environmental sense... sigh

In Olympic NP, there is no logging, but Google Earth allows one to see blowdown from the intense windstorm of Nov 2007. It knocked down areas of old growth on the Quinault ridge and elsewhere. One can readily see areas hit by wildfire or blowdown in earlier years, too. Please post lat/long (or better, a Google Earth link of the view you're concerned about). The concern behind your posting, that logging could occur surreptitiously in NPs or wilderness, frankly seems virtually impossible. Timber thefts do occur, however, adjacent to roads in National Forest, BLM and State forest. Usually these are isolated, individual, high-value trees (e.g. old growth big leaf maple or cedar). The recession hasn't helped...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

NPS actually does have a facilities program in which this is one element. And ARRA stimulus funds are moving some of these projects forward this year. But this is a far bigger topic than USFS, BLM and NPS. Shouldn't this goal apply to all government facilities? Is the technology really available? (show me how you're gonna heat Wrangell NP HQ & VC overwinter) Responsible stewardship of public lands isn't carried forward by merely dumping unfunded mandates upon already over-stretched land management agencies. If you're really serious about making a contribution, not merely bumping your posting count, think further before posting?

NPS already administers 392 sites, including 58 national parks. Its resources are spread too thin. The deferred maintenance backlog grows { <a href="http://www.gao.gov/highrisk/agency/doi/reducing-interiors-deferred-maintenance-backlog.php" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } as Parks become delapidated and less able to serve visitors or protect their resources. Before we add more NPs, lets first cut some of the existing sites by transferring them to states, localities, or other Federal agencies. Hasn't Mackinac Island done fine as a former National, now State, Park? Do we really need a Lower East Side Tenement NHS or a William Jefferson Clinton Birthplace Home NHS? Before adding new NPs, either cut the number of NPS sites by 1/3 or up the NPS budget by 1/3. Both are do-able! It's a matter of understanding what the NPS mission is... and is not.

Please read about the Nature Conservancy's Ellsworth Creek Preserve { <a href="http://www.nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/washington/misc/art31226.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } and Lomakatsi { <a href="http://www.lomakatsi.org/?p=502" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } thinning projects. Please read the Environmental Assessments for USFS projects to accelerate the development of old-growth characteristics in formerly clearcut areas, now being managed as Late Successional Reserves under the Northwest Forest Plan. I mention this because your proposal reads "These forests will not be logged and will be allowed to develop old-growth characteristics." That's fine, if the stand has never been logged. But Congress set a much more ambitious goal under the 1994 NWFP: the goal returning millions of formerly clearcut acres to old growth conditions. That requires thinning, removing the smallest trees to release the growth of the largest, removing the monoculture of replanted fir and releasing more a more diverse forest of cedar, pine, maple, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Staffing Park entrance stations, whether by NPS staff or volunteers, is already a challenging assignment... adding scales to all Park entrances so they are like the local landfill would surely enhance the Visitor Experience from the start (not!) and is a poor investment of Park resources. Successful Park initiatives are inclusive, not exclusive. National Park visitation has declined steadily since 1996 (the year the Recreation Fee Demo Program began { <a href="http://www.newwest.net/index.php/topic/article/the\_real\_reason\_national\_park\_visitation\_has\_declined/C41/L41/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ). This proposal would accelerate this decline. Fee revenue accounts for only 6% of NPS budget; 94% comes from general tax revenues, and depends crucially on broad public support of the NPS mission, in competition with all other Federal programs. That support is undermined if the Parks are not open to all. If National Parks become viewed as playgrounds for the rich (who don't care about fees), then they lose broad public support. Whether this proposal is intended to be helpful or punitive (readers may judge for themselves from its tone ;- ) it will damage the National Parks it purports to support.

Stict "no chainsaws, no helicopters" means yet more trails will become impassible, fewer trail bridges will be replaced, more trails will become abandoned. Stict "no rescues" means accidents, injuries and medical emergencies will more often become deaths. Strict "no cycles" means wilderness additions will be opposed and delayed (e.g. in Montana now) or cut into ribbons to preserve existing biking trails (e.g. Mt. Hood last year). Strict "no cabins" means the loss of historic backcountry ranger stations and shelters which are appreciated as destinations for most hikers, and which allow USFS/NPS to protect wilderness resources and conduct S&R. I've become convinced that this absolutist vision of Wilderness, however romantic at first glance, is not shared by most who love the backcountry when it comes down to specific trails, sites and issues, so is counterproductive because it engenders intense local opposition to new wilderness areas. And it goes beyond the intent of the Wilderness Act itself, which is very much a compromise between values, not of one value to the exclusion of all others.

The primary cause of National Park road damage is storm damage, primarily floods. From the Blue Ridge Parkway to Mt. Rainier, from Point Pelee to Acadia, repair of storm damage has cost far more than routine road maintenance over the past decade. The second cause is aging infrastructure, primarily bridges. The third, I think, is "normal" windfall trees and landslides on unstable terrain. Actual damage from traffic is a minor, almost negligible, component of road maintenance costs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem is well recognized, and affects every western state. This proposal is a novel solution, worthy of serious discussion. Although agencies have a number of small-scale initiatives underway in the southwest, the procedural burden of planning compliance outweighs the agencies' ability to negotiate at a rate sufficient to keep up with the growth of this problem. And I'm not aware of meaningful small scale efforts in the intermountain west and northwest. Under the current system, what's theoretically needed is a fuels reduction EIS which addresses at least hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of acres across all of an entire USFS region. The agencies just don't have the ability to accomplish a study of that magnitude, let alone act on it once done. So before any any brush or doghair could be cleared, there are a net of conflicting legal issues that would have to be cleared... by Congress, I guess?

There is a program to buy Park inholdings from willing sellers: the NPS Land Acquisition program. It is funded at ~\$100 million/year, or 3% of the NPS budget (see the NPS Greenbook { <a href="http://home.nps.gov/applications/budget2/fy11toc.htm." rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Although this has gradually increased over the last few years, it remains below 1990s funding levels. The reason is deferred maintenance needs have grown. I agree that the NPS budget is too small, but think it should be funded through general revenues, not through a dedicated fee. (A Federal real estate transfer tax could not withstand legal challenge on constitutional grounds.)

This idea is unfocused, would benefit from being more specific. The 1994 Northwest Forest Plan essentially ended this on USFS administered lands in WA OR ID nCA, and NPS never has logged. NW state lands are similarly protected. That covers essentially all temperate rainforest in the contiguous 48 states. The interior Rocky Mountain forests inherently have little old growth (the mean fire return interval in pine forests is measured in decades, not centuries). So I assume your focus is on the Tongass NF? If so, focus on it. (70% of Tongass old growth is permanently protected in reserves { <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tongass\_National\_Forest" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } and old growth logging is almost ended there, anyway.)

Vehicles are licensed and taxed by states, not by the NPS. Fuel excise taxes go into the DOT FHWA highway trust fund and to states. Park roads are primarily funded by FHWA through PRP (Park Roads & Parkways), PLHD (Public Lands Highways - Discretionary), FH (Forest Highways), ERFO (Emergency Relief for Federally Owned Roads) and other programs { <a href="http://www.wfl.fhwa.dot.gov/programs/transportation.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } The primary funding for National Park roads is already through Federal fuel excise taxes, not through the NPS maintenance budget. Apparently you don't realize that your proposal is effectively the way things have actually worked for more than 50 years already? This issue of taxing vehicles directly by weight (rather than taxing fuel consumption) is of debatable merit, but whatever its merits, it is not a National Park issue. Fewer than 0.1% of the nation's roads are within National Parks. Funding highways, and in particular sustainably funding the Federal Highway Trust Fund which is the primary source of funding all highways including in Parks, is a national issue.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Which state(s) do you propose to force all residents out, bulldoze all sign of civilization, and return to wilderness? Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Colorado...? These are among the fastest growing states in the US. And which states do you propose become a new American "Gaza Strip" for the millions or tens of millions of refugees your proposal creates? Imaginative? Yes, but more a nightmare than an idyll.

Yes, we wish to power southern California with renewable solar, wind and geothermal energy instead of burning coal and natural gas, but no we don't wish to build the transmission lines necessary to make that possible. Isn't blockading new transmission lines is the real issue here? Isn't it NIMBYism masquerading as preservation? Is a transmission line standing on rocky ridges spanning a ravine with Joshua trees in it an "irretrievable loss of resources", or is it the embodiment of true conservationism? Is this not better decided on a case-by-case, site-by-site basis, not with some broad national "one size fits all" law?

I was born and raised in the Flint Hills of Kansas but was 20 years old before I had even heard of tall grass and what the Great Plains used to be, one of the continent's great ecosystems. Pockets of prairie are being preserved but a vastly larger effort is needed.

Overuse of recreational facilities can degrade water quality, but our overall outdoor policy should encourage increased outdoor recreation more than limiting it. On the one hand we need to outlaw the most damaging uses, such as off-road vehicle mudding and camping too close of our waters, but at the same time enhance low impact recreation. We need to act to minimize erosion by limiting riparian development and harmful logging practices, improving and stabilizing river road crossings and boating access points, and developing low-impact campsites back from but with access to our waters. Increasing the number of outdoor recreators increases the overall health of the nation and creates more champions of good waer quality and conversation. But we do need to make certain that the recreation we encourage has low negtive impact

As I see it the main obstacle to achieving our conservation goals in America is our deep-rooted addiction to growth. We have this great fear as a nation that if we aren't growing then we must be stagnating, and we know we don't want to stagnate, so we accept whatever environment-damaging projects come down the pipeline in the name of promoting growth. If Congress and the President instead were to focus on stability, security, and happiness as our national goals, we would quickly see that it was in our own self-interest to stabilize the US population. Right now we are caught in a vicious cycle - we have population growth, so we think we need economic growth to keep up, even though the economic growth mostly benefits existing millionaires and billionaires. Then to keep the economy growing, we think we need population growth (e.g. more immigrants and more babies), which of course leads back to the need for more economic growth. It would be so much easier to protect, share, and enhance our natural resource base in America if we set a national policy on population stabilization. Stabilizing our population at some reasonable level is in fact the only way we can truly protect our outdoor quality of life for future generations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Depends on your definition of open space, which is not my favorite term to begin with. If you count cornfields in Kansas and wheat farms in Washington, not to mention deserts in Nevada, then maybe the 80% figure is close to being accurate. But that doesn't mean much for wildlife conservation - especially when you consider how much non-mountain/non-desert habitat has been lost. The tallgrass prairie is the best example - something like 99% gone and replaced by corn and soybeans. The Nature Conservancy is a non-profit organization, and any modest gain they make on reselling land to the government goes right back into their revolving fund for protecting habitat around the world. TNC only makes money on land sales when they get the land in the first place at a discount - the government only pays its own definition of fair market value. Right now TNC has been left holding the bag on a number of daring conservation purchases, since state and federal budgets are so broken.

For the first 12 or so of my 19 years living in the Four Corners region, I fished the San Juan Quality Waters at least twice per month year round, and loved the quality of the fishing experience there. Great baetis hatches much of the year, prolific PMD hatches in the summer, occasional strong summer caddis hatches. Now I seldom go to this formerly great fishery because less than half of the former "quality" waters have any quality these days, and about the only dependable hatches are for midges and these are less certain than in the past. The fact is that the San Juan is buried under much more silt than ever before. I don't know for sure if the huge increase in oil and gas drilling is responsible for this greatly increased siltation. But I do not accept at face value the assertions of those agencies that say drilling is not a factor without having conducted any credible study of the issue. Impartial studies need to be done that are not tainted by political pressures. And springtime releases are now more necessary than ever to help remove the increased load of silt. Stocking more fish or building more structure here and there in the river is not the answer. The fish need insects to eat, and the insects are being smothered. The structure only serves to trap the silt and in no time the new boulders have deep silt behind them. In the meantime, I occasionally fish the San Juan and occasionally have a productive day, but I no longer proudly recommend this river to out-of-state friends as a quality trout fishery.

Great idea! Surely now with the oil spill ongoing Congress can see the need for a robust Land and Water Conservation fund.

I believe it would be helpful for the advocates of full permanent funding for the Historic Preservation Fund to briefly articulate what we are losing, and what the recipients of HPF funding--states, tribes, localities, non-profit organizations--are unable to do without those funds. It may be trite, but I think it's also important to recognize what a drop in the bucket this amount of funding is in the big scheme of things, and how it compares to the public money that is spent (and often wasted) every single day.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I enjoy visiting wilderness areas very much, and I wish we had more such places to get away from the noise and psychosis of the urban environment. There are plenty of opportunities to expand existing and connect wilderness areas by removing unneeded roads. As points out, there is little truth to the idea that wilderness areas are pushing people onto smaller and smaller peripheral zones - in fact if you look at the trend over the last 100 years quite the opposite is true. Wilderness is now very much the rare treasure in a sea of farms, degraded plantation forests, and cities.

I stand corrected - Leopold's influence on our thinking about the value of predators began much earlier than the 1950's, most notably with the publication of A Sand County Almanac in 1949.

I support historic preservation, though if push comes to shove in the federal budget I would rather see that money go towards buying and restoring forest land at the battlefields than restoring old buildings. If spent well a million dollars can still buy a thousand acres of land in some states, but the same money doesn't go far when it comes to buying, restoring, and maintaining historic structures.

I support this idea (I always like the idea of a new big park) and I think it could be combined with the concept of a Great Plains National Park to let the bison roam free on. North America had wild horses before the first arriving humans killed them off. Overpopulation is a serious problem (as with white-tailed deer in the eastern USA)- but perhaps less of a problem if the same park was well stocked with wolves, mountain lions, and grizzly bears. Of course, when we had horses we also had lions, sabretooth tigers, and dire wolves, not to mention megaherbivores like mastodons that weren't directly controlled by any predator.

If you are up in arms protesting against wildlife corridors and wilderness, please read this: Someone actually took the time to make and distribute a totally fake map of potential wildlife corridors across the United States. The title for the map reads something like "Simulated Wildlands Project, as Mandated by the UN Convention on Biological Diversity". The word "simulated" is telling - this map is completely and 100% false, and was created intentionally to stir up the lunatic fringe (which charitably I am sure you are not a part of!) into opposition against valid wildlife conservation and wilderness projects. The map was contained in an equally false and misleading rant called "Understanding Sustainable Development (Agenda 21)", which would be laughable except for the fact that some people apparently think its true. If all you know about wilderness comes from this sort of nonsense, then please do yourself a favor and actually visit the websites of a few notable conservation groups, like the Wildlands Network, The Nature Conservancy, the Wilderness Society, etc. Also, check out the UN Environment program, and you'll quickly learn how little power this agency has over anyone's land-use decision-making. The black helicopters are not on their way, and with a little patience we can resolve our recreational preference differences and focus on protecting the public lands that most of us hold so dear.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just returned from SE Utah last month. I'll gladly drive 2000 miles every year to immerse myself in this place of spectacular beauty! The Monticello BLM oversees more than 1.8 MILLION acres of some of the most scenic, fragile and culturally rich land in America (Canyonlands, Cedar Mesa, Grand Gulch, Comb Ridge) - and much of this land is designated as wilderness quality by the Utah BLM. However, 'wilderness quality lands' in Utah are caught between State and Federal politics because of the 2003 'No More Wilderness' policy. Repeal the 'No More Wilderness' policy that keeps Utah wilderness-quality lands in limbo. Wilderness designation could provide the additional level of oversight and funding needed to protect these fragile areas for generations to come.

you are implying that the US needs to keep growing its population size and economic consumption forever - this is exactly the mindset that I am complaining about. If you like the great outdoors, and especially if you like the freedom to enjoy the great outdoors more or less as you see fit, then you have to be dismayed at the idea of a USA with 400 million people (expected by 2050). If you think we have onerous regulations now, just wait till every national forest is surrounded by suburbs. Even the military is complaining these days that urban growth is getting in the way of their outdoor training missions at large bases like Ft. Bragg in NC. Instead of a growth arms race with China, we should be helping them stabilize their own population size. The benefits to national security would far outweigh any investment we could make in smart bombs and cruise missiles. And no, stagnation is not the same thing as stability. A pond that is stagnating is an unhealthy place that is losing oxygen, whereas a pond that is stable can be full of fish year after year. I think most Americans would trade the current economic mess (caused directly by the urgent Wall Street quest for never-ending growth) for some stability in their financial status and quality of life.

OHV's, snowmobiles, and jetski's should all be banned from most public lands and waters - they are the usage that is least compatible with other uses, and they have the longest-lasting negative impacts. Just like America in general was sold by Madison Avenue into thinking we all needed giant SUV's for our single passenger daily commute, OHV-users have been sold into thinking that they can't enjoy the woods without a gasoline engine roaring between their legs. If OHV users want to band together to buy themselves a private wooded racetrack with a noise control barrier and onsite mountain dew dispensers, fine, but even then they should still have to clean up their act so they don't send water pollution downstream.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The best available scientific information clearly indicates that top carnivores play essential roles in maintaining the health of native ecosystems. We've known this since Aldo Leopold wrote about it back in the 1950's, and recent analysis of the impacts of returning wolves in Yellowstone (and cougars in Zion) confirms that you just cannot expect to have high-quality nature preserves without the big predators. In the southeast, except for a small pocket of red wolves in eastern NC, and a small band of panthers in southern FL, we don't have much in the way of top predators anymore. The official US FWS recovery plans for both species call for restoration of an additional two populations each so that the wolves and panthers can be delisted. Now would be a great time to carry those reintroduction projects out. Otherwise, all of our efforts at protecting natural habitat in the southeast will continue to be ruined by the deleterious impacts of overabundant deer, raccoons, possums, and wild pigs. President Obama could set the process in motion with a quick memo to the relevant federal agencies, and this would provide a much-needed conservation success story for his administration. Likely candidate locations for top predator restoration would include Okefenokee NWR-Osceola NF, Ft. Stewart, Francis Marion NF, Croatan NF, Apalachicola NF, Great Smoky Mountains NP, Pisgah NF, Nantahala NF, Ozark NF, and Ouachita NF. The goal of the projects should be to establish large, interlinked populations of the predator species so that they can be delisted from the Endangered Species Act and carefully managed (like other wildlife) by the states.

I don't think your assessment is very accurate. Communist countries did not have a good track record of protecting land for conservation and public recreation, they were much more concerned with micromanaging their economies and increasing their outputs. I am proposing the US government spend money buying land and development rights from willing sellers at fair market prices. When the government (or a land trust, etc) buys development rights, the property remains under the control of the landowner, and markets adjust the property values accordingly. China did have an aggressive and authoritarian population policy, but I'm not aware of any other communist nations that followed suit, so the only thing communist about it was their approach. I am proposing that we spend more federal tax money providing voluntary birth control techniques to women who want them but don't have them. No direct coercion is implied or required. I am confident that cost-benefit analysis would show that a dollar spent on reducing overpopulation is a better investment for the taxpayer than any other investment we could make in national security or natural resource protection.

The population growth due to US citizen has actually achieved the ideal of replacement of parent (ie two children per family) or even less. However, the population growth due to the governments lack of effective enforcement of immigration policies already on the books has cause our population to explode, causing many of the pressures that we see on resources and recreational lands. The Federal Government needs to step up and fill the role that it is chartered to do.

Not only do private land owners have a vested financial interest in taking care of their land, they also pay taxes. Every time we add acres to our public holdings, we decrease the local tax base. And, it is apparant in MT that the government does not have the resources to properly manage the huge amounts of land they currently own.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public Statement for “America’s Great Outdoors Initiative” Good morning, my name is Rosalyn LaPier. I am an enrolled member of the Blackfeet tribe. I came here today to offer my voice to the discussion regarding public land use in the United States. I come with a unique perspective and background. I grew up in a family that gathered plants on a seasonal basis for medicinal and edible purposes. Until this past year when my grandmother passed away at the age of 95, she oversaw our family’s efforts to gather and process plants. My grandmother was taught by her grandmother, Mary Spotted Bear, about the use of native plants. For the Blackfeet, plant knowledge was taught through the generations from woman to woman, usually from grandmother to granddaughter. Not only was the knowledge of gathering plants taught, but also how to process, preserve and prepare plants for future use. Archaeological evidence suggests that humans have lived on the northern Great Plains for at least 10,000 years. And that throughout that time humans have used the numerous rich natural resources found on the landscape. The Blackfeet used at least 200 different plants from a variety of habitats. The Blackfeet collected these plants all over what is now the State of Montana and the Province of Alberta. The Blackfeet went to specific places each season to gather and collect specific plants. Despite the stereotype that the Blackfeet “followed” the bison, the Blackfeet strategically traveled to certain places at certain times of the year specifically to gather plants or other natural resources and to also hunt animals. My family has gathered plants on the northern Great Plains and on what is now Montana for generations. I have spent my entire life helping my grandmother gather plants. It is something I continue to do (even after her passing) and that my family continues to do. However, I have found that we are an invisible presence on the land. Even though we continue to go to certain places to collect plants during certain times of the year, just as our ancestors did before us, no one recognizes that we have been there. This is in part because we do not harm the land or over-harvest it. Because of this we are often overlooked as a stakeholder in the discussion of public land use. And we are rarely, if ever, asked our opinion of issues related to public land use. Today, I would like to make you aware of a few of the challenges we face and the obligations that we believe the federal government has toward traditional cultural resource use. Challenges to traditional gatherers: 1) Each year it seems that there is more public land that is being leased for natural resource development, logging or for livestock use. Because of this there seem to be more roads, more ATV’s and more erosion on public lands. 2) Each year it seems that there are more pesticides and herbicides being used on public lands and that I have to ask where and when they are being used. We try to avoid places that are being sprayed but sometimes it is difficult, especially for older or elderly gatherers who cannot walk far from roads or far away from the car to gather plants. 3) Each year it seems that there are more noxious weeds on public lands. These seem to be near roads or development and they greatly impact the growth of native plant species. Sometimes it seems that we have to travel farther and into more remote places to avoid noxious weeds. 4) Each year it seems that there are more commercial harvesters on public lands. I have seen areas where commercial harvesters have over-harvested and have literally stripped a site of all natural resources, leaving nothing for either animals or other humans to share. 5) Finally, it seems that whenever there is a discussion of conversing land in Montana that it is said that the land needs to be restored to the way it was when Lewis and Clark arrived. People forget that when Lewis and Clark arrived there were numerous tribal groups in the region who had lived here for thousands of years and who

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

utilized the land. There seems to be a perception that “no one was using the land”, when in fact, people did use the land and continue to use the land every season and rely on that land for their health. America’s Great Outdoors Initiative should work toward: 1) Increasing and protecting access to traditional cultural resources on public lands for traditional gatherers. 2) Limiting development, the creation of roads, leasing for livestock use, and controlling erosion on public lands. 3) Limiting the use of pesticides and herbicides on public lands. 4) Restoring natural areas impacted by noxious weeds or erosion. 5) Protecting traditional cultural resources from over-harvesting by commercial harvesters. 6) Ending using the language of “restoring the land to they way it was when Lewis and Clark arrived” as if no one was here and no one was utilizing its natural resources. 7) Asking if traditional gatherers use public lands before allowing projects or leasing to occur. 8) Promoting the perpetual use of traditional cultural resources on public lands by traditional gatherers. For years my grandmother helped people on the reservation by providing medicinal plants for their illnesses and for their health. On Memorial Day I was on the Blackfeet reservation decorating graves. While there an elder (who is a veteran) came up to me and asked that now that my grandmother was gone, if I could make some medicine for him. Gathering and using plants has been a vital part of my life and the life of my family for many generations. We collect plants in a wide range of habitats – both on the reservation and off the reservation and both on private and public lands. I hope that I can continue this practice and so can the rest of my family. However, unlike commercial harvesters, we do not gather plants to sell them, we use them for our own family use and also for members of the community. I hope that my public statement will provide some awareness of how these issues impact individuals, like that tribal elder. Although this man does not gather the plants himself, he relies on others so that he can continue to live a healthy life. Ultimately though, he relies on the federal government to provide protection of public lands so that he can continue to benefit from that land. Just as his ancestors did for thousands of years. Even though our presence on the landscape is invisible I hope that my voice is heard today. Thank you for your time.

MORE FREEDOM! LESS RULES! No one has more of a right to use this "public" land than any other American.

So if you do this are you planning on going back retroactive for all the OHV land that has already been closed to travel by motorized vehicle and make that land 1-1. If so you owe us about 5 million acres. 1-1 this year and then it will be 1- .5 then 1-.25 Typical liberal incrementalism, less freedom and more rules.

Ya, just what we need more government jobs right. I agree, this country is broke we can't spend more money on anything. It's time to CUT all budgets DEEP. If you want something like this make all the people on unemployment checks go up in the woods and earn that check instead of sitting on the sofa for 2 years. Great idea

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Thanks for the explanation. I agree that the DOI, as with many Federal entities, is not capable of implementing another large program; however, I must have poorly communicated my idea if that is how you interpreted it. The Task Force would use existing DOI data to identify Conservation Priority Areas. Ideally, the Task Force would be composed of representatives from DOI, other Government entities, NGO's, and private industry, which would require minimal resources or administrative burden for DOI. Essentially, this program would use existing data and knowledge to address serious conservation issues on private lands. I'm sure an avid outdoorsman such as yourself, based on your numerous comments to other ideas, could support such an objective. If this is not the appropriate mechanism for achieving such an objective, you should submit your own idea and allow others to vote and comment on it as well. Thanks again for your explanation

The idea of a free ranging buffalo herd in Eastern Montana will have many negative & unintended consequences. Bison are very destructive animals that have few natural predators. Since wolves were reintroduced in Yellowstone Park they have decimated the elk, deer, & moose populations, leaving the buffalo herds to thrive. The bison have overgrazed the park and have caused less biodiversity in an already fragile ecosystem. Lewis & Clark's journals describe eastern Montana's landscape as a desert with few shrubs and trees along the rivers. This lack of vegetation was caused by the herds of bison trampling and foraging along the rivers' edge. With no hunting to thin the bison, their population will skyrocket, pushing out many other plant and animal species. Tourism would be very limited because of the harsh climate, lack of roads, large number of biting insects, and isolation. Most of the people who have commented favorably on this proposal have probably never been to eastern Montana. If this proposal is implemented, it will cause many of eastern Montana's hardy residents, both human & animal, to leave. It would decimate entire towns and destroy a decent way of life for thousands of people. There are already several free ranging bison herds in the United States. Bison are not an endangered species. I STRONGLY disagree with this proposal.

The national park system can't take care of the parks they already have. Why not take the money and resources and try to fix the problems in our existing parks instead. Maybe the interior dept. could fully fund their PILT payments to rural counties like they are supposed to. Does acquiring land adjacent to the federal land mean buying it from a willing seller or does it mean taking it by eminent domain. It's a good idea as long as you're not the one who has to give up their home and way of life.

CHERNOBYL. THREE MILE ISLAND. TERRORISTS. I'm sorry. Not a good plan. You forgot one "The sky is falling"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is an obligation of the USFS and NPS to provide visitors with a quality outdoor experience, not just during the day, but all night long. Half our world is above us -- the night sky. To connect with the stars and planets we need darkness. Protect the night sky by requiring all govt. buildings, parking lots, restrooms, etc. to use full cutoff lights that prohibit upward and sideways shining light. Zero upward light. Use timed motion sensors at restrooms. HPS and yellow LED lights interfere least with circadian rhythms and ecosystems. 2/3 of the US population have never seen the Milky Way. If they can't see it in our national forests and parks, where will they ever experience the awe of such a magnificent sight?

Local and state parks may be the only resources some people have to relate to nature. If those facilities are closed then we are eliminating a whole community from experiencing the outdoors. Funding through LWCF is essential for keeping facilities open and for building new ones.

People are twice as likely to be killed by a stranger with a car than a stranger with a gun. In urban areas that boomed after the automobile became the primary transportation mode, low income areas also lack sidewalks and safe street crossings. Federal transportation dollars should be made more available for projects that facilitate short trips on foot.

I see pluses and minuses to this idea. You aptly describe the benefits of eliminating fees -- total access -- but a potential downside is overuse of the parks, potentially resulting in the degradation of natural resources/ecosystems/trails/etc. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness of northern Minnesota has a system which, in my opinion, successfully bridges these two concerns: Access to the BWCA for a day trip (no overnight camping) is free and unlimited. Additionally, there are free Forest Service campsites on the border lakes just outside the area. However, if you wish to stay overnight within the Wilderness Area, you must purchase an entry permit. An entry permit is designated for a specific entry point on a specific day, and there are limited numbers of permits to control the amount of traffic in a given area. However, the permit is needed solely for entry into the BWCA and affords limitless days within the area so long as visitors do not leave and reenter. These permits are only \$16 per person, not a debilitating fee. I fully agree with and understand your concern. That being said, in the 1950s the federal government nearly closed many parks because they could not maintain facilities on pace with the wear and tear caused by heavy use. We must keep this piece of public resource history in mind as we create plans for access to these areas. We must guarantee access both for current and future generations.

Even though there is no doubt that forest and ecosystem health could benefit from well-thought out thinning efforts, there have certainly had some suspiciously self serving "thinning" proposals over the years. It seems important to incorporate state of the art science-based experimental forestry research into the equation, and use an adaptive management approach that evaluates the outcomes and adjusts if not performing as intended.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We must commit to preserving these monuments to the sacrifices made by so many to mold this nation into one nation. If we cannot preserve our past what makes us think there will be a future. I certainly don't want future generations ignorant of the blood shed on behalf of our country. We cannot allow the final resting place for many of those who gave their very lives to preserve this country fall victim to a shopping center or mall. We owe our children and grandchildren the opportunity to see the battlefields where our bravest fought and died for a cause they believed in. It is hard to imagine what our future would be without a past to learn from. Let us never take for granted the sacrifices made and the blood shed for the future you and I are now enjoying. These battlefields MUST be preserved.

We must preserve our history for our children and grandchildren. If we cannot preserve our history who will? Battlefields and other historic sites should be a priority for preservation. We owe all those who shed their blood to preserve this nation the honor they deserve. They have earned a place of honor preserved and maintained for future generations.

As we are all in this together, I believe it creates negative feelings when you are allowed to demote a valid idea. We need to all work together to gather the best practices, be it dealing with private land conservation, public land conservation, recreation, education, or just connecting people with nature.

B Meyer: I'm not against moving available OHV trails. The problem is that while trails are closed down here, new trails are *\*never\** opened up there to keep the same net trail miles. I suspect that most in the OHV community would not have an issue with new trails opening up to counter trail shutdowns (mile for mile swap of similar types of trail). \_\_\_\_\_ stated the issue perfectly, there are more people using less space (due to closures), which leads to over use. There are two solutions I see. 1. *\*Expand\** the 4wd/OHV trail network so that the land does not get over used. 2. Education and advocacy of TREAD lightly! - while most users (both OHV and non-ohv) are responsible, there are a few that are not and spoil it for everyone else. I've also seen a number of instances where hikers have damaged and trashed our natural resources also. For those that want to hike in solitude, remember that for every 1 mile of 4wd trail there are thousands of miles of hiking trails, where you can hike in solitude.

you make the same mistake that many people seem to make. Wilderness and all public lands are not the same thing. There are millions of acres of Wilderness Areas that are not accessible to motorized use and \_\_\_\_\_ is not suggesting any motorized access to those areas. I just don't feel there is a need to increase the amount of Wilderness. Here in the Northwest we have an abundance of Wilderness Areas that are easily accessible and rarely used by the so called quiet users who continue to want more. When I say an abundance, I don't mean a large backyard, I mean an excess of a million acres and almost half of the 1.6 million acres of the Bitterroot National Forest which surrounds the community I live in.

Don't forget the 120 million acres of existing wilderness areas. There is more than enough designated wilderness areas and we need to stop expanding these wilderness areas. Enough is enough. These areas are easily accessible and rarely used by the quiet users who continue to push for more and more unused space.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I suggest you take your own advise. Have you ever been to the Northwest? Do you have any concept of what 1 million acres of timbered forest looks like.

I too enjoy fishing, but ... just to play devil's advocate: Sport fishing can adversely affect habitats and fish populations, and introducing non-native game fish just so people can catch them creates other unintended consequences, like habitat reduction for native species etc. Also, gas powered boats introduce pollution into environments that cannot be removed easily, like litter can. I say this because I've known plenty of anglers (and hunters) who like to get away and fish, but have no problem tossing beer cans, spilling oil and gas, or mutilating fish to remove hooks and tossing them aside too. Outdoor sportsman are an important link to conservation, and should be targeted in this campaign to take greater responsibility for natural areas they utilize; but should not be assumed to be great stewards of the land, or stereotyped to be some sort of "noble savages".

Mr. Moffat you should try a day hike, plane ride or stand on one side and enjoy the view in the Bob Marshall wilderness (1.5 million acres), Selway Bitterroot Wilderness(1.6 million acres), Great Bear Wilderness(286,000 acres). Need I say more about the relevance of your comments?

People, in general, contribute little to wilderness areas, so it is better that they stay out. I understand people like riding ATVs and such, but it only takes one motorized vehicle to ruin everyone else's experience in the wilderness. The noise can be heard for miles, so forget any relaxing or listening to birds or the breeze or just silence. Even if most ATV drivers are responsible, safe, and respectful of nature, the handful who are not spoil it for everyone. ATVs need to be kept in designated areas--as do hikers and horseback riders etc. Any "multi-use" space that includes motorized vehicles is no longer a wilderness place for anyone else; it is just another spot with varying degrees of human noise.

the federal government has closed access to too many areas where we can enjoy the outdoors.The local governments and local citizens should have the control on most areas.Recreation areas are dissappearing with out local citizens input.Wilderness areas are to many and completly shut out oppurtunities to enjoy OUR lands.

You are an idiot. So, anywhere/everywhere on this earth that you think is sacred is then off limits to everyone else on this world? That's a very selfish existence, congrats. Where do you live? Where do you work, because both the buildings are located on ground that I feel is sacred, so I'm going to have to ask you to tear them down and return them to the natural state they were in. I feel it's wrong that someone would create a home on somewhere that I consider my church.....see the reasoning here? When you learn to see that you are not the only being on this earth, then maybe good change can and will happen to this world. Until then, it's people like yourself that will drive in your car on a newly paved road to the place you call sacred, and condemn all those who may have a different view of what is sacred. Don't worry, I'll actually go to a Church and pray for you and all of us.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

*(cont.)*

I take exception to being accused, as a full sized OHV enthusiast, of not being environmentally conscious. There are the typical "one percenters" in all forms of outdoor recreationists that do not care about thier impact to the environment. I have seen just as many on motorcycles as on ATVs. In fact, I tend to clean up the messes they leave behind. This kind of attitude, that one group is inherently better than another, is detrimental to our shared cause.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Long before there were environmentalists from the large cities and towns across the nation there were local ranchers and farmers who lived off the land. These ranchers were the original environmental stewards and activists. They labored day in and day out to provide not only food for their own tables but food for everyone else in our great nation. These Ranchers took care of the land, they built stock ponds for their cattle, they planted hay and irrigated fields. All of this resulted in an increased amount of food and water for the local wildlife. The animal populations have flourished since the ranchers made food and water more easily accessible. They were improving on the land and as a result they were improving the quality of life for the wildlife as well. The rancher's livelihood depends greatly on the quality of the land they graze their animals on. They take pride in keeping the noxious weeds controlled, in keeping trash off their land, and in doing so providing not only a beautiful place to raise a herd of cattle but a family as well. Modern day animal rights activists and environmentalists will tell you that ranchers are destroying eco-systems and wildlife in their pursuits of the American Dream. I can assure you that it is not so. Real American Ranchers do not make a lot of money. They get paid once a year when they sell their cattle or sheep and it is getting more and more difficult for ranches to survive. The cost of land and living in general has skyrocketed, the price of livestock remains the same. Now the federal government wants to impose "voluntary" regulations on private land conservation? At what cost? Ranchers are slowly getting priced out of their profession. There are very few people in the United States who can relate to the American Rancher. I was fortunate to be born into a family of Ranchers in Colorado, my wife was fortunate to be born into a family of ranchers from New Mexico, we know the troubles that lie ahead for the American Rancher. For four generations my family has slaved over our land to eek out a living. My Great-Grandfather, Grandfather and Father all spent countless hours on the ranch performing "Environmental Improvements" long before there was any such movement. Let the American Rancher be. I could go on and on about the heritage surrounding ranching and I could talk about how the American West was founded by the same people that are now facing extinction, but I won't. Do not impose ideas based on speculations on the American Rancher. They have been Environmentalists all along. I know that there are people out there who do not like the idea that people have ranches that no one else can access or enjoy. We catch them trespassing every year. They do not respect the fact that for four generations our ranch has been our home. The Division of Wildlife has already tried to persuade ranchers into giving up their rights by providing small incentives to ranchers who allow people access to their lands for recreation. Everyone in this country has a right to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness. There are millions of acres that can be accessed by any American at any time, leave private property alone. Please don't undermine private property rights. Every American should have the right to say what happens on their private property. Do you want people to be able to have picnics in your backyard? Voluntary efforts soon become mandates, and we will be undermining the very principals that United States of America was founded on. My idea for private land conservation is to leave ranchers alone. They have already lost rights to their property either from forced infrastructure improvements (i.e. roads/bridges/housing developments) and their ability to control wildlife that lives on their property. Do not move the American Rancher to the Extinct Species list.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe natural gas can be our Sadi Arabia. BUT we must find a way to get the gas without the use of harmful chemicals. There has to be a way it can be done. The problem is most Gas company's and their share holders don't have the patience to find it. They want the quick buck. Screw the environment and the people. End of story....

All who want to impose a tax on logging companies should immediately move out of there residence built with wood. There are a myriad of every day things we use that are made from trees. Do your homework before making blanket comments. Private forest land owners who have been caretakers of their own forests all have to place 50 to 200 ft buffers on every stream, wetland, body of water. They have to address wildlife and cultural resource concerns. This is a taking of private property. On top of that, all timber harvested in WA State is subject to a 5% timber tax already. Also, when Europeans showed up on the landscape there was not a continuous 400 yr old forest of old growth. There were openings due to fire, some of which was burned on a regular basis by Native Americans to maintain berry fields and wildlife areas. You see some species need the young succsional forest for forage, as well as migratory birds also use these areas as the plants are quite diverse in a forest opening. There are plants that need fire to propagate. The issues are complex and one size does not fit all. We cannot legislate from the top down. But on a local basis by those that live and work next to the forest.

FS to promote an email list to give out current information on proposed projects in the idea stage, allow public to participate in the ID team meetings. By the time a project gets to the public comment stage it is way to late. FS should have round table discussions and work groups with conflicting user groups so we get to know each other. After all the local community usually has ownership in what is going on in their back yard. When the logging was shut down the forestry companies were to get restoration work. However, those in the rural community did not get those jobs because the county they lived in did not qualify for HUB zone jobs. Federal Gov. is too slow to correct this. It has been 15 yrs since the Forest Plan came out and no work in out own back yard. So where is the local rural community support?

On the Mt Baker/Snoqualmie Natl.Forest less than 10% of the land is open to multiple use and motorized recreation. The North Cascades Wilderness Leadership School based at Burlington, WA caters to the 16 to 32 yr old crowd. We have lost 95% of our day hikes 3 to 5 miles round trip to alpine meadows and lakes in our area due to road closures by the FS digging up the roads or the roads washed out by floods. Wilderness is off limits to the very young, the elders, and the handicap. My love is to be in the mtns. hiking. However, this summer I turn 60 yrs. and was injured at work a yr ago and now cannot pack a back pack or walk more than 3 miles round trip, or do more than a 300 ft elevation gain. Which pretty much eliminates all hikes into the alpine mtn meadows. My husband is 63 and broke his back 10 yrs ago and cannot walk a long distance or pack. We love going slow on the ATV to enjoy the scenery and the wildlife. Motorized access allows the elders to bring along the youth to teach them about the outdoors. Bring back Multiple Use, we can make it work. We need all the groups to come together to find solutions.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To comment #6, most folks who see trees automatically think it is FS lands. The FS has not had any clear cuts and in our area only an occasional thinning since 1990 or 20 yrs ago. So if you are seeing clear cuts it might be State DNR Lands or private timber companies lands on which there is no recreation conversation. So when you look at a map go to the specific County Assessors page and find out who owns the land you might be referring to. In many places the land ownership is mixed.

We have lost over 95% of our day hikes in the Darrington, in the 3 to 5 mi. round trip, area due to road closures and flood damage. Increasing day hikes, walking all day along the valley floor and gaining 500' to 3500' elevation and spending 10 mins in the alpine meadow or lake is not my idea of a good time. Wilderness with the long mileages and elevation gains in the North Cascades is for the age group 16 to 32 according to the North Cascades Outdoor Leadership School based in Burlington, WA. Wilderness is not for the elders, families with young children or the handicap. Trails in the North Cascade Mtns are different than hiking the flatter areas of the East part of the USA. Men have a greater lung capacity than women so can hike longer and farther. We have very few places for the handicap. Those of us in our 60's enjoy taking the 4 wheeler to drive slow and stop along the way to photograph the flowers and the wildlife. When we were much younger we backpacked often.

We need to look at each area across the USA FS lands separately. Each area is different, has different needs, has different geology, landscape etc. This is where the local folks who live in the area should be active participants in the planning process for the forests. In our area, we want to be able to use ATV's on old FS roads that have been dug up and no longer used. We are not advocating using ATV's on existing trails used for hikers. All we want is to be able to access the day hikes we used to have in the 3 to 5 miles category. The roads to trails has increased day hikes from 3 to 5 miles to 8 to 13 plus miles which requires an overnight stay and a heavy back pack. The North Cascade Mtns are steep and rugged. And maybe OHV use may be increasing in other areas but in our area it is non-existent. So please do not legislate one size fits all. The local folks in each area should decide what is best. We local folks do not have a big budget to hire attorneys, nor do we get paid to comment on every project that comes up like the environmental side. We love the wildlife. My life's work has been documenting edible/medicinal plants in our area.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Goshen Farm Preservation Society is a group of dedicated people who have been trying to preserve 22 acres of land and a historic home in a heavily developed area near Annapolis MD. The property is owned by the Anne Arundel County Public Schools. It was purchased through eminent domain in the 1970's in order to build an elementary school and middle school. The elementary school was built and the middle school was deemed not needed. The house was built in the 1780's and there are 22 acres of forest and meadows left in the original homestead. Our group was formed when a few residents found out the the Board of Ed was about to demolish the house(which was on the MD Historic Register). These residents testified at the next BOE hearing and the demolition was stopped. Goshen Farm Preservation Society has spent the last 5 years trying to gain a lease from the BOE to renovate the House, create community gardens and a historic community preserve. Each time this organization feels close to achieving a lease, new roadblocks are created by the BOE. As a member of this group, my philosophy is that environmental protection is achieved in large (lobbying by the League of Conservation Voters) and small (saving 22 acres near the Chesapeake Bay) efforts. Both are critical. Our group is to speak at a hearing on August 18th of the Anne Arundel County Board of Education concerning the feasibility of our lease request. Our group has been busy over the last 5 years - getting non-profit status, a \$150,000 matching grant from the state of Maryland, fundraising, and much more. This lease hearing is our greatest hurdle. If you want more information, please go to our website [www.goshenfarm.org](http://www.goshenfarm.org).

It's been proven time and again that the existing built environment can provide ALL the clean solar power we need - so we need to IMMEDIATELY STOP KILLING OPEN SPACES FOR POWER INCLUDING BIG SOLAR AND BIG WIND. Democratically-owned, decentralized, affordable point of use solutions like efficiency upgrades, rooftop solar (water and power), passive solar, geothermal heat exchange, microwind - THESE are the tools of the future, while we continue to enjoy the enormous benefits of millions of acres of healthy desert and plains ecosystems. PLEASE don't believe Big Energy or the sellouts at the Big Enviros - we CAN generate all the clean power we need, right where we need it, and we DON'T have to rip open another landscape for Chevron Solar, BP Wind, Goldman Sachs Cogentrix, Bechtel/Bright Source, Sempra, GE or any other Robber Barons who will rob us blind and won't reduce GHGs at all. Feed in Tariffs and PACE loans will solve our clean energy needs quickly and affordably. Killing the deserts will only make it worse.

Support federal legislation to avoid permanently protected lands during the siting of utilities. If protected properties cannot be avoided, utilities should be required to mitigate the damage. LTA is sponsoring a National Utility Infrastructure Coalition and working with Congress to pass amendments to ensure that our permanently protected lands are safeguarded forever.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I repeat: Stop these monuments!! People who do not live in this latest proposal, the Siskiyou Crest Monument, should not vote for this until you have heard from us, the people who live here, work here, and have for over 150 years. We have not abused any part of this area: we take care of it. That is why it is as beautiful as it always has been. There are thousands of us, "we the people" who live in this particular proposed area and we are angry that those who do not live here can be so uninformed that they listen to special interest groups and their lies. We do not need another 600,000 acre monument!! Enough!! Shirley Fisher

Kansas does indeed need a national park within its borders and the most natural location would include the prairielands and involve preserving bison in a Buffalo Commons. Having camped with our children for many years, we were always disappointed that there was no National Park in Kansas. How sad! This is our heritage -- let's preserve it while we can!

Yes, to multiple use. We all pay taxes to support these resources. Seems like much of the decisions as to who can use what is not based on important factors such as how much damage a recreation type might do to trails, environment, or enjoyment for other users. Instead, decisions seem to often be made based on whether something is "traditional" (horses, which can damage trails and impact the enjoyment of other users) vs. mountain bikes which offer less damage to trails, no smelly droppings on the trail, or no noise like some motorized vehicles. Yet, either because horses are traditional or because they have more effective lobbying, they are allowed places where mountain bikes or not. What is the rationale? I'm not against horses. Or mechanized dirt bikes. All have their place. One wonders about the decision criteria sometimes, though.

Motorized users can experience the great motorized outdoors in the comfort of our many motorized urban areas accessible in minutes from even remote suburban areas. If their interest is in mudding and other destructive "great outdoor" activities, wallows should be established in our many abandoned industrial areas conveniently located near many urban areas.

Unfortunately balance is hard to achieve. It would take many hikers or quite a few bikers or horse riders to disrupt any ORV users. Bikers and horse riders disrupt hikers disproportionately. One responsible ORV user would disrupt the experience of many none motorized users, maybe unintentionally but it's still a disruption. A dirt biker, ATV user, or irresponsible ORV user disrupts just about everybody and everything except their cronies.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Farm and Ranchland Protection Program (FRPP) and Grassland Reserve Program (GRP) provide conservation organizations with critical matching dollars toward the purchase of conservation easements. Without them, many land trusts can't afford to purchase the development rights on the most scenic and ecologically important landscapes in the country. These dollars enable land trusts to purchase easements on working ranchlands, providing landowners with capital without having to liquidate acreage or livestock. We believe that FRPP and GRP dollars will be an important component of our collective ability to protect remaining native grasslands by aiding the transfer of working ranches to the next generation in the face of development pressure. The America's Great Outdoors initiative should support robust, dedicated funding for the protection of private, working lands within and in partnership with the 2012 Farm Bill. For example, LWCF funds could be made eligible for meeting the non-federal match requirements for GRP and FRPP. In places like Kansas, private land conservation is an important alternative to increasing the federal land base. The purchase of conservation easements is a fiscally responsible, one time investment – keeping land in private hands and on the tax rolls, preventing fragmentation of wildlife habitat and migration corridors, and conveying oversight to a privately funded organization and not the government. These programs help ensure working farm and ranch lands will continue to be devoted to the production of food and fiber and the wide open spaces we all enjoy.

The natural infrastructure that must be protected to create a Great Outdoors does not recognize local, state, or national boundaries, political districts, or the existence of different land managers and owners. In some instances, for example in the Morongo Basin area of the Morongo Basin of California, the landscape is fragmented by "checkerboard" patterns of BLM and private lands, small parcels that are a legacy of homestead acts that create challenges in assembling adequate patches of habitat for plants and animals to live and roam. As well, resources for protection and enforcement in BLM lands are limited, more so as personnel and \$\$ are redirected to energy development on public lands. Even when the studies exist to show the locations of wildlife corridors on the ground, the cross jurisdictional nature of corridors necessitates regional scale collaboration by all jurisdictions and agencies concerned. Not all areas of the country have wildlife corridor studies -- these are essential foundations for planning for growth and development.

Preserving battlefields allows us to keep tangible links to our past. It's important to preserve sites from all conflicts, from the French and Indian War, the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, and the Civil War. Once these sites are lost, it is almost impossible to get them back. These sites are valuable parts of our communities and require more attention and funding.

This part of the US history is not being taught correctly if at all. We need to keep ALL the battlefields as close to the way they were for all to learn from.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For 10,000 years the Native American Peoples managed their lands. They used fire to burn off sour grasses in the fall to promote new growth in the spring. they burned the thick brush in the forest. they knew every plant and tree in their environment and what it was good for. Then the Europeans threw out that knowledge because they knew better. Now we have a mess on our public lands with countless agencies (BLM, Forest Service, Park Service, and others) with no coordinated management plan. Any attempt to plan for managing our public lands is met with litigation from the radical environmentalist. We need a simple management plan that all government agencies must follow. Wilderness designation destroys more land than it saves. No new roads, no condos, no development, just common sense management.

Grazing on federal lands is a great deal for the cattle ranchers but a disaster for our wilderness areas. It's misuse of public lands, it pollutes streams AT THEIR SOURCE, causes erosion, breeds flying insects and insect borne diseases and makes for a very unpleasant experience for those of us who like to explore the great wilderness areas in our country. Proper, responsible management of these lands should not include grazing in any form.

I agree with. OHV's belong in the wilderness as much as cows do.

I agree that this would be a cost effective method for conflict resolution, however we in the Rocky Mountain West have found that every time the community has tried to talk over an issue the Forest Service gets a phone call from one radical environmental group or another. "Do it our way and ignore the resolution process or we will sue" says the caller and the conversation collapses. Until common sense and rule of law can be accepted nothing will change.

If rancher Joe can ride his horse and graze his cattle in the wilderness, why can't I ride my mountain bike there? Horses and cattle urinate and defecate all over the wilderness, polluting streams. You never see cyclists defecating on the trail! One horse or cow causes more erosion and damage to the landscape than a mountain biker would cause in a life time. Let cyclists use the wilderness.

It is all about balance! I have solar power on my house to (more than) offset my pool power consumption. I have a Prius to balance out my SUV. I recycle at all times. I go camping for 2 weeks every year at one of the most beautifully preserved and quiet lake in CA. I also ride OHVs at Pismo, CA with my family, but only in a responsible manner. Public land should absolutely be conserved and cared for, but OHVs do not need to be banned to accomplish that. People just need to think, respect, and "maintain a balance". It is always a few disrespectful, non-thinking individuals that ruin it for everyone else! Finally, please don't talk about OHV and air pollution. Overwhelming, vast majority of air pollution comes from cars, factories, and electric power generation... not OHVs!

Our battlefields are precious national landmarks. Once destroyed, they are gone forever. Please preserve our cultural and historic heritage!



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Public Law 88-577(16U.S.C. 1131-1136), "The Wilderness Act" clearly states on page-4, "Prohibition of Certain Uses" (c) "no other form of mechanical transport" shall be allowed. A bicycle is a form of mechanical transport. The Wilderness Act has been missused to the point that it should be repealed. Today your Senators are considering Jon Tester's S-1470 which will place portions of the Continental Divide Trail System into wilderness. This is a prime bicycle route, yet the mountain bike community says make it all wilderness to prevent all uses of the land, but give us a cherry stem route just for the bicycle. The bicycle community could gain a lot of support for their cause if they would support the other forest users and the activities others enjoy. The CDTS should be left open to bicycle use but not at the cost of keeping me out of the rest of the forest.

The Wilderness Act has already been perverted, and the original intent missused. The Bob Marshal Wilderness contains old homestead cabins and an airstrip that is still used to ferry the rich and famous to a "wilderness experience". S-1470 from Jon Tester is attempting to make new wilderness, lands that currently contains roads, old mine claims, dams, headgates, ditches and CCC constructed campgrounds. The radical environmentaist doesn't want to read the Wilderness Act to see what type of lands were originally intended to be so designated. Today all of the designated wilderness, 109 million acres, would cover California with room to spare. We don't need a single acre of additional wilderness as the wilderness we have is not used. Look up the FS Recreational Use charts. For 2009 Montana recorded just 3.09% of forest visits were to wilderness, while 96.98% were to multiple use areas.

Off roading is the best family sport & for years our areas keep getting smaller & smaller, but the sport keeps getting more popular. This will improve our riding areas & help keep the sport growing

Off roading is the best family sport & for years our areas keep getting smaller & smaller, but the sport keeps getting more popular. This will improve our riding areas & help keep the sport growing.

When professional outdoor educators and teachers want to lead field expeditions onto public lands, they face the labyrinth of the permitting process. Some national forests and blm offices require any paid professional, including teachers, to have a commercial permit to lead a trip on that public land. This lumps teachers in with guide services and mineral extraction companies. In some cases, there is no way to acquire a permit for an educational trip to a national forest. Some forest service and blm offices require an educational permit that takes more than six months to acquire while other offices only ask for the same wilderness permits that all users must get. This patchwork of permitting requirements makes it difficult to know where to go when choosing a destination. There should be a unified and simplified permitting process that would allow legitimate schools and universities to have access to the public lands in order to use the great outdoor classrooms of this country. Low impact backcountry travel, river-trips and day hikes should be allowed with far less permitting hassle to get our 'nature deficit' youth out in the great outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

3 million heritage tourists a year visit Gettysburg National Military Park. These tourists value our diverse, small town, rural and historic environment. But the casino industry is targeting a site just 1/2 mile from hallowed ground, just outside the boundary of the military park, right on the nationally designated Journey Through Hallowed Ground. We have no protection locally. The decision will be made by the PA Gaming control Board. The proposal (the 2nd one in 5 years) is ripping our community apart and if licensed will change our culture. There are hundreds of casinos...there is only one Gettysburg. Could there be a buffer? Federal zoning? Save Gettysburg. [www.nocasinoggettysburg.org](http://www.nocasinoggettysburg.org)

Gee, I think we have wilderness for those people who don't want to hear the "music of roaring engines". Every time we have a govt initiative to help in the forest, the motorized community lose trails. So if you don't like to share than help vote for more managed trails so there is no conflict between user groups. Everyone has a hobby and needs to get away and get their head cleared, we all do it in different ways. There's more land out there that there's no need to constantly shut down trails and what not, manage it for a change and we can ALL use the forest.

Gettysburg commemorates 51,000 casualties in 3 days fighting in 1863. Gettysburg is the reason we are a Union today. Now investors want the Pa Gaming Control Board to license a casino just 1/2 mile from the Gettysburg National Military Park. There is no federal buffer zone to protect the GNMP and nearby Eisenhower National Historic site from this inappropriate development. Please save our most hallowed ground with a federal buffer zone of at least 6 miles from adults-only businesses that would change the educational and meaningful context of the Park. See { <a href="http://nocasinoggettysburg.org" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I live within sight of two major wind farms. The agricultural fields they sit on are crisscrossed with roads to service the towers. This is definitely NOT something you would want in a nature preserve!

It's hard to imagine why anyone would demote this idea. Invasive, exotic species of plants and animals are costing us a fortune to manage. Regional education about invasives would be a good place to start.

The Wildlands Project, which is now called Wildlands Network, has always been about reconnecting habitat, not excluding people. It was victimized in the past by the "wise use" crowd who used bogus websites and bogus maps to advance conspiracy theories. The conservation biology approaches that Reed Noss helped promote have become mainstream. Basic concepts like cores, buffers, and corridors appear in the green infrastructure plans that many cities are developing.

Land trusts have been cautioned to not accept conservation easements if they feel the owners' appraisals are excessive. The IRS is reacting to a flurry of abuses that occurred in the past. It's a tough situation for all parties.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most counties have local planning boards with local citizens serving to view land planning issues. Perhaps this board could assist in promotion of multiple use of the forest through a 9 person subcommittee made up of local retired: wildlife manager, USFS manager, State forest manager, large landowner stakeholder, and 5 members at large from the county involved. This 9 person subcommittee could be the sounding board for various local recreational groups to submit their plan/trail request for developing "their" recreational interest. For example the local OHV group could submit a "plan" for a new OHV trail through the forest area which would be reviewed by the subcommittee for preliminary approval or modification. As the "plan" gains support and approval of the committee it could then be submitted through the local planning board for coordination with the government agency affected. Retired board members may be free of retribution by an employer and time to commit as volunteers. Trails could then be adopted by the users, which would require monitoring, maintainance and policing.

Mountaintop removal is perhaps the greatest threat to America's outdoors that exists. A radical form of coal mining adopted by profit-hungry coal companies, entire mountains are literally blown up, and the debris dumped into valleys. Mountaintop removal is devastating hundreds of square miles of Appalachia; polluting the headwaters of rivers that provide drinking water to millions of Americans; and forever destroying our natural and cultural heritage. Not only that, burning coal contributes to global warming, which is already having devastating consequences, and could make much of the planet uninhabitable. We must put future generations ahead of coal company profits, and stop this practice immediately.

Our kids' shortcomings at outdoor play and natural history awareness are becoming well recognized and are reflected by many AGO ideas about these subjects. It's a good bet that our goverment is listening.

Protecting working lands and ranches from development doesn't always provide strong public benefits. The protection should serve important conservation purposes, for instance to save high-quality natural characteristics or to buffer existing conservation lands. I don't think it matters whether some or all of the debts are federally held; and I don't think the agencies that hold the debts may always be qualified to say what lands are worth protecting or to actually monitor the conservation easements in perpetuity. For me, the bottom line is that while things like cash payments, tax deductions and debt reductions help to motivate landowners, we already have in this country an effective network of federal, state and non-profit organizations leveraging these and other methods while making good conservation decisions.

Rosalyn, the distinction you made between collecting for personal use and commercial collecting is an important one. It often appears in conjunction with activities in other parts of the country, like mushroom collecting and fishing. I have voted to promote your idea. The one thing where I might disagree just a little relates to your concern about Lewis and Clark. Most of us who have invoked their view of the West do so because their visit was the beginning of the end to the West's widespread biological diversity and its mostly-sustainable Native American life styles. By the way, being a small part Choctaw, I sympathize with you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Savory's method leans a little too heavily on increasing cattle grazing for my tastes. It's arguably a source of our grasslands' problems more than a source of solutions.

The BLM should be run by people who are motivated to protect, restore and connect their land's diverse ecosystems.

Very well said, Kristen. I agree with you completely. It could be argued that our President's personal background leads him to think of the environment as a balance between economics and social justice, more so than as an issue of Nature for Nature's sake (ex. endangered species). Our Secretary of Interior has a ranching background that may make him sympathetic to protecting the outdoors from harsher forms of resource extraction (ex. mining). However, ranchers are not always sympathetic to wildlife and wilderness. Clearly, we are much better off, administratively, than we were two years ago; so I don't want to be critical. Still, as a country, we can and should do much better than we currently do at protecting our natural heritage.

You are so right. Our nation is decades past the time when it should be encouraging and subsidizing the development and destruction of its own outdoors.

You pose a good question. There are seven designated Forest Legacy areas in my state, and land trusts have encountered the same limitation. It doesn't make sense since land trusts are reliable long-term holders of conservation lands and interests.

Your idea provides a good summary of the kinds of actions that are needed to address this serious problem. This issue is part of the Federal Biodiversity Protection idea that I suggested a few days ago. Because exotics exist across state lines, federal coordination makes lots of sense. Thanks a lot!

While it's unfortunate that so many of our most significant and cherished battlefields are so close to current population centers, we need to prove that our heritage really is important to us as a people.

Overlanding and ATV's do have a large part in this argument. When following the tread lightly guidelines offroading can be enjoyed with minimal effect on the environment. The way that BLM has managed their areas in my opinion is probably the best for every one. Every one is entitled to have access to public lands as long as they do so responsibly. A hiker who is careless with a camp fire can do far more damage than an ATV who is riding responsibly. Instead of restricting the access we should do more to educate the users in how to use the land with out ruining it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Backcountry areas constitute roughly one-third of all National Forest System lands, or approximately 60 million acres. Although backcountry areas comprise only two percent of the land base in the continental United States, they are found within 661 of the over 2,000 major watersheds in the nation and provide many enduring social and ecological benefits. As the nation's population grows, native forestlands, grasslands and shrublands and other open space continue to be converted to urban and agricultural uses. Between 1992 and 1997, almost 10 million acres of forests, wetlands and other open space were converted to more urban uses. This is an increase from the 7 million acres of forestland and other open space converted to other uses between 1987 and 1992, despite the fact that the population growth rate remained fairly constant from 1987 to 1997. In an increasingly developed landscape, large un-fragmented tracts of land become more important. Backcountry areas provide clean drinking water and large, relatively undisturbed landscapes that are important to fish and wildlife species and their habitat needs. Backcountry areas provide opportunities for dispersed outdoor recreation and biological strongholds for populations of threatened and endangered species. They also provide reference areas for study and research and serve as bulwarks against the spread of non-native invasive species that can displace native fish and wildlife. The following values or features often characterize backcountry areas:

- High quality or relatively undisturbed ecosystems, soil, water, and air. These three key resources are the foundation upon which other resource values and outputs depend. Undisturbed watersheds catch, store, and safely release water over time; protect downstream communities from flooding; provide clean water for domestic, agricultural and industrial uses; help maintain fish and wildlife populations; and are the basis for many forms of outdoor recreation, education and renewal.
- Sources of public water supplies. National Forest System lands contain watersheds that are important sources of clean water for industrial, agricultural and domestic uses. For example, backcountry areas within the National Forest System contain all or portions of 354 municipal watersheds contributing drinking water to millions of citizens. Maintaining these areas in a relatively undisturbed condition saves downstream communities millions of dollars in water filtration costs. Careful management of these watersheds is crucial in maintaining the flow and affordability of clean water to a growing population.
- Diversity of plant and animal communities. Backcountry areas serve as a bulwark against the spread of nonnative invasive species. Backcountry areas are more likely than roaded areas to support abundant populations of selected fish and wildlife. For example:
  - o In the Interior Columbia River Basin, 60 percent of the best remaining trout and salmon habitat are within backcountry areas or areas with low road densities.
  - o 85 percent of the healthiest populations of all western cutthroat trout species occur in wilderness and backcountry areas.
- Habitat for threatened, endangered, proposed, candidate, and sensitive species and for those species dependent on large, undisturbed areas of land. Backcountry areas function as biological strongholds and refuges for many species. In the northern Rocky Mountains, for example, backcountry areas provide core habitat areas, travel corridors and habitat connectivity for grizzly bear, mountain lion, and elk. Of the nation's species currently listed as threatened, endangered, or proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act, approximately 25% of animal species and 13% of plant species are likely to have habitat within backcountry areas on National Forest System lands. Backcountry areas support a diversity of aquatic habitats and communities, providing or affecting habitat for more than 280 threatened, endangered, proposed, and

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

sensitive species. More than 65% of all Forest Service sensitive species are directly or indirectly affected by backcountry areas. This percentage is composed of birds (82%), amphibians (84%), mammals (81%), plants (72%), fish (56%), reptiles (49%), and invertebrates (36%).

- Semi-Primitive, non-motorized dispersed recreation. Backcountry areas often provide outstanding dispersed recreation opportunities such as hunting, fishing, hiking, camping, picnicking, wildlife viewing, cross-country skiing, horseback riding, mountain bike riding, and canoeing. While they may have many wilderness-like attributes, unlike wilderness the use of mountain bikes and other means of mechanized non-motorized travel often are allowed. These areas also can take pressure off heavily used wilderness areas by providing solitude and quiet, and dispersed recreation opportunities. Backcountry areas offer some isolation from the sights and sounds of human activity and an environment with challenge and risk, necessitating some level of outdoor skill.
- Reference landscapes. Reference landscapes of relatively undisturbed areas serve as a barometer to measure the effects of development on other parts of the land. The body of knowledge about the effects of management activities over long periods of time and on large landscapes is very limited.
- Natural appearing landscapes with high scenic quality. High quality scenery, especially scenery with natural-appearing landscapes, is a primary reason that people choose to recreate. In addition, quality scenery contributes directly to real estate values in nearby communities and residential areas. A National Approach to Backcountry Conservation A national approach is needed to protect against cumulative, incremental loss of values and characteristics of backcountry areas. Backcountry areas contain traditional cultural properties and sacred sites. Traditional cultural properties are places, sites, structures, art, or objects that have played an important role in the cultural history of a group. Sacred sites are places that have special religious significance to a group. Traditional cultural properties and sacred sites may be eligible for protection under the National Historic Preservation Act. However, many of them have not yet been assessed, especially those that occur in more remote backcountry areas. Backcountry areas may offer other locally identified unique characteristics and values. Examples include uncommon geological formations, which are valued for their scientific and scenic qualities, or unique wetland complexes. Unique social, cultural, or historical characteristics also may depend on the backcountry character of the landscape. Examples include ceremonial sites, places for local events, areas prized for collection of forest products, or exceptional hunting and fishing opportunities. The Forest Service is responsible for balancing national interest with local needs. The local forest planning process does not always recognize the national significance of backcountry areas and the important national values they possess in our increasingly developed landscape. Left to a case-by-case decision-making process without effective guidance and constraints, management decisions could lead to an incremental loss of backcountry areas through new road construction, commercial timber harvest and mineral extraction, and irresponsible or unauthorized off-road vehicle use. Taken together, the cumulative national loss of backcountry area values and characteristics could be significant. On many National Forests and National Grasslands, backcountry area management has been a major point of conflict in land management planning, adding to what the Forest Service describes as “process gridlock.” This controversy continues unabated in connection with proposals to harvest timber, build roads, develop energy resources, or otherwise develop backcountry areas. The large number of appeals and lawsuits, and the extensive amount of congressional debate over the last 25 years,



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

demonstrate the need for national direction to protect backcountry areas and their values and characteristics. Backcountry areas are national resources that merit a national conservation management policy. Within that policy, it is equally important to provide for the consideration of local priorities and local input to decision making, as well as to recognize variability among backcountry areas and between regions of the country. Values of Backcountry Areas Important to American Citizens Secure Habitat for Native Big Game Species-- National forest backcountry areas provide large blocks of exceptional habitat for big-game animals such as mule deer, elk, moose, bear, bighorn sheep and mountain goats. While some roads are important for enabling access to these federal public lands, too many roads and associated motorized traffic are associated with increased big-game vulnerability and fewer mature bucks and bulls, often resulting in shorter hunting seasons and fewer available tags. Productive Waters for Trout, Steelhead and Salmon-- Backcountry areas offer intact waterways where trout, steelhead, and salmon – dependent on clean water, stable streamflows and consistent lake levels – can thrive. Backcountry areas also are strongholds for some of the last remaining native fish populations, providing unique opportunities for anglers to fish for native trout such as Westslope cutthroat, Rio Grande cutthroat, Bonneville cutthroat and redband rainbow. Motorized traffic on roads can increase sediment loads into waterways and decrease the quality of spawning habitat. Opportunities for Solitude in Primitive and Semi-Primitive Settings Backcountry areas offer non-motorized “primitive” and “semi-primitive” recreation opportunities where sportsmen can escape the noise and commotion of urbanized society. These areas are important not only to sportsmen who hunt and fish deep in the backcountry: high-quality hunting and fishing can be found by sportsmen who stay close to their vehicles, as many backcountry areas provide easy access via adjacent roads and trailheads. Contributors to Strong and Diverse Economies-- Fishing and hunting annually contribute more than \$190 billion to our nation’s economy. Conscientious backcountry management can maintain strong economic engines in rural communities and continue to supply stable jobs associated with hunting, fishing and other outdoor recreation. Businesses that provide services and products to sportsmen – everything from guide and outfitter services to sporting goods stores, motels, grocery stores and gas stations – are the lifeblood of many rural communities. These businesses depend on responsible backcountry management. Barriers Against the Spread of Noxious Weeds-- Invasive weeds such as spotted knapweed, yellow starthistle and cheatgrass choke out native forbs and bunchgrasses, altering water runoff and the historic frequency of wildfires – and can increase erosion and sediment loading into waterways while reducing the amount of food and available cover for wildlife. Backcountry areas are bastions for native flora, and these lands exhibit significantly fewer problems with invasive weeds compared to areas with roads. Conserving backcountry areas helps maintain native plant structures and high-quality fish and wildlife habitat and, indirectly, benefit sportsmen and hunting and fishing opportunities on federal public lands. Reference Landscapes-- Landscapes of relatively undisturbed areas, such as backcountry, serve as a barometer for scientists when measuring the effects of development on other areas. Many backcountry areas look much as they did when Lewis and Clark first crossed the Great Divide more than 200 years ago. The backcountry’s largely natural state provides baseline data to help land managers maintain and restore our federal public lands to maximize their benefit to fish and wildlife and the public. The Proposed Backcountry Area Conservation Program • Propose to the

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

U.S. Congress that they establish a national 'Backcountry Area Conservation Program' (Program) under which the Chief of the Forest Service would designate, protect and maintain up to 60-million acres of land within the National Forest System as Backcountry Conservation Areas. • When designating backcountry areas under the Program, the Chief of the Forest Service should consider giving priority to areas that—

- o are identified on an official 'backcountry area map' of the Forest Service;
- o contain at least 5,000 (five-thousand) contiguous acres of National Forest System land;
- o have no existing classified, temporary or unclassified roads;
- o protect healthy watersheds;
- o reduce damaging greenhouse gases;
- o protect fish and wildlife populations that are sensitive to human disturbances;
- o protect biological strongholds and refugia for imperiled fish, wildlife and plants; and
- o conserve native biodiversity; and protect crucial wildlife corridors.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Limited access to federal public land often has frustrated and disappointed hunters, anglers, and other naturalists and undermined the relationship between land owners and the general public. Some landowners are reluctant to provide access across their land to isolated parcels of federal public land through agreements with the federal government because those agreements invariably require perpetual access. State and tribal governments frequently secure access on or across private land through short-term agreements, contracts, leases or easements, and are not required in all cases to secure only perpetual access arrangements with private landowners. The Recreational Trails Program provides funds to the states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized recreational trail uses. The authorized funding level for the program for FY 2009 under SAFETEA-LU is \$85 million. Establish a voluntary federal public-land-access (Open Trails) program under which States and tribal governments may apply for federal grants to encourage owners and operators of privately-held land to voluntarily make a portion of that land available for access by the public to federal public lands for non-commercial wildlife-dependent recreation that shall include but is not limited to non-commercial hunting and or fishing, under programs administered by the States and tribal governments. Current law provides funding for the development and maintenance of trails that are used by anglers, hunters, wildlife viewers, and hikers annually. However, millions of acres of Federal public land remain either inaccessible or severely limited in public access opportunities. I believe the Recreational Trails Program should be strengthened by opening trails to sportsmen to address these needs in the following ways: Open Trails • Establish a voluntary Federal “Open Trails Access Program” under which states, tribal governments, and conservation organizations may apply for grants to encourage owners and operators of privately-held land to voluntarily open trails for access by the public to Federal public lands that is either inaccessible or severely limited in public access opportunities for non-commercial wildlife-dependent recreation that includes hunting and or fishing under programs administered by a Federal agency, state, tribal government, or conservation organization. • The Recreation Trails Program (within the Federal Surface Transportation Bill, SAFETEA-LU) in general, and the “Open Trails Access Program” more specifically, should allow states, tribal governments, and conservation organizations to enter into property leases to open trails to enhance non-commercial public access to isolated parcels of Federal public lands. • I propose that the Federal agency responsible for administering the “Open Trails Access Program”, should give priority to those applications that propose to: o maximize participation by offering a program the terms of which are likely to meet with widespread acceptance among private landowners; o ensure that private land enrolled under the Federal, state, tribal government, or conservation organization program provides open trails access to Federal public land that supports fish and/or wildlife populations and that provides or can be made to provide regulated, non-commercial hunting and fishing opportunities to the public; o ensure that any access secured across private land (road, trail, etc.) through the program is maintained at a standard necessary to protect adjacent private and public property and public safety; o strengthen wildlife and fish habitat improvement efforts on Federal public land accessed by the program; and o use additional Federal, state, tribal government, or private resources in carrying out the program. • The Transportation Bill should establish that the use of funding through the existing Recreation Trails Program generally, and the “Open Trails Access Program” more specifically, will allow Federal agencies, states, tribal governments, and

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

conservation organizations to enter into property leases to enhance non-commercial public access through open trails to isolated parcels of Federal public lands as a permissible use of funding. • I believe \$110 million should be dedicated annually to the Recreational Trails Program of which a minimum of \$20 million will be allocated to the "Open Trails Access Program" in order to begin implementing the program with Federal, state, tribal, conservation organizations, and landowner partners.

Seeing the Milky Way should be part of the experience in all of the Federal Class 1 Areas in our National Parks. There is no benefit to anyone to throw artificial light into the sky in National Parks. It not only pollutes, but also represents wasted electrical energy. Compared to the many difficult environmental problems involving air, water and habitat, this one is simple and easy to solve: (1) Light only where and when light is essential (2) Follow good lighting practices involving shielding and operating hours (3) Use efficient light sources of appropriate output. A light switch is a powerful tool in this effort. As an IDA member and lighting designer, I am happy to support Robert Wagner's Best Practices Proposal.

The proposed Open Trails Access Program would provide access to federal public land that has no public access. Most of the time these public lands are surrounded by private land on all sides and the public can get to them only if the private landowner allows access. This situation gives the private landowner exclusive access to our federal lands, and if that landowner is willing to provide some sort of access that is negotiated with the states or some other entity so that the citizens have some access to their land, then that is good for all of us.

everyone in the country has a given right to share the government occupied land. there should be designated areas for all. for those who do not do any type of off roading with a motorized vehicle should try it. each has a personal fun purpose. I have done all. i believe there are less OHV areas than any other group. Here in V.A. we have farmers willing to lease areas of land for riding so kids do not ride through there crops. unfortunately locals do not want it. the same people who never set foot on a off road vehicle let alone even cut there grass. The off road vehicle population brings in millions of dollars and builds up the working population. Hatfield Mccoy trail system is a great example. brings in tax money and keeps local communities working by creating new jobs. not for nothing but hikers and bicyclists do not bring in the revinue that the motorized ones do. im all for helping out the mom and pop shops ready to go out, and build up the acconomy in struggling towns that could offer great off roading.

Get the kids out of doors! Feel the earth & see the sky!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I like your idea. The problem is that the National Forest Service has shown it's propensity to close the areas in which you refer. Just last year (or was it two years ago now?) the Eldorado National Forest closed over 1,000 miles of roads and trails that were built to service the loggers and were still used by OHV'ers and others. Why? Many of the other National Forests are closing whole tracts of roads and trails that are still in use under their new "travel management plan." The real name should be the "travel prevention plan", since as far as I can tell, that is what they're planning and implementing. I went to a couple of the "travel management plan" town hall meetings. 99% of the people present were from the OHV crowd. That either means the other "interest groups" weren't interested or they didn't care as far as I'm concerned. Many good ideas were proposed, including volunteer trail maintenance programs run by the OHV clubs, FREE grading services by persons who owned and operated graders in the area and a whole slew of other useful suggestions. Pretty much it was a room full of people who were willing to do what it takes to keep the existing roads and trails open. Everything said in those rooms was completely ignored by the Forest Service Administration when the final plan came out. 1 for 1 will work. It will force those who want to close recreational sites forever to choose wisely as they will also be forced to give up like tracts of land elsewhere forever.

Hi Rebecca, Back with the same argument you've posted in many of these threads now? You have yet to provide any interesting or meaningful comments besides the same few "my way or the hi-way" spatterings of hatred toward OHV users. 1 for 1 would balance the extreme restriction of motorized vehicles from wilderness areas (many which are designated in places that OHVs are already present) by giving them someplace to go when they are shut out of the areas they are already using. This benefits you, Rebecca, in a few ways: 1. You get to continue to designate wilderness in areas that are deemed worthwhile to protect. 2. By giving the OHV user a place to go, you relieve the pressure placed on other unapproved areas to ride, as well as in the wilderness recently closed to said OHV user. 3. You can go to the wilderness, and the OHV rider can go to the OHV area. Everybody is happy.

I organized and was the first president of the Cradel of Texas Chapter (Brazoria County). We began our first class of 20 students on September 12, 2001 the day after the attack on the World Trade Center. We decided to not let the terrorists stop our class. The COT Chapter has grown and is one of the most active providing education to children and the public about the value of the Texas Wetlands. I recently moved to the Hill Country where I joined the local chapter here. Again I saw how people want to learn through excellent trainers about nature so they can go out into the public to share their knowledge. I recently received my 5000 hour TMN volunteer pin and a Presidentail Citation for volunteering. I currently serve as a member of the State Committee and have had the pleasure to see so many new chapters join and watch the older one still growing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Rebecca, I have ridden my dual-sport motorcycle from Oregon to Alaska without straying from the road or trail. I have also ridden it from California to Utah, again staying on roads and trail. I have ridden many more thousands of miles in the National Forests in the west, all shared by bicyclists, hikers, equestrian, and cattle ranchers. I assure you, the desire to cut new trails is not there. There are plenty of roads and trails already existing, to satisfy the riding population. The problem arises when each individual Forest Supervisor reads the new rules differently, and close a thousand miles of roads in their jurisdiction- roads that were used regularly until the day of the closure- in the name of, well, they never really tell you exactly why. They just close them. Now all those people who used that part of the forest are forced into an ever smaller area, creating congestion, noise pollution, and a lack of diversified trails. The OHV crowd isn't looking to make the forest an OHV Park (what you refer to as biker parks), they just want to be able to access the roads already in place, built by or with the permission of the Forest Service and BLM, and in some cases the NPS. And yes, just like there is wilderness where all things motorized are off limits, there should be designated areas where OHV's can do their thing as well.

This really is a no-brainer. Preserved historic sites and battlefields not only provide a history lesson for everyone (something sadly lacking, especially in our schools these days) but also open spaces which provide healthful recreation, wildlife habitat, help the environment and may continue to be beneficial in terms of agricultural use and resources (food crops, livestock pasturage, etc.). There are plenty of places to build our malls, homes and so forth but once a historic site is plowed under, it's gone forever. Support the CWPT and its efforts to preserve our mutual American heritage. It is absolutely one of the best and most effective non-profit organizations in the country. Been a member since the days of the APCWS.

" .....everyone knows motorized vehicles are incredibly destructive on the land...." Patently untrue. Yes there are irresponsible people in the OHV ranks. However the majority of us love the outdoors, the scenic beauty, and have great respect for these places. OHV's allow us to cover much more ground, and see places that are very difficult to get to by any other means. "damage" caused by OHV's is highly exaggerated. Try to find an OHV trail that was closed 3 or more years ago. You can't, they are overtaken by nature, like it never existed. Where is the damage? How do you define it? What was harmed? Are there not much more serious environmental issues to fight?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"I think the biggest problem with OHV's is their ability to quickly destroy things when the people at the controls are not aware of problems they are creating." "Damage" caused by OHV is highly exaggerated. One only need to look at old OHV trails that have been closed. After a year or two has passed, those trails are overtaken by nature and essentially disappear. So how do you define damage? Roads cut by bulldozer create far more "damage", yet there are no complaints about them. I enjoy hiking as well as OHV'ing, and like other have said there are millions of acres, and thousands of miles of trail where Mt. bikes and OHV's are off limits. In fact I'd guess that 98% of all public lands allow hiking, and ban OHV's. Please hike in those areas, that's what I do. Leave the 2% to us, if you feel generous give us say 5%, and keep 95% to yourselves. What we need are areas that are designated as Mt. bike ONLY, and OHV only. There is plenty of room for everyone. OHV'ers are willing to allow trails that we have built to be used by everyone. People on the other side of the issue are much less generous.

Fracking with salt water is purported as "common". However, others are using "proprietary" chemicals they will not disclose because they are "trade secrets". Seems a bit too convenient to me. Place unconditional priorities on gas supplies over fresh water supplies is STUPID and very poor long term thinking. Regulating the producers and full disclosure is a necessary FIRST step. Using WATER instead of chemicals for the extraction process would be far less toxic BUT still cause lateral movements of gas and affect peoples well water. The US fixed acid rain in the '70's, we can fix this too.

Stop FRACKING for Natural Gas.

Instead of picking on OHV's and their high maintenance trails, why don't we work together to try and get more multi use parks. Any trail that removes vegetation from the ground will cause erosion. I was a high adventure director at a summer camp on the East Spanish Peak in Colorado. The trails there are foot traffic only and we were constantly fighting a battle to maintain them because of running water. The problem with OHV trails is they generally get over used, under maintained, and the users are uneducated about how they ride or drive on public lands. If more trails were opened there could be a system of revolving trails, one closed one opened, to ease the strain per trail. If we required so many hours of volunteer work for your use of a public trail, all trails not just OHV's, people would see how much work goes into keeping any trail open plus under maintained trails would finally be worked on. We also need to inform people on how to use public trails. If it's super muddy, don't use it! There are places that you can go play in the mud, public trails should not be one of them. Also there is a time and a place for racing, it's on a race track, smooth riding (including mountain bikes) or driving without wheel spin or locking the brakes will cause much less trail wear and tear.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wildlife Corridors are essential to populations of wildlife that have been inbreeding for the last half century. As a OHV user I don't like the idea of more land closing off, but I do see the need for multi national wildlife corridors from South America all the way to Canada to help bring in new genes to previously closed off wildlife populations. I would propose instead of wilderness areas in between them that we open more multi use parks with some area inside them to be designated as a wildlife area so they can freely move between the corridors.

Why not learn how to walk or bike? Considering how fat US citizens are, solve two problems at once. Loose weight and preserve our natural resources.

How can you not support this. This is a major part of the story of our nation, yet we have people and companies that would like to build casinos and other disgusting development ideas on some of our most hallowed ground. As congested as much of Europe is they do hold some things sacred and you will find large tracts of the D-Day beaches untouched, Battle of Somme still filled with untouched trenches and nearly 95 % of the Waterloo battlefield left as it was on the last day of that world changing battle. We as a nation have far more land that isn't hallowed ground that can be developed, yet we still look at this "prime real estate" and our politicians buckle to those that finance their campaigns and allow things such as the proposed casino in Gettysburg to happen.

Public land means all Americans should have access and share the trails no matter the mode of transportation you choose.

The proposed casino will be built on the battleground ! The site of the casino is on privately held battlefield land that is known as the Cavalry Fields. This is the location of one of the largest cavalry engagements of the war. General George Custer and General Jeb Stuart clashed here on July 3rd, 1863. General Custer's actions that day helped seal the victory for the Union forces at Gettysburg. This is Hallowed ground where far to many of our Northern and Southern sons paid the last full measure for their cause. Sure this casino will bring in jobs...low paying jobs. It will also bring in crime and everything else that comes with the seedy side of the gaming business. This battlefield and the area surrounding it is the site of one of the most important events in the history of this country and casino has no business scaring that memory. The people proposing this endeavor are trying to profit off the history of this site, yet they could give 2 cents for the history of the site. DISGUSTING, SAD and HEARTBREAKING.

Why is it the only groups Ive ever seen doing trail mntc is the OHV community, oh ya and by the way we are also the only group that PAYS to use the trails. So we pay for the privilage of using the public land and it is slowly being taken away from us, how about the greenies and tree huggers pay for the use of the wilderness area and see if it gets taken away, then you can wine about needing more wilderness area. No more wilderness area.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Now you need to come down from 15,000 ft and take a close look on the ground, and see how well it is taken care of, producing for both man and beast. The term public lands is used loosely. These ranchers have private grazing allotments on these lands. I believe you can go back to the Taylor grazing act, where these private allotments were allotted. These allotments are attached to the ranchers private deeded property. The ranchers need to and do take care of the land to sustain a living for now and for future generations. Before you come down, take look of LA, Chicago, NY, DC and other cities, where you will see nothing but buildings and pavement, totally absent of wild habitat.

Be careful restricting outdoor activities that American families enjoy. When it's too far away, then kids will prefer sticking their faces into a phone-screen. For the future of the USA, we need kids to be active, know about outdoors, and enjoy the outdoors. The forest can survive hunting and fishing, biking and hiking, OHVs , campers and horses. Closing lands to the public will cause much larger problems for the next generation, because when the parents are shut out, a whole generation of kids won't know anything about the outdoors.

Can't see any real advantage to anything with wild buffalo. Where have buffalo improved anything? There is no natural predator of buffalo. What is going to stop the spread of disease or of the animals themselves. When they wander in unwanted areas such as urban development, how will they be removed?

Connecting kids to the outdoors and wildlife is critical to get them interested in the outdoors, especially those in metropolitan areas where suburban development makes "traditional" outdoor experiences more distant. Schools are part of the solution, but funding will never be sufficient. In many cities zoos, aquariums, botanic gardens, nature centers and others specialize in making such connections and also conduct informal and experiential education programs. Many of these programs are in partnership with local school systems and are focused on students and teachers in underserved communities. Funding for existing programs supporting such activities should be increased and federal agencies should seek to partner with zoos, aquariums and other informal education providers.

I am all for education, but it depends on the source and it needs to be all encompassing. So many of these educational programs are politically driven, it is agenda driven. It sounds good on the surface, the devil is in the details. I think a good environmental program should start and look at what these kids are doing now and how they are affecting their environment. Every time they turn on their computer, video game, tv, and buying all these things, they are supporting the destruction of land. These companies use tremendous amounts of energy and these factories and stores are built on land that was once occupied by wildlife. These education agendas fail to mention all of this. They just talk about saving land far far away from where they live. The wilderness was once right under their feet. Each new house, each new shopping mall, each new car dealership destroys the land. Not only that but it reduces the nations capabilities to provide the food and fibre they need to live on.

I have never seen a foot trail converted to OHV use. I have seen thousands of miles of OHV trails closed to OHV use and limited to foot traffic only.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think this is a much better idea than wasting funds trying to save lands that don't need saved hundreds of miles from the populations and development. People need to have land preserved close to where they live so they can enjoy them on a daily basis if they wish. This would also help control urban sprawl. Good idea

In the last 25 years over 23 millions acres of agriculture land have been lost to development. Over 13 million acres were of prime agriculture land. As more acres are lost to development, agriculture producers are asked to produce more and more for an ever growing population. At the same time budgets are continually being cut at land grant universities across the nation. The agriculture departments face budget cuts much deeper than other non-agriculture departments. Serious education and research is needed for agriculture and the general public on this issue. Where will the food and fibre for the nation come from if this trend continues? By far, today's education on agriculture is formed by anti-agricultural environmental groups, in return, agriculture research budgets are cut. Whether the removal of agriculture by development or by "Land preservation" efforts, food production is taking a turn in a direction nobody wants. Food may someday be more valuable than oil. Agriculture and nature does and can co-exist.

Incentives are not needed to grow organic foods, if the market is there for organic foods the farmers will grow it. If there is not much demand, farmers will not grow it. Don't put up false markets. The comment that farmers are bullied by large corporations is just not true especially in the case of Monsanto. I can't say I have ever used a Monsanto product. I have never felt pressure from them. I do know that they have some tough regulations in the use of the products. If you misuse the products, they will come after you. The farmers that didn't not follow the regulations are the ones calling foul on Monsanto. I believe they are the ones trying to make Monsanto look bad because they did not follow regulations. Which they agreed to when they bought. It was by choice not forced upon them. The comment that meat consumption is bad is a total scarce tactic. There is a lot of research into the benefits of meat. It is NOT a leading cause of diabetes, heart disease and cancer. Unfounded ideas and comments like this one, leads to more regulation and more problems. Nobody cares more for the environment then those in agriculture, a minority of the population. That's what the vast majority fails to recognize.

It is very nice there. All thanks to the agriculture producers who have cared for the land. It doesn't need any special preservation. Just wait until hundreds of thousands of buffalo make their way down to the river. That's when it will need preserving. I was just south of there in Billings, MT recently and I was amazed how people have destroyed the Yellowstone valley there. The new Cabella store and Sam's club and continued expansion of residential areas have destroyed hundreds of acres. Not to mention the airport that you probably flew in on. Not long ago I was in Charolette, NC it was quite disturbing there also. The list can go on and on. Why are you concerned about preserving it to the way it was just 200 years ago. Why not preserve it back to the way it was 10,000 yrs ago or even further back?



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

it seems to me that the vast majority of opposition to ohv by environmentalist groups is generated by irresponsible ohv recreation. while there are 'good' and 'bad' operators of all ohv types, the most entry-level freindly types of ohv attract the inexperienced, immature, irresponsible people. atvs, (quads, 4 wheelers) are not well suited to a challenging, low-impact, narrow trail system, and therefore their use becomes doing donuts in the mud, or making wide bypass trails around obstacles. 4x4 trucks are the same, only accessible to a far greater number of people who do not have any interest in preserving what little ohv access is still available. in the ohv world, many dirt bike riders are seen as being 'elitist' and this is why. we dirtbikers are environmental enthusiasts and dispise being grouped with those who do the damage that offends everyone but the offenders. single track motorcycle trials cause very little disturbance to the environment, and can co-exist with animal, hiking, bicycle, equestrian and other trails without the negative effects of other ohv types. please consider setting aside sepeate areas for different types of ohv use and allow the results to speak for themselves.

I think \_\_\_'s statement is accurate and well thought out. If the Spotted Owl Scam had not been perpetrated upon the private industry and residents of the west we would not have the need for this conversation. How is \_\_\_'s statement going to "...destroy what little (nature) is left"? I believe your environmental fascism is showing!

Much of the public, their jobs and their investments are the one destroying the land with constant development. Yet they fail to do anything about it. They are only focused on saving public land. Much of which is already saved and since its public it can't be destroyed. Look at what you have and what you continue to support with your purchases and investments. You are your own worst enemy. You state 6,000 acres are lost per day. Do something about it. If you are serious about this loss, you would ask for an wilderness area perimeter around every city in the United States. But don't stop there, check you investments and see what you are destroying overseas by investing in those companies.

One cannot forget these hypocrites like the Wal-Marts, the Board of Directors of Wildlife Funds, and even donors whose own businesses and investments destroy land with development, but then they think it is OK as long as they "save" land that is already preserved. If they are really want to preserve land they would change how they develop themselves. If they develop commercial property, then they should save another like kind commerical property.

Please clarify your idea, with the title "Funding Public conservation." What would you actually fund with the collection of these fees? If it is used to buy privately owned undeveloped land, then I would oppose. But I may support this if it was used to revert "like kind" property back to undeveloped land. Example: if new development is planned commerical property, then funding should be used to take some other commerical property and put it back to its natural state. It would also need to be nearby, not in some other state.

Poor idea. Why would wildlife need to be regrown? Why would plants need to be replanted? The wildlife is flourishing right now. The plants are in very good condition and well taken care of now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Some of the "monsanato" thing has been blown out of porportion. A person need to go back and do more research to find out what put us in this situation. Much leads us right back to much pressure by envirnomental groups forcing new government regulations on agriculture, such as tillage as bad and led to more erosion. This forced the use of more chemicals. At the same time govermental spending cuts for agriculture research such as that of Montana State University, a land grant university. When the funding is cut to these land grant universities, who does agriculture turn to? Private companies such as Monsanto. Funding to Montana State Agriculture is always subjected to large budget cuts while other departments see an increase. Agriculture people care about the land and are much better at it then the governement will every be.

Sounds good on the surface, but I believe you would mostly encourage hyprocrites to donate. In some situations you would just create playgrounds for the rich. It is amazing how many people invest in companies, including their 401K, that are constanly expanding and developing on undeveloped land. If only these land trusts and the nature conservancy types would protected the land from commerical development and all that pavement and concrete. Instead they try to save land nowhere near where they make their money. They invest and work in development, but then forgive themselves by saving land that they can't make money on.

The University of California has long had an extensive Natural Reserve System, thousands of acres in areas of critical habitat. These reserves are used for college education, research, and recreation. The Federal Government should encourage all colleges and universities to do the same, perhaps by making the existence of such reserves a positive factor in allocation environmental and educational grants from the NSF, EPA, etc..

This "idea" should have been a comment under another heading instead of an outright new idea suggestion

This will severely impact my property owner rights and my family's way of life. I strongly suggest that Secretary Salazar, himself, answer the numerous requests for a meeting with the local government entities of Siskiyou County. They need to meet Government to Government... NO Eco/Enviro/special intrest group spin... just the raw facts and findings!

Those who are disrupted by the actions of other users fall into these two categories: 1) this person must not really be enjoying the outdoors if their enjoyment is so close to the edge that sharing pushes it over the edge 2) this person values solitude but chose an area that was too crowded on that day. With millions and millions of acres of public lands already set aside for solitude, it seems like a poor choice of location was made (self-blame would be more appropriate).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Urban development is one of the largest causes for the loss of wildlife habitat. Whether it is residential or commercial, the land is lost forever to wildlife. It is not only a loss to wildlife, but to agriculture. Agriculture and wildlife can co-exist, but neither can co-exist with development. Lets use Wal-mart as an example, even though there are many similiar large corporations, they have destroyed hundreds of thousands of acres of nature. Not only do they have sprawling stores, but huge parking lots and extended streets and highways to get there. Walmart has a program called "Acres for America" where they preserve an acre for each acre that they destroy. What a cover up! If they are serious about wanting to preserve an acre, then they would quit building on undeveloped land. They are not adding one single acre to the world by preserving another acre. They destroy land, period! Development needs to find ways to either build upward, remodel existing buildings, or use abandoned areas of inner city as an example. The public has forgotten as they are shopping, that where they stand, deer once roamed, wolves and coyotes hunted and birds nested. Several hundred stores were built over productive fields of grain and a lettuce field. But now, Mary Howard, Edwin Smith, William "Bill" Conely, and so many others over seas have gone hungry because of the loss of this agriculture production. Now travel outside the city for several miles you will see fields where grain is growing deer are grazing, birds are flying and nesting. The pastures are healthy, deer, fox and coyotes are out in the same pasture as the cattle. But several years from now it will probably be a Wal-mart store and all paved over.

What a hyprocrisy. What are you balancing when you have a Prius and a SUV? If you are serious about pollution, make sure you are disconnected from the electrical grid completely. Then take a good look at everything you have, your job and your investments (check them all now) and make sure you not supporting pollution and development on undeveloped land. Now tell me more about your plan, how are you conserving land?

What is your plan? Please be more specific

Wilderness areas are closed to all but foot traffic. 99.99% of designated wilderness is never used by anyone. Massive amounts of public land have already been designated as wilderness and essentially closed to the majority of the public.

Yes, ranchers have a right to use their "private" grazing allotments on public land. It is just a win win situation. They take care of the land, and provide for wildlife on their own deeded land in which their allotments are attached. If you start removing agriculture from the land you will be paying more for that steak.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I love and enjoy the outdoors but the extreme environmentist have shown their true colors over the last 15 years. I've seen land in CA that many many OHV users have used for almost 40 years go away at the blink of an eye due to bias studies such as the bighorn sheep endangered species designation. In no way does a OHV effect the habitat or migration of the big horn sheep yet vast swaths of land have been denied to the casual OHV user for reasons that are unscientific and political. The sheep live in areas that are no where near the trails at the bottom of the mtn ranges yet this is the excuse that is used to deny the public access and enjoyment. This eco-facist policy has got to end and the silent majority of the OHV communities are fed up by this disregard to public OHV recreational access. Stop with all the wilderness designations already it's out of control and unscientific. What is truly endangered is the OHV family! We will fight for our public access just as hard as our grandfathers fought your freedom 65 yrs ago.

OHV trails are anywhere from 6 inches for motorcycles and 6ft for jeeps ect. Comparing this vs oil and gas drilling just shows your lack of education on the subject. OHV trails are not high intensity like mining or logging so stop with your anti-access propaganda. I've seen most OHV trails look the same after 10 yrs worth of use. In fact some of the small single-track motorcycle and mtn bike trails I've been on are in far better shape then your average hiking or horse trail. The impact is no different even after heavy rains. It's usually the OHV clubs that go out there and volunteer to clean up the trails after large storms too. We all need to respect each other's way of enjoying the outdoors especially the wildlife/hiker only crowd.

The vast majority of visitations on CA BLM & FS land are people using multi-use trails. Wilderness designations do nothing but shove more people in smaller spaces (which adds to overuse) so that a small minority can claim victory for wildlife and hikers. What is truly endangered is the american family being able to enjoy the outdoors as they see fit. Too much wilderness has already been appropriated and the focus now need to be on public access and multi-use route EDUCATION.

There has been way too much designation of wilderness and ACEC areas w/o any sort of scientific studies to back up these claims. People who use OHV for outdoor recreation should be granted the same respect and understanding as someone who uses other designated areas for hiking and horseback riding. Stop with the banning of OHV use in designated wilderness areas, just set aside areas that can be accessed for multi-use trails such as mtn biking and dirt biking. As long as the trails are maintained (plenty of volunteers for this) then everyone can enjoy the wilderness as they see fit but turning these areas into non-motorized areas shuts out a large population that contributes to the local economy and enjoyment of the outdoors. Keep public lands open to multi-use.

We should have a new designation of "national protection areas" instead of the the anti-access activists "wilderness designation? Clearly they are more interested in denying recreational opportunities to people than they are in protection. Since Wilderness allows them to permanently close existing designated multiple-use trails, that's the only tool in their toolbox. Kudos to multiple-use advocates like Blue Ribbon Coalition that are willing to be a more flexible and inclusive to many forms of outdoor recreation and public lands access.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to save the Battlefields before they are gone. A Pizza Hut where Gen. Cleburne was killed at Franklin was horrid when I saw it (and I'm from Illinois). There are so many sites that are disappearing before our eyes to the Wal-Mart's and the useless trashy strip malls with places like "Nail Envy". These men died for their ideals. To desecrate the land that they sacrificed their lives for makes me want to scream! How can we allow this to happen. In Europe they preserve their past, what about us? We need a priority now, not 25 years from now. President Teddy Roosevelt had the guts vision to save the west for future generations! Which President will have the guts and vision to save our Civil War history? As we approach the 150 events put people back to work in America saving and preserving the battlefields, not create more road projects under ARRA.

Western Kansas would be a perfect location for a Great Plains National Park. It has been stated that less than 4% of the prairies, tallgrass, mixed grasses and short grasses is left. Due to the federal government owning less than 1.2% of Kansas, we receive very little help for land development compared to states such as Nevada where the government owns 84% of the state. Kansas is known for its prairie and historic image and it would be a shame not to protect and preserve it for future generations. Presently the endangered ecosystem of the prairie could be sustained with bison, plant and wildlife. This could be a wonderful way to pay respect and remember how the pioneers, early settlers, farmers and ranchers lived and paved a way for us.

The Pebble Gold Mine is proposed for Bristol Bay, Alaska. It would be the world's largest gold and copper mine in the world. It would destroy the world's largest and most productive salmon fishing grounds in the world and forever pollute all the surrounding fresh lakes. The massive open-pit, hard-rock mine known as the Pebble Project calls for the creation of 10 square miles of "lakes" to contain an estimated 2 billion to 3 billion tons of contaminated mine waste at the head of salmon spawning streams. Opponents warn that a single earthquake in this seismically active region could release a poisonous stew that would take generations to clean up. "It's a region with huge, off-the-charts biological value," says Tim Bristol, Trout Unlimited's Alaska program director, noting that nearby Katmai National Park has the world's highest concentration of brown bears. Audubon Alaska has identified four large Important Bird Areas at the head of the bay that are major migratory waterfowl flyways for the Steller's eider and other federally threatened species. Plus, the watershed accounts for a third of all salmon caught in Alaska; its sport and commercial fisheries together earn about \$350 million a year.

There are vast amounts of country in the western US that are difficult to get to, even by motorcycles with long range off road capability. Turning these types of areas into wilderness will virtually assure that they are never visited, by anyone. To consider unmotorized travel 100 miles deep into the desert is tantamount to suicide for all but a very small percentage of highly skilled adventurers. So, except for those few, these areas will become lost. I've been to these areas (on motorcycle), and the few on foot or on bicycle are often traveling with support vehicles (motorized). So, this declaration as wilderness becomes some sort of "non-use" policy. Yes, the land will be preserved, but, what is the value if it isn't used. If the land needs to be protected from development, mining, whatever, is wilderness, basically shutting down an area really the best solution?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Go Lisa! The same overgrazing that destroyed the grasslands and ecosystems of the Arizona Strip and probably dried up its climate continues unabated. The BLM does not attempt to prevent it. The ranchers who profess to "love the land" take no responsibility for what they and their ancestors have done and continue to do. Multiple Use: There are some places, mostly existing unpaved roads, where motorized off highway vehicles can be driven without destroying an ecosystem and ruining the outdoor experience for everyone who does not fully appreciate the music of roaring engines. Unfortunately, the "daredevil, go anywhere, churn up everything, never follow an established route" attitude seems to be prevalent. Turning this set of dimwits loose to tear up any public land they please is simply wrong. Multiple use makes absolutely no sense if it means mixing motorized with non-motorized traffic. The noise levels and velocities involved are completely incompatible. Waid

This is one of those trick questions touching on strongly felt political differences. We need to stay out of the political quagmire. What I think people agree on is more open space everywhere. Who owns, manages and maintains depends on more than your political perspective and the parks visitors. Many parks are truly international gems typically visited by more outsiders than locals, e.g. Grand Canyon or Yellowstone. All levels of government have problems supporting the purchase and management. We need to work on stable funding at all levels.

"In southwest Montana, one of the greatest wilderness areas in the world near Yellowstone Park has seen a dramatic increase in ATV and motorized access." Surely you have some FACTS to back up this assertion? The FACT that you believe your income depends on keeping responsible OHV users from enjoying their right to enjoy the outdoors as you do would not have anything to do with your rant, would it? If it is designated wilderness, there are no OHVs being used. If the area is being managed as wilderness, I would highly doubt OHVs are a huge problem. Your definition of wilderness obviously includes legal roads and trails on public land. "Fact is, as more motorized pollutants like ATV's enter our wilderness areas wildlife is displaced, gone, perhaps forever." Again, your logic is not supported by the facts. Wildlife such as elk and deer will avoid certain roads and trails with traffic at certain times of day. If you care to hike off said roads, I think you will find your game. As a Montana hunter who does not care to use an OHV during hunting season, I find your stereotypes of OHV use silly and elitist.

"Why would I want to go for a hike and hear nothing but revving engines?" Good question, as there are MILLIONS upon MILLIONS of acres of public land where ohvs are prohibited. I would suggest finding these areas for quiet time.

Even if we did not add another acre of wilderness, Americans that enjoy motorized travel on public lands will see a decrease in their recreational opportunities. There is a concerted effort by public lands managers to deny access. This trend needs to be reversed. Many people who live in large urban areas in the East do not even have a clue as to the vast amount of land ALREADY in wilderness designation in the West. If you seek relief from urban pressures, I suggest you contact your local officials to try to get your own wilderness near you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe the good people of Utah should have a voice in what you are proposing, as in a state vote. If decided locally and not by the stroke of a pen by some Washington politician, then so be it. Chances of this area becoming a national monument or park are remote given this scenario.

Local governments are even more corrupt than and self-interested than the Federal govt. It's federal land, it belongs to all of us. Ride your dirtbike in your own driveway.

Motorized users should not have to travel hundreds of miles to experience our great outdoors. the current trend of closing access to motorized users concentrates many more people on constantly fewer acres causing greater conflict. Widespread dispersed use is more desirable. There are multitudes of quiet spots for hikers, etc already-don't get greedy.

OHV USE IS NOISY, DISTURBING TO WILDLIFE AND OTHER USERS, DAMAGING TO TRAILS INCLUDING EROSION, CAUSES AIR POLLUTION AND IS A WASTE OF GASOLINE !! OHV USERS NEED TO GROW UP FROM THEIR NOISY OBNOXIOUS TOYS. IT'S NOT ALL ABOUT YOU AND YOUR TOYS, ITS ABOUT STOPPING TO ENJOY, LOOK AND LISTEN TO THE WILDLANDS AROUND YOU. AFTER ALL...ISNT THAT WHAT'S UNIQUE AND BEAUTIFUL ABOUT OUR WILDLANDS. WHAT WOULD YOU RATHER LOOK AT, A BEAUTIFUL UNDISTURBED DESERT ESCARPMENT OR A PIRATED DIRTBIKE TRAIL THAT LOOKS LIKE A SCAR, CAUSED BY AN IGNORANT IRRESPONSIBLE SELFISH DIRTBAG. THIS IS MY SINCERE INFORMED ACCURATE OPINION. THANKS. WALT

To include Arches NP? Can ohv's erode rock?

I feel that trails should be single use only, thereby doing away with the accidents and such caused by having horses spooked on bike trails, hikers getting scared on ATV trails, etc.. That way, were a trail to be destroyed or an ecosystem damaged, one would know which group of users to blame for the damages and the extents to go to to prevent an occurrence in the future. Also, trail building should be done by groups of that recreation usage. For example, mountain biking trails should be built by active cycling groups such as SORBA or avid bikers only, and for different levels of experience, or at least not by someone that has no desire to bike or knows what kinds of things bikers like. The governing agency, be it NPS or just a state park would then only have to fund these groups and provide the technical and environmental impact support when planning out where these trails would go.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

More and more, children's learning comes from more of what school and media teaches them than from what they are taught by their parents. Many parents work multiple jobs trying to provide for families and plan for their kids' education and their own retirement. Therefore, our concentration needs to be on providing enough education about the environment and what makes our outdoors so "great" all around the country. A lot of kids nowadays have been conditioned to be afraid of the outdoors because parents and educators have never really taken the time to connect them to it, effectively barricading them from it by means of video games, TV, etc. If organizations, colleges of agriculture, forestry, the media, etc., would take the time to reach out to kids, and in return the school systems would work closely together with these groups, kids could take what they learn back to their households and encourage their parents to do things to help out such as donating to outdoor organizations their time and money in helping maintain the world around us.

The Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service faces a trail maintenance backlog that reaches into the tens of millions of dollars. Trail crews have been winnowed down to the bare bones and even further in many cases. Volunteers have stepped up to meet that need, but there are limitations to the scope of work that volunteers can do. Washington Trails Association generates nearly 100,000 hours of volunteer trail maintenance in Washington state each year, but we can't do that work when we lose experienced, talented and dedicated Forest Service staff to retirement regularly. As an agency, the Forest Service is aging, and due to anemic federal appropriations, many retirees aren't being replaced, or are being replaced by people with significantly less experience. If there's no one in the office with whom to coordinate, we have a much harder time leveraging those scant public funds. Federal appropriators must commit to making money available to hire Trails Specialists, Trails and Wilderness Coordinators and other District and Region staff, and USFS must groom people to take over those positions. We, and everyone else who loves our public lands, depends on the expertise, commitment and institutional memory of these people.

1 for 1 sounds good. we have lost so much opportunity, land. public lands are just that.

I am opposed to the government being in the land buying business. With that being said, it is still the lesser of two evils as man will never side with conservation when it comes to the almighty dollar. If public money is going to be used for purchasing properties, they should be managed for public uses. Buying up land and locking the public out of it is what has given environmentalism a bad name. Thankfully, we can still have conservation without fanatical environmentalism.  
Wayne Jenkins, FL.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am someone who has spent his career in business--mostly accounting and finance. During the last 15 years I developed an interest in American history. I am increasingly concerned that many Americans do not know much about this history of this country. This ignorance covers all class, race, and income levels. How can we appreciate America, and its freedoms, without an appreciation of how this country evolved. Outside of independence, the Civil War was the most defining event in our country's history. A basic understanding of that event is would be a start in the right direction. With the recent election of President Obama, and the 150th anniversary of the beginning of the Civil War America has an opportunity at hand. Preservation of Civil War era battlefields are key elements in this process. Preserved Civil War battlefields are tangible links to a defining moment in our nation's history. Other benefits related to the opreservation of Civil War battlefields...

- The 150th anniversary commemoration is expected to stimulate renewed interest in the conflict and generate unprecedented tourism to Civil War sites.
- Preserved battlefields revitalize local economies and create jobs by encouraging heritage tourism. In addition, preserved battlefield lands also save localities money by not requiring the use of sewer and other city/county services.
- Cultural and historic resources, such as battlefields, foster a sense of community and improve quality of life. They are a source of pride for communities.
- Time is of the essence for preservation of Civil War battlefields and other historic parks in the eastern part of the United States. Many of these parks are in urban and suburban areas, where development pressures are considerable.
- Preserved battlefields provide environmental benefits including protection of watersheds and wildlife habitats

i raised my 2 girls off roading. now there adults and still love it and the desert.we have a strong family and good old friends made in the wild.at 52 ive seen alot of my land taken from us.we also hike,fish,shoot,mountain bike.public lands are for all of us.not just a few purests. theres room for all americans.the future of u.s.a.are in the kids,we know what the inner city does to them.keep the waters, land open for my grandson and all. please thanks for your time.

National Forest and National Parks have lost control of many camping areas to concessionaires. These controlling parties have not served us campers well. Fees have gone wild with no upkeep. Those of us with Access Passes are not getting the discounts we are counting on as we did in the past. Gates are locked, fees are up, and something needs to be done.

ORV's are very destructive of the environment they are used in but should be allowed in some set aside areas. However, I think that most of the propose areas for wilderness should be designated as that. Let's see if we can find some common ground here. As far as the above comment about the earth healing itself for 5 billions years, the earth hasn't had 6 billion humans on it at one time.

With proper design and layout multi-use trails can work, but they need good sight-lines and sustainable slopes

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a landscape architect who has worked in cultural and historical preservation, i feel that the practice of preserving our cultural heritage makes us more aware of the importance of nature in our society. We just need to make sure that we recognize the land and natural systems with the same value and importance as architecture and human use. It is our interaction with the land that makes places important - not just what we put on them!

Bob - I see where you're coming from, but in my family, all 4 generations go hiking together. It keep us healthy and fit. And trust me, we are not a bunch of uber-athletes or fitness maniacs. Try going for a walk - where the sound of your footfalls and laughter are the only thing to distract you from the quiet of nature. That being said - of course you have rights, too. The negative environmental impacts of your machines just need to be added into the equation for there to be real fairness (along with the negative impacts of ANY type of use).

There is no such thing as "new" wilderness, there are only new rules to protect one of the few things that man can not make or imitate. Wilderness is not something we can create or re-create. We can only hope to preserve some small portions of it that remain from our already destructive, consumptive history. We CAN create areas for OHVers to play, where they will be able to enjoy their activities, but their negative impacts will (hopefully) not have long-reaching consequences . Over-simplified rules such as 1 for 1 do not respond to the complexities of the environment, of our society and of the dynamic nature of land. OHVers deserve a place at the table right along side environmentalists, hikers, campers, anglers, hunters, ranchers, farmers and developers. No one group deserves special consideration in this case.

What Mrs. Paddock fails to state in her opposition to a legal business on private property that is zoned correctly is that 62 percent of the local populace believes this to be a step in the right direction to economic growth. Not to mention badly needed jobs for this area. The proposed casino is going into an already existing structure.

I am an avid OHVer myself. Though I would LOVE to see more open land, a 1:1 ratio isnt going to work. Stop closing what we have is a good start.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

- Climate change is the largest threat our fish and wildlife have ever faced. Temperature increases, altered precipitation patterns, and declining water supplies in the Western U.S. are already adversely impacting many fish and game species sportsmen cherish. Bird migrations are becoming more unpredictable, numbers of caribou, moose, and bighorn sheep are dwindling in some regions and fish kills resulting from rising water temperatures are becoming more common. The Fish and Wildlife Service said, “the warming of the earth could potentially have more far reaching impacts on wildlife and habitat than any challenge that has come before us.”
- The only way to stave off this crisis is to dramatically alter the way we think of land and wildlife conservation; we must focus on building resilience into ecosystems to help them adapt to a warming world. The Treasured Landscape initiative should be structured specifically to address the challenges of climate change, and should include as a major strategy protection of crucial areas of habitat and connective migration corridors.
- Public lands in Montana are going to be critical in maintaining viable populations of game and non-game species and in providing high-quality public hunting and fishing opportunities for the public. Their management can be directed towards climate change amelioration by federal authority. All relevant land management operating units within Department of Interior must have explicit mandates to manage their lands for both present and future climate impacts, and all decisions should be based on sound science.
- The Department of Interior is responsible for the majority of our country’s federal lands. The National Park Service, Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service collectively manage about one fifth of the land area - some 507 million acres - in the United States. The Great Outdoors Initiative should begin by ensuring that all 507 million of these acres are managed for climate change.
- The Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management, in addition to the Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks, should receive dedicated funding to implement natural resource measures and strategies adaptive to climate change.

The levels of access for tourism, the protection of the land, the preservation of private property rights and the protection of the environment are all greater without monument status. Stop the insanity of the extreme environmental groups who are proposing the Siskiyou Crest monument.

These sessions are not only essential, they should be ongoing, engaging and including all stakeholders (interest groups). They are essential to the success of the outdoors. As an example, the Cibola National Forest, IMVHO, could not function without people from Albuquerque Open Space, Rio Grande Nature Center, Friends of the Sandias, Volunteers for the Outdoors, and the New Mexico Mountain Club. The 10-year plans for National Forests, now underway, must be open, inclusive and pro-active. Cibola National Forest goals should include improved on-going assets maintenance and resolution of disputes involving the Manzano and Manzanita mountains, especially the restoration of the Manzanos 30-mile Crest Trail and various trails and resources on the West Side, especially Trigo Canyon, Kennedy Campground, Salas Trail, Ojito Canyon, and the Kirtland AFB Boundary.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To reconnect with the great outdoors and only the great outdoors risks overlooking at least half of what the environment and environmental stewardship is all about. While this initiative alludes to "the cultural and historic sites that tell America's story," nothing in the rhetoric or actions suggests that doing so is worthwhile. It couldn't be more so. People generally don't trash or abuse things they understand and appreciate. The human history and stories that define our values and aspirations as Americans are indivisible from the impulse to be good stewards, neighbors, and custodians of the land. As Maya Angelou puts it, our lives have already been paid for by the toil and effort of those who came before. Gratitude is a fundamental value without which environmental stewardship can seem abstract or merely recreational. Stories, works of cultural expression, historic sites, and historic preservation both large and small are the building blocks of our identity and values. The environment isn't only about that which is "great" and some of it is emphatically not "outdoors." To be responsible stewards we must see and appreciate the whole of our inheritance, holistically and with equal reverence for the physical and cultural elements that are its basis. This campaign needs to find its basis in something wider, deeper and more inclusive.

As most schools across the country are faced with financial challenges, providing education in basic subjects will become the primary focus of all administrators. Students in many financially strapped districts will lose various opportunities to be exposed to the "Great Outdoors", from camp experiences to field trips. To maintain a sense of urgency in encouraging conservation and participation in outdoor recreation, it is imperative that federal funding be made available to local agencies through multi-year grant opportunities.

As much as I disagree with increasing taxes at a time when many are struggling financially, the bottom line is we as a society need to be willing to support the most critical issues. Many outdoor manufacturers are small companies who have a passion for the great outdoors thus the reason they got into the business. A small tax rate of 1-2% might be appropriate or we could take it one step further and only tax those companies who manufacture their product outside the US. Let's make a push for Made in America and help keep the U.S. employed. Just a side note. ditto on the OHV issue as we see its path of destruction in many ecosystems.

Thank you both for your comments. Although I am not hunter, I respect the tradition as family activity given the hunting is done in a legal manner. The intent of my comment was based primarily on the example represented. As a representative of a city agency in southern California, I have seen the impact that an excursion to a small park where animals are observed can have on a group of children. Children can be the impetus for future change as they learn conservation through hand-on experiences and memories. The preservation of nature is critical to not only America but to the entire global community.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Mexican gray wolf reintroduction program is in trouble. Another lobo, the third in the last month, was found shot to death in eastern Arizona just two days ago. A population of only 42 wolves at the end of 2009 cannot sustain losses of this magnitude. As a citizen-advocate who has camped in Mexican wolf home ranges at least 250 nights in the past twelve years, tracked and observed lobos in the wild since 1999, and photographed members of the very pack whose two-year-old male was shot on Thursday, I find the response of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service to recent events to be shockingly tepid. After each new killing, Regional Director Tuggle expresses his sorrow and promises to have law enforcement agents investigate. Yet the killings continue. Clearly, the regional law enforcement agents are doing their best to catch the perpetrators and bring them to justice, but they are undoubtedly stretched too thin.

Release the captive Mexican wolf family of eight into Arizona as soon as possible. New releases of Mexican wolves will increase wolf numbers and strengthen the wild population's genetic viability. A healthy, captive Mexican wolf family is ready to be released into the wild. This release has been held up by foot-dragging among higher-ups in the Arizona Game and Fish Department. It's time that the Fish and Wildlife Service re-asserts its authority and stops allowing itself to be held hostage to the whims of Arizona officials.

"Finding new funding sources to increase the financial viability for owning and maintaining private forest land", sounds like the timber industry to me, especially that "maintaining" part., I can not support that.

If this has been addressed already, forgive me! A National "highway" of preserved habitat. This was mentioned in the Nature Conservancy magazine "Nature" last year. Incorporate rare/endangered habitat and species, wildlife migratory paths. Use overpasses, consider this "highway" a priority before building the ever increasing network of High Voltage Transmission Lines and wind farms, community planning and urban sprawl, commercial/residential development, etc, etc, etc....

Definitely agree that there are certain areas where this is much needed, but eventually (sooner, rather than later) all planning should be done with this in mind. The main opposition I can see to this would be the increased costs incurred by the municipalities doing the constructing, so something would need to be done to ensure these costs are offset.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I BELIEVE THIS IS WAY OVER DUE. The generations coming up who are making our rules are not caring what so ever about the wildlife. Their parents for the most part were too busy to stop and smell the roses of the wilderness and teach them what is really precious in life. Where I live they poison the Raccoons merely because they bother the kids at night in the church camp in the middle of the forest. One boy had a candy bar and the Raccoon wanted it. The boy got scratched so the next thing we knew 13 of them were dead. All had been poisoned. The Bears get shot because they come too close to the houses that have invaded the forests. People up there are picking the natural berry's for themselves and leaving the bears without their natural food so they wander into the area where the homes are looking for hand outs. What is the wildlife supposed to do? Now we are killing more and more with our trucks and cars on the roads because we are invading their land and they are trying to find somewhere else to go. At least give them a safe passage to move along. They really don't want to be around us. Don't the people get the BIG picture?

Another idea complete with a self supporting voting block. How very clever and oh so subtle. Are you all in the same room with 60 laptops or just working from home. Y'all might want to remember to include locals and not try to sneak the idea through in your planning efforts for animal crossings. Be sure not to attempt to block hunting access or any other kind of public access or tribal access to cultural sites. Consideration of impacts upon other than umbrella species should also be taken into account along with FHWA 4f property. Others forgot these important items in So Fla regarding 2 underpasses for the oh so endangered Panther and lost the project when locals found out and demanded the designs be scrapped. Years of work went down the tube. Be careful folks are watching.

There are an estimated 80-100 Florida panthers left, I suppose you think that is not endangered?

I do not even they qualify as an endangered species since these cats are the same mountain lions, pumas, cougars etc. that are out West and in many other parts of North, Central and South America. What lead me to that conclusion was a book titled "Swamp Screamer" authored by Charles Fergus. Between the covers of the book at page 119 there is an admission by a veterenarian named Melody Roellke that her and a gentleman named Stephen O'Brien hired to study Fla panthers that genetic analysis confirmed that Coryi was actually a "hybrid" thus not qualifying for ESA funds. So much for honesty in that program. There are well over 100 in So Fla when all are actually counted but the count only includes mature cats. There already is a deficiency in land available for these cats and they are over the carrying capacity now. Wait until one of them kills a human instead of goats, dogs,feral cats etc. as they have been doing for some time in populated areas of SW Fla. At that time the sentence for them will be the same as it was for Alligators when they began killing humans. Florida will declare a hunting season for them and make tons of money. The permits will be in the thousands of dollars to bag one. These poor animals are being mis-managed by well intentioned misguided humans and will have to suffer the consequences we cause to fall upon them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem there... convincing the masses that these goods truly are valuable. Waste, extraction, is rampant.

The Bureau of Land Management is mis-managing our public lands to death and costing hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars in the process. They aren't supposed to be the Bureau of Livestock and Mining but that is what they are doing. Organic grass fed beef produced by family ranchers is a good thing but that is not what is going on. Less than 3% of US beef is produced on the range. Large corporations like Hilton and millionaires like Ted Turner own most of the grazing rights. The grazing program loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually. The price charged to graze on public land is decades old as is price charged for mining and drilling. Our public lands are being eaten and drilled/mined to death and we aren't even making any money on it. The Bureau of Land Management spends millions of dollars needlessly rounding up wild horses and holding them in pens in the Midwest and killing animals across the West. They pay to have coyotes, wolves, cougars, bobcats, foxes, badgers, prairie dogs, raccoons and other wildlife trapped and poisoned because it might cause harm to a cow or sheep. The BLM just killed a bunch of wild horses in Nevada removing them from the land that British Petroleum (BP) wants to put the Ruby Pipeline through. They ran them in the heat for over twenty miles with a helicopter and over a dozen dropped dead of exhaustion and dehydration. They killed over 200 last winter in the Calico round up. They are in violation of the Free Roaming Wild Horse and Burro Act and they are also acting with extreme cruelty. Water holes are being fenced off so they can say the horses are dehydrated and must be removed for their health. Horses do not have the same negative impact on the ecosystem that cattle do. There are also less than 30,000 in the entire West compared to close to 10 million cows and sheep. The numbers speak for themselves and there is no documentation that horses are causing any damage and they are very healthy animals. Horses actually evolved in North America and spread to Asia and Europe via the same land bridge people came here over. Unfortunately, their temperaments that made them so easy to domesticate in Asia led to them being easily killed and eaten in North America. Eaten to extinction. Hundreds of horse bones have been found here with spear and club marks on them and cliffs have been found with thousands of horse bones below where they were stampeded off and then cut up. The Conquistadors were actually returning the horse to North America, not introducing an invasive species. Many mustang herds in the West have been DNA typed to prove they are of Spanish descent. They are gorgeous, healthy horses and when adopted become extremely hardy, healthy, trainable riding horses yet the BLM would have everyone believe they are jug headed, skinny and worthless. That they are pests and have no value. We should be promoting our mustangs to the world rather than rounding them up. Land areas set aside by Congress in 1971 specifically for horses have now been reduced by more than half. There are less than 200 wild horses left in all of Montana yet the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge continues to be emptied. Even Cloud, the wild stallion made famous by three PBS Nature series documentaries is rounded up every year and members of his family taken away. If such a beloved mustang isn't safe, no mustang is safe.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree that BLM is not adhering to either the rules or public opinion. They are way out of line in many areas and need an overhaul and perhaps investigation into exactly who is supporting all the grazing of public lands that is practically 'free', and why! Not only are wild horses suffering but also the endangered desert tortoise. The cows are eating all the wildflowers these tortoise need to survive when they emerge from hibernation in the spring. Something is wrong with BLM and they need to be investigated!!

I also agree that BLM needs to be investigated & completely overhauled. We definitely should not be subsidizing mega-corporate ranching & farming & allowing them to abuse our wildlands. I am not sure about how the treatment of wild horses should be handled, but it needs to be one of the things addressed in the investigation & overhaul so very needed! So I am voting YES on your idea.

The BLM is in the pocket of corporate ranching and farming. They are a disgrace and need to be overhauled. You have my vote.

Agreed. Eohippus was native to North America. If you compare the numbers cited by Ms. Goen, 30,000 wild horses compared to 10 million cattle and sheep is a minority indeed. The BLM definitely need an overhaul, and most Americans agree that wild horses need to be protected. (How many movies are there about Moo, the Wild Bull of the West? I haven't seen any.) You have my vote too. Well said, Ms. Goen.

In 1971 Congress set aside approx 50 million acres as wild horse sanctuaries. Today, there are horses on about half. Wild horses are not starving anywhere, there are not too many of them anywhere. 200 in the entire state of Montana? Look on a map, Montana is huge and just happened to have an anti-wild horse senator, Conrad Burns for years. The Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge contains one of the most documented wild horse herds in the country and there are books, videos, photos and three documentaries available for anyone to see that the refuge is almost empty of horses and in excellent health. The BLM's says there can be 2600 horses in the herd management areas in Oregon alone but there are 2300 horses again, according to the BLM and yet they rounded up 120 two weeks ago with some deaths. This was reported in the Oregonian newspaper recently sourced directly from the BLM. Why did they round up those horses at all let alone in the July heat? No wild horse groups or observers agree with the BLM's tally of wild horses, they all insist there are far less. Actually, ten million cattle and sheep is very conservative, I read yesterday there are 15 million cattle alone but I of course, have not counted the cows. Not just Eohippus was native here, Equus was here until ten thousand years ago and all the evolutionary steps in between the two were here in the preceding years as well. Equus spread from here to Asia and Europe. At the very least the BLM needs to stop rounding up horses and shipping them off to corrals in the Mid West. 35,000 horses in pens, it is ridiculous, costly (millions annually) and cruel. With no valid plan to solve the problem and American's have demonstrated very clearly that slaughtering them all isn't valid, round ups need to stop. Now.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I realize I didn't finish a comment: The Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge is almost empty of horses and in excellent health and could support many more as it used to. Cattle are not grazed there BTW, it is too rugged. The horses were removed for political gain and nothing more. I urge you to watch the Nature specials available on PBS.org on Cloud and his herd. There are three and they are spectacular.

In the near future people in general will lose touch with the earth, the world of nature, the understanding of its importance if we fail to entrust this to the children. This type of program would be a great help in doing this. On another level this type of program would help the health and stature of our children.

It should be obvious to everyone by now that republicans no longer care about the environment or our wildlife. While republicans of the past have done marvelous things with an eye to conservation that is no longer true and it seems most, if not all, republicans would just as soon see our forests and wildlife disappear altogether. If it were up to republicans we would sell our national parks off to logging, mining and oil companies and would sell hunting licenses for endangered species. If they are not voting down bills for climate change or holding up legislation for oil drilling safety they are trying to promote mountain top removal mining, logging in pristine, old growth forests and getting rid of the ESA. Bush underfunded our parks for years, opened some up to mining, logging and drilling and closed dozens if not hundreds of wildlife refuges. He and his cronies tried their best to get rid of the ESA, the roadless act and many more environmental laws, now the holdovers in congress and the senate have taken up right behind him. If you are someone who loves and respects nature, has a fondness for wildlife and would like to see both around for your children and grandchildren to enjoy get out this November and vote for the representative that will do his best to preserve and protect what little is left of our forests and wildlife.

I think this is just the forum to bring this to light. The policies under Bush, Cheney and the republican lead senate and congress did more damage to our forests, lakes, rivers, wildlife and overall environment than all other factors combined. It is imperative that we get representatives that will protect what wild lands are left or there will be no places left to connect to.

I'm promoting your idea because it's obvious that the republican party is the one biggest obstacle to achieving goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors; what this list is all about! Get rid of em! I'm disgusted at how this so called democracy is being run by the vast minority of stone-wallas and fat cats. Brittish petro seems to have more to say about the US government than we the people do. Stand up for your rights people. The present republican party is owned by the oil spillers.

How about getting rid of republicans and democrats period!! These two parties are destroying America. They care of only their party and not about the American people.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think that any group that does not support maintaining our environment should be questioned about their motives. The environment is all we have in a quickly changing world. If we destroy it, we are eventually destroying ourselves. This has been played out through the history of mankind. Much of this history is not being taught in schools today, so people are not aware of it. We need to set aside places to preserve what we had and have regardless of the people who are elected to office. Unfortunately, too many of these elected officials seem to be "bought off" by big business or corporations for that corporation's agendas. They get into office and change the laws we have had for their own political purposes.

I don't know how this turned into a political agenda but I agree that things need to change back to taking care of the Environment. Since the Republicans are the ones that screwed it up then I think the Democrats need to be given a chance to fix it. The President cannot fix all the problems we have in 18 months, it took longer than that to cause them. I think President Obama is doing the best he can under the mess he took on, and I truly believe he cares about this Country. We need to get past Racism and Bigotry that has taken over this Country, we are just showing the World our BAD side. Let's stop all the HATE and give President Obama a chance, if it doesn't work than there is always the next election, that's the way America works best.

The idea was to establish wild areas to save or preserve the natural vegetation and animal life. If you allow these areas to be altered, the vegetation and wildlife will be altered. Perhaps setting aside marginal areas for recreational uses would be an option and keep wild areas as wild. We should put aside more lands for wild and recreational use. With our increase in population, we are putting more stress on our lands. Who knows, but if the population keeps growing these areas may be the only wild places left on the earth.

Who supervises what to cut vs. what to simply move over or leave alone. Who decides that a fallen tree is dead? We have a private tourist forest in California where many of the interesting trees that attract the tourists are actually trees that fell over and then continued to live. NPS still needs to have their hand in decisions that they will be held responsible for.

I kept the acacia felled by wind in my yard and now it houses a family of endangered oak titmice (a bird, for those of you who are not familiar with them). If this happens in a backyard (albeit very close to the fire-decimated Angeles National Forest), imagine what happens in fallen trees in a forest. In the Lowland Forest areas of the Park, the abundant downed trees are a necessary part of that old-growth ecosystem. Is this where you want to remove trees? Or is it the Montane Forests in their damp, misty heights? -- or on their drier, sunny south-facing slopes, where fire plays an active role and necessary role? Certainly not in the Subalpine Forests, where tree clumps are often separated by open meadows or rocky slopes, rendering fires small, just a few clusters of trees on dry, sunny slopes (and leaving behind silvery snags that last for decades)? In the boggy Coastal Forests, with their spongy wet floor? Or in the Temperate Rainforests, with their 140 to 167 inches of rain every year? Considering that 95% of the Olympic is Wilderness, with little human disturbance, the emphasis should be on what is natural, and those of us blissfully unaware of what is natural should have no voice in determining its future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

fallen timber provides nutrients and habitat for the forest, logging is invasive and it destroys habitat through erosion and depletion of nutrients as the dead and down rots on the forest floor.

Down timber is part of the ecology of the forest. Leave it be.

I kept the fallen tree in my yard and now it houses a family of endangered oak titmice (a bird, for those of you who are familiar with them). If this happens in a backyard (albeit very close to the fire-decimated Angeles National Forest), imagine what happens in fallen trees in a forest. In the Lowland Forest areas of the Park, the abundant downed trees are a necessary part of that old-growth ecosystem. Is this where you want to remove trees? Or is it the Montane Forests in their damp, misty heights? -- or on their drier, sunny south-facing slopes, where fire plays an active role and necessary role? Certainly not in the Subalpine Forests, where tree clumps are often separated by open meadows or rocky slopes, rendering fires small, just a few clusters of trees on dry, sunny slopes (and leaving behind silvery snags that last for decades)? In the boggy Coastal Forests, with their spongy wet floor? Or in the Temperate Rainforests, with their 140 to 167 inches of rain every year? Considering that 95% of the Olympic is Wilderness, with little human disturbance, the emphasis should be on what is natural, and those of us blissfully unaware of what is natural should have no voice in determining its future.

Wonderful idea but tell me, who is going to help me out the first time some drunken moron in a 4wd nearly runs me over or I have mud splashed all over me when he goes by? If my ankles survive walking over all the ruts and assuming I can navigate the parts of the trail that are impassable on foot from the wear and tear of heavy machinery who will return all the wildlife I like to see that has been scared off by the noisy ohvs? How am I going to enjoy the peace and quiet I seek as a hiker now that ohvs use the trails I enjoy? You ohv people like to blame everyone else and call everyone else greedy but it is you that wants more and more and more! You have your trails so why do YOU want it all? OHV use is up because americans are lazy pure and simple and walking is just too much exercise for them to handle and that should not be rewarded by destroying what hikers and equestrians like to do and why we like to get out into nature. Multi use trails are a great idea for ohv users because it will quickly rid them of the nuisance hikers and equestrians they despise and then they will have the trails all to themselves. Lets call it like it is and quit lying about your true motives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Joseph I want to agree with you but it just does not allow equal access for everyone to the same areas that are not a restricted type area (such as non-wildness). If I had my way “total enjoyment of our favorite leisure activities”- as you put it - I would hopefully be out there all by myself going to a destination and none of you are allowed in! No mountain bikes silently slipping down the trail, no horses near my camp dropping their usual business, no hikers stumbling into camp late at night wanting firewood from me, no ATV’ers sharing the same trail with me, no motorcycles blasting by me, cross country skiers are usually too focused to stop and talk, snowmobilers - do I have to see them at the warming hut! And why should I have to be slowed down by that 4X4 club doing trail maintenance on the trail I use! That would be my total enjoyment – just me and no one else. But then there would be the need to put in eight different trails for eight “different use” trails, one for each user group. Eight “different construction” types for eight different types of trails. Eight “different upkeep” for eight different types of trails. And all of these user groups just trying to enjoy going to the same destination. I am NOT serious about not sharing the trails like above. And I agree with you wholeheartedly that a single user type trail does make “for total enjoyment of our favorite leisure activities” And I feel the vast majority (if not all) of single user type trails should stay the way they are intended to enhance the outdoor experience. But where possible to adapt an existing trail for multi-use or when possible create an environmentally sound new trail for multi-use. There is one easier section of the PCT that I am still able to back pack into for secluded camping. In one week camping on the PCT not one other backpacker came by! NOT ONE! As I drove out the twelve miles of the area, on a multi-use trail, to the trailhead there were maybe a hundred families (several hundred people) enjoying the back country along the trail because they had the multi-use access to it. Hikers, equestrian, ATV’s, motorcycles, didn’t see any mountain bikers that day but I have many other times. Change the PCT to a multi-use trail– NO WAY! But maybe in a different area of this forest add a new or adapt an existing trail to multi-use so these families can experience their “total enjoyment of our favorite leisure activities” somewhere different than this one restricted area. Eight single use trails or one Multi-use trail?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Okay, now I understand. It is okay for you to criticize me and question my motives on my ideas but I cannot question your motives or criticize your ideas. Ahh, the typical double standard. Not a surprise. Here I will use the same words as you did on one of my ideas "this idea is a wolf in sheep's clothing"! Like that better? Yes here in CT where I live I have seen 2 trails I enjoyed ruined after being opened up to ohv use and a couple more not opened up to ohv use but used by atvs and motorcycles just the same and although not ruined beyond repair certainly damaged by that use. On the ruined trails wildlife all but dissapeared, giant ruts and huge puddles that formed after rains and lasted days if not weeks depending on the season making many areas impassable on foot without straying far off the trail. I saw meadows ruined, streams torn up, saplings and berry bushes run down, trash strewn everywhere, broken glass. In fact one area of a trail I used to frequent before it was turned into a multi use trail had so much broken glass I had to pick up my dog and carry him because there was literally no where for him to walk without stepping on the glass. Over the months I saw less and less hikers and eventually I stopped going to all of those trails so rejoice \_\_\_\_\_, your community drove away the hikers and the wildlife so now it is all yours. Congratulations. In fact with so much area now opened to ohv use and so much other areas developed on I have less than a half dozen trails to enjoy but who cares about hikers and wildlife as long as the ohv community gets all the access they want right? It is like some surreal, alternate world you ohv enthusiasts live in where your motorbikes, atvs and 4wd do not harm the environment or wildlife but actually help it. Is it possible that ohvs in your world are lighter than here so they cause less damage? Are they less noisy in your universe? Are the drivers more callous and less responsible in CT than anywhere else in the world? Or is it that your community is oblivious to the damage you cause and uncaring when you do find out? I never really gave the ohv community much thought to be truthful and I always thought it was like hikers and backpackers where most were generally good but there are always the few bad apples. That was until I saw with my own eyes the destruction they cause and the disrespect they show others. This forum has also been quite an eye opener in exposing just what you people are all about. I now know without any benefit of the doubt that it is indeed the very small minority that is in fact responsible and respectful of nature and others while the overwhelming majority care nothing about preserving nature and wildlife and care only about their own self centered pleasures. I still believe that ohv enthusiasts deserve areas to enjoy but I am quickly becoming more and more convinced that it should be banned altogether considering some of the comments and ideas I have read. Actually I have had motorbike riders drive me off a trail or to be more exact my dog. He was so frightened in fact that he was shaking and it took me quite awhile to calm him down and that was after I had moved out of the jerks way. Of course I should just wave and try to make small talk though because it was me and my dog that were in the wrong for being on the trail in the first place right? How inconsiderate of me to be hiking in the woods with my dog on a multi use trail and causing some speeding jerk to actually change his course by an inch or so. Trust me if god had shined on me that day and I had been able to catch up with that butthole I would have been doing something other than waving to him. He showed me and my dog ZERO respect and I would have shown him the same. As far as you being courteous to those people why would you not be nice? What had they done to you? They were just trying to enjoy the outdoors like you so unless you are like that jerk that nearly ran me and my dog down and think that hikers have no place in the forest they gave you no reason not to be

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

nice.

I have said time and time again that ohv users deserve areas to enjoy and yes if other areas were put aside and animal and plant populations in decline were actually stabilized and growing then I see no reason why more access to areas now off limits should not be granted assuming those areas were taken care of and the animal and plant populations did not go back into decline. The same goes for hikers, I am not biased to either side and I believe the most important thing is to preserve nature for future generations not destroy it by our own self centered pleasures. I too have seen areas harmed by hikers and backpackers and I have said that if we as hikers and backpackers cannot be better stewards then we deserve to have our privileges taken away as well. Still though the damage I have seen from hikers is nothing compared to the damage I have seen from ohvs and that is just fact. I cannot agree with you though that the people creating the damage is the small minority. Why can you not see that your machines, no matter how careful or responsible you are, are damaging to trails, wildlife and people that want to enjoy the peace and quiet nature provides? I have seen with my own 2 eyes animals run from food sources when a bike rumbles by, your machines are very loud and you cannot say they are not and be truthful, their weight damages trails and the tires tear huge holes in the earth when it is wet. Those are facts you cannot deny and if you are you are just blatantly lying. I cannot say the problem is only in CT like you want me to believe because I have seen many pictures that very closely resemble the destroyed trails in my area from all around the country and I have read horror stories much like my own many times from many, many different states so I know I am not alone. If you want me to believe that many want to preserve nature you will have a whole lot of convincing to do there. Tell me why so many ohv enthusiasts on this forum demote all ideas on preservation yet promote all ideas that include oil drilling or mining, even in national parks in some cases. You cannot even get them to admit endangered species need protecting. Sorry but that does not sound like people that are very concerned at all. You have the same ability to check peoples votes as I do so do some research and you will see that I am correct. It is a very sad day if in fact what you say is true about less and less people hiking because if the future is solely at the hands of the ohv crowd then I fear the future is very, very bleak indeed and I will have nowhere for me to enjoy my choice of activity. Not that I would want to with no wildlife around. I am sure that will please the ohv community to know that one less hiker will be around.

Thankyou for your comments. I too believe that we should be free to disagree. I think that is one of the best attributes of our form of government. We are able to openly discuss our opinions free from government oppression. In fact I think this website, provided by the government, is one of the best thing I have ever seen. Already I have been enlightened by the different range of ideas and concepts proposed here. I am however perplexed by your comment "I think I am most offended by the way this list has been taken over by an OHV group and every other so called idea is about driving ATVs through the wilderness." Please do not be offended that OHV users want to express their opinion. And I have yet to see anyone post that they want to drive ATVs through the wilderness. They are just tired of places they currently ride always under threat of closure due to potential wilderness designation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Great concept, however, when I ride my OHV (yes, I own one) I make noise and dust and disturb all creatures and the environment around me for half a mile or more. When I hike or back pack only my footsteps and soft conversation disturb the peace and tranquility and beauty; that is, after all, what I came here for. OHV's are a lot of fun but I don't want the disruption when I'm hiking, fishing, etc. Quiet sports on one trail, noise and thrills on another.

The EPA should cease promoting 'Environmental Justice' over 'Equal Justice' as policy. America was created with the goal of 'Equal Justice For All', even if it took many years of attempt. All Americans should be treated equally. No group should be considered above another and receive special treatment or benefits, as is stated in the EPA's Interim Guidance on Considering Environmental Justice During the Development of an Action. Such unequal treatment leads to class warfare. The EPA proposal states its goal "to protect the health and safety of the historically underrepresented...". Shouldn't the goal be to protect the health and safety of ALL Americans regardless of race, creed, religion, gender, ...?

Yes it should which is why something should be done about climate change, pollution and our overuse of fossil fuels. More regulations and fines if need be for the abusers!!!

As a victim of politically connected Enviro terrorists who can do what they want on their property but are deputy dogs on anyone else's I can tell you that Government Enviro agencies are corrupted beyond anyone's imagination. I used to be such a tree hugger that I wanted to join Earth First. However after watching what is REALLY being done which is terrorize anyone who is NOT connected, lie to authorities, and steal you property because they are Connected - then enough is enough. The government is a failure to police its own. The citizens who pay the freight are now the enemy.

One of the most critical things the Administration can do to protect and enhance wildlife in national parks across the country is to restore the landscapes and watersheds surrounding the parks. Restoration efforts underway in the Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, Everglades, Columbia River Basin, and other major watersheds should be supported and sustained. Restoration of these systems brings the added near-term benefit of thousands of American jobs on American lands, and the long-term benefits of clean water, recreation, tourism, and other values that are the economic backbone of countless communities across the country. Development, pollution, invasive species, and the changing climate are taking a toll on our national parks and their wildlife, from the coral reefs of Biscayne National Park in Florida to the salmon that migrate through Olympic National Park in Washington.

Proposed wilderness areas are vulnerable to human encroachment and need to be protected as soon as possible or will be lost as wilderness lands forever. Some of those opposed to a wilderness designation for sensitive federal lands are intentionally denigrating the land so that it will lose its wilderness characteristics. This is a challenge to federal lands that needs to be addressed before it is too late.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I voted to demote due to the flip side of this idea. That is that Federal agencies can acquire large areas and close them to all activities for 10 - 20 years claiming the place can't be opened to the public because there is no Gen. Mg't. Plan. In that long time the grass grows to cover the noticeable previous effects of modern man that would disqualify it for Wilderness. Then after 20 years NPS begins the planning process including a Wilderness proposal for 95% of it as has happened in the 147,000 acre Addition lands in So. Fla. under the rule of NPS. That should be illegal except that the Wilderness law has been amended to the point that my back yard in the city could qualify as Wilderness according to this unethical law devised by misguided elected officials in Washington.

Don't rangers have enough to do already? They are supposed to be experts on their park, be traffic cops, police, and rescue experts. What else, have them balance the budget too? Let them do what they're good at already.

My husband is a park ranger. He already does law enforcement, fire suppression, cleaning, building maintenance, interpretive programs on environment, history, wildlife, and flora, rescue work, trail maintenance, manages a water system, and the occasional domestic dispute. He also has to do budgeting, lobbying, deal with customer comments, and essentially run a hotel of cabins. Now you want him to become a public health nurse? When the history of the place warrants lessons on typhoid they already talk about it because they genuinely love their work -- nobody would work that hard for this low of pay otherwise!

I agree, but make sure OHV users and others have areas set aside for them as well.

I believe funding and preserving our State and National parks is very important both for our environment and our connecting with nature. They are the only source of nature connection for some and the best form of vacation for others. I can't imagine the United States without them. They are a most important legacy to leave our children and theirs.

OHVs degrade and erode the land they are driven on. It's really hard to preserve something while changing it beyond recognition. If we don't preserve natural places now, they won't be there to preserve later -- ergo, we need to preserve them now if we want our children and grandchildren to be able to enjoy them. We can find and designate some places that are already used by OHVs and let them continue to ruin those places, not areas that are currently off limits to OHVs.

Your OHV does not belong in our State and National Parks. Certainly there should be areas for you to enjoy too but not in parkland.

Great idea. Our forests are not simply an agricultural resource and should be managed for their inherent value, not just as commodities.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In many western National Forests, timber is sold at bargain basement prices, which don't come close to recouping the federal tax dollars expended to build logging roads. In one recent year, alone, logging in the Tongass National Forest added \$40 million to the federal budget deficit. If it's not economically feasible for corporations to pay for their own logging roads, then so be it, don't log, don't build the roads, and the forest and salmon streams, and the federal debt will all benefit.

I agree, but why should there be any timber sales from the federal lands, even if they did make the profit?

I'm not opposed to some harvesting of trees, done in a reasonable manner. But spending my money to subsidize it is just wrong. If the loggers and their kin want to be partly on welfare, fine, but be a little more honest about whether or not this is what you are doing.

We need to preserve the lands & forests for the health of all wildlife & to allow the atmosphere to continue providing us with oxygen. It is these very places which provide cooling to a planet heading toward global warming in leaps & bounds. As a taxpayer, I do not want the money I pay into the government going to unsustainable harvesting of trees. Going toward replanting our forests would make infinitely more sense, while conserving our very future.

I agree that managed forestry needs to be practiced - unless we're willing to forgo putting out fires and let nature run its natural course across the country, something needs to be done to clean and clear overburdened land. Going in and *losing* money by selling a resource for this purpose, however, is unacceptable. If these resources can't be extracted efficiently, then other lower-cost methods of forestry management should be tried before money is diverted away which could be used for more noble causes.

I agree. I am not opposed to sane, responsible harvesting of timber, but large scale clearcutting is neither sane nor responsible!

Although wheeled access with internal combustion powered vehicles causes some controversy, access for the handicapped is needed. Greater provision should be made for the use of wheelchairs and slow, electrically powered wheelchair substitutes.

Bob Like your idea, yes wheelchair access and access for all of the handicapped is needed, but not sure how you would accomplish this. I would think a great deal of construction would be needed even if it was for a wheelchair, there are a lot of safety concerns that would have to be satisfied. If you are making this a proposal for within Wilderness Areas I doubt that after safety aspects were addressed that it would be a true Wilderness Area. I know that you are for preservation and wilderness so I am hesitant to bring this up and open a can of worms. But there are many groups that get the handicapped their access to the backcountry, no way near enough of them do this or are available, but it does happen. Four wheel drive clubs and other OHV groups transport them often. I have taken quadriplegic's on ATV's that they can operate on their own. While it is not in the National Parks it is in the backcountry and only up to wilderness boundaries. Feedback often is it was something they never thought they would experience again.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I understand your cause and am, in general, sympathetic with it. I have volunteered much time toward getting more people to experience the natural world. However, I think your statement needs qualification. Should there be wheelchair ramps (or other facilities) to get people to places such as the top of Mount Denali who couldn't otherwise get there on their own? I agree there needs to be opportunities for people who could not climb Denali on their own to still experience natural quiet, solitude, and beauty. I would even agree that some areas should exist that present them with challenges different from what they'd experience in civilization. But I don't agree that every wilderness and deep backcountry location should be made accessible.

It would be hard to tell someone with no legs that they couldn't access the wild in some kind of quiet mechanical device, but, people who are fat and lazy might claim to have a disability in order to get access on an atv to places deep in wilderness. I just don't think it's a good idea to give some people loop-holes. This idea would be ripe for abuse.

I too would be horrified if all areas of our natural parks and wilderness was suddenly accessible to me, just because I have mobility issues. People need to understand their limits and accept that there will always be areas that only those who are in peak physical condition can access such as the peak of Denali, walk down to the bottom of the Grand Canyon, or all the way up the Yosemite Falls trail. Our park system has try to carefully balance access of our national wonders with the needs of those who are mobility impaired. Only thing I can ask for is better access for information on those trails and areas that are easily access to those of us that are unable to walk far, with signs that give not just distance, but also elevation to view points. Also free access to maps that are well mark with handicap accessible trails and camp sites.and information online or pamphlets by mail to help plan our visits.

I think \_\_\_\_'s idea of increased access to information is helpful and would be of great benefit to mobility impaired individuals who visit our parks.

It would nice to be able to easily be able to plan visits before going to visit state and national parks knowing which trails can be easily accessed by those who have mobility issues. This means more then just putting the length of a trail on the sign at the trail head, but also the change in elevation and if it's graded for use of an mobility device such as an wheelchair, scooter or other device as defined by ADA rules. Also it would help if maps are clearly marked and available on the Internet for free. While at Cunningham Falls State park with borders Catoctin Mountain Park, It was impossible to figure from the signs and map posted if I could handle a 0.5 mile hike to the falls from the parking lot and I just had to take my chances that I could make it all the way to the falls and back on my own.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I can't agree with you more. I'm someone with relatively limited ability and if I couldn't read a terrain map, I'd be in a world of hurt when it came time to pick walking trails (I'm too decrepit these days to call it hiking). I don't know how much use they would be for someone using a scooter or wheelchair, but I use the USGS store site to look up and download .pdf files of various maps. They don't have access designations, but if you can read a terrain map, they can help you gauge whether or not a trail will be too steep. The link is { <a href="http://store.usgs.gov" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Just click on the Map Locator link to choose the area, then download a .pdf file of the maps you want. This is the best it gets until they start putting all of the necessary access information on the various parks' websites.

This sounds fine, as far as it goes. Just to be devil's advocate, what's to prevent a corporation from sending in 300 workers to pick 5 pounds each and wiping out the mushrooms in that area (also driving up the price). Also, I can see some lawyer salivating already: Somebody's going to pick a poison one and sue when they become ill, saying the government should not have allowed them to do it. Just a couple of thoughts.

I would agree with you with the caveat that the mushrooms be harvested properly by cutting the stem rather than pulling them out completely as I've seen some individuals do. As always, there are individuals who ruin things for everyone.

OHV's, even if they are electric, would still be destructive to the fragile environment and would crowd hikers, walkers, and cross country skiers off trails. Besides, they don't make any noise, so the typical OHV user wouldn't be interested. I see no reason that OHV users and their toys should have access to the parks and monuments. They have plenty of access to trails outside federal lands. Paying taxes does not give anyone, including OHV users, the right to trash the parks and destroy the enjoyment of nature by non-OHV users. OHV's are destructive and noisy, and many of the people who use them are not interested in nature at all. They just want to make noise and raise hell.

This addresses noise and fuel consumption, but does not address erosion and the destruction of trails.

"The people who participate in this activity pay their taxes and deserve to have some access to Federal lands." Hey, there's a marijuana grower on public land a few miles from here who's avoided detection because he pays his taxes. Gold miners who have eliminated fish habitat pay their taxes (well, maybe not). People who enjoy peace and quiet in the woods also pay their taxes. The E-range is NOT the only fully electric 4X4. There's an outfit in Ashland, OR (Barefoot Motors) that produces all-electric ATVs, but they target vineyards and orchards, not recreation. If you look at the Russian word for energy you see that it is synonymous with "work." So, how about you consider what you're contributing to society with your play machine, gas or electric.

Where are we going to get the money to support this? We don't have the funds to support all the programs we have now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What I have gathered after reading through this site for the last couple hours is that we need much more science based environmental education in this country. Whether people are for things like more, less, or no motorized vehicle use on our public lands is irrelevant if the majority of people commenting have inadequate knowledge (often it appears none) of what's really going on in nature and their impact, even if they are tiptoeing through the wilderness. I worked as an elementary teacher for several years and the amount of time given to science education in the lower grades was pitiful. Partly because there was very little time left after trying to get the kids ready for all the standardized testing forced on us! Whether you want to roar down a trail at 80mph on your snowmobile (Don't tell me no one does. I'm a snowmobiler and I don't, but I have heard the boasts and seen people do it.) or actually be able to hear the squirrels and birds as you hike quietly through a forest, it's very hard to make a rational decision without a adequate understanding of ecology and the natural environment. A good education doesn't mean you have to be pulled to the extreme on either side of the argument, but it'll make your arguments carry more weight.

Tody we have so many folks addicted to motorized entertainment that it is going to be very hard to stop .Our parks are not the only problem we are facing today , we also have more and more peolpe seeking a way to boost their low self esteem by removing their mufflers. My guess is that 90% of all Harleys today have the mufflers removed . Also a large percentage of Pickups and Ninga motorcyces also .

Good comments. I've always liked this quote by Frank Church. "As the floor manager of the 1964 Wilderness Act, I recall quite clearly what we were trying to accomplish by setting up the National Wilderness Preservation System. It was never the intent of Congress that wilderness be managed in so "pure" a fashion as to needlessly restrict customary public use and enjoyment. Quite the contrary, Congress fully intended that wilderness should be managed to allow its use by a wide spectrum of Americans."

4 retired experts and 5 local members at large from the county, so the experts could easily be overruled. OHV trail there it is. Only one OHV trail abuser among any number of responsible users could foul up a natural area beyond recognition. The level of monitoring that prevention would require to is logistically unworkable. Our police have enough to do already and don't need additional areas and activities to police.

Man has been an important part of the natural order for a couple hundred thousand years NOT a visitor. We have been harvesting game, timber and planting crops for most of that time. Humans are part of nature not just an outside observer of it. Perhaps you are not a part of the process of nature but you probably are. If you eat meat and bread, use toiletpaper and live in a house you are detracting from nature. BUT thats OK, its supposed to be that way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Consultants for scenic highways are private and for profit, and do well whether things work out or not. Consultants on Tamiami Trail over an 8 year period walked away with \$400,000 dollars. Private companies can promote scenic hiways but won't get paid as far as I know. The program is prohibited from letting any private company be advertised by a scenic hiway in any way no matter what the company does for the program. Grant funds authorized for scenic hiways cannot be used for road repairs unless road defects can be proven to have been caused by increased traffic due to the designation.

What are we saving these lands for, what good is it to have something you cant use, if you look at the over all time man will be here on earth its just a fraction of the history of this earth, history has proven no matter how much you damage the earth it ALWAYS repairs itself and ends up being BETTER each time its repaired. Man is not going to be here much longer might as well enjoy everything to its fullest extent.

The initial "Wilderness Act of 1964" envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where Public Access is restricted to non-mechanized means - Thanks to Robert Clark the point is made very well. Give the green team an inch and they want a mile. Maybe we should figure out just how much is adequate. Or is the arguement just grab all you can anytime you can. Harry Reid just introduced a drastic measure that must not pass HR3534 will cost us Billions of our tax dollars, for many years for the purpose of buying more lands, most of it by eminent domain. Look up the bill and call your congressmen and Senators. This is important to shoot down! When is it okay to run a farmer off his land? When is it okay to tell the fourth generation rancher they have to vacate because Harry wants their land to become "Wilderness"? Will the stealing never end?

If you want an education on what we tax payers are up against you should to Google "Wild Lands Project" Which used to be known as the Wilderness Project. Go to the link that says citizens review dot org and read what these radicals have in mind so you will be armed when a green team says they "need" more Wilderness. You'll be shocked! People who are part of the green team, if you are not aware of the adjenda you need to be. By crying more Wild Lands you are playing into a larger role of domination of the planet and it is real... look it up. If you care anything about humanity you may want to rethink what you want to be a part of.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Mr. Lamica, Thank you for the nod and adding valuable information to the pot! I have been aware of TWP ([Link](http://www.twp.org/)) for over a decade! Although their name has changed their breath still smells the same! I have advocated all this time and warned of the pending storm at every opportunity but have seen them and others like them grow into a group who now dictate the very content and context of this AGO initiative with Ken Salazar and OUR President as their puppets!! Enough!!! Those of you who are familiar with all of the Public Land closures in the West over the last decade need look no further than the TWP map on their home page at the ULR included above to see that they have achieved many of their goals already through various methods, most of which are dependant on massive amounts of money stuffed in the right pockets! Please DO NOT let the AGO go forward without your input, get out to cast your vote this November and beyond for FRESH Public Servants who are like minded and in tune with your way of thinking!!!

"Building wildlife over-or-underpasses mitigates pinch-points where major roads interrupt wildlife pathways. " How do they expect to get the animals to use these? Animals cross roads where ever they please.

Cattle ranching on public lands provides only about 3 percent of the beef to the US supply. This practice is, therefore, of only marginal importance to the total beef supply. However, to the ranchers who have grown dependent on this cheap source of feed, it is their way of life. A balance must be struck to protect and preserve the land for all today and for future cowboys, miners, hikers, bikers and gauchoes.

Cattle ranching is cheap for the ranchers at our taxpayer expense. Ranchers keep away wildlife & take away the rights of wildlife like buffalo & wolves & elk. Ranchers should pay a fair share to use Federal lands. All wildlife must have preference over rancher's cattle!

"Service grazing programs represent over a hundred million dollar a year loss in terms of low permit fees versus the much higher cost of administering these programs. " That is exactly the point, government can't even do simple paperwork without creating a negative impact on their budgets. Just how many employees does it take to issue a permit? I don't believe those willing to give up a grazing permit want to do so permanent. They being on the ground and really knowledgeable about the lands know, you need to give it a season off grazing now and then.

Only an idiot sells the rights to visit his backyard at the start of winter and expects to still have that right come spring. The seller isn't the one messing up the permanence of this sale. It's the current regulations that say the buyer has to 'use it or lose it' and it will be sold again. The problem is once a purchaser of grazing rights takes land out of grazing use, said purchaser is then forced to graze the land in order to keep control of whether or not and when it is grazed. That's counterproductive and in fact prevents land from ever truly being removed from grazing. The savings come when the allotment no longer needs monitoring every year as it is not being used for grazing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The BLM loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually on grazing rights permits that are far below fair market value. The permit fees haven't been raised in decades. The Taylor Grazing Act is was put into law over 75 years ago and the fees were not raised then. The BLM also loses hundreds of millions of dollars on "controlling" predators and wild horses to benefit grazers. Yet less than 3% of US beef is produced on the range, millionaires and large corporations own most of the leases and the benefit to the local economies is very small. Even foreign corporations own grazing leases on US Public Land. It is a myth that cowboys and family ranchers are who owns the majority of the leases. Access to permits and allotments absolutely needs to be made available to all and at fair market value. If conservation groups or individuals want to pay the fees but NOT graze livestock on their allotments that only benefits the BLM. It is ridiculous that it isn't allowed.

Grazing brings profit to a few at huge costs to the many. Less than 3% of US beef is produced on the range yet most of our public lands are managed for grazing. Grazing leases cost hundreds of millions of dollars annually. Huge corporations and millionaires own most of the rights not family ranchers. The leases are not at fair market value, they haven't been raised in decades. The taxpayers subsidize grazing at a cost of money and destruction of habitat. and millions of cows are destroying the ecosystem not benefiting it. Cows trample riparian areas and destroy salmon spawning habitat as well. Millions are spent to try to save salmon runs but the BLM promotes grazing. Thousands of animals such as prairie dogs, coyotes, cougars, wolves and badgers are trapped, poisoned and shot "to protect cows" at the taxpayer's expense. Wild horses have been reduced to half of the refuges set aside by Congress for them. There were 2 million a hundred years ago and now there are 30,000 left. There are more in pens in the Midwest than running free. The BLM spends millions annually to "control" them yet they have never been proven to do any damage and are a re-introduced native species not an invasive one like cattle and sheep. Yes, horses evolved here and humans ate them to extinction here will in Asia they domesticated them after they crossed the same land bridge that brought humans to North America. Grazing leases should be made available to those who would want to pay for them but to NOT graze cattle on their allotments. There are plenty of groups and individuals who would do this but it isn't allowed. Grazing rights are sewn up for generations and sold at huge profits to the holders not the government. Grazing leases should be at fair market value. Millionaires like Ted Turner should not be subsidized as he plays at being a rancher. Huge corporations should also not be subsidized.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To protect wildlife migration routes and give national park wildlife the freedom to roam, the Administration should require measures to enhance current and projected wildlife migration routes in all federally funded transportation and energy transmission projects, and in leases for resource extraction on federal land. Throughout history, Americans have worked to save national treasures in their own backyards to retain what they find special for our children and grandchildren. At Yellowstone and Grand Teton National parks, pronghorn have seasonal migrations, but fencing and road development outside of the parks have threatened migration routes, limiting access to winter habitat, and leaving the park's pronghorn at risk. To further protect wildlife, the Administration should create a multi-agency wildlife habitat and migration corridors information sharing network; push for new revenue sources and prioritize existing resources for the acquisition or protection of vital wildlife migration corridors. National parks are not islands and their humanmade boundaries are not recognized by wildlife. As the climate changes it is widely expected that wildlife will migrate further from their park homes in search of suitable habitat.

Recreational overuse of our water ways become a major threat to these most important wildlife corridors. Establishing recreation-free riparian environments could significantly improve riparian habitat.

We should certainly preserve the wild areas and Parks, but to assume that we can change the local impact of a global issue is simply foolhardy. Climate change is an issue for energy policy. We should absolutely protect local wildlife species from local threats. The two are separate issues, one primarily national, one primarily local.

Allowing the public to carry firearms in National Parks is a very recent development. I utterly disagree with it. Individuals can be too out of control to be allowed the ability to easily maim and kill wildlife and other people. There may have been some who were always armed before it was legal, but this law will dramatically increase the number of firearms in parks and therefore the potential for violence.

There weren't any mass murders BEFORE the firearms became allowed either. The law just went into effect this spring. How do we know the difference between patriots and wack jobs? Is the idea that we all just walk around armed to the teeth so arguments and offenses go to the level of deadly violence more frequently?

We can talk about parcelling out percentages of land for OHV, camping, mtn biking, etc but none of it will make a difference if our wild areas and wild animals are destroyed by our own love of being in the outdoors. Yes, there are lots of ways to get out and enjoy nature but we must take the "seven generation" approach and make sure that our wilderness is intact for those who do not yet walk on this earth. Since most of us can't think beyond next Tuesday, we need legislation that puts into action long range plans that put the health of the environment first.

There is not enough funding to maintain existing national parks. Our Federal government is already deep in debt and painful spending cuts must take place.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All motorized use on public lands (county, state, federal) should be banned, period. Parks and forests are for citizens to relax, breathe fresh air, enjoy a natural environment. People who can afford \$5,000 or more for an ATV or snowmobile can afford to club together and buy or lease private land on which to enjoy their machines.

This doesn't really seem like much of an idea. There are only about 60 national parks in the U.S. and I certainly can't imagine creating 100 more of those before 2016.

This would be a great idea if the Boy Scouts weren't so exclusionary and discriminatory.

I also agree wholeheartedly that the BLM needs to be completely transparent.

Whereas I agree this would work in some cases, I had to demote this because of the number of tribes out there who are just as rapacious and exploitative as the greediest of corporations. One can't assume that all Native Americans are conservationists.

Actually, I should have said that there were tribal governments out there who are as rapacious and exploitative. Not all members within a tribe have the same notions.

Unfortunately, a very large number of those who own private forest lands are much more interested in harvesting every stand of timber large enough to make the process worthwhile. Most of those people then sell the land for development afterward, considering the length of time it takes to grow more timber. If you look at forested properties for sale in Washington state, as an example, you'll see that most of those properties have either been cleared of timber in the last 5 to 10 years or that it is being advertised as having a lot of marketable timber. That is neither conservation nor stewardship and I don't want tax dollars going to help those who are only interested in clearcutting everything down to the last sapling. If this program would fund only those who intend to nurture the forest lands and use only selective harvest to achieve any necessary thinning of trees to encourage larger growth and habitat for wildlife, I would be all for it!

How many people have been attacked in National Parks in the past 20 years where a visitor's gun would have saved life or limb? Darn few, if any. I feel much less safe camping near someone packing a gun than not. The only people who are sane enough to be allowed to have firearms are those who don't want one. At least until now, the real crazies stayed out of the parks because they couldn't bring their guns with them.

Todd, Since when is a study done more than 5 years ago invalid? And BTW, where is all your data showing that there is little to no impact? If you want to open up the public lands even more, then the burden is on you to make the case. Scientifically, please (even studies over 5years old are acceptable).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

So do you think there is no place that should be off limits to your vehicles?

No money for the BSA. Girl Scouts of America are not biased the same way as BSA are. But they're not listed in the proposal, and promoting one gender over the other is still wrong for government money. Propose this again without the BSA involvement and I could support it.

We ARE living in a warm period of an Ice Age. Reality is that this planet has two climates which are very much more stable than the one we owe our whole existence to. The hot one supported the Dinosaurs for hundreds of millions of years, toward the end of that climactic period, there was the beginning of a true winter at the poles. That means snow only fell on Earth in the Arctic circles for a brief part of the year, and that it ALL melted each spring. The geological history of the Earth seems to favor that climate. The stable cold climate, (what we usually think of as an ice age) is most climatically stable when glacial ice has spread well into what we consider the temperate regions today, that is as low as the parts of the southern states. Remember glacial ice doesn't melt away in summer. We've been living all of human history including our hominid evolution in an uncommon, barely stable warm period of a long Ice Age. Human history records the major effects of only a few degrees change in temperatures one way or the other. Neither of the stable climates are anywhere close to the one we and the rest of the current life on this planet require. Every other change in climate has been far slower and smaller than what conservative climatologist project will happen if we don't make major changes. Yet those gradual changes have contributed to mass extinctions every time. Change is natural and normal when it is caused by natural or normal events. Digging naturally sequestered carbon compounds out of the Earth and burning them off into the atmosphere at even 10% of the rate we have so done at any time in the last century is not natural. We are nothing more than arrogant fools if we don't start making changes. And we deserve to not be part of the next planetary ecosystem we usher in by causing the current system to fail. Any steps that will help us halt, reverse or slow this trend are well worth the effort. Our future generations deserve no less.

You have a point that some (or many) Americans may have obese trends. But this is not a good solution. I have a hard time believing anyone would promote the idea that the Federal Government make it a requirement for physical exercise to be performed in order to be allowed to use the land that belongs to ALL of the people. This just seems to me to be such a BIG BROTHER IS WATCHING situation. More government telling you what to do and when to do it, it's scary! post above is so right on, she has the right to live her life in the fashion she desires as long as it's within the law and common courtesy of others! Now may think she is a racist, a teabagger and need a little bit more tinfoil and I guess he has his right to express his views – if they are right or not. But I think there is there is a possibility he really is offering up the extra tinfoil just so the government will be able to track better to see if she is doing her jumping jacks while in camp!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My apology for my miss interpretation of your idea. I agree we need to encourage everyone to get away from "the obese trend" and I am with you right there. That is a personal life choice everyone needs to make for them self. But with your statement of "Recreation on government land should require physical exercise..." the word "require" leads people (at least me) of some type of enforcement to satisfy the "require(ment)" or mandated exercise. And I think your idea is making more of a reference to the government setting up a passive attempt in making people "get more exercise" as they visit National Forests and Parks without them realizing it. Personally I am a "dirt" tent camper and stay away from the parks and where the crowds go that usually want the amenities that you are suggesting be done away with. But that is my desire and there are others that desire or often require (physical needs) the amenities of electric hookups, convenient parking lots, and others so they are able to visit the forest and parks. Shouldn't this type of concern be directed towards United States Department of Health and Human Services rather than the DOI? A creative idea however, but I guess the words government and require just keeps me feeling we have too much governmental requirements in our daily lives all ready! Again, My apology for my miss interpretation of your idea.

I have lots of Free(dom) of Speech as stated in the 1st and 14th Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. I also have lots Wilderness Areas and I don't feel either are going anywhere.

Now why should we do that they are no longer endangered so why should they be protected? That entire act should be changed we were lied to when it was passed we were told it would protect the eagle but it is being used to protect pest like rats and yes wolves. Wolves are pest who kill farm animals and US pets. The act should be modifying to protect only major animals and all species added should have to be approved by congress every few years in televised hearings to keep pest like rats insects and blind fish off the list. In addition it should be modified to comply with the Constitution in that if any land owner is harmed he must be compensated as a taking. If you are told you can not mow your land because of a kangaroo rat then the gov must pay for your loss. Or pay to move the rat. the current law violates the takings clause.

We do not need a Climate Science Centers because the only people who support global warming theory are those who receive grant money to do research on it. Such an agency would only rubber stamp the disproven theory.

The Socialists and Communists always know what is best for the masses. As the President of the Audobon said (I paraphrase) - the people living on 20 acre "ranchetts" are the biggest threat to the environment. We will not cease until they are all relocated to the intercity using mass transportation. And the Water people say the biggest threat to the pollution of our lakes and rivers is not septic tanks but storm water runoff. My "ranchette" has natural perc - Only the "CITIES" have storm water runoff - Does ANYONE see the INSANITY from these property rights stealing Non Profits?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I find the Question is - how can a National Organization of Bikers with only 33,000 members nationwide have the clout to get Billion\$\$ to create more concrete to create more stormwater runoff, global warming, etc.? Their DEMAND for paths have torn up decades old beautiful landscaping, cut down trees, and created a road hazard on country roads where the pathway ends. They are NUTS. The rudeness of those on bicycles is only topped by those arrogant and drunk.

It seems people that are lucky enough to live near wilderness sometimes don't appreciate it. It seems they are in a rush to develop what they have, until it's too late and we can all look back and say "we should have" or "we could have".

Wolves are an important part of the eco system that were here before this country was established. What really needs to happen is enough land needs to be set aside so they can thrive again, without being forced onto farmland or into suburbs. Any animal that becomes extinct is a shame. Extinct means gone forever. Once animals start disappearing (which they are), it's only a matter of time before we are next. This may not happen in our lifetime, but I don't want to leave that legacy for my children or grandchildren.

"Security lights" left on by neighbors are annoying. Motion detectors would be an improvement over spotlights left on all night. We don't have streetlights in my small, unincorporated area but the commercial strip two blocks away is very bright; in winter I can see the golden arches of McDonald's from my house. Some towns have begun using solar operated streetlights, which save a lot of coal-produced energy. I see the commercial areas as the biggest offenders for lighting up the sky all night long. There are two large office buildings nearby built out of glass and lit up all night!!

Mr. Moffatt, You regurgitated all over my idea with your "fat and lazy" agenda and denigrated my Military Service to OUR Country, my fellow Veterans and the valiant Veterans who have gone before us in defense of OUR Country in addition to those brave and selfless young women and men currently serving OUR Great Nation! The disability I suffered while serving OUR Country is real, this coupled with my age disallows me from walking great distances with a heavy back pack into places like I once did but I should still be allowed to visit many of them via other means. While serving I defended your freedom of speech and access for ALL to OUR Public Lands. I am neither obese nor do I spend time with my butt parked in front of a T.V. or playing computer video games as you assert everyone in the world other than you is guilty of. I am out working my acreage 7/14/365 and when I can get a break to camp I do it in a tent on the ground in unimproved areas with no music, T.V., portable DVD player or anything else electronic except a cell phone which is off at all times excepting a personal emergency or to assist others with one. You are in my opinion an elitist pompous arse . . . period!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I agree about the value of extensive outdoor education and of after-school care, I definitely oppose further support for the BSA. Not only are they biased, they are poorly run and poorly policed. Here in Utah they are an arm of the Mormon church, and reports of deaths in poorly prepared troops hiking in the hot desert summers, of drownings in slot canyons in flood stage, and sexual victimization by leaders are not nearly as rare as they ought to be. If only we had a "Junior Sierra Club", something of that sort. I hope I'm not taking my life in my hands by saying that---as I said, I live in Utah.

I own three patented mining claims. At the time this law was created the government wanted people to go out and make a living off the land, how things have changed. I suppose that the land that people homesteaded should have to be returned to the federal government too?

Carrying loaded firearms for personal protection just got allowed recently. Prior to that you could carry them sometimes (hunting season) but they had to be cased and empty. Doubtful this will change soon.

One BIG problem - the standards to meet the Wilderness criteria have been amended down into the dirt and practically any piece land can be qualified. No Original High Standard - No Wilderness in my book.

This problem is obvious if you read Scoping Comments and then the DRAFT EIS on just about any BLM project. I have spoken with BLM employees who just shrug and say, "The bosses didn't want it in there." They actively discourage objectivity among their employees. Even worse, they had a great disdain for the average citizen. I have spent hours researching EAs and EIS documents, submitted lengthy, detailed comments with appropriate citations, and seen a follow-up document that dismisses these comments as "not substantive." "Not substantive" in BLM-speak means, to me, "We don't agree." Fine, don't agree, but tell my WHY. Nor does the average citizen get representation in any BLM activity. If I were a corporation, a special interest group (OHVs), a local government or even a tribe, I could get a seat at the table. But John Q. Average has no voice in the public process with BLM. Salazar needs to clean house!

Why do people think they can live wherever they want and the rest of have to put up with the decline of what's left of our wilderness and wild species? Biodiversity and healthy ecosystems are not only key to humanity's survival (as if that weren't enough) but they are also every American's right. Wolves are a natural and important part of the wild landscape - an ecosystem that does not have its top predators is not functioning properly. Furthermore, I and my children deserve to see and experience animals that for many centuries have lived in and are a symbol of the American wilderness. Why is someone's right to own property and do what they will with that property more important than my right to know and enjoy unadulterated nature? They don't have the right to destroy a species just because they want to have lawns and ticky tacky boxes or herd cattle or sheep right next to a National Forest or Park. That's not part of the bargain of private property in this country. And if they do choose to live and make their living on the edge of a park or forest, then they should have to abide the consequences (which is that some of their sheep will get picked off or they will have to dispose of garbage in special containers, or not be able to have a lawn, etc).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The fact that there has been no revision of this law and that the public lands of our country can be had so cheaply is a national travesty.

Wow! Thanks for the information! Very in depth and illustrates why further measures need to be taken to restrict ATV use.

Currently, Internal Revenue Code section 2031(c) provides an estate tax exclusion of 40% of the value of land protected by a conservation easement. Unfortunately, this exclusion is capped at \$500,000. In the context of rising farm values this exclusion is woefully inadequate. The American Family Farm and Ranchland Protection Act, H.R. 3050, would increase this existing exclusion to 50% and raise the cap to \$5 million – providing a powerful incentive for owners of high-value agricultural, forest, and natural habitat lands to protect these properties in perpetuity. More than 70 percent of wildlife gets food and shelter from our working farm, ranch and forest lands, and the greatest value for wildlife and other public benefits comes from the large, contiguous properties where estate taxes frequently force families to subdivide and sell their land for development. In fact, due to high land values, farmers and ranchers are disproportionately subject to an estate tax at a rate of approximately 4 times that of the general public. On private forest land, the U.S. Forest Service has invested heavily to promote sustainable forestry. As second home development pushes deeper into our forests, inflated tax values make it increasingly difficult for forest owners to hold on to the timberland they've stewarded for generations. In fact, a 2006 study indicates that approximately 2.4 million acres of forest land are harvested and 1.3 million acres are sold annually to pay the federal estate tax. These outcomes are no way to reward a good deed and good stewardship. We can avoid them by expanding the estate tax benefits for landowners who have permanently protected their land. The Joint Committee on Taxation has scored H.R. 3050 as costing just \$132 million over ten years, but its impact would be enormous, encouraging thousands of landowners to work with land trusts in their community to ensure that lands with important conservation values for the public are never lost to development. This provision works well with a deferral of estate taxes on family farmland (H.R. 3524) and we expect new House and Senate legislation in the coming weeks that will combine these provisions. This provision also works well with the enhanced income tax deduction for conservation easements (H.R. 1831) setting up the opportunity for America's Great Outdoors to promote a conservation tax package. For more information please visit: [www.lta.org/estatetax](http://www.lta.org/estatetax).

I agree whole heartedly! BLM is not acting in the interests of all. Just who are they acting in the interest of????? Pay-offs? Greed? Investigate!

I wish to absolutely agree here. There is no way money should be put into an organization with such discriminatory and indoctrinating practices.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wolves killed 6 cows in Oregon last year. Eagles killed over 200 lambs. Shall we shoot every eagle on sight? Loose dogs killed countless cows as they do every year. They aren't kept track of because feral packs of dogs are a dirty little secret of rural life and everyone loves dogs. The group Defenders of Wildlife does compensate ranchers across the West for valid wolf kills. Coyotes are eating people's pets in suburban and even urban areas across the USA not wolves. Coyotes have spread far beyond their native habitat in the last hundred years. Why? partially because wolves were hunted to extinction. Wolves prey on coyotes and kept their populations down and kept them confined to a much smaller section of the country. Unfortunately, human killing of coyotes does not work to reduce the population. Unlike the wolves, humans can't be in their territories day in and day out and when humans kill coyotes they just breed bigger litters. Wolves belong in our wilderness areas and in our national parks and deserve protection.

Not only do they need to stop illegal grazing but they need to completely overhaul the grazing program. The BLM loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually on grazing leases. The fees paid are decades old and far below fair market value. Big corporations and millionaires own most of the leases not small family ranchers. Less than 3% of US beef is produced on the range yet the BLM loses hundreds of millions of dollars not only on the grazing program but to "control" wild horses and kill predators at the taxpayer's expense all to benefit cattle and sheep.

They are losing hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars annually on grazing permits, wild horse round ups and predator control and they don't want the American public to realize what is going on. The BLM acts like they are the Bureau of Livestock and Mining not Land Mangement. There is no benefit to the land or to the government or to their finances in the way they operate. Grazing, mining and drilling fees are at rates that are decades old. Far below fair market value. They are actually killing wild horses and wildlife. They pay to have wolves, cougars, bears, coyotes, badgers, prairie dogs, raccoons and other wildlife killed to protect cows and sheep. Eagles actually take hundreds of lambs, can you imagine the out cry that would result if they were killing eagles too? The public doesn't know about all the other animals. They are rounding up wild horses in the heat and snow with helicopters. Paying the company over \$500 for each horse. They "lost" 200 last winter in the Calico round up and over a dozen in July in Nevada. They are emptying lands set aside by Congress for wild horses of wild horses. They are not allowing the media or concerned citizens/groups to observe. This agency desperately needs an over-haul.

Unfortunately, the Boy Scouts are a religious organization, and shouldn't receive Federal support.

When the use of a resource such as a park or national forest degrades the quality and the value of national resources -- in effect "using up" instead of simply "using" -- it is fair and appropriate to place limits on those activities. For that reason, we should limit the access of off-road vehicles to national parks, national monuments, etc. Let those vehicles be used on terrains where they are not causing deterioration of lands that belong as much to me as to any biker.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well-balanced programs that can teach our children the value of preserving our remaining wild lands and the skills to do so could be extremely beneficial. Note my use of the term “well-balanced” which the Boy Scouts most decidedly is not. Any such proposal for the creation of publicly funded programs must ensure that access and membership are open to all children regardless of sex, sexual orientation, ethnicity, religion or other factors before receiving any consideration whatsoever. The Boy Scouts is an arrogantly discriminatory agency that intentionally refuses membership to children who do not fit its bigoted criteria. The Boy Scouts is in no way and at no time entitled to the imprimatur of any government agency or the use of any public monies.

We have more than enough laws and regulations in place already. We will not have our land turned into a monument. Why cant the enviros just enjoy life instead of always looking for something to save?

Put the Northern Rockies population of wolves back on the Endangered Species list so they won't be hunted. Allow wolves back into Utah now. The Ecosystem is dependant on even wolves. They were here before us and all that was here should remain.

While I agree ohvs should only be allowed on restricted areas they should never, under any circumstances, be allowed into national parks so I have to demote the idea.

I think you misspoke. I think you meant to say the only ones who DON'T believe in global warming are the ones who have been paid off to think so.

Like many federal agencies given the responsibility of looking out for our wildlife, forests, prairies, streams, rivers and lakes they have been corrupted for years. I would like to see many of them disbanded and reinvented with environmentally friendly voices like those from non profits given a voice in decisions. Ending the secrecy would help also but as long as the right controls the media it would not help as much as is needed.

No. The LWCF already funds essential programs. Conservationists should not be competing for such a small pot of money (\$900,000.000 max!). We need Additional funds to preserve private lands plus an EXPANSION OF LWCF's budget. WE ARE RUNNING OUT OF TIME.

thanks for your input. Well documented and the note to monitoring civility on these posts is well-placed. I have to demote this idea also because I believe ALL OHV should be banned in public parks/wilderness area. OHV's should pay a fee and go play on private land. It makes me ill to see them destroy any land whatsoever, but private is private. I can only promote any ideas that entail the total banning of these unnecessarily destructive, noisy, fuel-burning, air-polluting monsters on public lands. I have periodically thought about taking a .45 with me on my hikes and blowing out a few engines, but my hiking partners have assured me that jail food isn't as good as it used to be. So, I'll have to settle for more civilized methods of expressing my dismay and working for change!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Boy Scouts? How about Girl Scouts? In Utah, the BSA is a Mormon-run organization and the Mormons are not leaders in environmental preservation. Quite the opposite. Private money only to gender-based groups.

This idea confuses the use of taxation to raise money for governmental functions and the use of public policy to set parameters for, among other things, land use. It also confuses the role of state and federal governments as set by our Constitution. Allowing ATV/UTV access to wilderness areas is nonsensical. Have you ever seen what ATV users and snowmobilers do to an area? It certainly isn't wilderness when they're finished.

The National Park Service can't maintain the parks they have now and you want to add 100 more? sounds like a recipe for disaster to me.

To assume that the present climate should remain in perpetuity is both arrogant and ignorant. It is totally contrary to the cycles and every changing patterns of mother nature. If it weren't for climate change all of the animals of the world including ourselves would be living in an iceage. Maybe instead we should study how the earth regularly changes and see for its inhabitants adapt and evolve. Some might refer to it as evolution.

Arguments like this amaze me at times. We aren't broke because we have too much government spending, we're broke because we don't the lower classes jobs with dignity and instead shuffle them off to work at McDonalds or Walmart and what little they get goes right back into corporate hands, not small businesses, not the community. If we don't create jobs that, while possibly being less glamorous, are good solid work and useful than we have to accept that we might have to support people to live because there are no jobs for them. You can't automate someone out of a job then call them lazy.

Any motorized vehicle that burns fossile fuel, is heavier than an average man, and makes more noise than a conversation imacts the environment and degrades the public land more than most other users. Why should one user be able to degrade the public land more than another? It may be "legal" but is not ethical.

I agree, I have sent emails and letters to the Southern Nevada office and get nothing, the Guys in Calente NV are will to discuss issues and possible soultions and the staff admitted the Las Vegas office had a totally diffrent outlook and attitude, I'm a government employee and would never treat a tax payer the way I have been treated.

Just this summer we hosted students from the Tahoe Baikal Institute, which is a program that brings environmental scientists from Russia/Lake Baikal to the US/Lake Tahoe. Students spend six weeks here and six weeks in Russia. One of the major environmental threats in the Tahoe Basin that they identified was cheatgrass- it is everywhere here. Besides edging out native grasses, cheatgrass is a serious fire hazard. We have removed it from our own property the old fashioned way, by pulling weeds, but what to do about the millions of acres it has infected?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need our some of our forests for hiking, mountain biking and other outdoor activities. In New Mexico, we do have some areas where people can use atvs, but we also have some designated wilderness areas where atvs are not permitted, or can use the forest service roads, but can't go off into the forest with them. They also have to have a permit. Off-road vehicles can damage the forest areas and disrupt wildlife. My mother's family has a cabin in Colorado located in the National Forest near where a couple of generations of ranchers have had forest land where their cattle graze. The ranchers in the area would not want people with off-road vehicles to be allowed in the area because it would tear up the grazing lands and scare the cattle. The homestead and the land has been in our family for 3, going on 4, generations now. We would like to see that our land and the surrounding National Forest stays the way it is, so future generations can enjoy hiking, mountain biking and other outdoor activities without the noise of off-road vehicles.

S.Colins, I don't think patented claims are part of any proposed reform. And this has nothing to do with homesteads. Those are private property. Miners pay almost nothing to mine on public land and can displace all other uses. That means government money is going out and all it is is a loss for taxpayers. The rest of us deserve compensation. I don't want to pay your way.

Recreation means different things to different people. One dictionary definition described it as "diversion". If America is going to break the obese trend we're in where it is normal for everyone to be overweight, the government is going to have to participate by quitting rewarding fat behavior. Recreation on government land should require physical exercise that gets the heart rate up. It should reward people who drive to campsites in small vehicles. It should reward vitality and shun TV, video games, beer parties, target shooting, car hunting, OHVs, motor home camps and sit-a-thons.

this is not a "Big Brother is watching" suggestion. There are very simple ways the transportation system in national forests and parks could be changed to encourage people to get more exercise. And there are simple things the government can do in designing campsites that would encourage people to sleep in tents or on the ground. Why does the government need to provide electric hookups in campgrounds? They don't! Or, what about making parking lots well away from scenic areas and trails leading away from them. You don't walk, you don't get the reward. I know of beaches where you can drive right on the gravel and camp with your trailer spitting distance from the river. That is lazy to the max fat behavior that encourages beer parties and garbage dumping. Who the heck needs a drive through redwood tree or a parking lot on a mountain top? My idea is about common sense, not big brother. It's about getting to know the land, not insulating yourself from it. Government land is big enough to get some exercise on. If the government wants you to get some exercise, they don't need to watch you or know where you are.

I know of many places that would make very fine additions to the wilderness system, and they have not yet been included because they have some marginal forestland on them. No other reason. No roads, no ohv trails, no mining scars, just pure wilderness. Big areas too.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The right wingers just don't get it. They say the envirofreaks are taking away their rights to transport cattle and feed (that carry invasive species seed). And then they complain cause their field is worthless because of something like star thistle. Then they want the government and taxpayers to come fix it. I just shake my head. The enviros aren't the problem. It's the cows. It's the feed. This is a message of hope. My hope that, if you have hate for someone you call an envirofreak, may your field become a star thistle patch.

The Siskiyou Crest is unique in its geology and geographically. It really is biodiverse and it needs to be preserved now and for the future. I have hiked a number of trails of the Siskiyou and realize that many areas are not well protected - even though many remain designated as wilderness. Many areas have been harmed by logging, roads, off use vehicles and livestock grazing. I live in this area and I know we need full protection for the crest and pristine places and restoration for the rest. The Siskiyou Crest is a valuable and important ecosystem. Jean Mount

Sadly, especially in the sense of recycling plastic, it is only delaying the inevitable. Recycling was for the most part put in place to satiate guilt over consumption and convenience. We need to focus on educating for less consumption. Read "Garbage Land" and you will understand the cycle.

I am tired of selfish, elitest, environmental snobs trying to tell me what I can and can't do on PUBLIC LAND and trying to close it down to everyone who does not fit their definition of acceptable recreation. I agree, I too am physically handicapped and would be unable to access our beautiful forests, mountains, etc. if it weren't for motorized recreation. Sure there are a few beer swilling jerks out there and I am all for getting rid of them. But for every one of them there are a hundred people like me that stay on established roads and trails, don't trample the earth, and clean up after ourselves - leaving the area as clean or cleaner than when we arrive. I carry a trash bag with me and clean up litter when I can. If you can't stand the sight of people like me, there are millions of acres of Wilderness that I am unable to access - so go there!

Why are hikers so negative? Well, I guess I shouldn't say all, I've never had a bad experience on the trail, mostly people complaining on the internet....makes me wonder if the people that complain ever actually use the trails.

It's not just Idaho. This is the perfect opportunity for all user groups to cooperate and actually do some good for the land, and I've said this before. Instead of everyone spending money on lawsuits over access issues, we need to be spending it on this.

Excellent idea. Where I live, there is a trail that will soon be closed if the Wilderness expands. It's been ridden by mountain bikers for years. As a matter of fact it even mentions in a hiking guide that it makes a good bike ride as well. The pro-Wilderness folks won't even compromise by shifting the boundary. It's such a remote trail, that conflict is not likely at all. There's absolutely no reason to close it to bikes other than selfishness.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

BSA is a private organization, which is why it's allowed to exclude gay Scouts, which is, in turn, why it is ineligible for public subsidies. The Supreme Court just recently ruled on this. See *CLS v. Martinez, et al.* { <a href="http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?court=us&vol=000&invol=08-1371" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Me either, I would support this as long as the private farm owners are not large corporations. I can't help wondering if there is some hidden loophole here for them.

What we need is a BIG Tax on OHVs ATVs and UTVs in order to build a few small trails to keep the riders out of our National Parks and Public Lands.

I think this is a great idea but, how will it be funded? Almost nightly I hear on the news some report about how over-taxed we are. Perhaps it could be tied in with welfare benefits?

Support federal legislation to avoid permanently protected lands during the siting of utilities. If protected properties cannot be avoided, utilities should be required to mitigate the damage. LTA is sponsoring a National Utility Infrastructure Coalition and working with Congress to pass legislation to ensure that our permanently protected lands are safeguarded forever.

Recreation in the Salmon Challis National Forest is not going to be an issue soon, as the Forest is dying. I would call the attack of the Western Pine Beetle a National Emergency! Hundreds of thousands of trees are dying daily. Every summer that goes by we see more and more forest dead, and new trees dying, and yet we see nothing being done. Mother Nature isn't going to take care of this one. I was recently in Canada and stopped to read about how the beetle had come to their forests near Revelstoke, BC. The Canadian government realized they had to take action and they did, with aggressively cutting down, spraying and whatever it took to eradicate this destructive pest. I can't understand why nothing is being done in this country. I'm frightened that we won't have any forest left in Idaho, not to mention the fire threat these dead trees pose.

People can enjoy wilderness if they have the willingness to actually get out and work at it. I can't go everywhere others can go because of my physical limitations, strength, etc., but I don't expect others to accommodate my deficiencies out in the wide open spaces. People who are afraid of wilderness designations and public lands in general should go to places where all land is owned and see how far they get with trying to "trespass" on someone's property with their ORVs, etc.

I don't really think this is realistic for the reasons other stated, but I like the reasoning, especially the idea of connecting areas into complete ecosystems. Fragmentation of ecosystems is a huge issue that needs to be addressed in a comprehensive way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Recreation on government land should require physical exercise that gets the heart rate up. It should reward people who drive to campsites in small vehicles. It should exude vitality and shun TV, video games, beer parties, target shooting, car hunting, OHVs, motor home camps and sit-a-thons. I'm disabled with chronic back problems. I guess I'm supposed to stay out of natural areas so these fitness freaks don't have to look at someone with gray hair limping around. I can't ride a bike or hike very far. I don't have an RV but I do have a Jeep and a tent with an inflatable mattress. Heaven forbid any one target practice, that would mean they have a GUN!!! Not only does "O" want to tell me what to watch on TV, he wants to tell me where I can watch it. If I want to take a portable TV or video game camping it is none of his business, though for the live of me I can't imagine why anyone would. If a group of us want to sit around and enjoy the great outdoors together what in the world is wrong with that? I do with there was some way to exclude the jerks who litter and leave graffiti on cliffs and rocks. Someone need to tell this administration that the government is the people not Obama.

One humorous aspect to \_\_\_'s idea is the fact that any taxes paid by "The Feds" would be, in fact, paid by the US taxpayer. Where does \_\_\_ think "The Feds" get the money they have to operate? From the US taxpayer....just sayin'.

If native Americans are willing to limit their use of these lands to pre-industrial tools and techniques, then I'm all for this proposal. If this law just grants the tribes special rights to access the lands to freely use their ATVs, motor boats, and firearms there, then this is not a solution to the problems.

How many people have been involved in a firearms incident or mishaps in National Parks I am having problems researching this. Thanks

Everybody needs to spend all their free time with a shovel out trying to control all the erosion I seen when driving around CA ,AZ, NV, NM, UT, ID, WY anybody that has not been to these areas should take a look its almost all washed and blown away we need to take action soon I have seen canyons more than a mile deep and a mile wide you should see this mess its horrible.

No thanks we have so many failed do good for all ideas we cant afford any more.

In economics, free goods are one justification for government. Because the good is "free" most people have no incentive not to waste or destroy the resource. National Parks, wilderness areas, national monuments, national forests, etc fall into this category. The government MUST regulate users of these resources in order to maintain its natural state. Roads and especially off road travel severely damage the resource. If off roaders want to damage a resource, they should damage their own property not the publics.

See "Tragedy of the Commons"...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Cheatgrass and other invasive species are gradually destroying the natural habitats in the West. These invasive species are expanding and reportedly collectively now cover an area larger than the state of California. Cheatgrass crowds out native vegetation, and creates excessive fuel loads when it dries out in the summer. When fires occur, these excessive fuel loads can change what was once a natural and beneficial disturbance process (fire) into an unnatural agent of destruction. Cheatgrass thrives on repeated fires, but the frequency and severity of the fires may gradually remove the natural vegetation and even the natural seed bank in the soil. Eventually, the permanent outcome can be an alien, annual grassland that is largely sterile for native wildlife and ugly to look at. This is a relatively quiet ecological crisis. Can you imagine the public outcry if many millions of acres were strip mined in the West? In my view, the response thus far by federal agencies and other stakeholders has been proportionally small compared to the enormous magnitude of the threat posed by invasives. Indeed, in most places, the invasives are still expanding. The challenge will be to aggressively apply the best science and tools to stop and reverse this expansion, and to better educate the public about how they may be inadvertently aiding in this expansion.

As someone who has followed federal lands issues in the West for many years, I believe that federal agencies need to be much more consistent and effective in how they respond to illegal or trespass livestock grazing situations. I have heard or read about BLM or Forest Service livestock grazing trespass situations that have lasted many years. For example, there is one publicized chronic situation near Mesquite Nevada where the trespass has reportedly occurred over the past fifteen years, and in critical habitat for the threatened Mojave desert tortoise. I believe that federal agencies can charge the offending rancher for the administrative costs of enforcement against the trespass, for the resulting resource damage, and, as a last resort, for the agency to round up, impound, and auction the trespass livestock. These cumulative costs should add up to a large bill hanging over that rancher and his family/heirs, and so I wonder why these chronic trespasses continue. Are the agencies not adding up these costs or submitting these bills? Are the federal managers afraid of the ranchers or their possible political connections? Are there no ways to track these chronic trespass situations so that the managers and ranchers can be held accountable? I recommend that the Obama administration establish a consistent program for tracking and monitoring the status of all federal lands trespass grazing situations. This would bring accountability from outside the local areas, and perhaps motivate more managers to do everything legally possible to stop the trespasses and recover the costs. The general data showing the status of trespass cases around the nation should also be available to the public, as part of the Obama administration's commitment to greater government transparency. Where there is a substantial delay in stopping a trespass or recovering costs, this program could flag those delays so that the manager could either provide a reasonable explanation for the delay or be disciplined for dereliction of duty. The BLM and Forest Service are supposed to manage livestock grazing as a multiple use, consistent with a variety of laws, regulations, plans, and policies. Allowing trespass grazing to continue violates all of those, and should be a huge embarrassment for these agencies. As such, the agencies themselves should support greater transparency and accountability to help shield them from the local pressures that may otherwise undermine prompt compliance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As someone who has followed BLM issues in the West for many years, I believe there is a pervasive, unwritten "culture of secrecy" in some BLM offices. This occurs where managers unofficially let employees know that they should not put anything in writing on sensitive issues unless they obtain prior approval from the managers. This can have a chilling effect on any employees who may want to document a concern in writing on a sensitive issue. This can also include when an employee wants to document something that they reasonably believe may be improper or illegal. BLM resource professionals are hired because of their substantial academic training and practical scientific experience, but that expertise may be diluted or lost if they are too intimidated to put their actual findings and recommendations in writing. This secrecy would also seem to frustrate the Obama administration and Interior Secretary Salazar's professed commitment to greater government transparency and accountability. If managers are successful in preventing anything in writing that they may disagree with, what is the point of Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests or discovery requests in litigation when everything in the official files has already been "sanitized" (like a motel room toilet seat) for the managers' protection? If President Obama and Secretary Salazar want to walk their good government talk, they need to root out this de facto BLM "culture of secrecy" wherever it exists, and discipline any managers who seek to maintain it.

What are the details of this idea? For instance: Would the private owners be given money from the gov't to "conserve" these privately owned easements? What does "conserve" mean in this instance? You state that these easements would remain "agriculturally productive" What does that mean? Would taxpayer money be subsidizing the private owners to grow crops? What would be the constraints on the landowners re the use/treatment of the easements?

You are absolutely right, and I will go even further. Several million acres of public lands are sverely damaged by 'legal' grazing that should be ended in the interest of soil errosion problems, stream degradation and extensive loss of plant species. These grazing rights have been passed down from generation to generation and are regarded by the privileged ranchers who benefit from them, as practically their God-given-rights. They are grazing their cattle on land you and I own.....to the detriment of that land!

Um, aren't WE the "feds"? Where does federal money come from? Oops, just read Tim's comment. Great minds...

When I am hiking, snowshoeing or cross country skiing I don't want to hear, see or smell the polution caused by OHVs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

People should be aware that conservation easements always exclude public access. So public tax dollars that are provided to non-profits for the purpose of purchasing conservation easements do not improve recreational opportunities. They primarily benefit the landowner, who gets to sell his land twice. In our western states, conservation easements lock up more scarce private land, drive property values up, and restrict growth of communities. As property values increase, affordable housing becomes difficult to find, and, eventually, our small western communities become affordable only to the wealthy. I do not support the use of public funds to support land trusts. There is simply no guarantee that these funds will be used in the best interests of the public.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dude, There isn't room for all the studies - hey and try to be a little civil with your tongue. Here's a start on your query. Currently, hundreds of thousands of miles of routes give off-road vehicles abundant access to our parks, forests, and other public lands and waters creating an imbalance between the amount of land available to off-road vehicles and the amount of land available to non-motorized users. For example, off-road vehicles are allowed on 93% of the 264 million acres managed by the Bureau of Land Management. Although ORV users represent only a small percentage of the total number of people recreating on public lands they are having a disproportionately large and harmful impact. Since the roar of motors can be heard by people and wildlife miles away, these vehicles can ruin the experience for those who choose to experience the outdoors without motorized vehicles. 3. Federal agencies have failed to enforce laws designed to protect our wildlands and drag their feet on implementing important new regulations. Exacerbated by inadequate or no route planning as well as severe lack of monitoring by these agencies, illegal and inappropriate off-road vehicle use has continued largely unchallenged. Americans want to experience natural quiet to camp, hunt, hike and fish with their families on their national public lands free from the roar of engines and the pounding of pistons. The Federal government has an abysmal record of enforcement of even established regulations barring ORV use. My personal experience comes from Arizona and the Coconino National Forest where ORV users transit signed/prohibited areas regularly. Repeated calls to Forest Service Law Enforcement brought zero results. The excuse given was insufficient resources. There is NO reason to believe that the situation for FOREST SERVICE is any different. Now in Williams, I hike an area where it is clearly signed "No Motorized Access", but ORV use takes place there regularly. 4. ORVs also emit large amounts of pollution, including carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, and carcinogens such as benzene. The small, inefficient two-stroke engines of some of these machines spew out as much as 30 percent of their fuel unburned polluting the soils, air, and water of our National Forests, National Parks, and other public lands including Oregon FOREST SERVICE holdings. With 36 million registered all-terrain vehicles and 12 million registered snowmobiles in the U.S. alone, these machines are a significant source of pollutants. They run on inefficient two and four-stroke engines that emit several dangerous gasses and chemicals including carbon monoxide (CO), hydrocarbons (HC), nitrogen oxide (NOx), and particulate matter (PM) (US DOT 2001). These emissions have all been shown to affect human health. Despite this fact, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has yet to establish emission standards for off-road vehicles. Carbon monoxide binds to the hemoglobin molecule in blood and inhibits the transportation of oxygen in the body. High levels of carbon monoxide exposure have been shown to lead to visual impairment, reduced work capacity and mental dexterity, poor learning ability, nausea, headaches, dizziness, and even death (USEPA 1991). Carbon monoxide is especially dangerous to the elderly, people with cardiovascular disease or other circulation disorders, anemic individuals, young infants, and pregnant women (USEPA 1991). Hydrocarbons are volatile organic compounds that include benzene, toluene, ethylbenzene, and xylenes. While these compounds can cause dizziness, headaches, and loss of consciousness, the EPA has also identified benzene as a carcinogen and those exposed to benzene have an increased incidence of leukemia. Nitrogen oxides can cause shortness of breath and chest pains and increase a person's susceptibility to respiratory infections and asthma. Long-term exposure can cause chronic lung disease. Particulate matter, also found in off-road vehicle

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

emissions, is detrimental in fine and coarse forms as it accumulates in the respiratory system, and can lead to decreased lung function, respiratory disease and even death (Janssen and Schettler 2003). Of the pollutants emitted by ORVs, particulates are of special concern because their small size makes them easily respirable and thus deliverable directly into the lungs, causing any number of the aforementioned maladies (NPS 2000). The EPA found that ATVs emit more than 381,000 tons of hydrocarbons, 1,860,000 tons of carbon monoxide, and 11,000 tons of nitrogen oxide each year across the country (USEPA 2001). While emissions from on-road vehicles decreased 56 percent over the last 20 years as a result of emission control programs, there was a 42 percent increase in ATV emissions during the same time period (Grambsch 2002). The list of greenhouse gases continues to show the impact of these vehicles. For example, on-road vehicle emissions of nitrogen oxide were virtually unchanged during the same twenty-year span, while emissions from off-road vehicles increased 56 percent (Grambsch 2002).

Anthropogenic emissions of nitrogen oxide account for a large majority of all nitrogen inputs in the environment and off-road emissions are a large contributor (Grambsch 2002). The EPA went even further to research individual ATVs: they showed that a two-stroke ATV or motorcycle could emit as much pollution as more than thirty automobiles operating in the same time frame. Even more shocking is that the ATV took a distant second from two-stroke snowmobiles, which can emit as much as nearly one hundred automobiles in the same time frame (USEPA 1996). It is well-established that off-road vehicles contribute a large amount of pollution to the air.

According to the EPA, if left uncontrolled, off-road vehicles will contribute 33 percent of hydrocarbon emissions, nine percent of carbon monoxide, nine percent of nitrogen oxide, and two percent of particulate emissions nationally by 2020 (USEPA 1996). The Environmental Protection Agency has yet to establish emission standards for off-road vehicles and the engines on which they run. The off-road vehicle industry has been slow to adopt technological changes that could lessen the impact of its machines on air quality at the local and, even the global, level. And while the industry has been sluggish, government regulatory and enforcement agencies have been all-too complacent in allowing continued degradation. References Cain, C.J. and J.

Coefield. 2001. Preliminary Air Dispersion Modeling Analysis of Yellowstone National Park West Entrance: Wintertime Carbon Monoxide Emissions. Monitoring and Data Management Bureau, Montana Department of Environmental Quality, Helena, MT. Grambsch, A. 2002. Climate change and air quality. In: The Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Transportation. Federal Research Partnership Workshop, Department of Transportation Center for Climate Change and Environmental Forecasting. Jamssem, S., T. Schettler. 2003. Health implications of snowmobile use in Yellowstone National Park. 27p. { <a

href="http://www.womenandenvironment.org/Health\_Imp\_snow.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [1]

Lela, C.C. and J.J. White. 2002. Laboratory Testing of Snowmobile Emissions: Final Report. Southwest Research Institute, SwRI 08.05486, Texas.

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). 2005a. Solutions-Oxygenated Fuels. { <a href="http://www.deq.mt.gov/cleansnowmobile/solutions/fuels/oxygenated.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [2]

Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). 2005b. Solutions-Two-Stroke Engine Modifications. { <a

href="http://deq.mt.gov/CleanSnowmobile/solutions/engine/modifications.asp" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [3] Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). 2005c.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Emissions from Snowmobile Engines Using Bio-based Fuels and Lubricants. { <a href="http://deq.mt.gov/Energy/bioenergy/biofuels.asp" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [4] National Park Service (NPS). 2000. Air Quality Concerns Related to Snowmobile Usage in National Parks. Washington, D.C. Sive, B., D. Shively, and B. Pape. 2002. Spatial Variation and Characteristics of Volatile Organic Compounds Associated with Snowmobile Emissions in Yellowstone National Park: A Preliminary Research Report Submitted to the National Park Service, United States Department of the Interior. Central Michigan University, MI, 2002. United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). 2001. About Transportation and Climate Change. Center for Climate Change and Environmental Forecasting { <a href="http://climate.volpe.dot.gov/national.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [5] United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1991. Air Quality Criteria for Carbon Monoxide. Washington, D.C. EPA-600/8-90-045A. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1996. Non-Road Engines and Air Pollution. Office of Mobile Resources, EPA 420-F-94-003, Washington, D.C. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 2001. Environmental Fact Sheet, Frequently Asked Questions: Emission Standards for All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs). Office of Transportation and Air Quality, EPA 420-F-01-027, Ann Arbor, MI. Source URL: { <a href="http://www.wildlandscpr.org/biblio-notes/off-road-vehicle-emissions-and-their-effects-human-health" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Links: [1] { <a href="http://www.womenandenvironment.org/Health\_Imp\_snow.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [2] { <a href="http://www.deq.mt.gov/cleansnowmobile/solutions/fuels/oxygenated.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [3] { <a href="http://deq.mt.gov/CleanSnowmobile/solutions/engine/modifications.asp" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [4] { <a href="http://deq.mt.gov/Energy/bioenergy/biofuels.asp" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [5] { <a href="http://climate.volpe.dot.gov/national.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } 5. The idea that most ORV riders obey the laws and regulation is patently FALSE, and additional designation of ORV areas will NOT solve the problem. It will only exacerbate it. I incorporate, for the record, the following research article. Just a Few Bad Apples: Research Shows Many Off-Roaders Break the Law. Introduction The ecological impacts of off-road vehicles on water, air and land have been well documented. In the past five to ten years, however, these issues have taken on social dimensions, and social scientists have begun exploring the attitudes and behaviors of off-road vehicle drivers. Countless newspaper articles are peppered with myths perpetuated by off-roaders, such as: "elite environmentalists are locking the public out of public lands;" "the old and infirm need vehicles to explore the forest;" "if you give folks a place to ride their ATVs, they won't break the rules;" and "it's just a few bad apples riding where they're not supposed to and causing damage." This article examines important social science research that debunks the "few bad apples" myth. Analysis includes a review of three state-level surveys revealing that a majority of off-roaders break the law. These studies point to the failure of this myth and show a pronounced preference and practice among off-road vehicle recreationists to travel cross-country and ride off of legal routes. Montana In 2006, Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks received survey responses from 446 owners of registered off-road vehicles. Among the full sample of respondents, 23% "always or sometimes" ride cross-country even though off-route

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

riding is against the rules in Montana and has been since 2001. Over 28% “sometimes or never” avoid riparian areas and wetlands, in violation of rules for federal and state public lands in Montana. Sixty-four percent of those surveyed have used an off-road vehicle while hunting. The majority of this hunting subset admits to riding cross-country — over 58% have traveled off of legal routes to retrieve downed game. Colorado A 2001 Colorado study cited the state of Montana’s off-road vehicle public education program as a model to emulate. According to the Colorado study, Montana’s “On the Right Trail” program “provided a list of key behavioral traits that define an ‘ethical hunter’ — with several of these related to proper OHV use.” However, as discussed above, the more recent Montana study revealed a significant disregard for the rules among many off-road vehicle riders, pointing to the ineffectiveness of the state’s education program. This supports the key conclusion of the Colorado study: “information and education per se – will not result in substantial behavioral change” (emphases in original). Monaghan and Associates, a marketing research firm, conducted the 2001 study at the behest of the Colorado Coalition for Responsible OHV Riding, a coalition of off-road vehicle representatives, environmentalists and public officials. Researchers surveyed Colorado off-road vehicle riders through a series of three focus groups. Monaghan and Associates found that the majority of off-roaders understand that staying on designated routes is “fundamental trail etiquette” and that going off trail is not “correct” off-road vehicle behavior. The survey revealed, however, that regardless of this knowledge “as many as two-thirds of adult users go off the trail occasionally.” A significant percentage of riders, 15-20%, admitted to frequently breaking the rules and riding off of legal routes often. Survey participants also stated that “others” ride off-route and cause most of the damage. Utah In a separate study, the Utah Division of Parks & Recreation commissioned Utah State University to survey riders to determine their “OHV uses and owner preferences.” The university conducted a telephone survey of 335 riders from a random sample of the 50,676 people who registered off-road vehicles with the state in 2000. The Utah report reveals that a high percentage of riders prefer to ride “off established trails” and did so on their last outing. Of the ATV riders surveyed, 49.4% prefer to ride off established trails, while 39% did so on their most recent excursion. Of the dirt bike riders surveyed, 38.1% prefer to ride off established trails, while 50% rode off established trails on their most recent excursion. When surveyed on issues affecting off-road vehicle use in Utah, survey respondents recognized the need for enforcement but not the need for protecting the natural resources where they ride. This questions the assumption that off-road vehicle riders will stay on-route if educated that cross-country travel is illegal or damaging. One-third of the respondents said there should be more law enforcement presence in OHV areas. Only 6% cited “resource management conservation” as the most important issue affecting off-road vehicle use in Utah. Nevada The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found a near universal disregard for motorized guidelines when the BLM experimented with a “voluntary off-road vehicle route system” in Nevada. The area in question serves as a refuge for the disappearing Sand Mountain Blue butterfly, a species proposed for listing under the Endangered Species Act. A 2006 monitoring report compiled over a three-year period found that “98 percent of all existing routes continued to be used and new routes were created, indicating an ongoing expansion of habitat degradation.” The study also found that half of the places where riders violated guidelines were near signs that discouraged them from proceeding into sensitive butterfly habitat. The cumulative impacts of such “noncompliance points” were

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

four-fold as each discouraged route experienced multiple incursions. Conclusion One can assume that many folks will not tell the truth when asked if they participated in a behavior known to be illegal or generally perceived to be in conflict with social norms. This tendency is known as the “social desirability bias” and defined as under-reporting undesirable attributes and/or over-reporting desirable attributes due to the tendency to present oneself in a favorable light (Groves et. al. 2004). Therefore, the percentage of off-roaders who violate the rules is likely even higher than revealed in the survey results discussed above. Many public land managers assume that designating additional off-road vehicle routes will lead directly to greater compliance, less cross-country travel and, as a result, less resource damage and fewer conflicts among incompatible uses. Some believe that off-road vehicle riders will quit creating renegade routes once more routes are designated “open” and riders are educated as to where they are and are not allowed to ride. In contrast, the research above shatters the myth that damage and conflicts are being caused by an insignificant percentage of off-road vehicle riders. The findings of these studies suggest that even if the “demand” for more off-road vehicle riding opportunities is met, riders will continue to fulfill their preferences by riding off legal routes. They also conclude or at least strongly suggest that education and information alone are not effective strategies for changing off-road behavior. Instead, Monaghan and Associates offers the following recommendation: “In order to be successful and actually influence behavior, OHV users must be motivated to behave properly.” While more social science research is needed to determine what will motivate users to behave properly, anecdotal research (Wildlands CPR 2007) argues most strongly for increasing enforcement, and especially increasing the consequences for breaking the law, through mechanisms like vehicle confiscations, increased fines, and closing areas to all motorized users when motorized trespass occurs. References Archie, M.L., H.D. Terry, B. Walder, and N. Jackson. 2007. Six Strategies for Success: Effective Enforcement of Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands. Wildlands CPR, Missoula, MT. { <a href="http://www.wildlandscpr.org/Reports/EnforcementReport.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [1] . Fischer, A.L., D.J. Blahna, and R. Bahr. 2002. Off Highway Vehicle Uses and Owner Preferences in Utah (Revised). Institute for Outdoor Recreation & Tourism, Department of Forest Resources, Utah State University for Utah Department of Natural Resources’ Division of Parks & Recreation. { <a href="http://extension.usu.edu/iort/files/uploads/pdfs/revisedOHVreport.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [2] . Frueh, LM. 2001. Status and Summary Report on OHV Responsible Riding Campaign. Prepared by Monaghan and Associates for the Colorado Coalition for Responsible OHV Riding. { <a href="http://www.wildlandscpr.org/status-and-summary-report-ohv-responsible-ri..." rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [3] . Groves, R.M., et al. Survey Methodology. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2004, p. 208. Lewis, M.S., and R. Paige. 2006. Selected Results From a 2006 Survey of Registered Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) Owners in Montana. Responsive Management Unit Research Summary No. 21. Prepared for Montana Fish, Wildlife and Parks. { <a href="http://fwp.mt.gov/content/getItem.aspx?id=19238" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } [4] . Nevada

The wildfire issue has resulted from your brand of conservation over many years - use it up. We want the chance to help nature heal.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'd love to enjoy life, but a number a folks are killing everything that gives me joy. you bet I will continue to "save" as much as I can! Bear in mind also folks these these lands are federal lands, belonging to all the people of the USA who also have a voice.

Noise pollution drives away much animal life and stunts plant growth, sometimes preventing germination. There is no such thing as a motor vehicle in the wild that is not destructive.

I used to live in Salt Lake City. I have woken up under the night sky while in southern canyons (dirtbiking). A telescope would have been a hindrance to me in that situation. It's the most beautiful picture I carry through life to this point. I now live in rural VT on a street where no one leaves lights on except the, usually, unoccupied vacation home at the bottom of my driveway who's motion detector lights turn on each time a car passes or the leaves move in the wind. It is annoying, but, I guess, it's the price we pay for "civilization". I'm no greenie or tree hugger, but I'll give you the nod on this due to a similar appreciation of night time as it should be. Thanks.

After 50 years of hiking, camping, fishing and photographing the American west, I can testify from experience that off-road vehicle operators are not "users" of public lands, they are "abusers" of it. Our public lands are among the most important legacies we will leave for our children, and their children and their children's children. Ten years ago, I could walk from my home to a lovely piece of desert -- wild, though not protected wilderness. Then came the off-roaders. Now the area is a trashed wasteland.

Boy Scouts was one of the worst experiences of my life. Too often they are run by churches who are promoting their own ideals.

Please elaborate on these "impacts" and be sure to site scientific evidence of these impacts with the results of these scientific studies being dated within the last 5 years. Otherwise your comment is worthless and ignorant.

Carrying a gun does not increase your security or the security of your family or companions.

Not being allowed to rip up and pollute larger swaths of the outdoors can hardly be considered causing harm to humans. There is no such thing as a RIGHT to adversely affect public lands. We KNOW OHV use adversely affects the wild-ness of a place. Why are OHVs so desperate to hit places that aren't already designated for OHV use? Could it be because current OHV areas have lost that quality of wild-ness?

Give federal land managers new authority to enforce offroad vehicle restrictions in wilderness and other federal lands, such as: (1) Confiscate the vehicle as evidence, then destroy it when the suspect has been found guilty. (2) Expand the closed area by 1 mile after the first violation, 1 mile more after every subsequent violation.

The National Park Service has made a good start on this, using good science and engineering to establish baseline data in some of the national parks. It's worth doing, because the sounds of nature are one of the values we enjoy in national parks and wilderness areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

People who believe that there is plenty of room for wildlife and that there no need for wildlife corridors have no idea what they are talking about. I have studied science, biology and chemistry, and we need more protected lands for wildlife in order to sustain the present population levels.

In your statement, you said "no more wilderness, we do not need more the land does not need to be taken away from the majority of people it needs to be used in a responsible manner, not burried in a hole for a select few." I grew up on the east coast and honestly I'm not sure if there is any "Wilderness" that one could go to on the weekend, and especially one that only serves a few. From what I hear the recreation spots outside of DC are packed on the weekends. But these "select few" that may recreate on the lands are not the ones benefitting the most. Myself and my family are benefitting when we see wildlife in the areas between the city and the wildlands, because they have habitat in the wildlands. We are benefitting on days when the air smells fresh and clean, because there is less dusts stirred up by construction because there is less construction happening in wild places. So just because only some people are physically visiting wildlands, doesn't mean the rest of us don't benefit, be it from the view at the overlook nearby, or the quality of life that we have.

Getting away from the hiking and OHV debates here, I do think that wildlife corridors are important for many varieties of wildlife. Intact and relatively contiguous wetlands and streams are of particular importance to healthy ecosystems throughout the continent. The arguments around OHV use have some limited impact here, but in the larger scheme is not important. In my (unscientific) opinion, urban development, major highways, and dams are the big potential threats to existing wildlife corridors. OHVs and even farmland are of minimal impact here.

Jack said it right. Machines mean noise and polluted air - exactly what hikers are trying to escape. They also mean wide trails (way too wide for a pleasant walk in the woods) and torn-up ground. I'm a hiking trail maintainer: one illegal ORV rider can in ten minutes ruin what a group of volunteers spent all day improving. It's heart-breaking.

how are you enjoying being in the wilderness, hearing the birds, watching the squirrels...seeking the peace and tranquility of nature when you can't hear anything but engines revving up and seeing dirt flying everywhere?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

It is so ironic that the Historic Route 66 Bridge in Eureka, MO was added to the National Historic Register last year only to be added to the demolition list by MODOT shortly thereafter. The Historic Route 66 bridge was built in 1931 and is one of the few remaining reverse trestle bridges left in America. This bridge is now the link between the Route 66 State Park Historic roadhouse Visitor Center and the Route 66 State Park. Since the bridge closure the visitor center and park staff have been cut off from the remainder of the park making visitation difficult for both local and foreign travelers alike. Travelers come from all over the world on a daily basis to visit our historic roadhouse and bridge. How is it then that we can deem a site valuable enough to add to the National Historic Register but not valuable enough to maintain and preserve. MODOT is trying to give the bridge away due to the public outcry to save the bridge but no one has the money to fix MODOT's failure to properly maintain the bridge. MODOT wants to demolish the bridge unless someone steps forward to take ownership and responsibility to repair the bridge. This bridge is also an important link to other trails in this area. There is a National Route 66 Corridor Preservation Program but there are no funds available to preserve and maintain this historic bridge. What is the purpose of these historic preservation programs and National Registers if our government is not going to see fit to maintain and preserve sites on the National Historic Register????? We need our President to champion the cause to save the National Historic Route 66 Bridge. Perhaps the National Parks and Sites should assume ownership of the bridge and see to its preservation. SAVE THIS AMERICAN ICON!!

Trees all across the west are dying due to climate change. Warmer winters and longer summers allow insects of all kinds to live through winter and produce more offspring. Rainfall is down, temperatures are up. Dead trees and increased fires are not caused by poor forest management. They are caused by climate change and will continue to increase if we don't work to mitigate our impact on the environment. There is not enough money in the world to manage all the forests that will be affected or fight all the fires that will occur if we don't deal with the fundamental problem: climate change. Read Bill McKibben's book *Eaarth* (2 a's because it's not the same planet anymore). He provides some staggering statistics on forest lands in the west.

Agencies do not need MORE land to manage. They need to manage the land under their jurisdiction more productively. In place of "acquisition", agencies should promote private land conservation.

As an education coordinator for a watershed district in MN, I provide many education activities for K12 students. However, it has been increasingly difficult to get teachers to participate in these programs. These programs are often completely free and do not require anything of the teacher but to show up. However, I've noticed teachers do not have the flexibility in their curriculum or the time to participate in valuable outdoors education programs. It's a shame because so many important experiences cannot be shared in a classroom setting. I would love to see the federal gov. back a program that at least encourages, if not requires, teachers to take classes on env. field trips, to nature centers, water festivals, conservation days, and many of the other programs that are available to them. Make it easy for teachers to participate, not more difficult. I don't know much about the educational policies regarding testing kids so I won't bother going into that, but I think that is part of the problem.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Huh? A "power grab" by the government to control its own lands -held for all Americans, no matter where they live, in the public interest? No, your idea is a thinly veiled power grab by the interests of the local developers, ranchers, miners, loggers and hunting and fishing interests who typically want the federal lands turned over to the the same local governments they personally dominate. Why do we need more deer? I love to watch them, but they're so numerous they're like locusts already. They thrive in transition forests, and most of the federal forests are already a patchwork of stands in transition between just-cut and nearly mature. Don't "watch out for the feds" --watch out for the ever-hungry money interests that would exploit the federal lands for their private profit.

Letting locals decide how to use federal lands would be an abrogation of federal responsibilities and obligations to the citizenry as a whole. Locals always want to have dibs on federal resources because they think they own them, personally, and should be able to develop and exploit them because the local monied interests almost always control the local politicians. I've seen it all before. Forget it. My tax dollars, and those of my parents and grandparents paid for their acquisition and management just as much as anyone's and all Americans have an equal say. The feds employ scientists and professional managers to follow the federal law. That doesn't mean enriching local power brokers.

Pollution credits and exchanges are just a "free market" ruse for one party to make money while another continues to pollute or even pollutes more. If nutrient loading can be reduced by Party A why should Party B bet to eat up that reduction by not reducing loading? better to make it much more expensive to continue polluting than to abate and put the fines into the Treasury or into corrective actions and research.

I think we're missing an important point here. There is more to be considered than how I can do my preferred activity and whether I get my fair share of land where my preferred activity is allowed or optimally provided for. The whole point of wilderness is not to give backpackers a peak experience; it's for preservation of habitat. Humans have taken over 95% of what was wilderness. At what point do we become concerned that the whole web of life is degraded if not threatened by the overwhelming precedence and influence of one species?

I agree with Mr Carpenter on this one. There is no such thing as smart "development" near pristine lands.

you are right on, here. I'd go further: You have a kid and you end up on welfare, you get sterilized. We need more tax incentives to not have children, and to adopt instead. Even if you buy into the mythology that God somehow told us to go forth and populate the earth, the corollary is that "He" gave us a brain big enough to figure out when we were done.

There needs to be a balance. Too often local interests are dominated by those who stand to profit by the exploitation of our resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I find it interesting that people are arguing that OHV use needs to be eliminated because of a few bad apples, but these people seem to have no interest in working on laws and enforcement that would stop this abuse. The comments by this group of dishonest. You hate people who are not like you and enjoy only the things you enjoy. You could at least be honest about this and admit it. I have hiked, biked, motorcycled, and driven on many of the public lands in the west. I have NEVER come across any OHV enthusiasts that express any hatred, distrust, or angst against hikers, or horse enthusiasts. However I have come across an overwhelming hatred and bias from the hiking community against the OHV and mountain bike community. Makes it quite clear which group is "not compatible". I guess these people never learned how to share and work/play well with others. If we all work together we can come up with a plan that ensures everyone gets to enjoy public lands and those that wish to damage(whether they be from the OHV, Horse or Hiking community) are controlled.

I'd be happy to let you "open season" as long as it works both ways - and I'd guarantee you that most of us "enviro-nuts" can sneak up on you and your friends a lot quieter than you can sneak up on us - and, yes, many of us are hunters. The difference is, we're the type that respect nature rather than rape it. As for the rest of your opinion, I'd rather be a Marxist than a Fascist pig. Talk about the pot calling the kettle black! Now, on to saner conversations...

Indeed, multi-use trails that include mountain biking work very well. This posted idea does not include anything about restricting the trails to only mountain bikes. What we do want to avoid is trails that are accessible by motorized vehicles. Single-track trails are not usable by ATVs, and thus help to protect natural areas from the misuse and noise of motorized vehicles. Trails must of course be properly constructed to avoid erosion. Studies show that mountain biking has similar or less erosion impact compared to hiking, and far less impact than horseback riding. The IMBA (Int'l Mountain Biking Assoc.) publishes a detailed document describing good trail building technique (the same principles apply to all types of trails). Trail grade and trail grade reversals are the most important factors in allowing water to flow off the trails instead of along the trails, thus preventing erosion.

Comment #38 is the best post I've read on this subject, and I wish more of the ORV crowd would read it carefully and think about the impact of road building on our wild places. Thanks, for the informed, responsible, and tactful post.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm going to quote from #38: "There are over 300,000 miles of designated Forest Roads (8 times bigger than the interstate highway system!) and probably a like amount on BLM land. How on earth is this not enough for ORV users? I drive a 4 wheel drive truck and use it to access trailheads and dispersed camping sites but I stick to the roads on the forest service map. Even if the USFS closes some of those roads for natural resource protection there are still more miles to drive on than one person could hope to drive in a lifetime. I don't begrudge ORV users from enjoying the forest but when "roads" are closed by the federal agencies or wilderness areas created by Congress it has NOTHING to do with creating playgrounds for the tree huggers and everything to do with erosion control, habitat protection, endangered species protection, watershed preservation (kind of important in the arid west), archeological and historic preservation, and myriad other natural resource reasons. It's our playground but it's the wildlife's home." What parts of this are "wrong,"? Do you care about erosion control and habitat preservation? Maybe you don't, but I know that many OHV users \*do\* care about these things, and sure, many hikers don't care enough about them. I wish we didn't have to be so alienated, to say one side is totally WRONG when engaging in a debate. How do you address the issue of erosion control in the use of OHVs in wilderness areas? Is there a way to mitigate this? I have read some intelligent and detailed posts in other threads that talk about different KINDS of OHVs...claiming that the 2-wheeled variety are less destructive than the 4, and addressing the matter of decibels in noise output. As a non-OHV person, I learned a lot from these posts, and wish I saw more of them here.

Why don't you hike on your own property then. You know, we like to explore as well, not just go round and round on a track. I am a responsible rider and always have been. Saying that we all tear up the land is nonsense. If we go by your thinking, No one should be allowed in the wilderness-no one. I have seen many a hiker running off the trail kicking up rocks, etc. I guess by your thinking, every hiker does that. I have been in the mountains all my life and OHV has changed nothing. I enjoy my OHV and will fight for the right to use roads and trails. You will never convince me of your narrow thinking.

Each OHV and ATV carries a large, clearly legible license number visible from front and back. The perpetrators among the OHV and ATV community rely on their speed, "all terrain" capability, and anonymity to evade detection by property owners and law enforcement. Although the property I monitor is surrounded by other properties that prohibit ATVs, nevertheless, as a monitor of protected land, I see many ATVs. Occasionally, the ATV is stopped or slow enough and the license plate is properly mounted and clean. More often, if there is a plate, it is invisible. Another land monitor stood at the edge of a field with a county sheriff as an ATV circled through the field. There was no way for the sheriff to apprehend or identify the perpetrator. Simplify the landowners' and sheriffs' task by requiring large, clear plate numbers visible from hundreds of yards.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In Hawaii, homeowners install solar cells on their roofs and sell electricity to the power company. In the US, Big Oil managers are the biggest spender on influencing the legislature and the administration. Three out of four of the energy lobbyists are former government employees. The Big Oil managers are among the 1/100th of one percent of Americans who take more than five percent of the national income. That is, the people who are paid an average \$25,000,000 per year. They are not the founders of the companies. They are not inventors. They are the survivors of office politics -- bureaucrats, if you will. They have effectively sold doubt about global warming for 35 years.

The energy industry spends the most money on influencing the Federal government. Three out of four energy lobbyists are former government employees. For example, look at the sad story of the watchdog Minerals Management Service that makes it easy for the big oil companies to gamble with our resources. If you think your air is bad, check out Houston. Big oil rules!

So, we should trust volunteers to manage our land? Follow the drilling industry model?

Estuaries are suffering from global warming. The expansion of the warming sea is pushing salt water back through the estuaries, replacing fresh water and changing the ecology.

We are putting increasing amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> into the air. The CO<sub>2</sub> does not stay in the air forever. Some of the CO<sub>2</sub> is absorbed by the ocean. The ocean is becoming more acidic. The increasing acidity of the water harms life forms that build shells. Whatever the cause, the atmosphere is warming. The heat does not stay in the air forever. The biggest heat sink is the ocean. The ocean is becoming warmer, more slowly than the atmosphere. As the ocean warms, the volume of the water expands, raising the sea level. The rising sea level covers land that people used. The warmer surface water prevents the upwelling of cold nutrient-laden water that supports phytoplankton. The loss of nutrients has caused the phytoplankton to decline by 40% since 1950. Phytoplankton is the base of the food chain. The smell of the sea is the respiration of phytoplankton. Phytoplankton breath includes sulfur. Sulfur particles are a nucleus of raindrops. Phytoplankton produced 50% of the oxygen in the atmosphere. The warming atmosphere melts the tundra, releasing methane, a more powerful greenhouse gas. The warming ocean melts the methane hydrates locked in the continental shelves, releasing more methane. Methane caused the extinction of the large animals once before, leaving the world open to the dinosaurs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just because cars cause most of our air pollution problems does not mean that OHVs on wilderness land is a great idea. I favor designated OHV areas with the vast majority of our wilderness lands confined to walkers or disabled travelers using some quiet, non-invasive form of motorized transportation to visit more accessible areas. I agree that balance is good, but these forums seem to be dominated by an organized OHV community that opposes limits on where drivers can take their vehicles. It seems to me that part of the attraction of OHV use is that drivers can blaze new trails, instead of confining travel to those boring byways that people on foot use. The temptation to cowboy around with wild abandon appears to be pretty strong and that's how many of these vehicles are marketed. It's good to know that there are OHV fans who are quiet, considerate and responsible like the writer above. My experience sharing the outback with wheeled vehicles (including mountain bikes) is that I usually have to be on the alert to stay out of the way. Noisy is the norm, which is antithetical to the whole notion of getting away from it all.

Does this mean the parks in my city will have to take out a soccer field, duck pond, trees or picnic areas? Or will the meadow at Yosemite have to include a parcel of public farm. Or will the public schools in my community have to designate some percentage of the lot to public gardens. General idea sounds great but not at the expense of existing publicly held land. Sounds better to be a requirement of future development.

All of our rights have limits. Just because I have a voice and a right to use it that right is limited to not yelling fire in a theater. Just because you own property doesn't mean you have the right to prevent the water that crosses it from getting to the neighbors down stream, or to pollute it. The sooner we apply that logic to the source of the very oxygen we breath the better. There need to be limits to what we can do to the land, water, and air of our world because personal short term decisions are not always what's best for the long haul. Wildlife is an intrinsic part of land, water and air. It's the part that recycles all of it for the future and therefore it must be protected whenever possible. Wise use gives us short term benefits that help the less informed justify the bother of protection.

e vv How much did you pay for the air and rain? Both are directly and inextricably connected to the health of natural land areas. Many of which are even publicly owned buy various levels of government. Meaning each of us own part of them. In any case we all own the air and rain, and therefore have a "stake" in protecting the parts of the world that affect them. Lucky for your descendants no matter how hard you try to sell or squander their share there are "stake holders" more enlightened than you that will protect their share while they protect the future for their own descendants.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You have me “falling down Laughing”! The vast a majority of all Wilderness Areas within the USA are west of the Mississippi. How could there be “Little quality habitat remains” west of the Mississippi? I think the Wilderness Areas and forest out west have great habitat or they would not have been designated Wilderness Areas and forest! You are right on the money with “...what does this have to do with the debate between motorized and hiking traffic?” I don’t see the author anywhere refer to motorized traffic (as you put it) within the idea. So why are you, and many others, bringing up a topic that has nothing to do with the author’s idea?

Man himself walking through degrades the environment. Period. Are you including hikers/backpackers as well in your statement of “Multiple use does not mean multiple abuse”. This idea is not about Wilderness areas where motorized vehicle are suppose to be prohibited, it is about Multiple Use Lands.

On your comment for “...Forest Service management...”. Can this be done under the status of being National Park? My limited experience with the classification difference between a National Monument and a National Park, with regards to your concerns for “recreational access”, is that the National park has restricted some of the access when changed from a National Monument. The only access staying the same or improvements, where I travel, were in the form of better roads and parking facilities, but an actual reduction in the areas you have access to.

Help me out here as I am not familiar with the areas that you are referring to. I get the grasp of what your idea is about and think protection for this type of areas are needed. But not sure why The National Park Service is the right agency to manage these areas. First, are these areas not currently protected at all? Such as State Park or regional park status? If they are protected what’s not currently work? Would the protection as a “National Monument” status work as well rather than National Park? I live within two miles in either direction of two state run parks that are well managed, that is at least as long as the funding holds out in these difficult times! When Death Valley was a National Monument in many ways I feel it was better run then under the National Park status it is now. Thanks

Help me out here. What is “RTP” stand for and what area does it represent? I am sure it is something like what we have in California State Parks, Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division. Gas taxes go towards many uses, grants and programs, that is unless the governor gets to funds first for other purposes. But I am not sure if they are also used for “most trails” - meaning hiking, equestrian and other non OHV trails. Thanks

Less government, less Dennis German's, more quieter off-road machines, more education. There are such things as responsible OHV users however the minority are ruining it for the majority.

Even as an OHV'r, this isn't a bad idea. I and many others takes great care in staying on the trail and nothing is worse than seeing tracks (be they bicycle, foot, hooves, OHV, or full size rigs) on areas that are not meant to be tread on. Even if law enforcement can't or doesn't have the resources to impound all the vehicles, there should be stiff penalties for off-route use.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

More than enough recreation, beauty, history, trail potential and international understanding through linking with the always-enthusiastic Canadian hikers, etc., the Great Lakes Basin is powerful, under-rated and very accessible. Let's link trails, especially cycling trails, throughout the region. Give it a thorough review for possible national/international designation -- perhaps creating a new category for mutual agreement, interest and a world-model for cooperation. Already a UNESCO World Heritage Site - Bruce/Niagara Escarpment, look at the whole picture and help educate on the formation of the basin, its resources and its future.

As the permafrost melts below the tundra in the arctic regions, the land is rebounding, rising, causing the upper Great Lakes to tilt. In effect, the water levels are lowering in Superior, Huron and rising in Erie and Ontario [of course some of Ontario water level is regulated by the St. Lawrence Seaway/Joint Commission]. In any event, the global effects of warming are affecting the Great Lakes. This is just one reason the area is significant. In addition, the fresh water resource is inestimable. The long complex history of industrialization's pollution needs to be revisited. The cities of the area are bouncing back in creative ways and the long-established ethnic enclaves have generated food, customs and spirituality that is significant in many different ways. For a few pics of L. Ontario: [www.westspit.blogspot.com](http://www.westspit.blogspot.com)

>OHV brings trampled earth. Opposite of natural beauty. >OHV brings fuel stations, fumes and ground pollution. Opposite again. >One for one isn't smart or fair. You clearly have never seen the forest we are talking about. Official ATV trails are built using gravel and are leveled off every so often they create no trampled earth. I do not understand the fuel stations argument most all of these forest have state roads through them with existing fuel stations in the area. I am against one for one because I am against all wilderness areas. They should all be abandoned because they are not needed. It was just a trick to shut down oil gas and coal production. But it also prevents motorized fire fighting equipment. If we are going to have wilderness areas the FIRE POLICE and RESCUE officials should be exempt from the non motorized rules. I am also against having any forest without access roads used to fight fires.

Yes its also true that wilderness areas violate the Americans with Disability act. Why should the gov exempt itself from this act and require businesses to follow it?

You clearly do not understand the constitution. The federal gov has no rights to regulate or control private state or Indian lands. Also I am against this creation of blocks of land. That's right out of the old rejected UN Bio Diversity treaty. To move people out of the country in to the cities and make lands into blocks with corridors connecting them together that no one was allowed to enter. As far as changing who runs this land I am in favor of turning it all over to the states. I see nothing in the Constitution that allows the feds to own or control land in blocks greater than 10 miles from a port, fort or official building. Under the Constitution such land should be controlled by the states.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Oh yes, Let us have the Federal Government take charge of just everything. Or better yet, why not have all the IMPORTANT people just tell the rest of us where we can live, how we are to live, how much money we must contribute to the whims and wishes of the IMPORTANT people. Then we can all wait in anticipation while the yellow school bus brings everyone lunch - this in light of the fact that Mom gets food stamps but is too stoned to make the kids a P&J. Then because we are all becoming fat off the yellow school bus we will have to pay more so the IMPORTANT people can steal people's land and homes to make parks so we can go and work off our fat. Children will grow up to believe that everything is brought to them by the Government - Oh wait - it already is.

I agree about the forests of the Alaska panhandle. A good start would be to institute the roadless rule in the Tongass National Forest. The only problem with leaving land with private landowners is future owners, when the land changes hands, may decide to develop it.

Logging should only take place in second growth forests that already have roads built. No new roads on federal land. There are already too many.

I think the people who want to preserve land for future generations and habitat for animals are concerned about the environment. I don't own a cabin or house in the woods and I would still like to see a lot more land preserved. There has already been plenty of land used and developed by people. Do some people want to keep going until it is all used up? That would be a shame, to say the least.

I agree. There is plenty of land that is more than accessible to everyone. Maybe not every single acre of every corner of the country should have a mini mall and souvenir shop. There is generational inequality when future generations won't have the same access to wilderness that we were afforded.

I think the remaining wild areas should be preserved as wilderness. I'm talking about areas in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, and a few others. If it's still wild in today's environment, with all the development that has taken place, and all the pressure from all sides for more development, then it should be preserved, before it is gone. The only thing standing in the way of preserving our last true wildernesses is big industry's quest for the almighty dollar. Don't forget that when these areas are developed, there are only a select few that make the big money, and the land is degraded forever.

What little wild land that is left should be saved. We have developed and used more than our share. Future generations should have the same opportunity to enjoy wilderness and what it has to offer in the form of solitude and rejuvenation.

I'm not for development at all near wilderness. That's the opposite of the idea of wilderness.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The natural resources are to use but I don't think anyone would say they should be used up for the rich man's quick buck. A good portion should be preserved for the good of all, including the people who don't profit from the development of our natural resources, and the plants and animals.

There are too many roads already. I suggest you walk in and enjoy the solitude. That is what forests are for. If you want to go where there are crowds, I'm sure you can find a road somewhere.

I agree with most of your comment. You are lucky to have wild areas so close to where you live. Remember, there are people who have to travel hours to get away from the crowds.

I say the problem is there are too many roads.

Quite a politician. I'm sure there are some campaign contributions from lumber and mining industries involved. Some land should be used for development, but with all the development in this country, more land needs to be preserved that is not used for development.

I don't really understand how this works. It seems confusing. It seems the land is just sold to whoever wants it for whatever purpose they want it for. Is the land preserved at all?

I agree that alot more needs to be done in America to take better care of the environment. No other country is capable of turning around a situation and that makes me hopeful. For example, remember when there was leaded gasoline? Lead levels were extremely high. We were able to totally turn that situation around and now lead levels are no longer a threat.

I think most of our national parks should be managed in their natural state. How much money does that cost? I say if we had fewer roads, there would be less maintenance.

Horses first evolved on the American continent but died off with the arrival of humans along with our native camels, mastodons, mammoths, saber toothed cats and other large animals. We should allow wild horses to remain on our range lands, cattle are not native to our continent and never were . Cattle are the intruders, not wild horses and return the wolf to the range lands to help control their numbers. Our national monuments, parks, and forests must remain free of those NOISY, DESTRUCTIVE, POLLUTING OFF ROAD VEHICLES! We go to what's left of our wild lands to ESCAPE the noise and pollution of other humans. When I take a walk in the wild lands, the last thing I want to see, hear, smell or dodge are those STINKING, NOISY ATV'S/ ORV !

The Listening Sessions should be held in the evenings so working people can attend - as it is all you have making comments are government bureaucrats and paid conservation advocates.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

So many young people have no opportunity to connect to the natural world. Many of our national parks are located only a short distance from urban communities, but children have never visited. As a former National Park Service ranger, I know from my own experience how transformative it can be for children to explore a forest, observe bugs in a creek, or experience the natural quiet away from the city. I also know that with constraints on the federal budget and limited staffing for interpretive park rangers, strategic government and nonprofit partners can greatly further the National Park Service mission. These key partnerships can make all the difference in reaching many more urban youth who would not otherwise be able to visit our national parks, and nurture our next generation of environmental leaders.

A Framework for Conserving and Enhancing the Benefits from Private Working Forests in the Western US - This Western Forestry Leadership Coalition report represents months of stakeholder workshops investigating the suite of issues hindering private forest landowners' ability to keep and sustainably manage their land and presents the following recommendations: • Reward landowners for their stewardship of ecosystem services • Promote diverse forest products markets and the utilization of woody biomass • Facilitate action through cross-ownership management and partnerships While only a fraction of the western forested landscape, private working forests provide critical ecosystem services to their owners and to the public. They also create important linkages that facilitate the production of ecosystem services on public lands. However, we are in danger of losing the benefits provided by private working forests owing to such forces as changing climate, economic conditions, demographics, and competing social values. To explore these issues, the Western Forestry Leadership Coalition brought together family and large-scale forest landowners, county commissioners, local and regional planning agencies, state forestry and wildlife agencies, federal land managers, tribes, universities, conservation districts, and nonprofit organizations. From this, a drafting committee synthesized workshop input and developed the report. The goal is to facilitate the creation of a new policy framework and new business model that, together, address the needs of private forest landowners; local, state and federal agencies; conservation organizations; and other stakeholders in the western U.S. The report's recommendations are meant to foster solutions at a meaningful scale. Policy, program, and on-the-ground actions by a multitude of partners can contribute to a future where sustainable forest management is an economic reality, a recognized social benefit, and a significant contributor to forest health and long-term climate change mitigation and adaptation goals. { <a href="http://wflccenter.org/forestthreats/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

"we are the worlds worst polluters" Really, what about China and India? "european nations have cars that get 60mpg" True, and did you know most of those cars run on small efficient diesel engines? The reason we dont have the same cars here is because they are diesel and the EPA will not allow them. Plus the oil companies wouldnt want us to start getting good mileage. "we are responsible for the loss of 110,000,000 trees every year" In the state I live in (Idaho) more trees die and rot every year than are harvested. If you cut trees they can and will grow back most of the time. How many trees are planted every year by the Forrest Service and by timber companies?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The intention is good, yet the results I'm afraid won't be. For example; the Peirson's Milk-Vetch plant has been listed as a Threatened Species, this was done back in 1998. To this day, there is NO recovery plan in place. This plant was used as a "tool" to close an OHV area in CA. If the Fish & Wildlife Service didn't have radicals within, we would have a workable plan to use by now...

"Leaders of non profit environmental groups are brilliant people. They are not radicals or extremists and do not oppose all development like some believe. Instead they are people who have dedicated their lives to a cause, saving wilderness and wildlife." You don't know Karen Schambach in CA of the PEER org. I would consider her a prime example of someone who leads a radical group. She moved to California's Sierra foothills in 1984. On a spring day six months into construction of her new cabin in El Dorado County, she was startled by the buzzing of dirt-bike riders just yards away. THAT HAD BEEN THERE BEFORE SHE PURCHASED THE LAND. It's like buying a house next to an airport and then demanding it close down due to noise. { <a href="http://www.hcn.org/issues/188/10012" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

"When I see many animal species down to their last 1 or 2% of their range and hundreds listed as either threatened or endangered while many have already gone extinct it pretty much tells me that not a whole lot of thought or action has gone to preservation." I believe that you see man has created all the reasons for these species peril. Having been in the knowledge of a Threatened species myself, (Peirson's Milk Vetch plant) learning everything there is to know and talking with those that have the both the credentials and credibility on the subject matter, it's really about politics more than science I'm afraid... To a True conversationalist in my eyes, just like the majority of those that experience the great outdoors on an OHV.

wild horses

Thanks. I'm afraid that most people will not get this until their drinking water turns sour, or the Kudzu smothers their shrubs and overgrows their house.

I have long thought that the Forest Service gives away too much to private interests. Why should I have to pay to use cross-country trails in a national forest that my taxes support? And, how do people get permission to build a private, no-trespassing home within a national forest?

Wild horses do create problems when their populations boom, so predators are needed to control their numbers. We need a coupled policy -- horses + predators.

The BWCA has been a big part of my spiritual life for the past fifty years and I want it protected for my grandson. PLEASE and Thanks!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As someone who grew up in a rural area in Vermont, I took my ability to get lost in the woods by myself and explore the environment for granted. The lessons I learned camping and hiking with my friends gave me confidence in myself and anchored me to something tangible and real. Now that I live in a city, I realize that the sense of wilderness I experienced as a kid is unreachable for so many. I agree that close partnerships between non profits and government should make it possible for everyone to experience the environment and feel connected with our planet.

What a bunch of one purpose crap,from wacko environmentalist ass/hole's who want too close off all our public land's too everyone but them,to protect it,bull/shit,it's about power & control,nothing else,always has ,always will be,and our Liberal Leftist,socialist,Government Leader's allow these nut cases to sue them,so they can go along with them, Not going to Happen,after November 2nd.2010, We are Taking Back our Country.

Amen, they are environmental ecofreaks, i like that better than wacko's,and your right on, we are not destroying the earth,and we already have way too much wilderness now,don't want or need anymore, they can all go hug a tree along with there idol Al Gore,and leave the fun to us.

One thing we all need too remember,is it's about,our Freedom's & Liberty's too,and witch seem to be getting less and less,as the Government grows more and more,and gets more into every aspect of out lives. smaller=is better,and=more Freedom & Liberty's, we are not Destroying our Outdoors,or Country,by being able to use them.

Too many wacko's on both side's to count,but i do know i can't go or use our great land's,like when i was 18, i would love to see it all before i die,or before it's all closed off, both of which are getting closer every day.

Drill baby Drill,when ever ,where ever,we need the oil,and have more than anybody else in the world, on our own land,but environmental wacko's stop us from using our own,get over it,get a life,enjoy it,and quit telling every one else how to live.

It's high time too put a stop to all these Environmentalists Wacko group's Law Suit's against the Government,and then our Government Caving into Them,because they agree with them,and allowed the Suit's in the first place,we the American People are not Stupid, We are Dam Pissed off,and getting even more pissed off,at our Elected officials,who work for US,taking more and more of our land's,away from our use,under the false claim of saving them,lying bull/shit,all way's has been,all way's will be only stealing our Freedom's & Liberty's,and Destroying our Constitution,which most don't read or understand, it say's what it means & mean's what it say's,if it is Not in there, You have No right to do it, keep up what you are doing, We will take it Back,starting November 2 nd. 2010, God Bless America,and Keep Her Free.

Amen Brother,they want it all,and tell you, what,when,where,why,they are taking it away from you, nothing but environmental bull/shit.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I had to stop from throwing up at this bull/shit, talk about destroying the view, nothing look's worse than looking at a bunch of stupid windmill's spread across the landscape, and you only worry about what color they should be, too save a bird from flying into them, I say take them all down, save the bird's and the Helicopters, and the paint too.

This may be one of the good scenic byways. One question - Did elected officials in the effected communities retain 100% of their authority over the highway involved or is that authority currently a shared authority including un-elected persons???

One thing about drivers is that they actually pay for at least some or most of the infrastructure they use (e.g. license tags, gas taxes etc.). Some of it may be subsidized but I don't know how much. Bicyclists are very well organized and politically savvy it seems from web sites I have viewed. From what I can ascertain they have been brilliant at maintaining their free ride off the backs of motorized vehicle drivers up to this point. Possibly if they started to support paying for at least a portion of the amenities we non-bike riders are being forced to pay for they would get more and not feel so underserved.

Don't want to pop anyone's bubble but mineral extraction is allowed in designated or proposed Wilderness as per the Wilderness Act. Roads are also allowed to be constructed to the mineral extraction sites. Congress had the wisdom to see to it that these necessary actions could take place for the Nation's security I would imagine. We do need certain resources to be available to continue our existence and they - Congress knew this in 1964 and still do. I have to demote since idea is not feasible.

I don't want to be accused of being picky but I thought this site was about helping folks connect with America's Great Outdoors not a wish list site for green marketing incentives. Our government knows well how to force citizens to do things. WHERE is the SITE ADMINISTRATOR when needed.

How are gov't. vehicles (ORV) leaving designated trails dealt with or kept track of? Records would need to be kept so civilians aren't blamed for gov't. duties being carried out. What about perceived trail violations actually caused by native Americans who are not usually under these restrictions - would visitors trails be closed for their un-documented unrestricted movements aboard ORV's?

Our governmental systems in AMERICA were intentionally designed to be very inefficient so that laws and rules could not be made easily. It should be brutally time consuming and difficult. Political boundaries mark out exactly where elected officials have say so. They should have a lot more say so but their authority has been incrementally transferred to bureaucratic agencies or flipped by the US Supreme Court. Now that is something in need of a big fix. So called insider "stakeholders" should have nothing (zero) whatsoever to say about lawfully operated private property.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Mr. Hines - Does the Constitution actually support the Federal government controlling the lands \_\_\_ mentioned it should not? Please help to educate us by expanding your comment 4. I do know that in Florida the Feds control a lot of lands inside the State. The reason for that here is that our State government has allowed them to do so through many nefarious agreements ( section 6, Lips and SWG etc.) in order to get their hands on Federal dollars which probably never should have gone to the Feds in the first place.

To all the regular working folks of which I am also one I will share what I have learned after 12 years of fighting for access of all sorts. The government works like everyone else Mon thru Friday for the most part. If we really value what might be lost WE better be ready to take days off and plan vacation days to attend meetings and produce informed comments (not whining how it was in grandpa's days) or suffer the consequences. It is that simple. Those who attend the meetings and do informed written comments stand a chance of getting what they want. Those who don't - DO NOT stand a chance.

While you're entitled to your own "beliefs", you are not entitled to your own FACTS. Please educate yourself about the realities of the issue. We need more science based solutions and less fox-"news"-based fear.

Public lands should be open to the public. Come one, come all. But leave your noisy, polluting, trail-damaging vehicles at the gate.

This sounds like a great idea, on the surface. I do not trust the federal government and the Obama administration especially has shown that their interest lies in more government control. We have a very large national park in Northern Minnesota, and there are areas of wilderness, that if logged and hunted would show an improvement in the overall health of wild life. Deer, grouse, rabbits and other wild life do well on a new growth forest, and right now, the only new growth in the park is the result of wild fire or controlled fire. There is no logging or hunting in the park. I also believe that local control of waters and land is always better for the environment and the tax payers. Any government project always cost many times that of a local project, and the results of the local program may take the local population in to consideration. Federal restrictions usually mean stricter restrictions and more rules for the sportsmen and women to follow. Any use of public lands and waters is becoming so complicated, that I believe many people are getting discouraged. So when I say "watch out for the feds", make sure this is not just another power grab.

Having confronted trespassers numerous times, the lack of identification is the biggest obstacle to prosecution. It is not a local problem, but one I've heard repeated in all parts of our country. Requiring identification is opposed by OHV enthusiasts because it would put the lie to their argument that problems are caused by only a few.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In Southern Oregon nearly three times as much State money goes into expanding OHV opportunities than enforcing the law. It is virtually impossible to catch a trespasser without a violent confrontation. Violators on both public and private land have repeatedly maintained to me that they "don't carry identification" when they ride. Often law enforcement is miles away. We need a way to identify these miscreants. We also need local law enforcement to quit looking the other way, to pursue these violators vigorously and no longer dismiss their actions as "minor."

Not close-minded, just fact. Once you put machines on the landscape, you eliminate the desirability and usefulness of that area for "passive" recreation, such as hiking, skiing, birdwatching, or any other form of recreation that is rewarded with peace and quiet.

For the past 50 years most timber sales on public lands have been based on large volumes and large acreage. This has benefited large timber companies and loggers. Over the past ten years fuel reduction projects have likewise been based on having enough commercial timber to make it worthwhile for the contractor. The result has been continuous litigation and a stalemate in the woods that costs the government money and takes away from healthy forest management. Prior to the growth of the large timber and logging companies, there were "gyppo" operators in the woods. These were small, two- to four-man operations. Their cut-and-run approach, however, soon made "gyppo" synonymous with bad. The better small operators, however, continue to exist as contractors to small woodland owners, the largest segment of forestry owners in the country. I suggest we take a smaller look at our public lands, particularly in the West. The emerging growth of small diameter utilization presents an opportunity for public forestry agencies (primarily BLM and USFS) to present more focused, smaller operations. (@ 200 acres) Contracting with an independent, two- to four-man crew that utilizes smaller equipment (e.g., UTVs) would produce less controversy, more jobs, and better management practices across the landscape. One of the big problems with public land management is the proliferation of roads. Smaller equipment and smaller operating areas would require fewer roads and have less impact on the operation area. Large sales will continue to be controversial, particularly in the West, for the next few decades at least. By implementing a program of smaller scale, local workers would gain employment, overstocked lands could be thinned with less impact, and a more progressive and sustainable management of public forest lands could occur.

In 2009 a study done by Colorado State University and the NPS found that human-caused noise has a significant impact on wildlife. We are losing our quiet spaces. Most studies I've seen say that less than 5% of our planet has only natural sounds for fifteen minutes or longer.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most off-road vehicle routes were not created with resource sensitivity or public land/national forest management in mind. Route designation is necessary on all public lands and national forests where multiple use management is an objective to determine what existing routes can sustain continued vehicle use along with the management of non-motorized uses and appropriate biological resource management. This is called or per the Federal Land Policy and Management Act and various statutes relative to our public lands and national forest lands. Route networks need to be closely monitored and managed, with open routes signed as such and designated closed routes put to bed with vertical mulching and other revegetation methods so they do not look like vehicle routes open for use. These efforts need to be fully funded by the government, using young adult labor where possible, to be completed in a timely fashion and promote awareness of our shared resources. There must be penalties for use non-compliance and the creation of unauthorized routes. Non-Compliance with a designated network needs to be fostered in the offroad vehicle use community to ensure these networks are available for use into the future.

Maybe we should ask 80% of the wildlife east of the Mississippi to pack up and move out west. But I am not sure if the animals are really ready to move. Besides they might not like the hotter dryer conditions out west. Don't get me wrong I am all about keeping land open for public use. But, you sound like a developer just itching to get your hand on some prime real estate!!

It is crucial to both wildlife & humans to have places in which no sound of industry, vehicles, planes or other noise intrudes upon them. It is only where the peacefulness of nature exists that the world cannot intrude upon us. We must have places of serenity to find it within ourselves, and to be at one with that which is greater than ourselves.

Sorry, as much as I like motorcycles and other motorized vehicles— speed and even the sound and feel of a powerful engine—it has no place or rather limited place in the natural surroundings of a National Park. This kind of recreation is not about beauty, it's about power, speed and excitement. So, I say make parks designated for that kind of action. Who in the world wants to hear the roar of engines racing thru the natural wilderness? Scaring every living creature in the vicinity, Tire tracks tearing up the trails. It's not nature. It machine. The Parks were set aside to preserve and appreciate the natural beauty of this country. It's not dissimilar to smoking cigarettes in an enclosed space, forcing another to breath it.

I agree. In Oregon, they have Outdoor School for 6th graders to foster an appreciation for nature, showing them the interconnectedness of all life. This in turn fosters a sense of personal responsibility for their interaction with their natural environment. Why not an adult version? The "bad apples" are just scared ignorant 6th graders that never got that education. These feuding land stewards are letting their egos misdirect them from the bigger picture of preserving this land for the next generations.

With all of the wonderful uses of petroleum, does anyone think about mankind 500 years from now? Do you think they could use some? Or should we just use it all up and pray that technology will find a solution?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Finally, someone have spoken for the wilderness. I cannot imagine trying to camp while ATV's are roaring around me. All these comments, and little has been said about the true inhabitants of the wilderness. Off road vehicles do not belong in the wilderness. Respect the wilderness--animals, trees, plants, birds, fish. They all manage to live quietly compatible, until we invade their homes. This is not just our land--to do as we please. This is their land too. Getting out into the woods should be quiet--as it was before we arrived. Family bonding? Camping? Roaring engines. Please! Wrong. Go have your own designated areas. Watching eagles as you roar through the woods? Sitting quietly for hours until they learn to trust us. These people like they write the same story, but do not write of their experiences disturbing the forests and their inhabitants.

If in an above post would get off his ATV, get down on his knees and take a close look at the desert sands he'd see an intricate system of nature designed to capture what limited water there is. That system not only feeds the sparce vegetation, but also prevents sand from being swept up by winds into sandstorms. Uncontrolled wandering on foot and the swaths cut by ATVs destroy that delicate system. Since ATVs/OHVs damage the landscape much more than other methods of recreational enjoyment, charge them appropriate fees. Given the revenue needs of the park and forest system, a seasonal fee of \$1,000. per OHV used in each land unit is a good start.

Not all lands need to be accessible for human recreation or economic exploitation. A reasoned balance should be struck, although I'd prefer to err on overprotection for the benefit of future generations.

Since OHV's damage the landscape much more than other methods of recreational enjoyment, charge them appropriate fees. Given the revenue needs of the park and forest system, a seasonal fee of \$1,000. per OHV used in each land unit is a good start.

you people who think wilderness serves no purpose but to drive your filthy, noisy orv's through it make me sick. i'd rather be a tree hugger than a narrow minded red necked jerk spewing gas fumes and noise through the woods on your little toy trucks. you people have absolutely no appreciation for nature, per se. you think adding your polluting, noisy, destructive form of 'recreation' to a wilderness is normal bec you think the world's creations exist for your selfish pleasures. go drive on road and stay the hell out of the woods. woods are for quiet, for restoring the soul, for getting away from all the hellish parts of "civilization" that want to encroach on every piece of quiet earth left. wilderness exists for it's own sake, not for the sake of people. if we want to enjoy it then we do it by appreciating it for what it is, not turning it into something it was never meant to be.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've lived in the West, I haven't just driven over it and flown over it. I've lived here all of my life. First of all, The Nature Conservancy is a NON profit organization. They do not hate people nor do they want everyone to live in cities. The only ones making obscene profits with regards to public lands in Western states are oil and gas companies and big agribusiness. The Bureau of Land Management loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually on grazing rights leases on public land and what they take in for mining and gas leases doesn't even out the loss. Both grazers and miners are paying fees that are decades old and not fair market value. The BLM is also losing hundreds of millions on wild horse and predator control when both are not needed. In Montana there are only 200 wild horses left in the entire state and that is on a refuge but they are emptying the refuge too. Small family ranchers are being blamed but it is big corporations like Hilton and millionaires like Ted Turner who own most of the grazing rights and who are taking gross advantage of the system. Less than 3% of US Beef is produced on the range yet most of the public lands in the West are managed for cattle grazing. The West does have a lot of open space but not pristine open space. Desert soil is very fragile and off road vehicle use does cause permanent damage in some areas. When you fly in or out of Phoenix AZ for example you can clearly see all the damage. Of course, ATV users should have access to ride and enjoy but so should everyone else. You also should consider that some of the biggest cities in the US are West of the Mississippi. Population counts only the cities themselves, not their surrounding suburbs. All of these cities take up huge portions of land. Miles and miles in many cases and they run together in some states with little to no wild open land in between for wildlife movement/migration. Los Angeles (2), Houston (4), Phoenix (5), San Antonio (7), San Diego (8), Dallas (9), San Jose (10), San Francisco (12), Ft. Worth (17), El Paso (22), Seattle (23), Denver (28), Portland (30). From Seattle to Portland there is city or suburbs almost the entire three hour drive. From San Francisco to San Diego same thing. From Los Angeles to Phoenix, same thing. The Northwest is clear cut and farmed in a checkerboard pattern that does leave wildlife nowhere to go in many cases. You don't see most of the clear cuts from the roads because they are required to leave trees along them in most areas but from the air it is horrifying. Yellowstone National Park is surrounded by ranchers who are afraid that bison will transmit a disease, Brucellosis which causes cows to abort their calves so the government pays to have hundreds of bison shot every year when they migrate out of the park during winter. Bison don't understand park boundaries. They go where they have water and forage. There has been not one case of a cow catching this disease from a bison yet hundreds of bison are shot at the taxpayer's expense every year. If more wilderness areas and wildlife corridors are not designated our National Parks are going to end up like Disneyland, surrounded by commercial interests as little islands of nature consumed by city.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness exists because it is an irreplaceable resource. It's where the world works naturally, without our stamp. A lot of us Americans are proud that you can have that experience here in our country. Some of us work out and prepare ourselves to go out into our wilderness and experience it, without roads, vehicles, buildings, etc. The idea is to experience the natural world on its terms, not ours. You don't need a motorized vehicle to get on top of a mountain or to a pristine lake deep in the woods. All you need is some skill, some determination and some time to walk and live in the moment. If you need a road or a vehicle to enjoy a place, then there are plenty of places to go. Visit your state parks. Heck, visit your county parks. But wilderness is there because people should have the right to dream, and dream big. It should still be possible to simply 'be,' deep in a wild, untamed place, worlds away from subways, malls and parking lots. It seems there are a lot of people who won't feel fulfilled until every last critter is shot, every last tree has a road within a half-mile of it, and every last swimming hole has a parking lot. I'm sorry, that sounds like a desolate and depressing idea of our world, devoid of something profoundly beautiful, missing the truly sublime.

Without wildlife corridors viability of the species declines. I suppose you would rather visit your "wildlife" at the city zoo? That's the only place you will find them if they are confined due to human encroachment. There used to be a balance in nature until we thought we could manage it better. Go figure.

Are you kidding me? The only reason ORV'ers want new space is because they have already torn up and destroyed what they have, otherwise they would be happy. There is plenty of room for these vehicles already in use. Even when private property is posted "No Trespassing" many of these riders will continue on their merry way and plow right through with no regard to the noise, the smell and the physical harm they leave for the property owner. By no means give them a license to destroy more of OUR wilderness!

Yes we need to consider TRUE economic costs when people propose things like factories, golf courses, and other such employers which look good for immediate gain, but in the long run may cost us. My other concern here though, is I have read studies on no matter where you live outside air is actually always "cleaner" than inside.

I don't know if editing and publishing a book is really where federal funding should be going. How/where would the book be distributed? Is it free or do people buy it? I think there are more effective ways to spend federal funds cultivating youth experiences in the outdoors, like funding programs that actually take kids to the wilderness.

Definitely need more federal partnership re: organic gardening and farming - and a return to pre-WWII food quality, before industrialized farming and intensive inputs.

Survival of the fittest is a misunderstanding - it was always survival of the most adaptable; human beings are maladaptive in the extreme when we deny that nature (biology, physics, chemistry) rules.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Brandy Station is America's largest and most important Civil War battlefield, and the effort to preserve this pristine historic landscape now spans more than twenty years. Thus far, we have been mostly successful in saving important battlefield acreage--areas where heavy and casualties occurred--simply because like-minded organizations have banded together and worked toward a common end. With superb leadership provided by the Civil War Preservation Trust, while supported by the Brandy Station Foundation, both battlefield preservation entities have worked closely with other groups--such as the highly-effective Piedmont Environmental Council--to accomplish noteworthy preservation and education goals. Whereas battlefield preservation advocates were formerly thought of as "no growers," we are now fully integrated partners in Culpeper County's land-use planning and economic environments. By the way, we have been relentless in this struggle, and since 1988, we have "kept our army in the field." There is much more work to do...

Protected how? From developers? From ranchers? From hikers? Some development must happen. It's that or everyone lives in cities which pollute more and have higher crime rates and are generally less pleasant to live in. Organic beef must be left to graze on large areas like ranches. Hikers opened these lands originally. If there were no hiking allowed they would never have been discovered so in reality hiking brought about all of the damage. Do you suggest we close ourselves out of the wilderness entirely? Of course not. You just want our beautiful peaceful areas to stay that way. Me too. But consider this. With the number of people using the wilderness for motorized recreation, if you kick them all out you lose a lot of the usage of parks and then lose funding. That's when the parks turn to logging companies to make ends meet. Charging the motorists extra fees is all ready done in the form of ATV vehicle registration. Care to tell local governments they can't have that money anymore because the fees are so high to use their atvs that most people stopped bothering? On top of that atv users provide a lot of land maintenance that is unnoticed by the government and unappreciated by the hikers and bikes that use it. They rebuild trails after washouts and they often maintain creek crossings and such. You will regret any harm done to the atv community because they are actually your allies in keeping the beautiful places from being developed and in keeping the trails available to everyone.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The atvs and motorcycles are responsible for the original formation of a lot of the trails I love to hike on now. As a hiker and mountain biker I definitely prefer not to compete with the machines, but I recognize the need to respect the outdoor activities of others and appreciate the contribution they have made by further opening the wilderness up to me with new and exciting trails. As a mountain biker I have seen many conflicts between non-motorized cyclists and hikers for the same reason hikers complain about atvs and motorcycles. They complain of trail and wildlife damage and the high speeds at which we come down trails. What the hikers don't know is that the cyclists do the majority of the trail maintenance for free in the woods. When cyclists were kicked out of a county park near my home many of the creeks quickly became impassible. Downed trees waited for months for country crews to get in and clean them out. Meanwhile new paths formed around them causing more damage to the forest floor. Hikers need to recognize that atvs make a contribution to our parks too. They keep the usage up which keeps funding coming in. They build sturdy bridges and maintain them at no cost to the tax payer. Yes there need to be divisions that are enforced. Motorized vehicle trails should be separate and often far displaced from hiking and other use trails, but that doesn't mean there is no room for them at all. If there were no atvs we'd probably lose funding for a lot of our parks and they would be bought up by developers. Anyone who uses parks is on the same side, so lets get along.

Well stated. The rarest and most sensitive species of plants and animals need large tracts of contiguous undisturbed land to maintain self-sustaining populations. I don't need to 'consume' them or their environs to feel I've gotten my fair share of our world. Rare plants and animals have value separate from human culture or economic needs. Wilderness is valuable for it's own sake.

Let's leave what remains of our Old Growth Forests alone. No logging whatsoever. We have plenty of previously logged forests that could be managed for logging without sacrificing the small percentage left of our original Old Growth Forests.

I have no idea how to solve this problem as both sides have their good points. However, travelling in the US and in Europe, I have noticed one very big difference in land use: In Europe, particularly in Germany, people live in (and I mean "IN") closed villages and smaller cities where you can walk, or have a shuttle service, to all amneties. A car is "not" a necessity! Once you step outside of the city or village, you can walk anywhere along service roads or paths through the fields and forests, privat, municipal or federal, enjoying the sights and sounds of nature along the way. Because of this, there is no real need for parks (outside of cities) as people are thinly disbursed all over the place. In contrast to this, in the US you do not have these closed villages. Homes are built everywhere throughout the countrysite and wherever you go, you see these "Privat", "No trespassing", "Keep Out", "Trespassers will be prosecuted" signs. As a result of this "My Property" mentality here, in order to enjoy the outdoors you are forced to either walk along the roads and highways or "hop in your car" and travel to some remote "Park" which is overrun by all the other people trying to do the same. This is where the concentration and overuse of puplic places and the inevitable confrontations stems from.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's about the wildlife and it gets stressed by the noise and intrusion of ATV. ATV enthusiasts have made trails on our private land without our permission. It is not the way to open the wilderness to everyone. Last week we heard the call of a crane nesting in one of our Northern Maine trees in the early evening. It is a sound I have never heard before. Animals and birds like that seek the uninhabited places. ATV noise disturbs them. Seems to me that is more of a racing sport and belongs on a licensed track.

I took the time to scroll up and read his post. What a waste of time that was. Why don't you petition for the street you live on to be closed. Then you can hike to work and not have to worry about your invasive vehicle.

I am not sure who is using my name but he is completely opposite of what I believe. Everything said is correct and ohvs are highly damaging to the environment and should NEVER be allowed anywhere near wilderness lands, national parks or vital wildlife habitat. I hope that is clear enough.

I guess there can be only one guy in the USA that is named? I will my tell my parents they are terrible people for not researching the possibility of another.

Good idea but I think the closed area should double every time an infraction is committed. 1st offense =1 mile, 2nd = 2 miles 3rd =4 miles 4th =8 and so on. Also a limit should be placed on the number of times an area can be damaged before it is closed permanently.

Boy a ohv user must get a major thrill running over a sea turtle. What kind of monsters are these people?

While your wife's comments and heart was certainly in the right place and this idea is promotable it is incorrect to think that all groups are good stewards of the land and should be given the same amount of input. The ohv community for example claims to be good stewards of the land but walk down any ohv or multi use path or even a path that is off limits to ohv use but used illegally, then read some of the comments regarding protections for threatened or endangered species and conservation of forests and you will see they are hardly good stewards of the land and wildlife and only want the land so they can use it for their own self centered pleasures and to heck with the animals that call that land home. Even the oil, logging and mining industry claims to be environmentally conscious with an eye towards preserving the land but I would hardly call them good stewards would you? As sad as it is to say even some non profits are out for the quick buck and care almost as little about preservation as the ohv, oil, logging and mining community. While it would be nice to see some cooperation between groups that really do care other groups would need to be screened out to prevent the same conflicts that exist now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Here in CT we have "bad air" warnings anytime the temps reach above 90 (which is most days now) and they warn people with respiratory problems to stay indoors. We have regular beach closures and several rivers and streams are considered catch and release because the fish are dangerous to eat due to the pollution levels in the water. I always thought those movies of people living in domes or underground were pure science fiction but the more we do nothing about climate change and our idiotic ways the more I start to think it is a very real possibility.

Always good to point out the economic BENEFITS of preserving forests to the anti environmental crowd that roams this site. They still think nature is only good for being logged, drilled, mined or driven over.

I agree we need to preserve the habitat for the wildlife but what does this have to do with the debate between motorized and hiking traffic? I know of several places on the east coast that have motorized trails only and have not seen a decrease in the amount of wildlife. As a matter of fact the deer population has increased because of the lack of hunting on the property. For the last three years there have been population decrease deer hunts on the property to curb the deer. The deer use the trails we make not avoid them. Here in the mid west the deer population is out of control.

Brenda- Hello from a fellow CT resident. I will gladly back your account of bad run ins with ohv users here and as a hiker have had to grab my dog out of the way of some idiot on a motorbike who thought it would be fun to buzz us on his way by and he did not stop to apologize either and have had to pick him up and carry him over broken glass left on a trail. When I told this story on another thread I was told by another ohv user that I should have tried to stop him and have a polite conversation with the jerk like it was my fault for being on the trail in the first place. These people have no respect nor love for nature and no respect for anyone that uses the trails other than them and only want to use it for their own self centered pleasures.

The two user groups have been proven to work together. Please reference again Interlake Offroad Park. Trails are being used by motorized and equestrians/hikers. We are a multi use family. We have horses, jeeps, fourwheelers and we hunt/fish and camp. We seem to get along with one another and enjoy being outdoors. I wonder how that happens?

Good idea and I promoted it but I do not know if it would help. Many of our senators need their hands greased through "campaign contributions" (a nice name for BRIBES don't you think?) in order to vote a certain way so unless there is a grizzly bear or moose holding \$1,000,000 for them when the senator arrives I cannot see a visit to view the beauty of nature overtaking their greed.

I really have to laugh when I see people using the constitution without understanding at all what it really means.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Compare the amount of land that has been designated to hunting fishing and foot traffic only to the amount of land set aside for motorized use in Indiana. What part of that is fair? As an OHV user I have four thousand acres spread across the state to use. It is a good thing in the mid west some have opened private parks for us to use.

We can not turn more land into national or state parks. These resources are already stretched too far and that's just passing more onto the government. Private landowners, especially ranchers are wonderful land stewards. Getting them on board and helping them to take care of the land allows everyone to win without taking land away from the private citizens. How would a person in the city feel if the government decided their house, building, neighborhood needed to be taken over to create a mall or freeway. Most of those living rurally are trying very hard to take good care of the land and also be able to make a living to afford to keep the land. Putting more land into the governments hands just adds to the difficulty of them trying to maintain it. What about stimulus aid for those trying to take care of it on their own?

I agree. ATV's do not belong on public lands. My family and I go there to relax in the peace and quiet of nature. It's disturbing (to say the least) to hear the noisy engines and smelly exhaust of ATVs interrupting the tranquility and damaging fragile ecosystems.

I shudder to think what this country will look like in fifty years if we allow the ATV crowd to take over the parks and wild places (more than they already do). These people (even the ones who claim to be "families,") have the "this land is my land" attitude that many men (and the women that belong to them) do. They have no more "frontiers" to conquer or mammoths to slay, so, they do other things to relieve the overabundance of testosterone fogging their brains. It sounds like the Japanese government saying that the world's non-whale-murdering nations haven't the right to deny them their whaling (it's a "face" thing). If it ain't one pi\$\$ing contest, it's another. "I caught more whales," "my ATV (euphamism; look it up) is bigger/louder than yours," "I can stir up more dust than you." For Pete's sake - learn to spell; read a book to your kids; make love to (not just frack) your "old lady." Build a house for Habitat for Humanity, do something/anything constructive/meaningful with your free time. Just don't rip the world apart a piece at a time while you're at it.

If people (or their parents) choose to live near federal lands, it doesn't give them some inherent right benefit from the federal land. I am a US citizen living in Boston and contributing to our country's economy and community; do I have less right to federal land than someone living nearby? No. We all pay taxes and work for what we believe to be the common good. We all get a voice in deciding what parts of the country we are willing to plunder and what parts we want to preserve for ourselves and our children.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Really? e wv, If "Viro" is short for environmentalist, then I would first warn you against characterizing us a group; it's like saying "Americans want to watch Dancing With the Stars"; some Americans want to, but not all of them. Also you seem to be painting a really exaggerated picture, creating an "us vs. them" dynamic and thinking of environmentalists as simply crazy or villainous. Thinking of others in such broad terms creates unnecessary divisions. To your point, you *\*are\** caring for the land for someone else. You did not create the land; it existed before you did and will continue to exist after you die. We're all just temporary tenants. You don't have to worship pristine nature to have some humility about the role of man in the grand scheme or our ability to manage things.

Please leave more land free of machinery of any kind--motorboats, ORVs, snowmobiles.

National parks and wilderness lands in general need to be protected from ever-threatening noise, construction, and traffic pollution. The federal government, in concert with local municipalities and land-conservation non-profits, should provide economic incentives (grants, tax breaks) for smart development near pristine spaces.

No more wilderness or national parks? NONSENSE. This is just the time when we need more and more of them, Have you looked to see what is happening to the natural world. WHat kind of conservation work has been prevented. Building ORV trails? Building dams? Maybe conservation "work" wouldn't be needed if people hadn't messed it up in he first place.

Why can't some of the funds set aside for our highways be put aside for bike paths, and or sidewalks? Could you imagine a place where you could actually walk to the store, or walk down a tree lined street, without the fear of getting hit? Everytime you walk out your front door you have to get in an automobile.

While it's of course better the more people appreciate the outdoors, the reality is that motorized uses have orders of magnitude more impact on the fragile environment than walking does. I am of the opinion that motorized use should be restricted to designated areas to minimize the impact and to preserve the peace of the backcountry.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The west is a mosaic of lands controlled by different land management agencies; Federal (BLM, NPS, US For. Ser., Bur. of Reclamation, military) Tribal, State, local governments, and private. This fragmentation is highly inefficient. First; the federal government should consolidate land management under one agency, taking fully into account ecological systems, recreation, science, education, transportation and energy corridors, recreation, resource extraction and reclamation, and community needs. Second; all stake holders need to be at the table to participate in developing long term sustainable management plans taking into account needed short term needs. Third; public and in some cases private lands need to be consolidated into meaningful contiguous blocks through land swaps and in some cases purchases for efficient management with all stake holders represented at the table. Fourth; realize that access to wilderness areas is critical for management purposes, but needs to be controlled. With the wealth of exotic plants and animals in this country, over grazing, climate change, and pollution a hands off approach is no longer possible. There is almost no pristine land left. Managing and rehabilitating our public lands is, and will always be, a long term effort. Finally; there needs to be consequences for abusing our public lands! When someone pollutes (fine them meaningfully), poaches (take their guns), steals antiquities (claim their property), or drives illegally off road (take the offending vehicles).

All Americans have a responsibility to "watch the government." We ARE the government. However, your anti-Obama rants are not suited for this forum. This is a pro-idea forum that the Obama administration is using for green ideas. I concur with Melissa - do not make up data and call it science or research. Thank you.

Hmmm...not so sure that I'm really excited about exposing our President and his family to a highly publicized vacation in the outback with the ready access to high powered rifle-toters who are of extreme and dangerous political persuasion. Easier for the Secret Service to shore up a hotel than a 50 mile stretch of river. Allow the First Family to choose their own vacations while their security is at risk.

Motorized activities should be banned from public lands--especially national parks. There are commercial outlets where for ATV users can enjoy their vehicles without harming public spaces. ATVs and other motorized vehicles directly harm the environment where they are used. Their use should be restricted to commercial establishments that are equipped to repair damage that are caused by these machines.

\_\_\_\_ - your comment , "GOD gave us the earth natural resources to use so we can flourish if he didnt want us to use those resources he would not have given us so many." has only one flaw.... If the Great Creator gave us these gifts and the stewardship over them, don't you think that He may just be REALLY ticked off when He sees how we are wasting and destroying them through greed and selfishness?? Just a thought....

Let's also remember funding. If we can't get the funding to adequately care for major parks like Yellowstone and others, how can we presume to care for a flock of new special-interest parks or monuments?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No worries--they'll assign the pack to a staffer, and meet them at the drinks tent at the end of the trail conveniently set up by some corporate interest out for some special project. The basic idea is good, but until we fix the rules for congressional fundraising (hah!), not very practical.

I have been coming to the Superior National Forest, now BWCA, since 1965. It is a unique resource to the peoples of both the USA and Canada (with the Quetico Provincial Park). It needs to be protected from temporary incursions like mining and logging that decimate the area briefly for short term profit and leave poisonous residue for decades or centuries to come at the expense of the taxpayer and future generations, not to mention the wildlife that doesn't even have a voice. How many parks and recreation areas can claim lakes pure enough to drink without filters and chemicals? Where you can see moose, bear, eagles, otters and others, and hear wolves (I've seen the above; have yet to more than hear a wolf). The wilderness is a place to commune and share the peace (and occasional fury) of God's nature. It can also be a place to challenge yourself and your abilities. We should not allow extractive, poisonous uses of this beautiful area and the areas that feed it (watersheds). I have been coming to this area for many years (and hopefully a few more yet), and would like to pass this to children and grandchildren without damage from these intrusions.

Have not heard much from equestrians such as myself, so here goes. From my experience with public bridle paths in CT, the ORV folks have no respect for anyone, only themselves. They think they have the right to go anywhere, even on trails not meant for them & even going on private land. Some ORV riders were responsible for injuring someone a few months back by riding on a designated bridle path. A horse spooked, the woman thrown & the idiots left without even rendering aid. The woman, a single mother was badly injured & lost her job. Like some of the the other comments on this thread, quite a few of us want to be in a quiet, natural environment. That does not make us extremists. The bullying tactics of the ORV folks make me very angry, they create noise, make ruts in trails, destroy animal habitat & then call it "family fun time." They are too self absorbed with their own pleasure to think about contributing to the environment they so wantonly tear up with their noisy & smelly vehicles. On a political level the wasted use of petroleum/gas contributes to two wars & makes our country dependent on foreign oil. They might consider using a bike & getting some exercise for "family fun time." After all it is cheaper than an ORV.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While 1 for 1 sounds like a good idea, I can't get on board. What is wrong with all of the wilderness that has already been designated? Why do we need more? If anything we need less restrictions on our PUBLIC lands. That being said I am the last person that wants to see our public lands degraded. I want it to be available for my kids and future generations. "Tread Lightly" for all forms of recreation on OUR public lands is the key. I love the great outdoors and that is why I am a regular visitor to our national lands and I enjoy many forms of recreation on them. However my passion is motorcycle riding. Just like the hiker, mountain biker, ATVer, rafter, kayaker, equestrian, and others, I love to go out and explore the great natural wonders this wonderful world has to offer. I think that is the draw for most people that venture into our public lands, no matter what mode of transportation they use to get there. Maintaining our public lands for MULTI USE should be the priority. I don't understand the hate, anger and elitist attitude that anti access activist have displayed on these forums. And as far as conservation goes, the different users of the national forests provide more service to the public forests than any government agency ever has. In Conclusion, since President Obama wants to know "What obstacles exist to achieving your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors", I would have to say that restricting access to our public lands is the single biggest obstacle to all three! Thank you!

Every activity has an impact. Sending the forest service out to post signs that a specific area is a zero impact area, has an impact. Our job should be to manage activities and thier impacts so that all creatures, us included, can enjoy the natural wonder the forests have to offer, for current and future generations.

I am sorry but has anyone ever wondered where our fertile valleys came from? It is called erosion! Without erosion of the mountains we would all be dead from starvation due to the lack of food bearing soils. The fact that the clean water act considers siltation as a pollutant is a clear indication that the environmental wackos who wrote the legislation have no concept of how the environment functions. We all want clean water and a vibrant environment but lets stop arguing with falsehoods and get our heads on straight.

I can't believe that I am going to agree (to a certain extent), but here it is. Licenses would have no effect here because you can not regulate stupidity. Whether it is the littering hiker or the irresponsible OHVer, stupid is stupid. The only solution to stupidity is education, and there are multiple groups out there trying to educate our citizens to respect our public lands. Government licensing would only create another inept wasteful agency and more taxes. So I am going to demote this idea, because in my humble opinion it would be as effective as licensing baby making.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wow, a hot issue. I even heard a person suggest many be slaughtered and the meat sent to the developing world. I live in one of those developing countries and know how this would be received...."arrogant Americans always push their problems off on others." The meat and milk is delicious, also we all have our own horses, thank you. We don't have horse problems. Just accept that the horses, and burros, are on your lands, they have been there a long time, longer than the Europeans (it's true). So steward them intelligently and without heated argument. I suggest the responsibility for these animals be taken away from your BLM and given over to such as your ag universities, the horse genome project, and other organizations that must be capable of treating the issue in a manner that will protect the horses' right to life in such a way that is sustainable (no tax burden), does not harm others who need to use the lands in order to make a fair living. Genetically viable herds can be organized and placed in areas that will not disturb the latter. Intelligent management of these herds should have as its objective selective improvement of each of these herds. Is this an insurmountable challenge to one of the most brilliant nations in the world?

While I think it may be a bit too far to say that "any audible over-flights of wilderness areas should be banned and re-routed", I do think that there should be *\*some\** places somewhere that if not all, then at least *\_most\_* of the time are as free as reasonably possible from extraneous noise(s), especially industrial ones. I agree that the issue of sound pollution really needs to be more seriously considered insofar as to how this type of noise affects one's cognitive abilities and emotional predisposition.

Thank you Lisa Rutherford for drawing attention to the name-calling, which is very rude and inappropriate. As to the underlying issues: the primary problem with ATVs, OHVs, dirt motorcycles etc. is that their users have no regard for the land itself -- they LITERALLY rip it open, leaving deep raw ruts everywhere. The idea of "quiet vehicles like 4x4s" is just a contradiction in terms. I've never seen such a beast. Here's a secondary problem: the whole fun of the ATV crowd is to make as much of a raucous racket as possible, while tearing up the land and its fauna -- and scattering ruined debris of Mother Nature over every exposed boulder. It looks just awful, and it does NOT repair itself (as the ATVers seem to assume). Over ten years maybe, some of that damage might weather off, but not in any reasonable time period. Speaking of debris, there's a tertiary problem: the beer cans, garbage pits, etc. left by those same people. Then there's the stench of the fuel (irreplaceable petroleum) that they burn as they move along. It appears that they're accustomed to being poor neighbors at home in the city, and can't help but extend that behavior to the out-of-doors as well. Sadly, they are poor advertisements for themselves. The references they make to handicapped people, and the like, appear to be only a red herring. What tiny fraction of OHVs are used by handicapped people? What infinitesimal fraction of handicapped people drive or ride on OHVs? This argument is just a tail wagging a dog, not a realistic consideration. The cruise ships to Alaska are just one superb example of breathtaking scenic splendor that is available to handicapped. I personally would like to invite these folks to come backpacking, hiking, mountain-biking etc. and see how much greater a pristine, spiritual experience can be had in these ways. So far, they don't seem to be responsive to such ideas, and I think that's sad.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Open Space" does not mean protected. That land is owned and cannot be walked freely upon or camped on unless it is agreed upon by the owners in conjunction with some Park or Wildlife Preserve or Protected area. And as population expands, we will be carving it up for development just like the areas on the edges of our cities now. The wild animals that make it their home can be moved forcibly or crushed beneath the machines as the land is developed, and it will be developed. If it's not protected, it's not truly "Wild", and could become a mining area, a clear-cut forest, a condo development, etc,... If The Grand Canyon wasn't protected, it would no doubt be a mining operation or a housing development and its peaks would be lined with billboards and satellite dishes!

Love the idea, except make trails for hikers and bikers and get rid of the OHVs! OHV'ers need to be in separate spaces. I go to the woods to get AWAY from loud destructive machines that terrorize wildlife and rip up land. I see the devastation every time I go to the park after the rains. They sneak in and do "Doughnuts" and leave the land a muddy disgusting mess for the rest of us. I know it's fun to ride around in those things and tear up the mud and Earth, but, for the rest of us, who want to relax it is rightening and sad, and just plain LOUD and obnoxious!

OHV's are noisy, and take away the quiet enjoyment that most people want from nature. Ban them from parks altogether

At this moment, my daughter is being kept indoors for recess because Atlanta is having an orange ozone alert day with a heat index of 105 F, which makes it problematic to promote her connection to the outdoors. Similarly, the spring fed creek which runs through our property recently experienced a sewer spill of ~400K gallons of raw sewage spilling into it, so her enjoyment of that resource also had to be curtailed. When we camped in the national parks along the shore of Lake Michigan, local campers cautioned us about playing in the little stream running into the lake because it was chemical runoff from the golf course. The challenge is to identify the unhealthy environments and means to remediate them, and to find local, clean healthy outdoor environments to explore and enjoy.

I'd rather remove designated wilderness or at least make it available to quiet vehicles like 4x4's. Protect and preserve so nobody gets to enjoy it? If you look at the forest service surveys it shows less than 1% actually backpack. Backpacking is the only way to fully enjoy the huge amount of wilderness that exists. What about those with disabilities, people that can't carry a heavy backpack, small children, etc? If there was an allowance for quiet vehicles like 4x4's to access designated wilderness I would be more open to the wilderness designation. Until that day those that support it are closing some of nature's most beautiful areas to the handicapped and I am against that 100%. I think those that are not ignorant of the above and still support the current wilderness designation should be ashamed for being cruel and selfish !!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is crazy. Protect and preserve so nobody gets to enjoy it? If you look at the forest service surveys it is less than 1% that actually backpack. Backpacking is the only way to fully enjoy the huge amount of wilderness that exists. What about those with disabilities, people that can't carry a heavy backpack, small children, etc? If there was an allowance for quiet vehicles like 4x4's to access designated wilderness I would be more open to the wilderness designation. Until that day those that support it are closing some of nature's most beautiful areas to the handicapped and I am against that 100% and think you should be ashamed of yourselves for being so cruel and selfish !!!

I'm voting no on this one. OHV's & mountain bikes do not make for a wilderness experience. Opening more wild, undeveloped areas to mechanized recreation will only mean fewer wild and undeveloped areas = degraded wildlife habitat, damaged riparian zones, permanent negative impacts to archaeological resources.

Great idea, except for the OHV/ORV part. Eliminate OHV from public lands. Their use is inconsistent with concept of conservation.

Why not try to develop a quiet alternative energy fueled vehicle that can take you quietly into the wilderness? Then perhaps we'll do 1:1.

\_\_\_\_\_ provides a good reason for the responsible use of OHV's. I wish that I felt that more OHV users were looking for this as their experience.

I agree with \_\_\_\_\_ and perhaps others. It is imperative that there are places for OHV's to go for their enjoyment too, of course, but these places were not established for loud machines. I'm sorry, it's a different view. Once we hiked a long way up Mt. Blanca's slope, to an alpine lake. And there was a camper who had driven there in a 4 wheeler, with a large radio blaring. It wasn't my idea of a wilderness experience at that point, but I was subjected to his style. These are mysterious places whose beauty is enjoyed in quiet with the sounds that have existed there for aeons.

Having multi-use trails for everyone is pretty much of a sham. Horses are scared by motorized vehicles. Hikers and wildlife watchers do not want the noise of motorized machines. The motorized machines, especially if they are numerous, can ruin the experience for many others who seek a quiet place to get away from the noise of the cities. The noise of an OHV can often be heard from a mile away. An excessive number of motorized OHVs, motorcycles, jet skis, ski-doo's, etc. can even cause a high level of air pollution, which is not desirable for anyone.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's time that all mining, drilling, four wheeling and anything else that tears up the ground cover and pollutes, forestry that requires road work is also destructive, is dis allowed in pristine land no matter where it is. There are enough places that have already been destroyed by these practices. Keep corporations and clubs that promote the destruction of the ground cover out of our parks. We need to keep the special places that can only be reached by a good days hike clear of the kind of damage that these irresponsible organizations and groups can cause in a few hours. If you can't hike there, it's not for you. There are already enough places that the winnebago four wheeler crowd have ruined for any but themselves. Dirt bikes are every bit as destructive if ridden in an irresponsible manner. It's time to save the very few pristine places left in this country. Selling off these special places to private interests is also a cause of friction among the locals who are used to using these places for generations. Save our pristine land and respect native land claims.

I hear your Sincerity and agree. We have no right to infringe on what has been long standing our only Graced Sanctuary.

\_\_\_\_, I applaud you. To the rest of you: if you drove on smaller roads and not 70 mph on the interstate, you would realize there are ranches and farms, where we grow your food, in those open spaces. Those lands are owned by private individuals, not the federal govt., and they would be surprised that you consider their land as wide-open and not being used. As for saving lands so your kids can't use them either -- if you don't save the land, your kids will never know the joy of getting out of the big city, getting away from other human beings, and seeing and hearing the sounds of nature uninterrupted by OHVs, radios or other human paraphernalia. There are already "citizens" living in the wild; they just happen to wear fur, fins and feathers.

You have the right idea. We shouldn't destroy more and more land just so people can have "access" to pristine areas, whether they are wilderness or not. I'm getting older and unable to hike to some places I used to go -- but that doesn't mean I should be able to use whatever offroad vehicle I want to go there. And people aren't the only ones involved; the further we go with our ORVs or OHVs the more the animals that have lived there for centuries are affected. Native plants can also be affected by the humans that pick them and the soil that is eroded. Mindless use of anything is generally not the best idea.

Do we need a different management system for our national public lands? I don't think one agency is the answer. Much of the time, the bigger an agency is, the more unresponsive it is because of levels of bureaucracy. It is probably more efficient for the various agencies to administer the lands under their auspices since each has specific legal mandates for those lands.

I was wondering when you were going to bring this up. Of course, Mount St. Helens is already protected as a National Monument, and it has strong local support to be expanded to include five nearby lakes. However, to maintain local support, recreational access, and funding and management efficiency, it should remain under Forest Service management, but with direct line-item funding.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Is it just me or does the Cape Hatteras closure expansion seem wimpish. On a OHV I could run over fifty turtles before I even had to speed up for the get away.

here in the west, the timber industry owns the air quality control monitors so we don't get air quality warnings. According to the ozone and pm10 monitors, everything's rosy here. I'd like to see a dome built to encapsulate every smokestack. That might help solve the problem. People who work at the business making the smoke can live inside the dome.

This is exactly the problem with forestry education. You say you are a forester, but you have no appreciation for the forest. To say "There is nothing unique about the area other than what some folks want to make of it" is a very telling comment.

Actually, I'm pretty moderate. When the president was running for office, I pretty much agreed with him on every speech, including on the environment, health care, bank bailouts, and regulation, ending the war. He Got 53 percent of the vote. So are you saying that 53 percent of the voters in the last election AND the president of the USA are "ecofreaks"?

You say "GOD gave us the earth natural resources to use so we can flourish if he didnt want us to use those resources he would not have given us so many." Wilderness is a resource for animals and god gave them the resource and they enjoy using it. You should learn about sharing. Fact of life: if you take away their resources, they will starve. If they starve, there will not be as many animals for you to eat. It's a downward spiral. There are so many people who think like you that some species of tuna are in danger of going extinct. TUNA. That's like saying that chicken is going extinct. Doesn't that bother you? Pretty soon all you'll have to eat is dog food. I wonder if you'll look as foolish as my dog does when you chew on your kibble.

If the fed is on your side and the locals disagree with you, you would be talking exactly the opposite. I've seen a lot of times when local enforcement people do exactly what they want no matter what the law says. That's not very good for our democracy. In fact, I think that happens more than half of the time. And it's ruining the country.

I don't get it. If the fed owns the land, why should the state tell the fed what to do with it? If you own a piece of land, I could understand why you would want very local control of the land, but this land we're talking about is owned by all the people of the US. I have a problem with local officials not enforcing federal laws pertaining to federal lands. I have a huge problem with adjacent landowners acting like, because of their proximity to federal land, they somehow should have more control over it's use than any other US citizen. This is just common sense.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have to agree with you on one thing. I would love to see it all before I die... But the power plants are belching smog over it, the cities are paving it, power lines are criss-crossing it, fences are keeping me from it, and freeways are dividing it. The enviro-freaks (your definition), myself included, want there to be something left to see. What do you propose to see when it's all gone, not roped off or locked up, but GONE. How nice it would be to go back to the creek I grew up next to and cast a fishing line in the water and catch a real fish, not just a sucker. You know how many kids these days can't go do the basic kid stuff like fishing because the water's too polluted. You are lucky if you can drive a car far enough and see something that's not crapped on. The enviro-freaks don't want to lock it all up. They just want there to be something left to see when they get a chance to look for it.

Hey folks, a large number of new people have just come onto this list. I am "enviro-nut", and I need you new folks to quiet down a little and listen to the discussion for a while before you chime in. Please. When I first came here the ORVers dominated the blog and it put a lot of stress on people like me. Now I see the opposite point of view, and though I agree with you, I was developing a real conversation with people from other walks of life who have valid points of view. There are some very quiet and polite people on the other political spectrum and I wouldn't want to drown them out. Thanks a lot!!!

There is a huge difference in letting someone with limited mobility use an motorize off road vehicle as mandated by ADA law and opening more areas to Off Road Vehicles to anyone who wants to use them. I can no longer hike or climb, as I once did, so accept the limits to where I can easily travel these days. Until my doctors feel I need a scooter or motorize wheelchair, I will either plan my days to things I know I can enjoy without putting myself in too much pain or can do with help from those willing to help push my wheelchair. If and when I have a scooter, I will limit it's use on to those trails the scooter can handle. I don't need to be able to go anywhere I want to be able to enjoy my time outdoors. Just because I would love to be able to do something, doesn't mean I should be allowed to. When I was able bodied, I didn't go hike up above 10,000 feet, and then camp anywhere I wanted to set up my tent. Then I realize what the costs of having a military helicopter flown in, to rescue someone are due to mishaps at high elevations are. I just feel taxpayers should be ask to pay for irresponsible use of public lands.

I agree with \_\_\_\_'s remarks. OHV users SHOULD have designated recreational areas, but due to OHV's inherent high noise levels, engine fumes, soil erosion, speed and so forth, they need to remain isolated from low-impact trail users such as hikers, campers, hunters, anglers, bird-watchers, etc. Non-motorized outdoor enthusiasts simply cannot pursue their outdoor activities on the same trails with motorized users; the two groups' uses are incompatible, plain and simple, so separate facilities are critical in order for both to pursue happiness. To designate motorized vs.non-motorized use areas on a 1:1 ratio would eat up far too much national park/forest land. We need to maintain separation of motorized from non-motorized users, and to the extent feasible, consolidate multiple users on the same trails. Even current multi-use trails where equestrians share the road with hikers and bikers, leave the hiker/biker dealing with mounds of horse manure, but some compromise certainly is necessary to accommodate everyone.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of the biggest issues facing the "National Landscape Conservation System" is....the NAME itself. The American public will have a hard time learning about and embracing a collection of lands, when the name is long, confusing and misleading. Our National Parks invoke an image of Yellowstone's Old Faithfull and the Teton Mountain Range. Based on focus group testing throughout the west- National Landscape Conservation System invokes an image of shrubbery or a bureaucratic system. Please officially adopt the name- our National Conservation Lands to describe this relatively new but important collection of lands, waters and trails.

How do you track people who don't use OHV's and do vandalism?

Unfortunately they would find another reason to close access. They always do.

"As much as I HATE irresponsible riders who create their own trails through untrod soil over and over again, construction sprawl does more to kill habitat then bicycles." irresponsible hikers do that as well...

Lot's of people are so down on OHV's and the damage they cause. I ride a mountain bike and have seen way worse damage from horse. I like that OHV's maintain trails. I wanted to do my part, so I took the forest service certification course this year so I could volunteer as well.

Without looking at reports, I can tell you every time I'm out riding my mountain bike on trails, all over. I see way more people on wheels than hiking.

Thank you \_\_\_\_\_ for an articulate and well balanced perspective for long range preservation of our Great Outdoors. I strongly support working with scholarly organizations and I hope that ATV demolition of our Great Outdoors is severely limited.

It's actually about BOTH. You have the potential for injury to the user groups of: dog walkers - frightened dogs may bite, run away, attack a horse or wildlife, or worse, people. Equestrians: They may get dumped by a bolting horse who's been frightened by a bike or a dog, or is being chased by several dogs. Being thrown by a horse or falling off a horse is a potentially life-threatening injury, as many jockeys and other riders can tell you (Christopher Reeve comes to mind first). Wildlife can be badly frightened by bikes, dogs, and even horses (not so much the latter - the closest I've ever come to wildlife was because I was on a horse). They may abandon young and nests, or even stop reproducing. While a case can be made equally against dogs as it can against bikes, it's much easier to control a dog and keep it quiet than it is to muzzle a bike. So they are less likely to cause distress to wildlife and horses (the second user group) than a bike is. In a perfect world, all would be created equal; unfortunately, our world isn't perfect.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem I see with wilderness is that there will never be enough for the environmental industry. They continue the lobby for definition change so that more public land(also private lands) can qualify for consideration. The 1964 Act and resultant surveys and designations have long since established the true remaining wilderness areas of this county. The industry prays on your emotions to get you to donate money to support their cause, which is their bank accounts. We currently have enough wilderness and we should not grow more.

ATV users clearly do not value wilderness, habitat, the varied species that live there, clean air, etc. They just want space to drive fast. There are many of them. How about we give them places like abandoned airports and manufacturing areas that are already cemented over for them to drive their vehicles? Actually, can we encourage them to find a less destructive hobby? How about jogging? Photography? In terms of putting roads into the wilderness to accomodate the handicapped and elderly, I agree that access would be nice, but as an impending old person I think there're plenty of roads for that already. In my old age I'd rather know the planet is safe and pure than be able to access every inch of it by motorized vehicle.

The federal government needs to recognize, fund, and build on important community-support programs like RTCA, which has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts. In middle Georgia, much of the floodplain along a 50 mile stretch of the Ocmulgee River between the cities of Macon and Hawkinsville is managed under a patchwork of federal, state, and local jurisdictions. Because of this fragmented management, recreational access to the river has traditionally been very limited. RTCA is helping to change that by working with city and county governments to improve public access points along the river, creating a water trail, or Ocmulgee Blueway, that might eventually connect to the Atlantic coast.

No. Sorry, no fossil-fuel burning, loud, tread-heavy motorized ATVs should be part of the National Park experience. Period. Let them find, build and maintain their own roads and off-road experiences.

OHV use is a legitimate, sustainable use of appropriate public lands, particularly on National Forests and Bureau of Land Management Units.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Remember, it just takes one noisy, stinking, rut-making, plant-crushing, wildlife-terrorizing, irresponsibility-promoting, stream-blackening, tree-uprooting, topsoil-eroding, wilderness-abusing, serenity-destroying, all-intrusive fossil-fuel vehicle to ruin a wilderness experience for numerous considerate and responsible admirers of nature and wildlife. Wilderness should be kept wild and free from overt human and corporate intrusion, abuse and exploitation. Too much of the planet and its precious biodiversity have been abused, exploited and trampled by the inconsiderate, thrill-seeking, self-absorbed minions of self, the morally bereft corporate plutocrats who think the Earth is theirs to ravage in their greedy madness, and their servile lackeys in government. If their me-greed ideology were to persist, sterile eroded ruts, asphalt, concrete and neon perversions would cover Yellowstone and Yosemite, and Earth's wildlife would soon consist of flies, cockroaches and rats. Altruistic and ethical people must speak out and stand up now to protect and preserve our national parks, the remaining fragments of pristine wilderness worldwide, and Earth's precious biodiversity.

Keep wilderness wild and free from overt human and corporate intrusion, abuse and exploitation. Too much of the planet and its precious biodiversity have been abused, exploited and trampled by the inconsiderate, thrill-seeking, self-absorbed minions of self, the morally bereft corporate plutocrats who think the Earth is theirs to ravage in their greedy madness, and their servile lackeys in government. If their me-greed ideology were to persist, sterile eroded ruts, asphalt, concrete and neon perversions would cover Yellowstone and Yosemite, and Earth's wildlife would soon consist of flies, cockroaches and rats. Altruistic and ethical people must speak out and stand up now to protect and preserve our national parks, the remaining fragments of pristine wilderness worldwide, and Earth's precious biodiversity.

Yes, keep wilderness wild and free from overt human and corporate intrusion, abuse and exploitation. Too much of the planet and its precious biodiversity have been abused, exploited and trampled by the inconsiderate, thrill-seeking, self-absorbed minions of self, the morally bereft corporate plutocrats who think the Earth is theirs to ravage in their greedy madness, and their servile lackeys in government. If their me-greed ideology were to persist, sterile eroded ruts, asphalt, concrete and neon perversions would cover Yellowstone and Yosemite, and Earth's wildlife would soon consist of flies, cockroaches and rats. Altruistic and ethical people must speak out and stand up now to protect and preserve our national parks, the remaining fragments of pristine wilderness worldwide, and Earth's precious biodiversity.

Notice the words "large-scale forest landowners", sounds like an idea that will end up promoting the corporate lumber industry.

Bruce, without "super" predators to thin the ranks, wilderness suffers. Deer, elk, and other herbivores overgraze and unbalance the plant life, which in turn can lead to losses to smaller wildlife and to soil erosion. Why should wolves and bears not be in areas where they survived in a balanced way with other wildlife for hundreds of thousands of years before Man came along and decided that wolves were a threat to their profit margin?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Albert, Along your lines of thinking then why does your type feel that your hiking shoes come with a permit not only to use them on public property but to also dictate who can and cannot use that public land. OHV recreation is an acceptable form of recreation in most states as is horseback riding, mountain biking and yea even hiking. If all of you hi and mighty feet on the ground types were really so disgusted with the combustion engine being out on the trails then you should stay off most trails since they are funded by OHV gas taxes, thru the RTP.

H. E. PUFFENBARGER (05 Aug 2010) Having been a forester on the Siskiyou N.F. I can see no advantages to having a Monument. There is nothing unique about the area other than what some folks want to make of it and .... there is already a Wilderness nearby. I am for conserving our national heritage but I am not a preservationist.

I wholeheartedly agree with Barbara here. We've overfished our oceans into collapse. We've polluted our air into of climate catastrophe. And we've fragmented our wild lands so severely that not a single regional-scale ecosystem is intact. When do we learn our lesson in humility and make a change? There are so many thousands of miles of backcountry roads in my homestate, Colorado, that there is only one place where an animal or bird can get more than 7 miles away from a road. And people think we need more of them?!

What many people don't seem to understand is that by destroying the environment, including other species, we are destroying ourselves. This is the only planet on which we can live. Once again, we need wildlife corridors because the wildlife spaces we now protect are inadequate for healthy herds/packs of wild animals. I do not hate other humans. It is because I want humans to be around for a long time that I am so concerned about the environment and what we are doing to it.

What sounds good on the surface is again another ruse to promote motorized vehicles in wilderness areas. Once again, they erode and destroy trails and they are noisy. They should not be allowed in wilderness areas. Also, the BLM has done a terrible job of controlling grazing on grasslands, timber cutting and mining on public lands. They do not protect the interests of the public in general. I am tired of my tax money subsidizing the timber, ranching and mining corporations (I should say conglomerates.) There aren't many families left who are making a living this way. Even if there are, the costs of their products should reflect the real amount of damage done to lands in the process, and no products reflect that today.

We need wildlife corridors between parks. The designated range for wildlife is currently too small to promote healthy herds/packs.

Although education is a good thing, motorized vehicles still should be prohibited in protected wilderness areas because they cause erosion and destroy trails.

I have just finished reading Bill McKibben's "The End Of Nature" so I am concerned about comments to manage for sustainability. The description of this sounds good but I worry about the economic reality and social benefit taking over from forest health. The forest was sustainable without our intervention. But we keep wanting more for our lifestyle and less for nature's way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most of the open space is ranch land, not national park or state owned land. So if ranchers would like to host off-roaders I would love to see that work out. They could make some money by allowing access to their ranches which are NOT wilderness and would not be disturbed by off-roaders.

Please allow more OHV recreational use of public lands for the benefit of current and future American families.

Rivers Alive at Wall Street Pier 13 Rivers Alive Maritime Pavilion (Ramp) Pier 15 A place where visitors will be able to learn, touch, and see the water and any tall Historic Ship that visits the NYC area. [www.riversalivenyc.org](http://www.riversalivenyc.org) The site is somewhat dated, but our web masters are hard at work updating our exciting components. Our partners in the Rivers Alive at Wall street team are the Open Space institute, Pace University, Raplh Appelbaum Associates, Albert Butzel, Esq., Plaza Construction, Al Landzbery, Tony Walmsley, and David Rocco of the Walkway Over the Hudson background!

Every year at my school, we have a clean up day. My school runs from Pre-K through 12th grade and each student does something to help the environment. High schoolers and middle schoolers take garbage bags and gloves and pick up any trash on the campus or on the road. Lower schoolers plant flowers and other plants in the front of the school which makes it look nice, but also helps the environment. Although there are some complaints here and there about not wanting to pick up other peoples' garbage, in the long run, everyone feels really good about what they have done. I've also heard kids say, "Wow, I guess I won't be throwing my trash out the window of my car anymore." This experience gets kids outside, working with their hands, and makes them more aware of pollution problems. What's great about this approach is that it is relatively cost free! There is no transportation cost (because we are working in a walking distance), and the teachers who would normally be teaching classes during the clean up time are the chaperones (so nobody needs to get paid for the chaperoning position). The only cost is for supplies like bags, gloves, and the plants which the smaller children plant. I think every school should have a clean up day.

When reading these comments, I sense a very different attitude by those making comments. I don't think that name calling or labeling will solve the problems that face us. There are many places that I will never be able to go because of my physical limitations, strength, etc., but I don't expect others to accommodate my needs. There are plenty of beautiful places I CAN see and experience. People who don't care for wilderness areas or public lands should experience places where all the land is owned -- Texas comes to mind - and see how trespassing on ORVs, etc., works there. There are a variety of reasons for establishing areas as wilderness. There are plenty of wonderful places to experience without running roughshod over areas that may be considered worthy of protection.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Getting people involved in helping with America's public lands is critical to having people buy into the idea of these lands being "our" lands and working to protect them. The services that oversee these lands have been stretched to their limits during the last several years and volunteers are needed to help in many areas. I support the idea of 4x4's teaching their folks how to preserve trails and keep to approved trails. There are, however, places where a quiet experience is expected by people who don't have to rely on a 4x4 or ORV to get them where they want to go. I appreciate the fact that some people have to use 4x4s or ORVs because of their physical condition, but it seems our nation would be healthier and the next generation be hardier if they'd do a bit more walking.

The challenge in the coming century will be to protect wilderness areas such as the BWCAW. It has been a challenge to protect such areas up to this point, but as we go forward in the coming years it will be even more difficult. Every year there are more and more attempts to increase motorized usage, to expand mining exploration, and bring more commercialization to the very edge of these wilderness areas. Once lost, wilderness areas are almost impossible to reclaim. Protecting these areas now means having them in the future for the next generations to experience. We should be able to expect the Federal and State agencies to protect these areas for us, the people, against the intrusion of corporate mining exploration and to keep the wilderness just that, wilderness. Wilderness areas were established and rules set up to manage those areas for a good reason, and those reasons have not, and should not, be changed.

All categories of public land should not be open to the same access. Wilderness and most National Parks should continue to be closed to motorized or mechanized access. Land and habitat destruction is inevitable. Even horses chew up the terrain, but nothing compared to 4x4s and bikes. They need access to land that can take the abuse. Walking is still the basic human activity, and should be supported.

Ok, I've been going through these pages for almost 2 hours and do I have a headache! Not from some OHV racing by on a nearby trail, but from the some of the ridiculous comments from both sides of the use arguments. For one thing, both sides need some coursework in biology and ecosystems. BOTH SIDES! There is science involved in the choices we make, but few of us take the time to learn anything about it before we jump on one bandwagon or the other and start calling each other names and spouting what is often just plain ignorance, but it's what their particular side claims to be the "truth." I'm already actively trying to learn the science, so that I can make wise decisions and comments, but I'm going next to find a website to get some clear definitions on how we designate public lands and the current allowable uses. I've gotten to the point in reading through the existing comments that most of us don't have a clue what we're really talking about!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

GG uses my favorite word, "balance." My husband works for a motorsports related industry, rides dirt bikes (only tracks and designated trails), and we both ride snowmobiles even though I'm the greenie in the house and influencing him more and more. Regardless of where the balance level of motorized to non-motorized use might fall, it's vital that uses are monitored and enforced. Even a hiker or hike in camper can do terrible damage by a misplaced foot, trash forgotten, or an improper fire.

I had to vote demote for this even though I support the work the volunteers do, because I don't think we should make the uses permanent. Changes in climate, wildlife/plant life, population using sites, etc. may require the ability to change the rules also.

If people were better educated about the issues, there would be more in the riding community making wise decisions about how, when and where to ride.

Encouraging biodiversity is key, and the primary threat and challenge is monoculture. According to Douglas Tallamy who wrote a great book called "Bringing Nature Home," only 5% of the US is truly wildlife habitat. The rest is urban sprawl and agriculture. Large, vibrant, and complex environments have been replaced with highly "efficient" and rather boring rows of houses, roads, monocultures of corn or soybean or turf grass. There is an overabundance of fear and ignorance out there when it comes to wildlife and wilderness, and needless destruction of our fellow living beings and their habitats. I am not against development, agriculture, or even a little bit of lawn here and there, but monocultures are very dangerous (risk of disease and blight, not to mention chemicals and pollution from sustaining them), and with just a little more effort, we already have ways to better develop agriculture and housing that allows nature to flourish with and alongside of it. We need to share and give back to nature (like to a "mother"), not simply exploit it (like a "resource"). One crucial challenge is to encourage more local native plants, which are the key to allowing wildlife to flourish (native bugs and birds, for example, have developed with native plants over the aeons and need them to survive, whereas exotic plant species often produce chemicals which native bugs are not adapted to, thus killing off local native bugs, in turn wiping out a huge base of the food chain). Since our population is growing, we need to either say goodbye to a diverse array of wildlife and get used to only a few adaptive species such as squirrels, deer, and sparrows (not very auspicious for our own species!), or learn to live in greater harmony with nature, and allow native plants and wildlife into our everyday lives, our schoolyards, our backyards. I believe most people would be very angry and upset if they knew just how much biodiversity we have lost and continue to lose. This is something that transcends the banal divisions amongst us, and we need everyone on board - republicans, democrats, independents, religious folks, scientists, farmers, ranchers, businesspeople, rural, urban, rich, poor, young, old - everyone can and must do a little something.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of trails and millions of acres of public land open to motorized users in this country. The lands of the wilderness preservation system are an important refuge from their noise, ecological destruction, air pollution, and other negative effects. As a non-motorized user, if I'm canoeing, hiking, cross-country skiing or finding another traditional way to enjoy the outdoors, and an ATV or a snowmobile or a motor boat passes by out of sight but within earshot, their presence is undeniable and a serious intrusion on my outdoor experience. On the other hand, that motorized user has no idea I'm just over the hill or behind an island. My use of the land has no impact on their experience, but their use has a serious, and profoundly negative, impact on mine. Non-motorized activities like those I mentioned above are truly traditional activities. They have been around since the dawn of time. ATVs, motor boats and snowmobiles are recent inventions and their claim on our public lands is completely overstated. As newcomers to the outdoors, they should show some respect for the people who have been quietly enjoying the outdoors for many generations.

The single most sensitive indication of the health of any wild ecosystem is the health of its soundscape. Preserving the intrinsic sounds of a wild natural place from the extrinsic anthrophony (human-generated sounds) should be one of the highest priorities in the management of wilderness and other natural areas. Sound has long been ignored as an indicator of the health of an ecosystem. The Park Service has a small soundscape research group, but their work is not particularly influential. For example, even in the most remote portions of Yosemite National Park, jet overflights are audible more than 50% of any given day. Sound sources like roadways, railways, and especially over-flights should all be managed to preserve the pristine wild-natural quality of wild places. In particular, any audible over-flights of wilderness areas should be banned and re-routed.

3)) Not close-minded, just fact. Once you put machines on the landscape, you eliminate the desirability and usefulness of that area for "passive" recreation, such as hiking, skiing, birdwatching, or any other form of recreation that is rewarded with peace and quiet. So your saying you can only hike on groomed trails?

I agree but that is also part of being a parent and teaching your children, cant count the cars and trucks I have seen driving down the hwy with the kids throwing their fast food garbage out the window as mom and dad set in the front seat and say nothing, take a look at your ditches any place in America if you think it dont happen.

BWCAW is exactly what? GOD gave us the earth natural resources to use so we can flourish if he didnt want us to use those resources he would not have given us so many.

99% of the places I go to ride OHV's I am alone their is nobody else, at night I have to sleep with the radio or TV on its so spooky quiet, I suggest you rethink where your driving to when you want to "escape the noise" because your doing something very wrong, if when you get to your location and you find a bunch of motorized or man made noises. Please dont drive to the local mall on black Friday to do your Christmas shopping then complain about the crowds and noise.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your statement is the same as smoking vs non smoking. What a smoker does hurts another. What a non smoker does hurts no one. Whether you like it or not, noise pollution as well as gas emissions from dirt bikes, ATVs, or any motorized vehicle hurts. It isn't that we are being dishonest. I have no hatred of dirt bikes, ATVs or motorcycles. I just don't think they belong in a nature setting where the noise alone upsets the balance. If you actually hike, then you will know that most hikers travel the trails almost in silence or in soft spoken voice so that the very things they are there to enjoy aren't scared away by noise pollution. And it is sad, but there are more than a 'few bad apples' who have no interest in working on laws and enforcement. They use short cuts or travel off the trails causing untold damage. The mentality of most dirt bikers and ATV's is more of competition/excitement than it is of enjoying nature. HOW can anyone enjoy nature while creating the very thing which removes the natural sounds? I have an equal dislike of hikers or horsemen who take shortcuts, switchbacks or leave designated trails so my opinion applies across the board. There are areas suited for ATVs, dirt bikes, and the like, but a forest or park is not the place. The hatred, distrust or angst you feel may not be from all hikers/walkers/naturalist or horse enthusiast. I think it is more that they are aware that the damage done by motorized vehicles is far more damaging than even horses. AND as I said, you are trying to compare apples to oranges. Hiking does no damage to the quality of the air or destroys the sounds of nature. Unfortunately....motorized vehicles of any kind does. Let there be areas for ATVs and dirt bikes AWAY from public lands that are shared by hikers/campers/naturalist or those seeking quiet and peace AWAY from what they have to live with while at home. Again...the analogy: Smokers hurt others by second hand smoke (we won't get into increased medical costs which is passed along to non smokers by smokers)! Non smokers DO NOT HURT OTHERS. That's about as simple as I can state it. Noise hurts just as much as the smells and emissions. Does this make the picture clearer for you? I certainly hope so. I don't think the two will ever reach an agreement. I know you won't find me in an area where multiple use is in effect. To be able to enjoy and enjoy the peace and quiet of nature along with nature itself (birds/squirrels/snakes/slugs/lizards/whatever is in nature)...IS THE REASON I LEAVE MY NEIGHBORHOOD/COMMUNITY/CITY/TOWN/ETC. ! TO GET AWAY FROM THE DAILY NOISE/TRAFFIC/MOTORIZED VEHICLES/HURRY/AND CROWDS IS THE REASON I GO/SEEK/VISIT FOREST/PARKS/NATURE SETTINGS.

I like your post. I just don't understand why those who want to take motorized vehicles into can't see the difference. Just because it's there, doesn't mean we should use any means to get there. I agree with you. Thank you for your posts. I tried to explain to \_\_\_ that this is like trying to compare apples and oranges. To put it simply and maybe in a way some can finally understand: It's like smoking. What a smoker does...harms others. What a non smoker does by not smoking does no harm to anyone! SIMPLE!

Go drive your lousy vehicles on a private track.

Bar all off road vehicles from public lands. Too lazy to hike? Tough luck.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Community Forestry Conservation Act of 2009: Financing the Conservation of America's Working Forests The Setting The US Forest Service estimates that 23 million acres of forestland will be lost by 2050. With economic conditions encouraging such forest loss, the long-term viability of rural mills and jobs are threatened, along with public values including habitat, water quality and carbon storage. At the same time, approximately 84% of America's industrial forests have changed hands in the past 10 years. This unprecedented level of transaction activity creates opportunities for largescale working forest conservation purchases – with funding for such purchases being the limiting factor. A New Conservation Tool The Community Forestry Conservation Act of 2009 would authorize Community Forestry Bonds to be used as a new financial tool that conserves working forests while providing jobs and respecting landowner property rights. In short, tax-exempt revenue bonds are issued to allow for the acquisition of forests by a qualified buyer. The low-cost bonds will be revenue bonds, backed by the revenue stream generated by the low-impact management of the land. The land will be owned in fee by the qualified buyer. The municipal bond market financed approximately \$386 billion in public benefits projects in 2008 and will allow qualified forest organizations to borrow tens to hundreds of millions in an efficient and timely way. The Concept A group of conservation, business and other interested parties with a desire to conserve specific land would become a qualified buyer and reach an agreement on what land would be acquired and at what price range. • Typical of private buy/sell transactions, discussions with the existing land owner would occur as a first step. Subsequent to reaching agreement with the seller, a management plan and a conservation easement would be finalized. • Pursuant to the agreement, tax-exempt revenue bonds to fund the forest acquisition would be issued by an appropriate government authority on behalf of the qualified buyer. • Title to the land would be held by the qualified buyer and the land would be managed to service the tax-exempt debt in a manner that would comply with the management plan. For providing increased public benefit, the qualified buyer would be able to borrow money at a lower cost. Competition with private sector buyers is eliminated by the increased acquisition cost and limitations on commercial returns. • When the bonds are paid off, the qualified buyer would retain ownership and would continue to operate the working forest as it best sees fit -- conservation, revenues for schools, roads or community projects, or other uses. Benefits of the Community Forestry Conservation Act & Community Forestry Bonds: Good for Landowners - All land sales will be voluntary and non-regulatory so property rights will be protected. Moreover, all transactions will be negotiated with the landowner at fair market value. Good for the Environment - Working forests and open space would be protected and qualified buyer organizations will have greater financial flexibility to apply lighter resource management practices on the land. Good for Natural Resource Businesses - While qualified buyers will own and manage lands, forest products will continue to provide raw material for mills and jobs for communities. Good for Governments - Local governments will continue to receive tax dollars that result from the continued land management. If a municipality participates financially it could benefit from revenue flow. Also, public environmental benefits can be achieved across a broader landscape at a much lower financial and political cost. Good for Communities - Qualified buyers will become groups where communities can unite and share responsibility for managing their natural resources. As bonds are paid off, communities will benefit from locally owned and managed forests. Make Community Forestry Bonds a Reality Community Forestry Bonds requires

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

legislation that clarifies unique issues associated with a nonprofit organization's ability to service debt with sustainable timber harvest proceeds. Versions of the Community Forestry Conservation Act have passed the House and Senate in various forms in the past but never through conference committee. The Community Forestry Conservation Act of 2009 was introduced on July 22, 2009. Senators Patty Murray (D-WA), Mike Crapo (R-ID), Maria Cantwell (D-WA), Ron Wyden (D-OR), and Jeff Merkley (D-OR) sponsored S. 1501 in the Senate, and Representatives Mike Thompson (D-CO), Jim McDermott (D-WA), and Dave Reichert (R-WA) sponsored H.R. 3302 in the House. This idea was originally posted in the Private Lands Conservation category where it had a total of 14 votes. The following comments were posted before that idea was "archived" in late June: Original comments: 1) Thomas O'Keefe (04 May 2010) This is an example of the kind of great and innovative approach the MOU seeks to identify as stated in Section 2(c)(i) "It should recommend efficient and effective use of existing resources, as well as opportunities to leverage nonfederal public and private resources and nontraditional conservation programs." For the original list of votes see the archived idea here: { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/4AFD72DB57A9485E86257717006F30F0?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Sounds to me like another boondoggle by the lumber industry.

In this era of rapid environmental change, solutions to ecological problems rest on people understanding how the state of the Earth's land, air, and water is linked to their everyday lives, health, and well-being. Parks, nature preserves, and other protected green spaces worldwide offer opportunities to capture data on the earth's systems and then to "translate" it into information that helps people connect with nature, strengthens and supports scientific research, and informs policies to improve environmental conditions. There is tremendous opportunity to apply the burgeoning field of green technology and green business service solutions to creating an informed and motivated citizenry and, in turn, protecting the natural environment for current and future generations. Shifting manual processes to digital systems is not a simple process, but is critical for reducing operational costs and increasing organizational efficiency. For example, greater use of the Internet reduces the cost and time of transacting memberships and daily fees and helps free up personnel to provide other critical visitor services. Interactive kiosks or smart phone technologies provide information to engage visitors at strategic locations. Greater use of the Internet to disseminate information enhances organizational ability to reach members, volunteers, visitors, policymakers, the media, and the general public. Application of GIS mapping applications are critical for effective planning and management.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Hudson River Valley is a National Heritage Area with a population of 2.2 million. Ulster County, in which the Mohonk Preserve is located, has a population of 180,000 and an over-65 population expected to grow 62% by 2030. Currently 150,000 persons come to Mohonk Preserve each year. This number is expected to grow as the 22 million residents of the New York-Newark-Bridgeport, NY-NJ-CT-PA combined statistical area spend leisure time closer to home due to economic realities and a trend toward “staycations” making scenic recreation areas such as the Preserve more attractive destinations. The Preserve must be prepared for increases in the numbers and changes in the needs of the visitors it serves in order to properly steward the land and maintain the organizational capacity to meet new financial and operational challenges.

Economic Impact – A study conducted by Business Opportunities Management Consulting using economic impact models used by the National Park Service determined that tourism and operations at Minnewaska State Park Preserve, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point Preserve generate an economic impact on the local area of \$10.7 million and support 352 local jobs.

- Annual visitors to Minnewaska State Park Preserve, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point: 392,695
- Annual spending by visitors to Minnewaska SPP, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point: \$13,051,000
- Annual local sales taxes generated by visitors to Minnewaska SPP, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point: \$459,000
- Total economic impact of Minnewaska SPP, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point on the local economy: \$10,669,981
- Number of local jobs supported by Minnewaska SPP, Mohonk Preserve and Sam’s Point: 352

Defining "sustainability" is so important in these dialogs. In the case of this report, the goal seems to be a balance of environmental, social, and economic goods. Emphasizing one - any one - way over the others does not get us - the west, the US, the world - where we need to be.

We have enough wilderness areas already. The public land belongs to the public. All of the public not just one segment or another. Wise use of those lands involves all parties. Some areas should be left in their original state and others should allow managed OHV use.

last times seen have wilderness area get away rest us,plus nat forest are public land

did any one forget that are wilderness area want get away for ohv use,i am off road and love the outdoor , that seen on my fan page on facebook is robert thigpen off road adventures and other trip

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is my first visit to this web site and I am amazed at the arguments people have here - I love Mr Sutherland's thoughtful post too however. I do think that all the arguments will be irrelevant though if we continue to argue and bicker down "party lines" as it seems everyone does now. The pollution continues to dirty our air, animals continue to be pushed from their homes, the ocean gets dirtier and we get unhealthier. We need to stop arguing and actually do something positive - cross the party line divide and do what is best for the planet. It won't matter one jot who has the biggest and most powerful Off Road Vehicle if there is no gasoline left. And it won't help the polar bear swim for its life from one melting ice floe to another. We are way too selfish a species. Perhaps we should try to come together and help the earth we have already so badly damaged, starting with our superior attitudes and beginning small, in our own homes.

This is how it all worked out with the recent purchase of Plum Creek lands in Montana: The Nature Conservancy purchased a bunch of Plum Creek land using interest free bonds from the Feds. They slapped restrictive covenants and conservation easements on those lands and then sold them to the Forest Service, complete with restrictions, and perhaps at a profit. We ended up with a bunch of highly restricted public land without any open, transparent, or public process.

\_\_\_\_\_, I agree with the title of your thoughtful idea, but disagree with your characterization of the issue. I would point out that the various committees and collaborative groups you mention are typically dominated by professional paid employees of wealthy conservation groups whose job is to attend and join such groups. The listening sessions for the AGO Initiative are an example. These sessions are held during the work week during the day when most ordinary citizens have to work. Yet professional, paid representatives of conservation organizations showed up by the hundreds -- just doing the job they are paid to do. The outcome of these listening sessions is predictable -- they will support the addition of 13 million more acres of National Monuments as the organizers intended them to do.

I do support multiple use trails, while also supporting wilderness area designations (and their expansion where the original designation was flawed). \_\_\_\_\_ seems like a reasonable person proponent of these things, and that part of his proposal is fine. Don't read much more into his proposal than what is there. He is not proposing to strip the wilderness of its protections, or to cut down every tree. "Sustainable timber harvesting and grazing" are acceptable ideas, if the Forest Service and BLM could be trusted to practice them. History is not on the side of that idea, however, so I will reluctantly vote against this proposal. If he were proposing to put some teeth into regulating these things, I would change my mind.

Some of the arguments in favor of "managing" forests seem to be conveniently forgetting that natural ecosystems do a fine job of managing -- without human intervention. These arguments may be instead promoting logging. Fire has been proven to be a natural benefit to western forests. Go to Yellowstone NP & see for yourself how the fire of '88 has improved the ecosystem. Some plant species need fire to open their seed pods, such as the Lodgepole Pine.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

The administration should apply the lessons learned from the National Parks Centennial Challenge effort and launch a new campaign and partnership to protect and fund our national parks and better connect them to communities and young people. With the approaching centennial, national parks should receive the funding they need so they are fully restored and ready to serve the country for another hundred years.

We don't need to spend \$ on people and gadgets in of for parks. We need to preserve more lands, protect them, and connect them. Otherwise the "smart parks" of the future will be in our living room through virtual technology.

Many of our Western Wilderness Areas are shot through with both private lands (inholdings, 400,000 acres) and state and local government lands (400,000 more acres). These are like time bombs waiting for development - and that's already happened in CA, OR, Co, etc. We need to finance the buy-out of willing sellers in these areas and negotiate with state and local govts to greatly reduce these gaps in our existing wilderness. They have the potential of great reducing the human values embodied in the Wilderness Act and certainly causing immense degradation of wildlife habitat.

Here is the kind of thing that can happen to those pockets in the wilderness. Is this what Muir, Leopold, Zahniser, and many others had in mind? Is this what we want? Is this the future of wilderness in the USA? In Oregon: { <a href="http://oregonshores.org/narrative.php5?nid=557" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://www.katu.com/outdoors/featured/95424464.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://www.oregongoldtrip.com/goldopportunity5.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } In Colorado: { <a href="http://www.denverpost.com/recommended/ci\_15058325" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/04/15/developertom-chapman-pla\_n\_538872.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } }

Most of the land west of the Mississippi or either farmland, rangeland, oil and gas, or otherwise developed. Much of what is left is desert of montane. Little quality habitat remains. And about the geart profits the Nature Conservancy is making, they are falling down laughing! Do you just make up what you say as you go along? Do facts and reality have no bearing on life?

No activity that degrades the environment. Period. Multiple use does not mean multiple abuse. Dispersed recreation (wreckreation) is contrary to the best interests of nature and future generations. This proposal is a Trojan Horse people. Read it carefully.

Environmental groups are in fact pushing for forest thinning, but NOT for taking out the last of our Old Growth. Get the facts straight.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need more open space areas. The human population is increasing and many plant and animal populations are decreasing. We have recently seen how our government works when they deem an area is needed for a political agenda. The removal of the wild mustangs, even though we had the ROAM Act to protect these herds, which some politicians changed for some political agenda. Now it is questionable whether or not these animals will have viable populations. The killing of the reintroduced wolf populations, so that once again it is questionable whether or not they will be a viable entity. And on it goes..... So, yes we need to have more wild areas, so that we can maintain organisms that exist today for our future and future generations. Once they are gone, how are they going to be replaced?

We need our public lands. I believe that much of the problem comes from a lack of education about the wildlife and plants that inhabit these areas. I think that if people are educated about the organism that are in these areas and how important they are to the habitat and the individual's life, they would view them differently. Of course there are some people who would take advantage of this and they need to be controlled. Education needs to be provided for all age groups and people from all walks of life. Man needs to learn how important these areas are and how to reduce human impact on our natural areas, so that we will have a future.

Really, you're lives and attitudes are presumed better in you're eyes simply because you want to believe them. Really didn't your kindergarten teacher teach you to share. Many areas being proposed are not true wilderness areas by definition, they are merely larger tracts of land that have not been locked up, and so in the fervency of the movement, more is more, is more, is more. Get a grip on reality. I drive by elk and prairie dogs whiten feet of my car daily and they do not seam to mind sharing with us..

So far the only one suggesting running over sea turtles is... This idea is asinine. Using this logic, the entire Apache-Sitgraves National Forest should be closed to hikers, since one who was lost decided to start a 250,000 acre signal fire a few years ago. I refuse to be punished for the actions of others.

Instead of deferring estate taxes, just do the right thing and permanently do away with them.

If anything, we need more protections for citizens, states and local governments who take on the federal government. All too often the federal government makes decisions and rules that they have no business making.

What is ruining our republic is a federal government that does not recognize its limits and states that continue to allow those limits to be overstepped. If the federal government would stick to the 3 things it is actually constitutionally authorized to do (Provide for national defense, conduct foreign policy and PROMOTE interstate commerce) this would be a non-issue. My state and its residents are largely in line with what I think should be happening. If they were not, I would be working on changing that or finding a state that better fit me. Preferably without an over-reaching federal government getting in the way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public land is just that, public. While people are out enjoying the great outdoors it's best to respect the land and each other when passing. OHV's have their place and should stay away from areas hikers trek and vice versa.

GG, as others have stated, has a reasonable suggestion on user fees as management funding, but motorized vehicles and quiet enjoyment are the issue here. This is an either/or thing: pedestrians and horses can not coexist safely with motorized vehicles, no matter how responsibly the machines are handled. By having a motorized vehicle there, that does not give someone the right to infringe on another's enjoyment of that area, but that's what occurs. Noise, fumes, and risk of bodily harm are accepted by the OHV user. Non-OHV users do not accept those negatives, but have those forced upon them. These two user groups must remain separate.

Programs like this are an excellent idea because, like all science, environmental science is best learned in an authentic, hands-on manner. Alas, it is true that because there is no state-mandated test for science, all science curriculum is becoming marginalized. Also many, if not most, teachers feel anxious about taking time out of the classroom until the state tests are completed. In our state that means no one is interested in big field trips until May. May may or may not be the best time to observe any given ecosystem or to integrate those observations into the curriculum, but certainly no state park, hatchery or watershed district can handle every school in the region in just one month. So I would agree with the above author that the current educational policies do interfere with the schools' attempts to utilize our national natural resources. Could something be done?

Human recreation should be done in the areas we've already decimated -- not in wilderness or park areas that we are trying to preserve. Using motorized vehicles on trails should not be allowed in any wildlife area -- it opposes all reasonable thought when it comes to protecting our great outdoors. We are not a vocal minority -- it's just difficult for us to believe that people actually feel it's okay to destroy so much of what has been preserved -- and the destruction is not only physical, but the incredible noise of vehicles adversely affects other people as well as wildlife.

And the intrusion of motorized vehicles is no way to protect anything in the wilderness. The loudest sounds wildlife is exposed to -- without human intervention -- is their own calls of mating and claims of territory. Not much of what a rider of ORVs does supports wildlife -- and not only is wildlife disturbed by the noise, but so are so many of us who are trying to get away from it by heading to the wilderness area, forest or park. I know that ORVs have a right to ride their vehicles -- but it should not be through area set aside for wildlife. That's not fair to those of us who care not to see the damage or hear the engines -- and it's certainly not protective of anything wild.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Intolerant, yes -- of so many people who are focused on the, what's in it for us, mentality. What should be looked at is the impact on wildlife. The unnatural intrusion of loud, destructive vehicles that have no place in the middle of a forest, or meadow or mountain valley should be limited to areas outside any park land. What in the world makes anyone believe that these motorized vehicles lend themselves to wilderness protection?! What we need is firm protection of those lands that have been set aside as parkland. If we want to visit it, we should do so on foot -- the least intrusive and disruptive way possible. It's so amazing to camp out with family listening for the natural sounds of a forest, day or night -- away from human-made sounds that most of us have to listen to in our everyday lives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHVs belong on well-regulated private tracks, not on public land. Off-road vehicles (OHVs, ORVs), aka All-terrain vehicles (ATVs) are not compatible with hiking, nature study, and other healthy, environmentally-friendly use of our public lands. But there is strong pressure to allow more ORVs on public lands. Manufacturers and dealers are working to open up public lands to ORVs. ORVs have important environmental significance as well as health and safety implications. Some ATV's are even advertised as suitable for users six years of age or older. The Forest Service maintains an ATV trail system in North Carolina. It is reported that usage of the area is causing multiple plumes of visible sedimentation in the Tellico River and its tributaries. The ATVs have cut deep passages in the soil as they repeatedly traverse this steep area of loose soil and big rocks. Trout Unlimited and other environmental organizations served on the Forest Service a Notice of Intent to sue. The purpose was to force the Forest Service to stop the destructive sedimentation of trout waters. The exhaust of all terrain vehicles (ATV's) contains unburned hydrocarbons. You will sometimes see a blue haze. Because of the known dangers of unburned hydrocarbons, our automobiles are designed to reduce these emissions. Automobiles utilize a four-stroke-cycle engine. There is an intake stroke, compression stroke, power stroke and exhaust stroke. And many modern auto engines are designed with two exhaust valves and two intake valves for each cylinder. Many ATV's utilize a two-stroke-cycle engine. Two-stroke engines combine functions and use ports for intake and exhaust. This arrangement simplifies the design and produces a higher power-to-weight ratio. The tradeoff is much higher noise levels, poorer efficiency, and abominable pollution levels for ATV's. Based on some calculations, the pollution due to one ATV equals the pollution due to fifty automobiles. ATV's cause other problems as well. Many ATV's are inherently unsafe due to the lack of a differential. They are destructive of trails and make our open space areas unsafe for hikers, nature lovers, and other users. The vehicles can wreak environmental havoc by eroding hills or streambeds. And riders who illegally speed through back yards usually favor the least effective mufflers possible, endearing themselves to no one. There are private tracks available, but it is unlikely that more will be built due to safety, noise, and air pollution concerns of potential neighbors. ATV owners and dealers are asking for more access to parks and other public land. The owners and dealers are well-organized and polite as they advocate multi-use trails. But, hikers and other trail users are unsafe on trails frequented by ATV's. One watershed/forest preserve allowed the owners of ATV's and motorcycle dirt-bikes to have an opportunity for off-road recreation on designated off-road-trails. They reasoned that the logical management plan was a "permit process" that would encourage and limit "off-roading" to a special use area within the forest, while discouraging and preventing it in the off-limits areas. As the numbers of off-roaders increased, the permit process failed. ATV's overran the watershed and had the run of the place. Unfortunately, the designated off-road-trails led directly to all the hiking trails, bridle paths, colonial roads, and utility rights-of-way throughout the forest. But, the off-road environmental degradation didn't stop at the borders of the forest. The mechanized destruction within the ecosystem spread unchecked onto State Park Lands and private land holdings. When the rains fell, illegal off-roading churned and turned forest hiking trails into muddy streams and historic colonial roads into scarring rivulets. Brooks, upland ponds and wetlands - along with the very life they supported - were choked to death by the wash of silt and debris torn-up by off-roading. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other agencies have noted that we are facing an epidemic of health

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

problems, partly due to lack of physical activity. ATV's interfere with healthy and environmentally-friendly recreation. ATV's just don't belong on our public lands.

Multi-use trails that allow motorized use are no longer suitable for hiking or cross-country skiing.

I am an avid hiker and love the outdoors but it seems awful closed minded that people feel they can ride mountain bikes and horses on public land's but are against those of us that want to ride Dirt bikes and ATV's . We have a State forest near us that allows everything and we all have designated areas for all of us,the ATV trails are always trash free and there is never any horse crap in the middle of our trails,you can hike and hunt on our trails.Riding Dirt Bikes and ATV's is a great family activity and we don't do any damage staying on our trails.There are very few places for us to ride and I pay the same taxes as everyone that opposes this,I think all of you that oppose this had ought to be fighting all the new sub divisions that totally destroy forests but most that oppose this are buying the new houses in these wilderness clearing sub divisions.

Nobody prohibited from enjoying lands protected by wilderness or National Monument designation; instead, certain types of usage are restricted. But anyone can hike or canoe these areas. And the public isn't being "forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness." That's ridiculous...the reason these areas get wilderness designation is because there aren't any people (or even evidence of civilization) there!

What rips my heart out is when I see people say we should use up the resources we were given as if there is no value in having some areas in their natural state. Every day we are surrounded by asphalt, roads, buildings, cell phone towers, cars, trucks, construction, stores, and noise, noise, noise. It is everywhere except a few unique places where you can go to get away from it. I am a city girl but have been going into the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness for the last 23 years. I started when I was newly married and now my children are going with me. There is something so amazing about paddling into an area with none of the above. It cannot be described. Once you experience a paddle only trip into the wilderness, you realize its value is beyond anything that can be built or bought by "us." Please take the time to experience this and it will forever change your outlook on protecting wilderness areas. I cry every time I leave the BWCA because I always worry that it will go away and this may be the last time I see it. People are too greedy for every piece of dirt, land, and section of water. Let us learn to preserve things of value or they will not exist. PLEASE!!!! Take one trip and when your trip is done and you paddle out across that line into an area that allows motors and cabins, it is so jarring that the stark contrast says it all deep down to the bottom of your soul - save the wild places! - There are so few of them left!!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

One of the biggest challenges facing our non-profit 501c3 educational operation are insurance costs. We are developing a unique idea and providing unique opportunities for tourists to experience. Plus throw in there working around animals of all sorts, you can see premiums skyrocket. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Granted, we have a unique idea. The statistics that are being drawn together by the insurance companies bring into account many more factors than what most organizations experience. But when you are looking at developing an historically rich agricultural experience, it is inevitable. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Some of the areas we are getting into include agriculture, historic preservation, historic revitalization, international agricultural, operating original machines ranging from threshers to locomotives, raw material processing facilities, herds of domesticated animals, operating whole agricultural industry centers that are the model for the world to follow, and much more.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Could it be possible for subsidies to go to insurance companies who are insuring historic preservation organizations?&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;We are doing something that is unique and on a scale never seen before in American history and it is being done by a private organization. There is so much to it that I can not explain here. If you are interested in learning more...

Actively managing any resource is folly. We as humans think we have the answers but more often than not we create more problems than solutions. I am sure there were healthy forests long before humans and logging existed. Nature will find a balance if left alone. We may not like that balance but we cannot fight it forever.

I almost promoted this except for the fact that it states nuclear energy is the only alternative. The real truth is that we do not yet know what the solution is and there is no clear energy source with all upside and no downside. What I think we need diverse energy sources so that a fault in one type of source does not bring the whole system to its knees.

I agree with \_\_\_\_ in one sense, that there is no such thing as saving the Earth. The Earth will be here long after humankind disappears. There is only preserving humanity and possibly the natural world as it exists now. However, I do not think logging in our public lands is the panacea that stops forest fires. Forest fires are a natural phenomenon that many species of organisms have evolved to take advantage of. The problem seems to be where the fires negatively impact humans.

OHVs cause erosion, air pollution, noise pollution, contribute to global warming, cause injuries, consume fuel that must be imported, and detract from the outdoor experience of all other users of federal lands. Their use should be banned except for maintenance and rescue purposes

Designating areas specifically for OHVs may be appropriate in some places, but in others it could mean a terrible sacrifice of public lands and waters. For instance, the Upper Tellico OHV Area in the Nantahala National Forest was so severely eroded, the Forest Service had to shut it down. The OHV groups have sued the Forest Service to get it reopened.

I totally agree. This practise is totally medieval and we shouldbe long beyond it. I did not realize it was permissable on public lands

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This idea as stated is confusing. Is the proposal to bring OHV and wilderness land into a 1:1 ratio? Is it a proposal to create this ratio only with newly created public lands?

The degree of noise pollution in our society can be overwhelming at times; those of us who live in heavily populated areas seek the wilderness in part because we need a break from this constant stress on our nervous systems and because we want to hear the wonderful sounds of nature without human noise for a change. Off-road vehicles in national and state wilderness parks make no sense! As a society we are also in serious need of reducing our gasoline consumption. It costs so much more in so many ways than most people seem to want to acknowledge. The survival of the human race is at stake.

Everywhere the OHV is allowed access, hikers and horse riders decline. Is their idea of shared use? Don't be fooled by their BS. They want the park for themselves and any hiker that doesn't get the message is what is known as a target.

So, I know I'm going to get flamed on this, but I really enjoy taking my dogs with me on vacation. While I'm all for getting rid of private autos (my husband and I just circled the earth on public transportation), unless there are shuttles designated for people and pets, this effectively locks us out of these parks. My dogs are better behaved and better managed than most young children, but no one suggests leaving the kids in a kennel at the entrance.

If we are to use the logic preferred by the anti-OHV crowd that all OHV enthusiasts must be punished for the actions of a few then we must remove hikers and horses from our parks as well. Some of the most filthy, neglected areas I have ever been in have been hiking trails. OHV organizations do clean up and maintenance volunteer events ALL THE TIME. I have NEVER heard of ANY of my hiking friends volunteer to clean up a hiking trail.

You are being dishonest. You say the OHV crowd should stay in "their" areas, yet you also promote closure of lands. If you feel you should be allowed to protect your access to public lands, the OHV community should be allowed to protect their access to public lands. There is no need to change the status quo, unless it is true that the non-OHV community wants it all for themselves.

Rob K you said it. My words exactly. They don't care about anything as long as they get what they want. I ride responsibly and respect nature. I have seen plenty of hikers yelling, running down slopes kicking up rocks etc. Maybe they should go back to their peace painted vw buses.

I do believe in climate change, but tell me, do you own a car? Are you generating your own electricity from a carbon neutral power source, to power your computer, to add your one sided views to this forum? Didn't think so. By the way, how many hiking trails have you worked on in your life? Probably too busy shopping at Whole Earth Access for you manufactured products! You really need to look in the mirror and see the hypocrite that you are!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Come on people, get real! The offroaders I know aren't asking to go riding in the wilderness, they're asking that the trail systems that we already have/had not be shut down! Again, how many of you exclusionists don't own a car, don't own a computer, don't as a matter of fact use anything that doesn't put a tax on Mother Earth & nature. If you were practicing your day to day living like Colin Beavan aka: No Impact Man, then I would say you were justified! However, I think even Colin would concede that in today's "modern" world, it's impossible to have absolutely no impact. Now I know what you're going to respond, "we're not talking about no impact, we're talking about the wilderness!" Well if you don't think that hiking, camping or riding your horse in the wilderness causes any stress to the areas that you trample on, think again. What about the insect that you stepped on that could have fed a baby bird or the vegetation you pitched your tent or sleeping bag on. How about the deep hoof prints that your 1500 lbs horse left and the vegetation that it ate or trampled. or the introduced non-native vegetation it brought into the wilderness in its dung. As far as noise & pollution go. I already know what's going to happen when I get my electric off-road motorcycle that I will charge with my currently installed solar panels. You exclusionists will complain that it's too quiet and is a hazard. Until we realize what Woody Guthrie sang about in his great song "This Land is Your Land" we will never reach a workable solution! I and most of the OHVs I respect are more than willing to respect your wants & desires, as long as they're reasonable and respect mine also. Sadly I don't see that!

There are areas for this type of use. It's called OHV trails, and they're being shut down everywhere. As far as \_\_\_\_\_'s comment on what stated. His comments are factual. I don't think he was comparing which is better, he was just stating the fact that horses do cause erosion damage. You have obviously never gone back to see what happens to a trail used by a horse, that is not maintained. Just like a motorcycle trail that is used frequently and not maintained. The OHV community however has been taking - forced upon us - progressive steps by maintaining the trail ourselves. This in spite of the fact that we actually pay a fee to have these trails maintained by the Forest Service. Maybe we should start charging equestrians and hiker \$50.00 a year, and then spend that money on something else, all the while locking them out of more and more land. Oh yea, that won't work. It doesn't suit their wants & desires!

Calling Mountain biking low impact is an error. I have been hiking the trails in Pinckney State park in Michigan since 1985. They were beautiful forest paths, slightly springy, pretty much level with the forest on either side. They started allowing mountain biking at some point and the trails were immediately degraded. Now they have to bury plastic webbing to try to halt erosion, the trails have sunk several feet in some places, they're dusty and rocky. I don't understand the bikers -- they're riding so fast they don't see much. I have talked to some of them and they have no idea how much damage they have caused because they never bothered to walk these trails. I feel like something valuable has been stolen from me.

Motorized vehicles make noise that carries a long long ways. They steal the natural sound of the environment from those of us who are willing to use our muscle power. They have no place at all in wilderness areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree completely. These vehicles completely destroy the wilderness. Why do machine users need their machines so badly? Walking or skiing connects you to the land you are in. Driving through it devalues it.

Land that is converted to human use today will not be wilderness within the lifespan of many generations. Land left wild can always be 'used' later. Land that is used can't go back to being wild. This means that if we err, we should err on the side of caution, preserving lands wherever possible.

We must set aside these lands. I think everything is out of balance now. There should be more land/wildlife with areas being dedicated to human habitat since we change are living space so dramatically.

I must say comment #9 is definitely out of touch with what "nature" really means! Too say that horses are 2nd to being destructive to the wilderness/environment. Please explain this one too me. Are you kidding me! Horses are living breathing species that aren't noisy, don't pollute and bring true spirit to the open land heritage. Anyone that thinks a machine is better than a living animal needs to re-evaluate their true outdoorsmanship.

Often designated Wilderness Areas include parts that do not qualify as a TRUE wilderness. DON'T drop the standards that make a wilderness, just to change a title of an area.

I have seen acts of disrespect by hikers in the back country. Piles and piles of garbage in places where the general public has easy hiking access to. In Wilderness Area's I have help to extinguish fires that had gone beyond a careless backpackers fire ring and cleaned up areas that is only assessable to hikers. Should all hikers and backpackers be considered as " ..have no respect for nature or the rights of others. Please ban or restrict their access to public places" as well? There are and always will be the small few that are the problem. I don't advocate keeping hikers/backpackers out, but they are a problem.

Once the land was destroyed by the use of vehicles, it would probably never be back to the way it should be, wild and peaceful.

I am against any vehicles in forests or beautiful, peaceful places I am able to go and enjoy nature. That would take away from the beauty and peace for me and my family.

Damage from ORVs can be extensive and irreparable. To see a photo taken in Big Cypress by Broward Sierra Group member, visit { <a href="http://www.nationalparkstraveler.com/2007/12/big-cypress-national-preserve-more-orv-access-bear-island-unit-wise" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Contrary to the comments here UTVs can be very quiet compared to ATVs. I know that my UTV mule is so quiet I always can sneak up on deer with it. I don't consider it annoying any wildlife. While I understand the ban on cross country atv use I do not understand the ban on riding ATV/UTV on existing gravel roadbeds in the forest. These roads are not traveled by street autos due to poor condition however they are legal for auto use only. I also do not understand why no ATV trails exist in my area. They say its the cost but they won't let us build them if we pay for it and they tell us where to build them. I also do not understand why the legal trails do not allow side by sides UTVs which do less damage to the trails because they have auto rearends that can be unlocked. It appears that these rules were not made on the local level because no one on the local level agrees with them even the forest service.

If we are not going to be able to use the land that belongs to us then it should be sold at auction. Why because the feds are not paying state and local taxes on this land. To compensate us for this loss of tax rev we should at least be allowed to use it if not then it should be sold to someone that will pay the taxes or it should be transferred to the state so the locals can control the rules and not some enviro in CA. The opinions of out of state hikers complaining about ATVs on land where no hikers even exist or know about is total nonsense. The only people I have ever seen walking in the forest for 60 years were hunters.

Off road vehicles have their place but their proponents seem unwilling to really see the damage they do. It is true that in relatively lush areas damage is quickly grown over--unless it's in a place where water concentrates and erodes it into a gully. But in the desert it not only can take centuries for a trail created by an ORV to disappear, but because it's often pretty flat with sparse vegetation, riders very often go off on their own, leaving tracks that'll be there for a very long time. I have yet to hear of a quad or ATV that has differentials for its driven wheels. This means that every time the vehicle turns, one or both of its driven wheels must skid--and if you'll take the time to look closely at the tracks left by one, you'll see that every turn will have some degree of damage because of that skidding. In the desert where my wife and I spend the winter there are ATV trails everywhere. You can still see the tracks made by army vehicles training during World War II--and the new trails will last at least as long. In addition, the dust kicked up by these machines literally clouds the air--it often looks hazy even when the air is very dry, and you can see the dust rising in the distance every time one goes by, and the noise at the peak of the winter season is almost continuous and is audible for miles. So. While I can empathize with ORV lovers, and when I was younger did my share of dirt bike riding, It seems to me that proponents of these machines need to set their emotions aside and take a serious interest in seeing just what the real affects on the earth their machines have--and with that knowledge in mind make proposals that genuinely take these affects into account. You might encourage manufacturers to create machines with differentials, for example, as that would significantly reduce the impact those machines make. And seek to design trails that minimize impacts. And acknowledge that there are impacts on wildlife that may be very hard to see, on nature in general, and on people that need to be taken into account.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

At the Grand Canyon, I was delighted to find that the western arm of the rim road had been closed to private cars. This allowed visitors to escape the crowds around the South Rim commercial establishments. Can something similar be done in other parks? Decades ago, Yosemite proposed closing out all cars except for overnight visitors. Instead, why not block cars from the roads that reach into the valley beyond the lodges?

OHVs are an abomination

Although I don't understand what is so enjoyable about ripping up our planet with noisy, destructive contraptions, a lot of people really like it. So, I think we need to designate specific areas for obliteration. It just shouldn't be everywhere. People who like quiet and undisturbed natural places should have that right too. My definition of grace: Getting to where you are going disturbing as little as possible on the way. The Homo Sapien is graceless. We rip up, tear up, slash away everything on the way.

I believe this idea to be well intentioned but zoning, unless only for safety reasons will mean LESS access to the entirety of a place for everyone who goes there.

Does that mean you would support the use of our homemade swamp bugtgies and airboats down in the swamps of So Fla? We do not import them yet. Not a big enough market for China.

I grew up and still live on a 460 acre farm. I love the peace and quite of the country. Nothing is more disturbing to this peace than the noise from a 3 or 4 wheeler. I hate these things. To me, they are the lazy person's way to see nature. Keep them off of public lands for the noise that they create and the damage that they do to the environment, particularly erosion. And, add snowmobiles too for the noise that they create, plus the people who are so stupid that they ride in avelanche areas and cause avelanches.

You're right. Let me put it this way: "All of the off-road enthusiasts with whom I have dealt have no respect for nature or the rights of others." There. On the mountain to my east there is a large, clear field that is very steep, like a San Francisco hill. Four years ago the timber company owning the land just below that steep terrain put in a road. Today, when I look at that mountain, there are scars running from the clearcut below to the peak above. Two men died on that hillclimb, yet those with no respect for nature continue to come. The echoes of their assaults ricochet off the steep draws and canyons around me. The land on the hillclimb is public land. BLM has closed the hillclimb, but still they come. I witness it on a nearly daily basis and, while there may be a few in the hardcore enthusiast category who actually care, they are in a very small minority.

Let's compare apples to apples here. You can't ride a Prius on a trail or a Coleman stove for that matter!

Just what we need on protected lands - more exhaust stench and noise.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've always wondered about a country who bases its economy on building buildings. That's why basing the economy on conservation and clean energy is a much better idea. Yes, some areas will have to be destroyed for that as well, hopefully with much study by scientists concerning the impact of alternative energy sites, but why is "development" even necessary. We have put under concrete some of our very best farmland, which a lot of times exists right outside of cities. Support local food production and organic farming. Get rid of the 50 little townships in a county, each one's hands being greased by the local contractor, and have real county and state planning about what to do with existing farm and wilderness areas. Start teaching our children about our connection to nature.

Let's make sure our kids are fat and lazy by putting them on ORVs when they're not busy at home playing video games. That way when the foreigners invade we can just be pushed over. Having kids on ORVs is child abuse! It ought to be illegal.

If I had not clicked on the full description of the point being made, I would have been like many people I am sure who disagreed with this proposed statement. Needs clarification from the beginning.

The CBD, the Sierra Club, and a lot of folks here are saying that OHV users are "taking over" trails in the park system. As an OHV user, I can tell you that we are trying to take over nothing! We are trying to keep a place, some place, just about any place, that we can still enjoy what we love. We lose more and more trails every year, even tho our increasing vehicle fees are supposed to be helping our cause. I certainly haven't seen a green sticker on a pair of hiking boots. More land is taken away from us and given to you, but you 'environmentalists' never have enough land. You took half of Glamis Sand Dunes years ago, after agreeing to take no more if you got that, then you took half again. Now you are trying to "renegotiate" once again, and we both know what that means to you, don't we? There is a huge swath of Glamis closed to all vehicle traffic. Do you want to know how many hikers I have seen there? That is right. None. Zip. Nada. The 'environmentalist's' self-important, self-serving ways have cost them any sympathy from me and many others.

I don't like ORV's, the noise, the pollution, etc. But to make a blanket statement damning ORV users as having "no respect for nature or the rights of others" is incorrect and mean-spirited.

ATV registration is responsible for maintaining many of our outdoor spaces. Getting rid of atvs is a good way to lose funding for the parks. Local state forests have turned to logging to make up the financial difference. You think atvs cause damage? Check out a fresh logging trail sometime.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have got to STOP OFF ROAD usage in our forests and wilderness areas! Also campgrounds, BLM lands. These areas are for enjoying the outdoors-not destroying it with noise, gas fumes, loud machines! If these people want to ride their tricycles with motors, then they can do it on county roads-not where people camp, hike, fish! And, what about the wildlife??? It's their living space-NOT MANS. WE ARE GUESTS!!! If we keep allowing motorized toys, etc., everywhere, there will be no more places for wildlife, or people who want to enjoy these places. Also, these places were set aside for man to enjoy nature-NOT TO DESTROY IT. This needs to stop!

The problem with motorized vehicles is that they destroy the outdoor experience for hikers and other non-noisy, smelly users. When used near horse trails they freak the animals. There should be areas for this type of recreation, but it should not be allowed to destroy the outdoor experience for the rest of us.

In a world of roads, our national parks are about the only place I can go to get away from the noise of our times. I used to walk in the Ocala National Forest and nearly be run over by motor bikes that were so fast they seemed to appear through the brush before I could even hear them. I would dive to the side as they whizzed by. Naturally I could never ride my horse in these areas as the scare of a rapidly approaching bike would scare my horse and have me killed. I think the woods is all about the quiet use of the land. Leave the motors out. This is an opportunity for motor bike enthusiasts to buy their own land and whiz around all they want on it. It is no place for conservation and national pride in wild lands. This is about preserving for our grandchildren, as our grandparents preserved for us. This isn't about racing or bringing motorized vehicles in to the woods. I am so grateful my Great Smoky Mountains National Park does not even allow the rangers to use chain saws except for one week a year to preserve the silence and the peace for the animals.

since you grew up in Nebraska, one would think you would "love" tree-huggers....home of the influential and important Arbor Day Foundation!! Seriously, do you really think the best way to gain peace, reflection and natural solitude is by roaring through hill and dale at a fast speed...not to mention the homes of countless creatures living there? It goes right back to the human ego...all things on Earth are here for their express use and pleasure!

Well said. I live in CT and there are virtually no places I can go to escape man. I can hike a couple miles into the forest and still hear planes overhead or noise from neighboring houses. I cannot find "back country" because none exists here. Ohv use has also taken many areas I used to hike away from me and I now have very few areas to go where I can relax and enjoy what peace and quiet I can find. That is just my own personal enjoyment. When you factor in the need for wildlife to have wilderness for food, water and their home it is even more important to protect what areas remain. Wilderness designations are a wonderful thing and there needs to be far more of them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do you think the forest belongs to you? Does the OHV group have the same right to enjoy the land as you do? How many square miles of land do you have to hike on compared to the OHV group? How do you know what the majority of any group of people does? The OHV community is a very diverse group of people that have both responsible and irresponsible people. Could I say the same about your group of hikers and climbers or are you perfect? I have seen what is left after the climber trash has left the rocks trash and fecal matter everywhere. Get a clue you are wrong.

We dont want to ride on "your" hiking trails. We want land set aside away from where you are to use. Why would we want to be in the same area with people that just complain all of the time?

Just to be clear I ride a jeep on state owned property and I dont ride to see wildlife. I am there for a completely different reason. I take my family with me and we enjoy being outside together. Why is it we cannot enjoy being outside our way. After reading some of the post above you would think we are practicing scorched earth principals everytime we go out. I have a log of how many hours I have spent cleaning up someone else's trash on the trails and on cleanup days. How many of you tree huggers have organized trail cleanup events?

Here's an idea bubbas... keep the national "natural" park areas and conservations areas free from OHVs period. They have NO place in nature beyond destroying it with damage from tires, noise, oil and gasoline as well as damaging the air quality. Animals are harassed by the noise and from idiot OHV users chasing them down. I also doubt that the damage done by horses is close to OHV users. Hike it, bicycle it, wheelchair it or ride a horse. As for the comment on fecal matter & trash... at least trash can be collected by more conscientious nature lovers and fecal matter is a byproduct of nature that breaks down. You can't claim the same for oil, gasoline or other motor fluids whether you're a "responsible" OHV user or not.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I appreciate your caring, your concern for the environmental cause, thanks also for the answer given previously, even though it isn't on tract with what I asked. I do think your heart is on tract though. The information for endangered species is varied, for every reason to make more wilderness, there are reasons not to. As stated, some are way off course from any reasonable cause to make one. Politicizations are the root cause for designating Wilderness areas, not environmental concerns or helping endangered species. My point in asking questions was to show that there are no inherent differences between a wilderness area and the surrounding national forests, which are also set aside, except for access by wheeled contractions, human powered or otherwise. Grazing cattle in wilderness areas is allowed. Horses are allowed. Those two alone, horses and cattle are very destructive to the environment. Hikers are destructive as well, look at some of the fourteeners in Colorado to understand. Taking game is allowed. How conducive are any of those activities to endangered critters? That is one reason I say making more wilderness is not mean to protect endangered species. Here is an example, LaGarita Wilderness in Colorado has a 300 ft wide corridor for five or six miles to the Wheeler Geological Area, the first National Monument in the U.S., (if I recall correctly), anyway, wheeled ingress or egress does absolutely no environmental harm when travel is limited to the existing roadway. LaGarita Wilderness designation came a long time after the Geological National Monument area as well, so, point is why the Wilderness? Why are there so many Wilderness areas? Some of these Wilderness Areas I used to travel with four wheel drive vehicles, I don't see any harm that caused. The roads are still there, now used for hiking or horse travel. Why take an area that has roads, for a hundred years or better, then turn it into a man-made wilderness? I don't see the point except to keep the majority of folks out.

Wilderness areas provide recreational opportunities that other public lands do not. Perhaps this is not apparent in all areas of the United States, where public lands are plentiful, but in Minnesota, the Boundary Waters provides a unique opportunity to enjoy recreation in a different way. I can't get the same experience anywhere else in the state. I recognize that this is not a true wilderness, being managed by man, but it is the closest we can get, and for that reason it is valuable. Motorized boats and vehicles have opportunities to recreate in other parts of the state, but to canoe in total isolation without the hum of a motor is something difficult to obtain elsewhere than in the wilderness. In addition, the Boundary Waters Wilderness is currently threatened by a mining project as well as cell phone towers within its sightline. I respect ATVers having areas for their recreation, but they are plentiful in the state of Minnesota. I hope they can respect my desire for an area for those who enjoy as close of a wilderness experience in the Midwest as possible.

I love how all these retards are bitching about noise and how OHVs are disrupting their time with nature. As long as you get what you want, no one else matters, right? Hey Lucille, maybe when I'm hiking I don't want to step in a bunch of horse crap, ever think of that? Self righteous hippies interfere with my ability to enjoy nature as I see fit, should they be banned from public land? Should we close every hiking trail currently open to the public because some hiker scared away an endangered chipmunk? The mindset some of these people have is amazing. They are all for keeping people off public lands, as long as it doesn't effect their idea of recreation.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The idea that OHVs contribute in any significant amount to the amount of fossil fuels being burned is a poor argument. If you're that concerned about the amount of oil being used, recycle your cars for scrap metal. Don't sell them because that's just transferring the pollution to someone else. Boycott all use of any petroleum products including, but not limited to, rubber and plastic. Do not purchase any food except that which is grown in your own backyard. Do not use any electrical appliances except that which is power by solar panels on your roof or wind turbines in your back yard. I have just as much a right to ride the trails as you do. Your very presence on the trails is rude because you are in my way. Every argument about "rights" goes both ways and for "environmentalists" to claim that the way I choose to enjoy the outdoors is selfish is hypocritical. Your ASSumption that no OHVers enjoy any other outdoors activity is profiling, stereotyping, shallow, and narrow minded. If I ever meet you in person, I'd happily share my stories with you about the thrill of racing to a state wide 2nd place overall finish in offroad motorcycle racing and that same year, spending 10 days backpacking in Ansel Adams Wilderness listening to the wolves howling as I slept under the stars at 6000 ft. I will also share my pictures of my father and I on my first successful hunting trip harvesting a deer that eluded me for 3 months and in the same sitting show you the pictures of my family helping release baby sea turtle into the Gulf of Mexico. Please stop the charade that the only way to enjoy being outside is via hiking or other so called "eco activities". I am proud to responsibly enjoy both sides of this topic. To those who suggest we support what riding areas we have: Where do you think we have to ride?! The places we can legally ride at are decreasing in number at an alarming rate. In my state, there is one place within 3 hours of me and it only has 50 miles of legal trail. The attempts at private riding areas have failed because the government refuses to permit them and what private areas do currently exist are getting shut down as well and if you turn out to see the number of people at the private areas, you will realize it is NOT because of lack of rider support.

Well I live the metroplex in fort worth and it keep spreading and spreading. You used to find bob white quail right off 820 and 35. That was just 10-12 years ago. We have to start finding ways to stop the onslaught of our grown to such threatened species. Study areas long before we tear through them with homes or businesses. And then making the home builders better find land to conserve not just for wildlife for us and our kids. Working together city to city working right down to asking people about the local wildlife. Creating wilderness areas and wildness connection so wildlife can go in different directions not having to worry about a car running them over. We have to get innovative as we lose more land everyday to subdivisions, malls and businesses.

ATVs and OHVs (recreational use especially) directly harm roads and trails. They pollute the air with exhaust and noise. They should be banned from all public lands and used only in places that are equipped to repair the damage they cause.

The arguments for the use of OHV's reminds me of Japanese arguments for continued whale hunting--preserving a traditional way of life. Just because we are used to do something does not mean that this is the thing to do. If lands are called "public", does that mean that everybody should have the right to use them whichever way one wants? I agree with #54 that in the absence of individual personal responsibility the economics of land (ab)use should play a role.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All federal lands? Why do people contribute ideas that are idiotic on their face? The federal government currently claims about 60% of all land in the western half of the U.S. You and the people who support stupid suggestions like this suggest that you are not capable of thoughtful, intelligent dialogue and are likely to contribute no ideas of real use or value. Please continue.

Please see our series "What We Need To Know About Oceano Beach and Dunes" at [safebeachanddunes.org](http://safebeachanddunes.org). Thousands of fossil fuel burning vehicles plunder our beach, creek, and dunes in Oceano California. The Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area is a health and safety hazard. In addition to the carnage and destruction to the environment, its activities cause life threatening concentrations of particulate matter downwind. This noisy, dangerous "recreation" is an unabated nuisance that we subsidize with \$65 million a year from our state fuel tax. It needs to be stopped.

"(Hikers) cause erosion, air pollution, noise pollution, contribute to global warming, cause injuries, consume fuel that must be imported, and detract from the outdoor experience of all other users of federal lands. (Hikers) should be banned except for maintenance and rescue purposes" All of this can be said about any group that uses federal lands. Just put what ever you want in the parenthesis and wala you are now the champion of the cause. Lets try this one...  
"(Skunks) cause erosion, air pollution, noise pollution, contribute to global warming, cause injuries, consume fuel that must be (ex)ported, and detract from the outdoor experience of all other users of federal lands. (skunks) should be banned except for maintenance and rescue purposes"

"People who (have no respect for nature or the rights of others) have no respect for nature or the rights of others. Please ban or restrict their access to public places." If your are going to make general statements about an entire group of people that you do not associate with and have no understanding of, please make it general enough to be true. Bigotry has no place here.

Off-road vehicle use has taken over our forests and public lands to the point where it is a joke to call them "wilderness areas" or "wildlife management areas". They ruin the experience for everyone else - hikers, horseback riders, bicyclists, etc., not to mention the wildlife.

Yes, \_\_\_\_\_ wins the civilized man of the decade award -- a decent chap, who actually goes out of his way to avoid and minimize the downsides that are normally associated with OHVs etc. If all other offroad drivers chose their vehicles as he does, and used their vehicles as he does, we'd have a lot less to argue about. Unfortunately, they don't. Before too long, however, we are all going to run out of petrol, permanently. Just read a little from the "depletionist" authors, and realize that we are already on the downslope of inexpensive and ample fossil fuel -- as well as all other sources of artificially generated energy. Yes, the crest of the curve has already been passed. You may be in denial, but I'm sorry -- you will soon be unable to maintain that attitude.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHV's have no place out in the Nature that we all share in the Parks. there should be private lands that cater to your need to bring machines out into wilderness and you should pay for the privilege so that they can fix the earth afterwards so you can mess it up again and again. Someone could make some good money creating OHV parks around the nation for you to rip up the land and be loud in. It is just inappropriate to make us hiker and biker share space with you. It's like asking joggers at your local park to share space with Motorcycles! Every time I go to the Parks after the rains I see huge scars and muddy "Doughnuts" tracks and destroyed fields that are the habitats of animals such as bunnies and foxes! I saw a dead snake in the road that had been killed by and OHV, it had a perfect OHV tire track right across it's middle. Look, with all the leaf blowers and lawn movers and construction sounds and traffic and airplanes and helicopter sounds, loud music from neighbors, saws, beeping backing up trucks, augh! I REALLY need to get AWAY from Machines and their destruction and noise. You dominate the whole world, why can't Nature, and the rest of us, get a break from you in just a few wild places?

"ATV and off-highway motorcycle riding encourages and promotes physical fitness." that's a bit of a stretch.

What IS the current ratio of OHV to wilderness land...is there an actual law? It's hard to vote "yay" or "nay" on your vague proposal.

People who drive off road vehicles have no respect for nature or the rights of others. Please ban or restrict their access to public places.

These devices spoil my time in nature. They are noisy , polluting and destructive. I do not want them in the wilderness.

How can you "enjoy wildlife" if the noise of your vehicle has chased it away????

Something I have not seen addressed here is the pollution-noise and smoke- that accompany all vehicle use. This is extremely disruptive to wildlife and to those who try to find nature a sanctuary from the hustle and bustle of daily life. Why can't vehicles stay in urban areas, and leave the quiet of nature to those who can't find it elsewhere, and to the animals, who live there?

Leg-hold traps are dangerous to humans and pets recreating on public lands, and do not discriminate among species not approved for trapping, endangered or not. The practice is inhumane in the same way cockfighting or dogfighting is inhumane. There is NO EXCUSE for this sort of barbaric practice to be allowed on public land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The extremist so-called environmentalists are the real problem. The last time I checked, the public lands of this country are exactly that, PUBLIC! That means they belong to everyone; OHV, hikers, bikers, fishermen, hunters, equestrian. You name it, it belongs to every tax paying American. If I want to go to an area and drop a line for some fresh trout, I have that right. If I want to go hit designated trails with my dirt bike or 4x4, I have that right. If I want to chill out with the camera and form lasting memories for my living room wall, I have that right. What I, and everyone else DOES NOT have to right to is to determine who gets shut of our PUBLIC LANDS!!! If you want to shut people out, then pool your cash, find a piece of land that's for sale and buy it and then you have earned the right to shut out whoever you please. You do not have that right on PUBLIC LANDS!!!

And what on earth is 'healthy' about motorized recreation???

I don't agree on this. I've personally encountered horse trails in my state parks. The horses' hooves tear up the soil, and produce very large, deep, clumpy grooves. When it rains, this muddy soil destroys nearby plant life. I know you mean well, but these large animals and the added weight of the riders have a very MAJOR impact on the land.

We can all have access, but we can't all have access to all. It's just not feasible. There needs to be some separation of activities, or the entire public land system will only be suitable for motorized recreation. The fact that motorized travel detracts from the enjoyment of non-motorized travel is neither party's fault. Some hikers like to think that because their preferred use of public lands (and mine) doesn't annoy anybody else by creating noise, it is therefore less invasive. But this isn't exactly true. The very nature of wilderness hiking requires that there be no motorized recreating nearby. This detracts from the OHV rider's options. The only solution is to have dedicated uses of different segments of public land. There will be an ongoing fight on how much should be dedicated to whom, but it certainly can't all be opened up to OHVs.

Dear \_\_\_\_, As \_\_\_\_ said, ohvers are directly contributing to terrorism. I wonder why you think it's so important to use fossil fuel to propel yourself forward when you could use your own two feet. All I can think of is that it's FAT behavior. Your fat is telling your brain what to do. You seem so adamant about using gas, maybe you work for BP.

If mountain bikes are causing that much damage, then the trail is probably not properly designed. I've seen trails open to OHV's that are smoother and more narrow than a popular horse trail in Wilderness.

Why is it a strange idea? He didn't say "mess them up" or anything about "cutting down trees" or "rock music". No, he said share the land with all users. Why is this such a hard concept to grasp? Everyone has different likes and dislikes, it's what makes us individuals. Why is it usually the hikers that are unwilling to share?

Have you seen the traffic jam on some of the National Parks?? No thanks, I'll take the quiet multi-use national forest land.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

As Idbf said. Footsteps also disrupt the soil....the footsteps of people, and animals. Does that mean you want the animals out too?

Our parks should be for foot traffic only. We should not disturb the land, we should not destroy land, we should get exercise. OHVs can find land to mess up outside of parks. As the world gets noisier it becomes more important to have a quiet place to go. Our mental health depends on that. Keep OHVs out of parks

Intrusive, irresponsible, noisy, polluting and destructive activities have no place on public lands, where responsible others enjoy the serenity of God's pristine, soul-reviving wilderness, and wildlife live and have homes. Let the irresponsible boys play with their destructive, noisy and stinking toys on dirt tracks on their own properties. Then they won't mind when trees and other plants are torn out by their roots, and crystal-clear streams and other freshwater sources are fouled and rutted into filthy mud holes. And they won't mind when topsoil erodes and washes away, depriving wildlife of plant forage that once grew there. The real problem is irresponsible selfishness, and self-absorbed promoters of such a depraved ideology can't comprehend that the natural state of pristine wilderness always takes precedence over intrusive and destructive activities/behaviors. Following their attempts at reasoning, they would be fine with drag racing down residential streets, or open, illegal drug use in public parks, libraries and schools. It's called wilderness for a reason; leave it wild. Keep your abusive, noisy, fouling, adolescent, destructive, irresponsible, self-absorbed intrusions to yourself, and leave beautiful, serene, untrampled wilderness to God's creatures and responsible adults, who know the value of unspoiled wilderness and will fight to protect and preserve it from the likes of selfish off-road abusers and other exploiters, who will despoil all wilderness into an eroded, sterile rut if they have their way.

I can't say it any better than Patrik Jonsson, but I'll add a few points. The people riding ATVs are not in it for the wilderness experience (what deer is going to hang around with that noise going on?) ... they're out to destroy and disrupt. It's like radios on the beaches ... I go for the sounds of nature and have to put up with interference. Keep them off our public lands. They have enough landowners who don't mind whoring their piece of wilderness for profit.

Ban them now! The noise alone ruins the experience for everybody else, not to mention the wildlife. And they are generally loud, yelling to be heard over the obnoxiously noise of the engines. Who wants to hear that when they are trying to have a wilderness experience. Not to mention the destruction of habitat and pollution.

Oil is a precious natural resource. Wasting this finite and important fuel on ATVs, Snow Mobiles and Jet Skis is extremely short sighted. People who place their pleasure over the greater good of others are simply selfish and greedy. These recreational vehicles should be banned from all government lands for the greater good of society. This is not to mention the pollution they create, the noise that disturbs tranquility and the damage done to the land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public lands are open and "accessible" to the hilt. Even our most restrictive designation -- the gold standard of Wilderness protection -- still allows all citizens to enter. Just not our machines, industry, development, and other damaging uses. We need more pristine lands preserved for their ecological values, not destroyed just so we can use them up even faster.

Off road vehicles tear up the trails and cause erosion and noise. Keep them out of our public places!

First of all, motorized vehicles on trails greatly erode them. Even if I were deaf, I wouldn't want them on the trails for that reason. I am not deaf, however, and I resent the noise they make as well as the torn up terrain. It's hard to see wildlife when there is noise.

I worked with Volunteers for Outdoor Colorado for 9 years. We went out and, among other things, built hiking trails. All wheeled vehicles are destructive to trails, as they channelize, or deepen the center, of the trail. Water collects, creating either mud or a small creek whenever it rains. The creek erodes the trail, and the mud is easily squished up to the sides creating a deeper creek; alternatively, people move over and walk/ride beside the trail causing an ever widening track and more damage. Also, ORV's like to go "off trail", damaging previously undisturbed plant life. Heck, my DOG doesn't like motorcycles with mufflers near our house! Imagine the stress it causes to pregnant, lactating, nesting, baby, juvenile wildlife!!! Stress kills animals as surely as it kills us.

Terrific concept. In the pursuit of food, some species will go a certain distance. If that is interrupted, some species will not "jump" the gap. Loss of habitat and food, loss of species. Check you the Nauter Conservancy and their thoughts on just your comment! Be well.

Indeed when travelling to Yosemite a few years back, I couldn't help but feel guilty that I was entering the park in a big gas-guzzling car (the only rental available when I arrived in CA). I was fairly disturbed upon entering the park to find that I had nowhere near the biggest vehicle around, and that there was a road infrastructure leading everywhere through the park. I agree that something must be done to address the fact that even casual 1-day visitors should be granted access to the parks, and that some method will need to exist to shuttle these people around and let them see the wonders they came to see. Perhaps allowances only for electric vehicles to certain points, and only authorized park vehicles/shuttles in others would be a way to keep "drive-by tourism" to a minimum. As was suggested elsewhere, perhaps a balance could be found by levying a large fee on private vehicle usage in order to subsidize the lower-impact access by others...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most of the comments regarding OHV's focus on the land--but what about climate change? Scientists telling us that we need to add no more than a trillion tonnes of CO2 to the atmosphere before 2100 to escape grave consequences for the Earth. It sounds like a lot, but it's not. This means our opportunities for using fossil fuels are limited. There are a lot of things we're going to need those opportunities for: to heat our homes, to power our industry, and to get people and things where they need to go to keep our economy functioning until alternative energy sources are more economical. Why waste these opportunities on providing a minority of citizens an adrenalin high from off-road vehicle use? I suppose the reason that nobody has mentioned this aspect is that they don't want to argue with the inevitable "climate change is a myth" deniers. But the high probability of global climate change can't be swept under the rug with rhetoric. It's something we have to deal with. Given all the other reasons mentioned above for limiting OHV use, AND the high probability of OHV use contributing to the dislocation of whole ecosystems through advancing climate change, why are we even considering anything but a gradual phase-out of OHV use?

My family just completed a 10,000 mile trip from Florida through the SW to the NW and back. I can not conceive of being able to experience all the Parks we visited without an automobile. My family just completed a 10,000 mile trip from Florida through the SW to the NW and back. I can not conceive of being able to experience all the Parks we visited without an automobile. Of course we stayed on paved roads, It was a wonderful experience for our grandchildren. In the past I did extensive backpacking and canoeing and found that the crowds diminish rapidly after the first four or five miles or first portage. Lets not shut the parks down for those that now enjoy a less physical visit. As far a wildlife goes, it appears that automotive presence does not impact it much as proved by traveling through Yellowstone. It is the hunting that alters the behavior pattern of wildlife.

I am an avid mountain biker, however, I completely disagree that mountain biking is 'low impact'. Any trail I have traveled on which mountain biking is allowed has become a great mountain bike trail, but it is no longer "wilderness". We need to leave wilderness areas alone. There are thousands of square miles of other park lands and more developed areas that serve up a wonderful choice of mountain biking trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I know we have shirking recourses and both groups have legitimate concerns But I think one of the biggest problems is developers buying up land and building big projects in the middle of what should be reserved land for all including the animals that have an equal right to it. This is not going to happen unless the government starts buying the land and does a better job of management for all to enjoy. I really enjoy the out doors I use to hunt and fish and miss both a lot but now the only way for me to enjoy the out doors is use my OHV and I except most limitations the forestry and fish and game have come up with however I see more trails being closed to me. There are different types of disabilities and age is one that affects me I also have other friends that are affected by the same disabilities that depend on OHV's to be able to enjoy the out doors as well. Destroying the trails and back roads is not what we are about but when I see another trail closed because someone in good health wants it just doesn't seem fair. It is a law that you can not discriminate against disabled persons but no one thinks about it when it comes to the out doors. I hope the forestry takes this into account when making future changes.

OHV's do not pay enough to overcome their damage to land. Second: There are those of us who are in the forest/nature trails/camping areas, etc. and we are using our two feet to get around these areas. We are not contributing to the pollution of the environment from the gas/smog/smells/etc which are put off by all ATVs, dirt bikes and the like. In the future, when gas is even more limited or people are so fed up with the pollution, ATVs, dirt bikes will not be as proliferate as they are now. ATVs and dirt bikes is a totally different type of recreation those who travel to forest for hiking/camping/nature/photography enjoy. I don't build fires unless I am camping in weather where the temperature drops to about 45 degrees. I see building campfires in warmer weather as nothing more than pollution. They aren't needed. When the weather is cold and I am going to be around a camp site after sundown, I have a very small 'campfire ring'. It isn't blazing huge and while it is pollution, the amount is small. It is another of my 'peeves' when campers build fires just because they are camping. They don't need them. As for the fees for the areas I use. They have increased, but I was one that voted for or agreed to an increase so that we could hopefully have more rangers in areas and to help in the upkeep of parks/forest/nature trails. I don't mind paying a little more. Many aren't going to like this, but I also suggested putting up 'toll kiosk' to cut down on those who use things like the Blue Ridge Parkway as a short cut or way to avoid traffic on public roads and the Interstate during 'rush hour'. So far this has not been implemented, but I'm hoping it will be. There is enough travel on these roads by those who are there driving slowly to enjoy the scenic views it was designed to provide. Between vehicular travel and the extremes in weather (cold winters) the road has to be repaired. This is done by taxpayers and those who use the Parkway. It is a nuisance to have someone driving behind you (tail-gating) because they are using it to avoid traffic and get home a little faster. It's a nuisance to feel you are being 'pushed' or have to pull over to let those who are 'flying by faster than posted speed limits'. That's not why we are there in the first place. Putting tolls kiosks at the entrances to areas like this would cut down on this type of activity and until it's done, those of us who are there to travel at a leisurely pace, enjoying views and nature are going to have that peace and enjoyment ruined. I hope the Park Service takes this recommendation into consideration and implement it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If I wanted to hear motorized vehicles of ANY kind, I'd stay home. The only sounds I carry with me are the radio in my car and that is used for weather ONLY. I don't even carry my most favorite or soothing music with me when I travel to the forest to camp and SPECIFICALLY NOT WHILE I'M HIKING ! There are areas which are already designated for these vehicles. Let them pay the fees required there and race, sling mud, make noise and create mayhem all they want in those spaces. BUT NOT IN OUR FOREST! Some privately held lands are already allowing dirt bikes and all terrain vehicles to the use of their land. Some are even charging fees. Personally, I wonder if they report these fees to the IRS as income. What snow mobiles have done for areas where snow skiing was once the only thing in the forest during the winter...is what will happen to our forest. The majority of people who own these all terrain vehicles or dirt bikes have no respect for the land. They get caught up in the 'race' or the competition and they leave the designated trails. It only takes one vehicle leaving the designated trail to do damage AND to leave a trace that the next vehicle may mistake for a trail and also use it. Before long you have trails off the designated trails. IF I WANTED TO LISTEN TO ANY MOTORIZED SOUNDS.....I'D JUST STAY HOME. THEY SHOULD BE BANNED ALL TOGETHER IN OUR PARKS AND PUBLIC FORESTS. LET THEM TEAR UP THIER OWN LAND! IF THEY DON'T HAVE ENOUGH LAND TO RIDE THESE VEHICLES THEY DON'T NEED TO OWN THEM. I'M DISGUSTED WITH THE PROLIFERATION FROM COMPANIES THAT ARE BUILDING THEM IN THE NAME OF 'ENJOYMENT' AND 'ENTERTAINMENT'. LOOK AT THE STATISTICS OF ACCIDENTS. THAT ALONE SHOULD TURN OFF MOST PEOPLE ON OWNING THEM IN THE FIRST PLACE. THERE ARE DIRT BIKE TRACKS, JUST LIKE GO CART TRACKS AND RACE TRACKS THAT ARE SET UP FOR THIS PURPOSE. LET THEM USE THOSE. PLEASE, KEEP THEM OUT OF OUR WOODS, FORESTS, NATURE PARKS, NATIONAL PARKS, STATE PARKS, HIKING AREAS AND PRESERVATION AREAS. LET'S DO ALL WE CAN. I DON'T WANT TO HAVE DESIGNATED DAYS EITHER. THAT MEANS I WOULD ONLY HAVE CERTAIN DAYS TO ENJOY THE QUIET, AND THE SOUNDS OF NATURE. WHAT IF THOSE DAYS AREN'T THE DAYS I CAN AFFORD TO TRAVEL TO A FOREST, PARK, OR HIKING AREA? PLEASE, PLEASE PLEASE....VOTE TO KEEP THEM OUT OF OUR FOREST!



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

For those riders who say they like to hike, I want to laugh. I've seen NO ATV or DIRT BIKER hiking anywhere and I do know some who use these vehicles as 'entertainment and competition. THEY DON'T HIKE AND FOR THE MOST PART DON'T CAMP. It's become a personal joke between us. So it's laughable when I read responses that say they like to hike. While we're on the subject of impact on the forest trails from hikers, I'm one of those who pick up after those who have gone before. I'm one of those who DOES NOT LEAVE THE TRAIL! I'm one of those who believe that every trail should, for the benefit of Mother Nature to heal ....should be shutdown for at least one year. It would not hurt any of us to have the areas rotated and specific trails, hiking area and camping areas closed for one year in order to allow nature to 'heal' from what impact we do have on her. So far, my feelings on that subject have not been listened to. The only time a campground is closed is because it was damaged by severe weather over the winter and they are clearing it, but this doesn't allow sufficient time for nature to heal itself. The same goes for camp grounds. The only time I've seen one closed was because that specific campground decided it was time for an upgrade of features, resetting tent pad sites, doing some repairs where rain water run offs was causing erosion, etc. It wasn't just closed to give 'Mother Nature' a year off to heal. As for fees and costs. I've have maintained that fees should be raised. Not only would it help the parks and trail systems, but the increased fees might make those who are not dedicated to nature out of the environment. Easier to find a free or cheap man made 'water park' or other 'entertainment' area to have a little fun. Those of us who travel (and I have to travel a pretty good distance to get to a 'nature area free of motorized vehicles' (other than one government military facility which excludes all motorized vehicles from trails other than parking two small parking areas. The road (much larger than a trail in some areas) is full of runners/joggers/walkers and ALL are on their own two feet. They allow horses which are kept on the grounds, but in all my years of visiting this area on a military base, the only place I've seen the horses was on the grounds where they are kept which. There are riding rings etc. They are allowed on the trails, but I've never seen anything to indicate they have been there. Maybe that is because they are not there in great numbers. But I certainly don't see any 'impact' from them. If I have to travel for more than an hour to find a nature trail where I can spend time walking, hiking and just enjoying what 'Mother Nature' put there, I certainly don't want to hear the buzz of a motorized vehicle. **MOTORIZED BIKES, ALL TERRAIN VEHICLES, AND THE LIKE ALREADY HAVE PLACES WHERE THEY CAN CREATE MAYHEM ON THE EARTH. KEEP THEM IN THOSE AREAS AND OUT OF OUR PARKS, OFF OUR HIKING TRAILS AND OUT OF OUR PUBLIC OWNED FORESTS!** I do my part to keep any place I visit cleaner than it was when I arrived. I hike out more than I ever carry in and I consider myself very environmentally aware of what I do to the forest. I still remember a friend who went hiking with me years ago telling me "When you have to step on a root of a tree while hiking, ask the tree for forgiveness." That particular friend is almost a 'woodsmen'. That friend could survive in a forest with nothing more than the bare essentials. They taught me a lot. I'm aware that every time I use a trail, I do make an impact. I travel light, light footed and I stay on the trails. Perhaps the answer it to alter the trails in some areas at times. That would decrease the 'foot fall damage' of our feet, but again, that is the same as my original suggestion of closing down areas for a year to give 'Mother Nature' time to heal from the impact we do place upon her in designated areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

One more response and I'm done for today on this subject: You say the places that have all terrain trails are shutting down. WHY? Could it be you are causing so much damage the owners can no longer afford to continue the upkeep? Is it because the fees you pay are so low that the owners can no longer afford to keep that designated area open for you to use your ATV or dirt bike? Maybe those of you who choose the form of recreation/excitement/competition should be willing to pay a bit more to keep your areas open or pay enough to allow the owners to maintain the areas. We don't want motorized vehicles, no matter how small, in our forest/parks/nature trails. We are there to enjoy nature. Your ATV or dirt bike is noisy and a nuisance. It scares away any creatures we might otherwise get to witness in a natural habitat. Want proof of what you do when you 'buzz through'? Try WALKING into a forest. Listen. When you walk into an area, you may notice it gets quiet and still. Sit down for 10 minutes and keep listening again. The forest will once again become alive with movement and the natural sounds of birds, bees, etc. Hikers, walkers, naturalists know to keep as quiet as possible so that they don't scare away or cause what is there naturally. **UNDUE ALARM!** We still get to listen to the birds and other sounds. Even the sounds of a breeze through the leaves of the trees is a joy to most of us. **BUT** to understand this, you would have to get off that ATV or dirt bike and actually use your feet to hike/walk in to the forest. From the sounds of your posts, I doubt you'll ever do this so you'll **NEVER UNDERSTAND** what we are trying to say. This is what we find when ATVs and dirt bikes are constantly on the trails. We no longer get to hear or see the things we are there to see and hear. We won't mention the tracks (man made vehicles) changing the scenery and making enjoyment or photography unaffected by man made machines. You talk about "COME ON NOW...." Well come on now and look at it from our perspective. **KEEP YOUR BIKES AND ATVS IN AREAS DESIGNATED FOR NOISE, THAT 'RECREATION/SPORT/COMPETITION' AND PLEASE, LEAVE OUR FOREST, PARKS AND NATURE ALONE.** Be willing to pay for your sport. Support the areas you have with adequate fees and maybe they won't be shutting down. Another thing to think about is this: Maybe the area you are using is now being populated by homes. I can assure you, most don't want to hear the constant buzz and noises from ATVs and dirt bikes in their homes and they don't want to live with the dust and dirt thrown up into the air. Maybe you should start attending your local city/town/county council meetings and find out where homes are going to be built and how close they are to your 'trails' or facilities. This may also be a reason they are being shut down. I attend meetings and keep abreast of what is being planned and the impact it is going to have on areas where I live. Can you say the same thing?

No vehicles in our wild places. Too lazy to hike? Tough luck. Lard-assed? Go on a diet. Disabled? The world ain't fair.

Ban them! Get rid of them now! They're a recipe for destruction and abuse of our wild and rural lands!

global warming is joke, is sun get hot

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am compelled to "weigh in" on a couple of comments on this idea. In comment #28, an obvious Wilderness advocate, does not feel that he is in the minority in desiring a primitive outdoor experience. Actually, you are decidedly in the minority. The NVUM surveys indicate fewer than 4% of all visitors to our National Forests go into Designated Wilderness areas, yet some 20% of NF lands are Designated Wilderness, which are designated for the exclusive benefit by "quiet" uses!! So you are a member of an exceptionally well-rewarded minority. Comment #41 seems to claim that we are making our kids fat and lazy by allowing them to participate in ORV activities. Obviously, hasn't tried snowmobiling, motorcycle riding, or mountain biking. I think the obvious point here is that any outdoor activity is preferable to sitting in front of the TV, endlessly texting friends on the iPod, surfing the web, or experimenting with drugs.

What a strange idea. The parks belong to all of us, so you should be free to mess them up? Try cutting down trees in your neighborhood park, so you can build an overnight leanto! Of course there should be park and public lands suitable for car camping and wheelchair access, etc. But if you set up your 1000 watt rock music rig in the campsite next to me, or even run your generator all night, I'll be the first to pull the plug. And when you want to drive your camper into a wilderness meadow and set up camp there, you are just plain nuts.

You overstate the case. There are lots of national forest lands that belong with the national parks, but there are lots that don't. As for clear cutting and bulldozer mauling of the landscape, I would agree with your notion if that were the only way to harvest the forest. Take a look at how they do it in Europe. If you could restate the question in a more neutral manner, I would certainly vote for it. But this version looks too much like a political overstatement. For now it's "no opinion" from me.

Emotion is not the proper way to address issues involving others. Feelings are not facts. You have a very narrow minded view on this subject and of the majority of OHV users. Tolerance was taught to me at a young age, was it not taught to you as well? First, we the people own the NFS and Public lands, not we the hikers or we the Sierra Club. Second, since you feel so strongly about the environment, I assume that you travel barefoot and do not own modern appliances. You must realize that the impact of your daily life far out weights the impact of daily OHV use. How many trees did it take to build your home? More than you think. What was the impact of manufacturing your car? ECT.

We went to the Pacific North West recently and were shocked at the deforestation (clear cutting) of National Forest Service lands. It not only looks awful but it also causes land slides, reduced variation in species, and death of many animals. The logging companies may be "reforesting" some of sites, but they end up being one species of tree that are all the same age. This greatly reduces diversity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Someone suggested user fees for equestrians. That's something that many horse owners do thru local riding club memberships. Trail maintenance and improvements come from that funding mechanism, supplemented by club fundraising efforts. Many have spoken well here on behalf of keeping motorized vehicles off of federal hiking paths and I support that. This is an either/or thing: pedestrians and horses can not coexist safely with motorized vehicles, no matter how responsibly the machines are handled. By having a motorized vehicle there, that does not give someone the right to infringe on another's enjoyment of that area, but that's what occurs. Noise, fumes, and risk of bodily harm are accepted by the OHV user. Non-OHV users do not accept those negatives, but have those forced upon them. These two user groups must remain separate.

Public land needs to be available for everyone to use...

The continued closures to multiple use and motorized recreation is unacceptable. Search and Rescue, weed management, fire and fuel reduction, responsible oil, gas and mineral development for our national security, access for the very young, elderly, and physically challenged. All these needs require multiple use access and multiple use management. I would not want my children and grandchildren to experience lands locked away for wildlife with only small human corridors available to enjoy and this is where I fear our federal land managers are heading. The current actions of these land management government agencies is contrary to the vision of reconnecting people with the landscape as portrayed by Obama's great American Outdoors. The 2 listening sessions I attended were clearly stacked with anti human access organizations demanding full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This fund is used to facilitate more government land purchases which in turn hurts small communities and their tax base. Higher cost of land managers with more land to mismanage, higher taxes, more debt and less access. This is not about the environment anymore but is all about money. Money to support organizations with only one mission and that is to restrict or remove human enjoyment of the land. A land once created FOR the enjoyment of the people. Environmental organizations collecting billions of dollars through the Equal Access to Justice Act and then turn around and use these tax dollars to file lawsuit after lawsuit against any active management project or multiple use road or trail being open. Nothing will change until these agencies are exposed in their backroom deals of concealed emails and communications. I know when I ride the trails with my quiet four stroke motorcycle, I have never have had a bad experience with other user groups. Everyone is more than happy to SHARE IT. Shame on those that would distort trail conditions, user conflicts or wildlife disturbance just to make those less familiar with the great outdoors think multiple use visitors destroy our environment. Fact is less active management and less access is far more destructive to the land.

There should be local park/track access to people who want to ride their motorized vehicles for pleasure. A wilderness area set aside to protect wildlife should not be one of those places -- it is dichotomous to the whole point of protection. Studies show that a great many ORV riders are disrespectful of the places they ride, and the noise their vehicles create do nothing but harm and disrupt the local wildlife.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is very little about offroading that is good for the environment; from soil degradation to noise pollution, very few offroaders actually respect the ground they so callously tear up. Wilderness should remain as such -- wildlife, in its natural state, is not exposed to loud noises -- and those of us who wish to visit wildlife in its natural state should be able to do so without the loud intrusion of human folly.

Fine, Black Mesa. Tell that to the Rubicon Trail OHV users that have also claimed about ten miles of the Pacific Crest Trail. The only reason they don't trash more of the PCT is that blowdowns make anything but walking harder. I can always tell when I'm getting near a FS road/ohv use area. The brush is beaten down, trail bed washed out, trash under bushes, and the signs see lots of use for target practice. Around where the Rubicon crosses the PCT I couldn't even FIND either trail, for a mile the area was too beaten down. I have had an ohv user drive his rockcrawler through my camp in the middle of the night. Watson Lake, Tahoe Rim Trail, summer 2005. "Oh, sorry dude, didn't see ya there....." Family fun. right. I say, leave it better than you found it. OHVs are big peoples toys, play nice or don't play. The bigger the toy, the bigger the traces. Nothing sadder than a high mountain meadow with 40-year-old 4wheel tracks where somebody did donuts in the middle of it. Jackson Meadows, Sierra Nevada. For what its worth dirt bikes can be fun. I used mine to herd cattle, ride fence lines. I'm also a long-trail backpacker. Like I said, I can ALWAYS tell when I'm getting into OHV territory.

After a long week in the city it used to be comforting to be able to go to the mountains and just chill. Listen to the sounds of the wild and catch a fish for breakfast or dinner. Not much of that anymore. People here in Calif do not respect the sounds of nature. All one hears anymore are the machines. Even the wildlife can't hear their babies or mates if they were in trouble. And if there were a bear within range of camp one would never hear the crack of the branch it might have stepped on before an encounter with the camper. All I long for is a peaceful day or two with only the sound of a running stream or the animal and bird calls of God's creatures. Oh and one comment about the horse droppings next to a stream or on a trail. Does a bear, deer, cougar or other creature Sh.. in the woods next to the stream they depend on for their water? Not much difference. I am an avid fisherman or women and have encountered many a pile along the creek. Does not bother me one bit. Would much rather see that than spilled oil or gas along side the stream or trail.

Climate change is already drastically affecting the earth's climate and causing damaging mega-storms and drying out tinder dry forests causing them to be extremely vulnerable to fire. Motor vehicles in the United States are now on about every available road and trail through out the country. This type of vehicle adds to the pollution that the US Government needs to begin reducing. Animals are being pushed further and further into smaller and smaller spaces by the intrusion of motor vehicles into their realm. The recreational use of motor vehicles on federal lands is destructive to the land, destructive to wildlife habitat, noisy, polluting and has reached a stage where it needs to be curtailed and reduced. They have a limited role in a forest environment if the forest is to protect water, wildlife, and soil.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

A "hefty" fee??? Sometimes an individual's exploration of one of the National Parks does not fall in line with utilizing public transportation. Make public transportation an attractive option for those for whom that would work in how they choose to enjoy the various parks, but don't talk "hefty fee" for those for whom it wouldn't work.

This idea would also disallow mountain biking and horseback riding, and perhaps the person whose idea this is thinks those are evil also. But there is plenty of land that areas can be available for hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding, and ORV. After all, footsteps also disrupt the soil, so soon, under this idea, no one would be able to enjoy the public lands!

off-roading should be done on private land whose owners do not mind flooding caused by soil erosion and deforestation. let them take their childish toys out of the public lands.

Hikers do not create major annoyance for offroaders with noise or smell, but the loud stinky vehicles bother a lot of people. get them out of our parks!

As parks expand, the private property within the newly designated 'coveted boundary' becomes an "inholding". As park expand their boundaries to encompass tracks of private land, NEPA should be MANDATED to document the effects ON these private tracks of land and their owners.

"Theodore Roosevelt would turn over in his grave if he saw how our refuges have turned into today's killing fields" Are you aware Theodore Roosevelt was an avid hunter? Many of the first wildlife refuges were developed by money from hunters for the enjoyment of hunters. Without funds from hunters many of these wildlife refuges wouldn't exist!! Anyway, legal hunting in the US is completely sustainable, and hunting organizations actually positively impact wildlife conservation around the country.

"WISE USE" - a term coined by the great conservationist John Muir - has been co-opted by the people who want to mess up the wilderness. It is promoted by Bush's minions, one of whom said, justifying logging, that "forests need to be managed" - and one might wonder what in the world the forests did for the first couple of million years. BEWARE the use of this term, since once you have accepted "carefully-planned" projects, you don't know what you are going to get. Check out 'wise use' and 'dominion theology' on google, and you will get an eyeful.

30 years ago ATV and "mountain biking" did not exist. Our National Parks are no place for loud, fossil-fuel guzzling, heavy tread machines--bicycles are included as the continuous tread(s) is orders of magnitude more invasive to the environment vs a footprint. The ATV, like the mountain bike, communities should thrive (if they can afford to) just not in our Nat'l Parks where only the natural sound of foot-falls (man's and animal's) can be detected along w/the wind in the trees and the singing of birds.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a volunteer land monitor for about five years, I have had many interactions with atv riders. The biggest problems I have are unsupervised teenagers and adults who lead their children to disrespect the property of others. These vandals live outside the law. There seems to be no way to communicate effectively with the vandal minority other than through coercive enforcement-- fences, ditches, helicopters, and sheriffs. Many of the atv riding adults have been respectful. After hearing once that they are on private property, they don't return. Some of the adults and most of the children have not been respectful. They put bullet holes in the "no motorized" sign, break it off, and throw it in the weeds. When I step into the path and ask them to stop, they do a wheelie and threaten to run me down. We don't try to block the paths, because they drive around the blocks and tear up more vegetation. After talking to the same trespassing family group two or three weekends, they still claimed they were lost and did not know they were on private property. Of course, the atv dealers and, perhaps, some mature individuals would use public lands responsibly. However, based on my experience, most of the atv riders are vandals.

As with many of the other proposals, a balance of uses and resources is required. There is no one purpose that should supercede all others, with the exception of maintaining a park system, which is paramount. As a result of cutbacks, restrictions and overall lack of adequate funding, promoting low impact usage is consistent with low maintenance costs, and the current restricted budget. I support allowing use of parks to be as open to all interests as can be reasonably allowed. Fees for uses that incur maintenance costs should be imposed. For example, if ATV's are allowed in restricted areas, which I do not oppose so long as the areas are truly restricted, a usage fee should be imposed (through licensing and requiring displayed sticker similar to automobile license plate requirements) because these vehicles do cause damage which intermittenly need repair.

the idea of wilderness is not silly. In a world with a population over six billion still growing, the idea that we should set aside some land as a connection to nature and to the past is an extremely important one. Being born in Montana or moving there doesn't give the people of Montana some special right to the place any more than the people of modern Egypt have a right to the pyramids; they belong to all of us as much as they belong to any of us.

Core samples show that prior to the arrival of cattle in the Southwest, dust storms were unknown, and dust was not a factor in the melting of snow in the mountains of New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, etc. This is because the soil surface in arid areas is alive and able to withstand high winds and water--until someone steps on it or rolls over it. Recreational use is only one way the living soil crust is destroyed, but it is a significant one. The situation could be helped greatly by helping walkers and riders of all types to choose to stay on trails and by limiting the number of trails. It is a matter of keeping humans healthy as well as protecting arid ecosystems. The challenge is helping people understand the importance of not loving our land to death. Education and self-enforcement is ideal, but has not yet solved this problem.

Designate lakes and rivers with a noise component so human or wind powered vessels would utilize the waterway 1/2 the time and engine powered vessels the other half. Also during the human/wind powered time, no amplified sound equipment could be utilized.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

EWV, the various non-wilderness use arguments are irrelevant because they have 97.3% of the contiguous 48 states already dedicated to their purposes. What little is left -- what has already been protected as wilderness -- is wholly insufficient to sustain natural processes, or provided for historic animal and bird populations, let alone continue to cleanse our air and water as we pump ever more toxins into them. This idea is not a band-aid. It extends the WSA idea into a default selection, so that rather than the default being 'develop everything until we run out' it's switched to 'preserve what little there is left until we can protect it permanently.' And Devlon, your lawsuit point is moot. Every governmental action is open to lawsuits, and almost every action is challenged. The number challenging this idea would likely pale compared to what are filed now by conservationists because these protections are not in place.

although I agree the population issue needs to be dealt with (or at least acknowledged) I have to demote because "population control" is out of the realm of consideration by the US Government (NFS, USDA, or anything else) as a means of enhancing park/wilderness areas. I'm also for gun control - but this isn't the forum for that either. Please make a concrete suggestion the government (we, the people) can implement in a concrete way at the current time. We can't throw money at population control and call it "wilderness funding." It is an entertaining thought, though. Save the wilderness - practice abstinence?

fly in or out of Phoenix and you'll see hundreds if not thousands of tracks in the desert crust caused by off road vehicle use. They are not on "trails" they are on just about every bit of open land there is, private property or public, including in parks. You can see every move the vehicles have made, circles, loops, figure eights etc. clearly etched in the soil. These are permanent. Once the crust is broken, erosion and dust occur. As the city expands so does the damage to the surrounding areas. When I moved to Phoenix in 1972 "dust storms" were few and far between, now they are very common and much of the surrounding desert, even in parks is coated by a layer of dust. I'll only speak of Phoenix since this is the city I've flown in and out of the most and have personally seen the damage caused by ATV use but I am sure the same situation is occurring surrounding other desert cities though I have not witnessed it myself. While cattle certainly damage the rangelands of the West and there are millions upon millions of cattle and sheep on our public lands at a cost to the US taxpayers of hundreds of millions of dollars a year using cattle as a reason to create more trails for motor vehicles on public lands is a joke.

Food for thought: the last time the earth went into a long solar minimum (prolonged lack of sunspots), the earth went into a mini-ice age. We just started coming out of a long solar minimum in January. Yes, we had a harsh winter, but there certainly is no ice age, with glaciers visibly melting all over the world. We thought we would have wars over petroleum? I fear wars over water. When the fresh water glaciers melt, what then? We have got to stop basing energy usage on carbon. There should be a carbon tax on all carbon used. We must start paying the REAL cost of what we are doing to the only planet where we can live! Preserving wildlands helps absorb some of the carbon, any way. It will take a lot more to "fix" what we have destroyed, if we can! How about some stewardship of creation here? How about renewable/sustainable energy? Bark beetles are caused by stresses in the environment. Wake up before it's too late.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Can we leave the last 1% or so to the animals or must we cut down every tree, dam up every river, pollute every lake and send every animal species to extinction because of "human needs"?

From Foreign Policy, via UN Wire (United Nations Foundation) On Aug. 8, 1975, geoscientist Wallace Smith Broecker published "Are We on the Brink of a Pronounced Global Warming?" in the journal *Science*, the first time the iconic phrase "global warming" was used in a scientific paper. Broecker -- known by all as Wally -- was already a prominent scientist by then, having served on Columbia University's faculty for 16 years. Today, at age 78, Broecker is recognized as one of the fathers of climate science, with more than 450 journal publications and 10 books to his name, ranging from paleoclimatology to chemical oceanography. "It's Going to Make a Huge Mess." An interview with the man who coined the term "global warming." The past 35 years have also seen humanity answer Wally's question in the affirmative, running a radical experiment on the only planet we inhabit. Carbon dioxide levels have risen 40 percent to 392 ppm from preindustrial levels of 280 ppm, and the global mean temperature has risen 0.8 degrees Celsius, on 1.3 trillion tons of carbon dioxide. Humanity has produced 60 percent of that global-warming pollution since Broecker's paper was published. As a result, the planetary ecosystem has fundamentally changed -- weather has become more extreme, seasons have shifted, and global ice and snow are in decline -- with more rapid and radical change on its way.

you don't need scientists to tell you there is a global climate shift going on right now. All you need to do is watch how the growing season is getting longer. Don't believe the scientists. But make sure your corn is in the ground a month earlier than you planted it 30 years ago.

Mountaintop removal/valley fill mining is a huge threat to Central Appalachian Cove Forests, which are the most biodiverse forests in the temperate climate zones. The Federal Government does allow this mining to happen. Fortunately, citizens across Appalachia and beyond are trying to change this.

I absolutely agree. We can all be at one with nature without throwing tax dollars at it. Our "rail trail", that goes behind homes in a rural area, is a popular spot for attacks and for thieves to use as an escape route after breaking into homes. They can watch houses without being seen. Crime in our rural community has gone up since the rail trail gives easy access to criminals. I say use your own money to recreate the way you want, not mine. Recreation and parks are not a priority over safe roads and infrastructure, and security/police.

I agree. We do need jobs, and we definitely consume resources. However, the multiple-use mandate given to the forest service has been heavily tilted towards silviculture since its inception. We don't need to increase logging activity on our public lands. The idea that the forests need us to "reduce their fuel loads" and that they are "overgrown" is ridiculous. Those are G Dub's "scientific" policies still lingering.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am astounded that there are still individuals denying global warming (or preferably worded, global climate change). However, I have also heard there are some folks who believe that the moon-voyage was a hoax, who believe the earth is flat, and who believe Adam and Eve were real people (because they had a secretary there who documented it). I know there are also adults out there who still believe in the Easter Bunny and Santa Claus. The regrettable thing about the "climate-change-is-a-hoax" tragedy is that these folks are so loud when they scream. They must scream because they can't convince anyone using logic, science, or even the most basic tools of observation and common sense. Sigh... I think we should put more money in education, honestly.

I am very much against ORVs in wilderness and protected areas

I believe you kind of fooled me with the title of this idea, ENFORCE existing laws. We have PLENTY of laws on the books now, we just need to write more people up. I'm tired of picking up trash after others wherever I go. I went to the LA listening session, I'm not impressed with Ken Salazar. I would like to know just how much taxpayer dollars are spent for these people to travel all over and talk to us for 2.5 hours and then listen to us for .5 hours...

I do agree, but sadly at the moment our education system is so strained for resources schools are lucky if they can provide any field trips let alone days in the wilderness. But we can certainly bring the subject into the classroom and many schools do have life labs or gardens where the kids can grow their own plants. Education is certainly one way to do that.

I do thank and appreciate the environmental folks of the 60's and 70's that caused some real problems to be addressed albeit not perfectly - but they did their best. I must confide that I do not even listen to Rush's shows and never heard of Hannity and do not watch Fox news. I look to public TV for news and in depth interviews (e.g. Charlie Rose). People like yourself could help bring folks to understanding your point of view or at least listen, if you would simply stop bashing humans and being so mean spirited. Have you ever thought about possibly being visibly accepting of the cultural traditions and activities of all the others needed to be on board to improve things you worry about. If you could find it within yourselves to do this maybe you wouldn't have to resort to name calling and disrespect of others commenting on this site. You might be surprised but when I am hunting in deep Cypress swamps I do connect with a higher being. I won't mention Him though since it might frustrate some atheists here. The skills of a hunter might be very well needed if the catastrophe y'all are worried about happens. Just for your information hunters have been the ones conserving wildlife for many many decades prior to the environmental movement of the 60's. They learned quickly that game as well as other animals and habitat must be managed in order to maintain renewable resources. I'm sure some hunters disagreed with that in the old days but luckily they didn't win that debate. Seriously though you folks need to put that chip on your shoulder away for a while. Try it you may like it and actually get closer to your goals faster and cheaper. Shame on me too for sometimes pushing folks buttons.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I don't see the sense in this idea - somehow reversing protection on "commodity" resources would be helpful for conservation? This seems very anti-conservation, actually. Don't forget about the phenomenon that is the Tragedy of the Commons.

I love motorcycles and I love our environment. Our parklands are preserves and only should be enjoyed by the masses if it doesn't harmfully impact that preservation. I go to be in nature for the peace and majesty. If I have to listen to others noises, I am taken away from my full enjoyment of the beauty and connection to nature. Motorized entertainment in our Parks should be restricted.

I oppose funding non-profit organizations like TPL and TNC with public tax dollars. In my experience, these organizations use public money to purchase land and then attempt to restrict or eliminate public access. If public money is used to purchase land or conservation easements, then the public should expect responsible and sustainable access.

I remember "multiple use." It was almost universally interpreted, and was always argued by the exploiters, to mean all uses on all lands at all times. This often resulted in degrading the public lands indiscriminately to the lowest, most devastating uses, as these obviated all others. You can't simultaneously have clearcut logging, watershed preservation, wolverine habitat, minerals extraction, camping, ORVing, and wilderness hiking; these are almost all mutually exclusive. But clearly the less exploitative uses do not close the door to the others -they don't make the other uses impossible should the need for them arise. But minerals extraction, for instance, obviates all the rest indefinitely. Clearcutting is next in line. So more intelligent than "multiple use" are "appropriate use" and "best use" (note: not as in "highest and best use," which throws a bias toward financial gain). Each resource area needs to be evaluated based upon its inherent character, its sensitivity and uniqueness, the impacts each use option will have for adjacent areas, critical habitat, sensitive species, migration routes, fragmentation, water quality, contiguity, and so on, so that the areas selected for consumptive exploitation are most appropriate.

I strongly agree. Wolves are an integral part of the animal and plant habitat. Studies have shown how elk and deer herds have devastated watersheds when their populations are not controlled through natural predation. Hunters don't fill the same role as wolves.

I support balancing the protected lands with lands open for general use. Hunting would be improved if some areas were left for wildlife replenishment, and your comment about green peace hippies is childish and ignorant and diminishes your entire argument.

I wanted to make it clear that I am not defending cattle grazing on public lands. Less than 3% of US beef is produced on the range but it is at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars a year to we, the people. Huge corporations and millionaires own most of the grazing rights, not small family ranchers. The price paid to graze a cow calf unit on public lands is about a buck fifty and fair market value is five to ten times as much depending on the location. Organic grass fed beef produced by family ranchers is a good thing but that is not what is going on.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If I knew that 100% of the user of our public lands would respect our natural resources, I wouldn't mind opening more areas to OHV users, or any users at this rate. Problem is even those who hike on just two feet often don't care to take care of the land or follow park regulations. The day I can walk out of a park without more trash than I brought in, and can enjoy a day in my campsite without having to listen to noise levels that can damage my ears, I'll be happy to open more area for any access others want. I stay on the trails and camp only where allowed so not to cause damage to meadows or natural drainage along trails. I can no longer hike far as I wish, due to pain, but that doesn't prevent me from enjoying myself when I go to parks. At Cunningham Falls St. Park in Maryland, I just took the shorter trail that didn't require walking up steep hills. If I was in my wheelchair or a scooter, I still could have seen the falls and help my boyfriend spot trash to take out of the park. The state provided trash bags for use in the park, yet we still found a diaper along the trail.

I'm not a big fan of snowmobiling, but it has the potential to be less of an impact than other off-road motorized vehicles. You ride on snow, not the ground. It's still noisy as all hell. Just sayin' the rules for snowmobiles can be a little different than for "mudding."

I'm with you, there is no reason to go into protected areas. Those that do should be fined dearly. As a member of many OHV organizations, that is what we attempt to do, Educate those that use public lands. I've used peer pressure many times while out on the trails, most people get it, some are just a-holes and don't care even about themselves. I've walked into a group of people leaving trash on the ground, had to be careful on how to approach them. Told them they would be helping the Sierra Club close down the area they love to ride in, their camp was spotless when they left... OHV use has increased in recent years yet available areas have been reduced. This creates safety issues and environmental issues as well. Many go to recreate on holiday weekends, that is when the typical family has the time off work to travel outside the concrete and asphalt of the cities. Average time to get there is about 4 hours drive from my city. Once there, it is so nice to relax and enjoy nature, have a campfire and explore the surrounding areas on my OHV.

It boggles my mind that there are so many people who want to deny the fact of global warming given the photographs of melting glaciers, soft permafrost, and an ice-free Arctic. 99% of the scientists who study the Earth have no doubts about it, and the other 1% are flacks for the oil and coal companies.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's late to be arguing about whether the warming is man-made. The increasing carbon dioxide driven warming is heating the tundra and releasing methane, a more powerful greenhouse gas. The ocean, the great heat sink, is slowly warming. The warmer water will melt the methane hydrates and release more methane. The warmer ocean surface is preventing the upwelling of cold nutrient-laden water that feeds the phytoplankton, which has declined 40 percent since 1950. Phytoplankton is at the base of the food chain. Phytoplankton respiration produced perhaps 50 percent of the oxygen in the atmosphere. The decline in phytoplankton may have contributed to the fact that there is less oxygen in the air we breathe. The respiration of the phytoplankton is the smell of the ocean. It includes sulfur; particles of sulfur form the nucleus of rain drops. The ocean is absorbing the carbon dioxide we put into the air and becoming more acidic.

The OHV community is tired of always being assaulted at every corner. We don't want to tear everything up. We don't want access to every acre of land. What we want is to be included in land management decisions, and we want to be able to continue to use the lands that we currently have access to. Outlandish generalized comments about our behavior only continue our resolve to fight back. The same comments that are made about the OHV community can be made about every other user group.

the original post states that modern environmentalism started in the 70s. Your assertion that the wilderness areas have sustained little damage since the 70s defeats your own point. Nora, what about my right as an American to enjoy some peace? The notion that one persons desires must be balanced against another's is at the heart of government; no one has the "right" to do whatever they want whenever they want. So much of this country is already the domain of noise and machines; do we really need to start adding more? I agree with Elana. Public lands are a shared property. Nothing destroys the peace and silence of others enjoying nature as quickly as a noisy vehicle screaming through the woods.

Please check your facts. President Theodore Roosevelt established our first national wildlife refuge in 1903. Even though he was a hunter, he clearly saw that our nation's wildlife was being annihilated by hunters. Our first wildlife refuges were true sanctuaries. No hunting was allowed until 31 years later when Congress changed the law in 1934 to allow limited hunting. Theodore Roosevelt would be appalled by the mass killing of millions of animals every year in our National Wildlife Refuges. This is not sustainable, especially with today's wildlife management practices, such as allowing predators to be killed off so that there are more animals for hunters to kill. Our wildlife needs help, not hunters. It is past time to restore our wildlife refuges to being true sanctuaries.

I have read in a few articles that climate change and over hunting has caused as much damage if not more to elk in Yellowstone as wolves. Predators bring a natural balance, climate change and increased hunting throws that balance off.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Just some quick thoughts about "global warming" Well it's easy to believe it when you doctor your findings so that they tell you what you want to know. 99% of the scientists told Columbus that the world was flat and he would fall off the face of the earth too. The idea that today's climate should remain stagnant through out time is ignorant and arrogant. Mother nature is far smarter than us and has been changing her climate constantly from the beginning of time. I for one am quite happy that she has, since I enjoy the fact that I don't live in a cave in the middle of a heavy ice age.

Lotteries are a form of taxation and most lotteries are regressive. (There is some evidence that large stake lotteries are less regressive than small jackpot lotteries.) Use fees target those people who actually use a facility, and may seem more fair, but they are regressive, in terms of income, and can contribute to the inaccessibility of facilities to people with low income. Income taxes, although not perfect, are the least regressive of these options.

those "few, hand-picked individuals" are ALL the students of the younger generation who have been educated about the environment. Attaching this to the PE program is dangerous since PE is one of the subjects that has been cut back over recent years. Less required PE classes. More students per teacher. That makes this difficult to execute.

Mountaintop Removal not only destroys the forests, it also destroys our water, our communities, and any vision we have for a sustainable future. Mountaintop Removal needs to end now!

1st 2 sentences of the idea. I am just very sensitive to and critical when I see any statements that can be interpreted as one type of public lands visitor knocking another's type of use. My philosophy is we all should be mutually supportive of all of us who want to enjoy and access these marvelous places we are truly blessed to have. There are many very arbitrary rules and planning processes that limit access by dividing the visitors into bickering groups. Example - NPS zoning management for recreation needs to be kept to the absolute minimum to facilitate real not perceived safety issues (e.g. horses vs. bicycles). Zoning carves up large areas into smaller chunks for small user groups and simultaneously separating us. In doing that diverse types of visitors never have much of a chance to socialize in the woods and possibly rid themselves of the misconceptions they may have about each other's uses or misuses they have heard a lot of hearsay about from the extremists or the media. Therefore it is very difficult for folks to come together to form something other than very narrowly focused special interest groups (hikers, bicyclists OHV'ers etc.) fighting over the crumbs being offered in the zones. My feeling is we all should work together to have more of the entire area to share together than a smaller crumb for a small group even if it is our own group. Zoning means less for all to me.

people don't understand the real issues. The beetle destruction in Utah to the public forests is thousands of times greater than the damage caused by those few people who abuse the land.

Not sure how to vote on this, so I demote. OHV use in the wilderness is utterly destructive. OHV'ers SHOULD listen to each other, but it's obvious that too many don't. Because of the rampant abuses by so very many (not just a few) I am one of many wilderness users that would absolutely support a ban on OHV use.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Nothing we do is sustainable and much of that is due to the fact that there are simply too many people using finite resources. For example, in 2007 according to the USDA the U.S. farmed 405,733,317 acres and the U.S. has a total land area of 2,263,960,601.6 acres, which is 17.9% of the U.S. The CIA states, on their "The World Factbook" page for the U.S., that 18.01% of the U.S. is arable. Therefore, we are currently farming virtually all of our arable land and farming is the driving force behind human encroachment into wildlife habitat and depletion of freshwater resources. Only those severely delusional think that we can add another 1/3 to our population and meet their needs. It is time that the U.S. government end subsidies for children and act globally to reduce human population because everything that happens in distant parts of the world affect us and even more importantly, affect those that live in those distant parts, both human and nonhuman. Only those that exist have rights, those that do not exist have none, and no one has the right to take resources from those that exist in creating a person to satisfy their desire to have a baby.

Off roading on the Central California Coast in the Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area was recently linked to life threatening concentrations of particulate matter downwind (Phase 2 Study [slocleanair.org](http://slocleanair.org)) Please see the "Danger Downwind" series at [safebeachanddunes.org](http://safebeachanddunes.org). Health trumps recreation.

OHV's are noisy. That's all we need to know. Silence is becoming the ultimate luxury in our overcrowded world and we don't need motorized vehicles in one of the last refuges left to us.

Our parks are our nation's greatest treasure. As a non OHV enthusiast, I am not in favor of expanding opportunities for OHV recreation use on public lands. Balancing preservation and access was originally a common practice "everyone" understood ... leave no evidence of your visit behind you. Based on observance of this one single premise, access should be expanded to all Americans and its foreign visitors. When engage in low-impact activities, there are still park rules and visitors may be ejected for non-compliance and subject to penalties. Mudding, obviously, sounds irresponsible and engaging in it should be subject to severe fines. OHV supporters should be willing to balance the fun of having the privilege of being in the parks with respect for the land and the animals which inhabit it. OHV users who believe in respect first should weigh in and provide some positive commentary.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Since I was a kid in Idaho forty years ago, I've watched one outdoor space after another replaced by desecrated wastelands of cement inhabited by cars and big-box retailers instead of animals and trees. First the areas become dusty mazes of ORV/OHV trails, then no one cares when the bulldozers come in. The fact that--150 years after Thoreau--we're debating how to "share" the slivers of nature that remain (slivers that are UNnaturally separated from each other), reveals the sad truth of the inevitable. Humans have too little memory and even less ability to imagine what no longer exists. (A coworker of mine who grew up in India once bemoaned how "lonely" she felt because of the lack of population density here--and that was in a major U.S. city.) First, regarding roads and development: There are vast tracts of unused, already developed lands available for business and recreation; there is no "need" for another road or slab of concrete EVER. Second, unless we human beings somehow become rational enough to curb our own population, we will destroy ourselves along with the rest of the planet, like bacteria that overtake a petri dish and then die off.

So true. Overpopulation is the root of most, if not all, environmental evils. Unfortunately, it is also the third rail - no politician or policy maker is willing to touch it.

The best way to protect wildlife is to preserve some land for them. The biggest threat to our wildlife is development. I don't think we were meant to develop every bit of our land. More should be set aside for future generations. Developing all our land for the quick buck would be a mistake.

The damage that can be caused by a minority of less than a tenth of a percent of OHV and ATV users is surprisingly huge. So peer pressure alone isn't enough even in a perfect world where only an exceedingly small number of them are either callously indifferent to or unfortunately ignorant of their actions. If an individual person walks off a trail the damage is far less than any one vehicle. Whole families could go off a trail on foot and cause less damage than a vehicle. Add to that the simple fact that the rouge family on foot can only cover a fraction of the distance that the vehicle can cover and the scale of the difference in damage becomes apparent. Invasive weedy species (in dryer environments than the everglades) prefer ground that has been disturbed as in wheel ruts, not occasional foot prints. They are adapted to take advantage of the very disturbance that kills the original, natural species. I promote this because until there is no detectable OHV or ATV trail abuse they have no place in our wild areas. Only an extreme cultural shift toward a group mindset of collective protection of the environment not short sighted personal freedom will be able to achieve this goal.

The idea is great. Make the government maitnance worker be involved, in stead of spending all their time on less needed tasks they can help with this activity. Yep I see them take a lot of breaks too at restaurants/coffee shops... and I pay with my tax for their extended breaks. regular bikes for city trails. Renting a bike for 20\$ /hour is way to expensive. Make it affordable.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The main challenge of resource management in parks is maintaining a balance between preservation and access. The two somewhat mutually exclusive objectives are to protect and preserve a park's natural resources while providing access to those resources by the general public. Clearly, if the first objective is to be met successfully, public access must be restricted to low-impact activities, such as hiking, tent camping, picnicking, rockclimbing, cross-country skiing, fishing, kayaking, canoeing, rafting, sailing, Nature study, and photography. Such high-impact activities as dirt-biking, ATV use, alpine skiing, mudding, and snowmobiling are incompatible with resource protection and preservation and should therefore be prohibited or heavily restricted.

The opinion that global warming is not man-made, is man-made; mostly it's made by those who don't want to take responsibility and deal with the changes facing all of us if we want a future with any kind of quality of life for our grandkids and their grandkids....

There is plenty of land to use ORVs. Wilderness should be set aside for future generations. Hiking, fishing and hunting are fine. Use the land in its natural state. Why do we need to take our vehicles to every last acre of land. Walk in and enjoy the solitude. It will cleanse the soul.

This idea and comments 1 and 2 are the extreme of extreme and do expose the anti-human nature of many so-called environmentalists. I am surprised they didn't mention Reed Noss along with the supreme anti-human person in America E.O. Wilson. I actually witnessed Wilson admit while being interviewed by Ben Wattenberg that he thought treating/curing/preventing malaria in the 3rd world was a BAD idea. Now if that is not anti-human I don't know what is. I would not doubt that some folks commenting on this idea are part of the Human Extinction Project I stumbled into on the internet. If not my mention of it may get them looking for it so as to support the idea. Malthus probably thought we humans would be long gone by now but we are still here aren't we. In my opinion that is because we have the capacity somehow to right the wrongs we do as we discover them. It would be great if we could see as Ms. Glover suggests - generations ahead to avoid our mistakes but we don't seem to be capable of that. All of us should read the book "Black Swans" to understand why. We have proven ourselves capable of solving tough challenges when they confront us. That is what counts whether it is food supply or land management or economic collapse. One thing for sure is that all humans need to protect themselves from the lethal attitudes expressed in this discussion. We in So Fla have already seen an Everglades Restoration project knowingly designed to endanger human safety on a major highway in order to save money. Myself and others squashed this bad idea of DOI and their accomplices by shining the light of truth upon it. When that occurred the cockroaches ran away from it and found the money to do the job without lethally endangering So Fla residents in order to dump water into Everglades National Park. What all humans reading this need to understand is that the moment we allow environmental concerns to take precedent over human needs is that HUMANS will then be on the road to extinction because of their own stupidity. The well organized voting campaign for this idea between 8:54 am and 11:38 on Aug 4 also exposes the well oiled anti-human machine out there in cyber space. My compliments to your organizational abilities in your war against humanity but I must admit I hope you lose.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is an important concern. I live in the Mojave Desert and the the destruction caused by the illegal use of ORVs is a documented threat to desert ecosystems, ranchlands and animals, and the social, health, and safety systems in rural areas. From the air it is easy to see the multiple tracks going in all directions impacting root systems, animal burrows, feeding areas, and the drainage patterns that distribute life giving water. There is no consideration whether the land is public or private. Fencing is cut and signs destroyed. Law enforcement is ineffectual and, on occasion, supportive. Those that complain are subject to intimidation, retaliatory threats, and even physical violence. This problem is nationwide. The Bureau of Land Management has testified before Congress that it cannot handle the problem. A 2009 General Accounting Office confirms this for all federal agencies. ORV numbers and riders escalate by the millions making it impossible to properly train and educate riders. Manufacturers and user clubs promote reckless use and intimidating behavior.

This is such a complicated issue. Population growth just by itself is so complicated. We already have many cultures on this earth that are on the road to destruction because of lagging childbirths, in fact most industrialized nations are statistically on their way out. How do we weigh the impact of too many people with loss of diversity of cultures? How do we save our wildlife, freshwater and forests without raising the cost of living beyond the average Joe's ability to financially support it? All or at least the majority of destructive ideas and projects were at one time good ideas. So, how do we make decisions today that will not backfire on us and become those bad and destructive ideas in the future. Clearly a whole new set of parameters needs to be carefully thought out using multiple disciplines before we go off half-cocked. Life was never really simple. Every action has an opposite reaction, many of which will not be felt until decades and centuries later. I believe the first step is to begin to think not just globally, but generation-ally.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm glad your thoughts are admittedly "quick" as it's clear you didn't put much thought into them. Apparently you believe that the thousands of scientists that have produced the many thousands of studies pointing to anthropogenically-induced global warming all doctored their findings because they all had some perverse reason to want the public to believe the earth's heat budget is out of whack. The fact that a very few of those scientists smoothed their data or omitted anomalous outliers that made no substantive difference in their findings, employing accepted statistical methods has little bearing upon the legitimacy of their work and certainly none on the body of work as a whole. From the Contrived Facts Department: 99% of scientists telling Columbus the Earth was flat? Please! If anyone was telling Columbus the world was flat it was likely not a scientist, but perhaps a lay person unwilling to accept what he could not himself perceive (sound familiar?). As early as ancient Greece, Pythagoras, Ptolomy and Aristotle all wrote of a spherical earth. As did Thomas Aquinas in the 1200s, and Dante early in the 1400s. The issue was not the shape of the earth, but how far to get to Asia. No one is suggesting that the Earth's climate should (or could) remain "stagnant." It's a question of superimposing upon the natural fluctuations, variations and oscillations a massive and long term input that could push the Earth's climate hard in one direction. "Mother nature" isn't sentient, much less terribly smart. Unless you subscribe to the Gaia Theory, or have a Pagan belief in the Earth/Mother Nature as a kind of sentient goddess, there is no rational way to justify your faith. Even then, your statement is irrational, as you attribute Her with both ending the Ice Ages because she is so smart, and, apparently with causing them (because she's so smart? so stupid? Or ???).

Too many children in our rural areas are taught from an early age that our wild areas and parks are for human entertainment, not for the birds, plants and animals that actually live there. Even in urban settings there are opportunities to learn about the wonders of nature, through school gardens and trips to local forest preserves. Make environmental education part of school curriculum, an awareness of our connectedness to nature. For too long, those who feel it's their right to graze cattle, cut trees and tear around riding off road vehicles on public lands have managed to damage what belongs to all of us for their own benefit. Now guns are allowed in our national parks, something that will keep many people away. People with guns tend to shoot them, at birds, at animals, at campers, there are many targets. If we get young people involved in saving our precious national parks, there is hope for the future. If we don't their parents may leave us all with nothing but dirt tracks and blowing dust.

We cannot give engine activity the same amount of time as wind or human activity because it is a known fact that activity using fossil fuels is much harder on the environment (plant, marine and air quality).

We go to the parks to get AWAY from the sounds and sights of destructive machines! already they are sneaking in and doing "Doughnuts" in beautiful open fields and leaving huge scars in the mud after rains "just for fun" I get it, it does seem fun to rip the Earth up and drive a loud machine, but NOT in a pristine wilderness! But an old farm and transform it into an OHV Park.. It would be a great way for someone to make a little money and provide a place for OHV'ers to go and the money could pay for constant fixing of the damage to land that the OHVs do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well spoken, we have to come to grips with the population and understand that growth is not good in this regard. Seven point five billion people is too many when there is genocide in Rwanda, and drug wars in Mexico... Yes, I'm saying it... these things are caused by population pressure. E.O. Wilson et. al. dictate that no more than two children per woman is necessary to achieve zero population growth. That might be a good place to start.

Well there is an old adage that still rings true : " There is a time and a place for everything. " Our Parks are not the place at anytime for Motorcycles. Thank you for your comment

What land that is left that has not been developed should be saved. There are plenty of areas that have been developed and used by people to set aside the remaining wilderness. Do we need to drill in every valley left?

Why doesn't the US ban the shark finning we don't need the Chinese and Japanese to ban this horrible practice. Everybody but these guys want to stop finning and most all shark declines. Stop finning all together its cruel find other uses for the rest don't just fin and throw them back still alive man greed is definitely the end of us. We have to stop our unchecked harvesting first and see if we can talk the Chinese and Japanese to sustainably harvesting theirs just like any other animal we use for food. You keep killing at an out of control pace then what do you think is going to happen. Even the ban of others to stock back up because it takes years before they breed again and some usually only one and it's not guaranteed to live. Message to Chinese and Japanese we need predators just as we do prey they all serve a purpose. You can't have ours just like you want have all our turtutles in the states cause you ate all of yours. Sorry.

I just returned from the local mountains. Taking walks there has become a nightmare. What used to be a very quiet and serene experience--one in which I could spiritually connect with nature-- is now turning into a stress-inducing nightmare because of all the motorized vehicles whizzing by. As soon as one had gone by, it turned around and came by again, just as two others did. Simply awful. When I was a kid, our parents taught us to appreciate the quiet and serenity of nature and to even keep our voices down! I had no idea this motorized vehicle thing had happened--I guess I hadn't been on a trail in awhile. What a mess we are letting our beautiful wild areas become. Too many toys and not enough areas to simply reflect.

"Bottom line is they are not going to go away, and making them illegal on public lands won't stop them from coming" quoted from author. I appreciate your point of view and acknowledge that off-road vehicles are very much a part of many American pastimes, but the lack of respect by OHV operators for rules, wilderness, and non OHV users has got to stop. What has our society come to when we allow law-breakers to set the standards?

"How can you be so one sided? Do you really think the land is there only for your enjoyment? Do you realize what OHV and hunting groups have done for the enviroment?" Alright, I am with you on that one!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"these units are looking to 'their' public lands for places to ride?" "Their" public lands are my public lands, too, but I'm not destroying them. I've hiked in the vicinity of the Paiute Trail, and the segments I crossed were barren and case-hardened.

A hiker does not disturb anybody. A single user of an OHV creates noise, pollution and stench I agree !

All vehicles and bicycles should be kept to designated routes. I've seen the ohv damage in utah, it might as well be a parking area or torn up lot. how about designated play areas so they can race around and not general cross country travel anywhere else?

Areas that are protected wilderness should not allow the use of motorized vehicles on trails. These vehicles destroy trails and cause erosion and noise.

As the world population increases, wildness decreases. Vehicles in these areas have significant negative impact on habitat, flora and fauna: increased noise, erosion, land degradation, air pollution, introduction of invasives. One vehicle can disrupt wilderness for miles, with immediate and long term consequences. If we wash our boots before treading in the wild places, let us consider the importance of the wild things that reside there, and continue to recognize the need for their preservation.

ATV's and off road vehicles are the noisiest and most destructive means of transportation available. Most of their operators tear up the ground "jest cuz its fun" - ridiculous. Only the park personnel should be able to operate these things in our beautiful parks. tell the redneck element to go tear up their own property.

Ban the sale and use of all Trekking Poles 90 to 95 percent of all thru-hikers on just the Appalachian Trail use trekking poles. And all of them are having a significant impact on the environment. Impact on Vegetation, Impact on Soil, Impact on Rocks, and Social and Aesthetic Impacts. If we truly do want to preserve this pristine environment the sale of trekking poles should be outlawed. There is no possible way for them to be used without some type of environment harm.

Clear cut logging, drilling for oil or gas, Mining, commercial development and off road vehicles do not belong on our land. The ONLY OHV or ATV used in a National Park should be one registered by and used by the National Park Service to maintain trails or one used by a Rescue Unit to save lives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Comment 9 got it right. OHV use is an optional activity, just like drinking and sex and recreational drugs. But OHV use doesn't just damage the user, it damages the very planet that sustains us. I see people spending \$10,000 to \$20,000 for a "play machine," and none of the user groups I'm familiar with donate a dime to help society through social organizations that help the underprivileged. All of the fundraising, in my experience, goes to further their goal of national trails and cross-country riding everywhere and anywhere. Propogandists for the industry continue to parrot the argument that "managed use" will solve all the problems, but my experience says the argument is a smokescreen for "give us more land."

Count me in as supporting muscle-power only in our parks and recreation areas YES !!

Does anyone know what wilderness designated lands are out there. I have to admit, before this I didn't know how many there were myself. I think we have adequately set aside important lands. So why do so many want to keep everyone else out of the forest. We should all be allowed to visit the forest and enjoy its beauty and natural wonders in a variety of venues. Everyone finds renewal through the forest in different ways. One of the biggest obstacles to "reconnecting people to the outdoors" is restricting access to those outdoors. It is really hard to reconnect people to the outdoors when access to those outdoors is so restricted.

Existing park space should be fully usable by the people, not preserved and made inaccessible. We have millions of acres here in NYS that the government cannot afford to manage, but they try to keep the people from having the full usage. The governments role should not be in purchasing additional land for preservation with tax dollars.

So you were fine with it when an anti environmental group took over the site some 500 strong and in 2 days demoted every conservation idea while promoting every ohv idea yet an environmental group comes here to add some balance and all of the sudden you are up in arms with outrage? You are as transparent as you are ignorant.

Well said, like the other said he does not go into nature to see wildlife or enjoy nature they go for "other" reasons. It seems most ohvers could care less if every animal species on earth went extinct. To whoever said I think everyone who hikes is a nature hater I never said that. I hike and backpack and I love nature as do most of my fellow hikers and backpackers. On the other hand the opposite is true for ohvers who seem to turn a blind eye to the damage their machines do to forests and wildlife habitat.

What about the Animals !?! Are you crazy or just naïve !?! How would you like OHV's driving past your front porch randomly.

How can you be so one sided? Do you really think the land is there only for your enjoyment? Do you realize what OHV and hunting groups have done for the enviroment?

I agree entirely! The notion that wilderness areas should be sandboxes for motorcycle enthusiasts is absurd.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with all of the people who do not want ATV's in our parks. We go there to get away from city noises, and humans in general. I want to listen to the birds, and the breeze in the trees. Aside from what I want...how about the needs of the wildlife? These poor creatures have been beaten down enough as we take all of their living space with our urban sprawl. Give them a break!

I agree - if an area is currently designated as wilderness, we should continue to forbid motorized vehicles - some of these ecosystems are too threatened; if new land is being designated as NP or wilderness area, I think the studies suggests are good.

I am against increased OHV on federal lands. OHVs are too noisy and cause too much pollution and create erosion problems. Those are the cold facts. They should only be allowed on private land, not federal land. Federal land is basically set aside to preserve it and OHVs destroy the land.

I am an environmentalist first. I also ride a snowmobile and grew up riding 3 wheelers (I don't think they even make them anymore). I have always said that OHVs need areas to ride, which should be separate from wilderness areas (national parks, etc.). I would not want to destroy nature with my hobby. I think alot more land should be set aside as wilderness. Using me as an example, I would be happy to find an appropriate place to ride if the area I usually went to did not allow snowmobiles or OHVs anymore. Mr. Reid has a good point. Also, I read a comment about a focus group. Maybe the person who posted the comment about a focus group should just accept that there are alot of people who don't agree with his views. The first day I found this site, there were alot of OHV users making comments. I was alittle disappointed with most of the points of views. I think the environmental group just found out about the site. There seems to be alot more people who are concerned about the envirnment, rightfully so.

I am puzzled by the insistence of OHV users. We all complain about having to spend too much time in the car, and yet we decide to do more of the same for recreation. And all that when obesity and lack of healthy activity are a huge problem. On top of that, with each moment of excessive driving we increase our dependence on foreign oil. A hiker does not disturb anybody. A single user of an OHV creates noise, pollution and stench, and destroys trails, denying others the experience that they look for in the nature. Even worse, OHV use jeopardizes the very existence of some of our greatest resources. What will our children think of us if we do not act more responsibly?

I am sick and tired of seeing people and their kids polluting our natural streams by bathing in them. Every summer all you see are dammed up areas of the streams with people sitting in the water. They leave their trash behind including dirty diapers. Their kids pee in the stream and the wildlife down stream find only a trickle of water in which to drink. The trees are dying off as well because of the lack of the natural water flow. Used to be a law in place that read one could not alter the "natural" flow of the water but no one is enforcing this law. WHY? We have many public parks with pools in which to swim or sit in. Why does Calif continue to let these people dry up our natural resources and pollute the streams? It is so bad that they no longer stock the stream because of it. Water can not maintain a level to support the fish.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe that different types of users should have their own areas. I hike a little & spend a great deal of time on horseback. When someone on an OHV doesn't slow down when approaching me, I usually have a wild ride with the horse. Only so much desensitizing can be done to any animal. Those riders that understand horses, slow down & give me a little room, which I will also do in return. I've been run into several times, resulting in expensive vet bills. I understand that we all have our different ways to recreate, but some courtesyto each other would be nice.

I can appreciate the want and need for OHV use. However, we need to take into consideration the damage to the land they cause. There should also be limits on the decibels that any particular machine can put out and limit where they are allowed by determining places where there is the least impact on the environment. Allowing them in back country where they can create washout causing erosion and water and noise pollution should be a first consideration

I disagree as well. When land is purchased by the government for conservation purposes, it should \*explicitly\* be up to the government to decide what uses this land can be put to. Opening all land to usage by anyone who has access would degrade the value of protecting the land to begin with. I venture to central NY state frequently, and there is an abundance of usable public parks and lands which already allow high-impact camping, snow-mobiling, etc... we don't need more of the same. Conservation is about conservation, not "everybody have a good time". That being said, I agree that there are areas of the country which are underserved in that regard as well, and that isolating lands from development and allowing public use is a step in the right direction in those areas, but that should be considered separately from conservation.

I formerly enjoyed OHVs. However in recent years I have seen them do more to destroy wilderness than anything else around. I am for stronger penalties, not for making this a model. Get this stuff out of our parks.

I have some experience with the damage that OHV's do to the environment and their use needs to be tightly controlled and vigorously policed. I'm not sure how many desert tortoises have already been killed, but even one more is way to many. Plus the damage they do to the ground and vegetation is severe. Land open to OHV's needs to be carefully selected so that the inevitable damage does not affect the surrounding areas.

I live in Washington State and I have seen astonishing damage done to trails and roads on public land by ATVs, especially in the Gifford-Pinchot National Forest. Come see for yourself if you do not believe me. I will take you around! There is no justification for allowing--at the public's expense--the use of ATVs on any public land. Just because these idiotic machines exist does not mean they should be allowed on our public land. Let the crazy motor-heads ride in their own backyard and destroy their own land. Then maybe they will recognize why we don't welcome them on public land--anywhere! Michael Shurgot 8/4/2010



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I obviously should have placed more definitive information along with the Idea. One of several articles. The main advantage of a trekking pole is for stability, other advantages as well. But the use has an environmental impact. Published by Appalachian Trail Conference Jeff Marion, Ph.D., is a research biologist with the U.S. Geological Survey who studies visitor impacts to national parks and other protected areas. \_\_\_\_\_ is an associate regional representative with the Appalachian Trail Conference. Bob Proudman is the Conference's director of trail management programs.

**Impact on Vegetation**—Trailside vegetation can be damaged from the swinging action of trekking poles, particularly from contact with the baskets, which can get caught in lowgrowing plants. One North Carolina hiker noted in an e-mail to ATC that "the ground was becoming torn up by spiked walking poles. On the uphill side of the trail, moss and wild flowers were torn from their bedding. On the downside of the trail, parts of the trail were also torn away." The potential consequences of such damage include a reduction or loss of vegetation cover, change in vegetation composition, and trail widening.

**Impact on Soil**—In wet or loose soils, pole tips can penetrate up to two inches and leave holes one-half inch in diameter. These holes are often V-shaped, wider at the top due to the swing of the upper pole once the tip is embedded in soil. Under some conditions, we have also seen soil lifted by pole tips and dropped on the ground surface. In a letter to the Appalachian Trailway News (ATN), a Virginia hiker observed, "These things are tearing up the trail on each side of the footpath. Some places look like they have been freshly plowed." Such disturbance could cause the loss of organic litter, expose soil, and increase erosion and muddiness. Research is needed to document if, and to what extent, pole use can increase rates of erosion. When surface water runoff after rainfall fills the holes created by pole tips, to what extent does it cause muddiness? Does increased water and soil contact in areas with high densities of holes turn trailsides to mud, as often occurs on horse trails when water fills hoof prints? Trails that are outsloped for water drainage would not prevent such muddiness; water bars and drainage dips would prevent muddiness only on the downhill sides of trails. Significant impacts from heavy pole use could even make the trail more difficult to use or increase maintenance work and costs.

**Impact on Rocks**— The carbide tips on trekking poles leave visually obvious white scratch marks on rock surfaces and also damage lichens. A hiker in Maine related in an ATN letter that "the scratching is so pronounced on granite surfaces that it is sometimes easier to follow where the poles have been than to locate a white blaze." In a letter to Backpacker magazine's Web site, a hiker in the Adirondacks wrote, "I was upset to see all the rocks had little white marks on them. Not just a rock here or there, but all the rocks on the trail were chipped by hundreds of people.... It got to the point where I could not concentrate on anything else but these thousands of little white gashes in the rocks I was stepping on. It really left a bad taste in my mouth and a grim look to the future."

**Social and Aesthetic Impacts**— The audible scraping noises that trekking poles make when used on hard surfaces can also be an irritant to fellow hikers. One Internet "newsgroup" correspondent likened the sound to "'fingernails on a chalkboard' when crossing rock surfaces." For some hikers, visual impact "takes away from my experience because I feel like someone just walked by there a few minutes ago...bye-bye wilderness." Collectively, those impacts have the potential to trigger conflict between trail users, much the same as conflicts between hikers and horseback riders or mountain bike riders.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I repeat and will continue to do so every time I read about more OHV's in our parks or forests. Why are they allowed to be there in the first place? Only park employees and volunteers doing trail maintenance should be allowed to have these. After all the original trails were put there for the nature lover who enjoys being out in nature and listening to what NATURE has to offer. Besides they are driving the wild out of the forests and into our back yards. What a stupid idea. Who wants to go on a sight seeing tranquil trip and have to listen to a lot of un-natural NOISE in the forest or wilderness? Bad enough already that we get shot at by hunters if you happen to get in the way or scare off what they were trying to shoot just for sport.

I see why the author is frustrated.....but a evacuation with 6 people, walking on either side of a litter making a vehicle-sized swath, plus a second team, plus prepping the patient, or landing a helicopter, causes a MUCH greater impact than trekking poles. So if you don't want there to be trekking poles, you'll have to remove rescue programs too. And generally, the public doesn't like it when people die. So good luck with this idea.

I think the problem is there are too many roads and not enough land set aside for wildlife to flourish. What is left of wild lands should be saved before there isn't any left.

I want to add my voice to those calling for increased OHV opportunities on public land. I hike, snowshoe, kayak, mountain bike AND ride an off road motorcycle. OHV's are a great way to enjoy the back country and explore the great outdoors. There are plenty of places on BLM and National Forest land to expand OHV opportunities in a sustainable way, while still addressing the needs of conservation and other outdoor enthusiasts.

If OHV drivers want to drive more in the wilderness, they should invent silent OHV's, with smaller footprints (Tire tracks). Sorry guys, I know it's fun to ride those things, but lets face it,... they are a nuisance to everyone else. Look machines rule the world and are dominating our lives in the form of noise and pollution and scarring of the earth. I really need to get away from all that and enjoy the sounds of God's nature and let the Earth dominate the space for awhile. Your OHVs can really tear up the land and they make a horrible racket that just ruins any enjoyment of nature and wild animals. I have also seen that you have a hard time staying on the trails and there always end up being alot of damage ito beautiful fields filled with bunnies,... it's like OHVers just can't resist ripping up the land and throwing mud off their tires! I get it. But just buy an old farm or something and rip up that land, 'cause the rest of us want to get AWAY from destructive machines! ". Sorry, but there are a lot of imature OHVers ruining it for the rest of you, as well.

If you mean this site I will tell you. I received an email with info about DOI holding behind the scene meetings about Monuments and Wilderness proposals - basically development of a short list of these things. Certain other things were mentioned and with a little searching on the internet I found this site and decided to participate. I must admit I am not an industry insider just an American and like many others very worried about our future albeit from my own perspective as a member of the Gladesmen cultural community.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If you're concerned about being shot at by hunters, you'd be well advised to not go where people legally hunt during hunting season. By the way, I don't want to listen to the car you drive or the airplane you travel in to get around this country, so if you could please limit yourself to walking or bicycling only, I'd sincerely appreciate it. I find it distasteful to be enjoying my pool and have to listen to the roar of a 747 as it passes overhead.

I'll have to pass voting on this since I DEFINITELY don't support ATVs in native habitats. Get rid of the ATV part, and then you'll have my vote of support.

I'm against OHV use anywhere, certainly not in public land such as National Forests and Parks. We do not see them on highways and we should not see them. There is at least one reason: they are not safe. And they pollute the air with fumes and pollute the peace with loud unnecessary noise. In this country, there are way, way too much gadgets that soak up oil from power tools to powerful engines of all kinds. Now is the right time to start using our own energies in brain and brawn.

It has been a long time coming since that first Earth Day, but we as a species (human) are beginning to understand the limits of the only planet we have. I grew up in the machine culture and everyone I knew wanted a hotter car, a faster motorcycle, a bigger boat, etc. etc. etc. Like the majority of our species, I have since learned that we were ignorant of the full costs of internal combustion engines. Continuing to operate on "what we have today" fails to consider the future. Native Americans often based their decisions on the impact to the next seven generations. I'm ashamed to say that the legacy of my generation does not bode well for my children and grandchildren. However, we can admit our mistakes of the past and build a better future. Economic arguments for damaging culture (OHVs) are worthless, since we can see in the last few years just how well those kinds of economic models have served us. Time to hang up your spurs, dirt-bikers, and admit your days are limited.

It isn't about money! It is about the land and we only have one planet. Because someone purchased an off road vehicle doesn't mean we have to give them a place to operate it. The assumption should be that they have a place to operate the vehicle is why they purchased the vehicle in the first place. Long after they are tired of their vehicles and they have been scrapped and/or rusted in oblivion the land will still be scarred.

It's important to realize that it's not sensible to make all areas of our nation wilderness access to various vehicles. Motorize vehicles compact soils, destroy plant life and pollute natural resources far faster than humans on 2 feet. The rules and decisions on land use should try to protect as much areas, while balancing the public's use as much as possible. With the right vehicle I been able to car camp at the Jackass Dike camp ground in the Sierra National Forest, taking the Con Ed jeep access roads, when the Kaiser pass was open, in our Datsun 240. One just had to plan for the weather and make sure to bring medical supplies in case of an emergency, since it was a 3 hour drive to the nearest ranger station. I also suggest book for Wilderness medicine for anyone who may be visiting an area away from phone lines.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've never driven an OHV. I am a hiker, walker, backpacker, runner, paddler. But public lands are public. Your emphasis on excluding various categories of users from all public lands will only serve to create a backlash against those with a lighter "foot print". Have some tolerance for others. I live in the city now and love getting out into the wild lands of our beautiful country. I used to live in small towns. Many OHV users come from rural communities or small towns. Recreation opportunities like theaters, clubs, arts, etc. and even parks are limited. These wild spaces are in their backyard. They have every right to recreate there. Wilderness areas (and most National Parks to a lesser degree) are the exclusive preserve of hikers and those of us with lighter foot prints. Applying this to all public lands would be elitist, and in the end foolish. The backlash would turn what remains of the conservation/environmentalist movement into pariahs. There is much more common ground between OHV users and us than you realize.

Lazy, lard-ass ATV riders go to private lands to wreck the woods!

Let's also ban hiking boots! In reality, using poles helps you cross streams and go over obstacles safely, the alternative, going around these causes more damage via these "new trails"

More land should be preserved by the government in the form of national forests, national parks, wildlife preserves, etc., before it is all developed.

underpasses for wildlife where I am at have at least 1 - 2 miles of fencing each side of the structures. The fences are 10 feet high with 3 strands of barbed wire on top at a cost of \$35.00 dollars a foot - yes foot in addition to the \$4,000,000 dollar a pop underpasses. The fences stop other species from migrating to water when water levels drop along with preventing normal feeding and breeding behaviors of the very endangered species and other species they are supposed to protect along with merely moving the road kills beyond the fencing at each end of the project. The up side is that road builders get some work out of these boondoggles that also prevent access to any public land on the other side of the fence.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My family owns, and uses (camping, hiking, hunting, fishing, etc) nearly 300 acres in on the Wisconsin shores of Lake Superior. Our land was once open to OHV/ATV and Snowmobile access, but is now closed to the former. This closure was prompted by the abuse and misuse by a majority of the OHV/ATV operators "borrowing" our land. We would often see new "trails" tearing through the woods, vandalism to our established camp sites, litter, and excessive erosion on and around the established trails. About five years ago we closed the land to the OHV/ATV traffic and have seen most of this go away. Despite our efforts to maintain OUR space, we have found evidence where OHV/ATV operators have "broke brush" to circumvent our gate and posted "No ATV" signs, along with vandalism to said gates and signs. I fully understand that it is not the entirety of OHV/ATV operators that disrespect private property and land-owner wishes, but there are always those bad apples that ruin it for everyone else. Yes, it is a slippery slope, but if the OHV/ATV community can not police their own actions, and respect private property, how on earth are we supposed to trust them on public lands? There are numerous public OHV/ATV trail networks throughout Minnesota and Wisconsin open for their use, yet are closed to those of us who ride slower, and lower impact, trail motorcycles. The lobby is strong, but time and again local communities come together to prevent or further limit OHV/ATV trails in their areas. The local populace are the ones that have to clean up the messes left behind by the trail abusers, and are frankly becoming tired of it. I say, maintain the amount of public lands these users have already, and leave the pristine wilderness devoid from this misuse and abuse.

My suggestion is to reinstate the Roadless Rule to protect National Forests (and Parks) from new road construction. This rule should also limit the deforestation and poisoning of our waterways that result from unnecessary road construction in our parks and forests.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Name-calling doesn't cut it, gang. There are just as many "extreme" off-roaders as there are environmentalists. I notice the off-roaders continually refer to their "rights" to use public land. Too often they forget that the right to swing your arm ends when it connects with someone's face. Public lands mean just that.....they belong to ALL the public and should be managed in balance for ALL the public. So if any one form of activity takes a disproportionate amount of the public space, it is out of balance. That is what has happened with off-road vehicles. Because they can cover 90 miles in one day, their impact is far larger than almost any other form of recreation. And let's not forget this is recreation we are talking about. Optional activity. Swimming, bowling, skateboarding and other forms of recreation all have appropriate places for their activity, yet off-roaders want full access to all public lands. It is out of balance. I live in the backcountry. 40 years experience with off-roaders tell me they are selfish, disrespectful and terribly ignorant about nature. Their noise reaches me from as far away as two miles. Their stench lingers on the mountain long after they are gone. Their trails have resulted in high sedimentation in local creeks. And, in my area, their local enthusiasts' group is constantly trying to expand their riding areas. Relying on history to support more riding is ridiculous. The few dirt-bike trespassers I had to contend with 40 years ago are nowhere near the numbers causing trouble today. That they have been allowed to expand their unrestricted riding across public lands is the fault of a government that has not followed the law. (Executive Orders 11644 and 11989) Just because you have "taken" something does not give you a "right" to it, particularly when that supposed "right" takes away from society at large. Two more points. Calling the Blue Ribbon Coalition a "multiple use" advocate is like calling Osama Bin Laden a great religious leader. And, for those of you who brag on riding 90 miles in one day, I would ask how many wildflowers you identified across that terrain, how many game trails did you see, how many different types of vegetation did you encounter, how many mice or snakes or bugs did you watch, how much windsong did you hear, how many bears did you hear grubbing, and how many hawks did you watch ride a thermal? You do not see these things are 30-, 40- or 50mph. What else will the children do? Why, explore the outdoors on their feet and actually learn about nature.

No ATVs on public lands! Go drive 'em elsewhere!

Nothing should be done that would in any way compromise the status of forbidding motorized vehicles in areas currently designated as wilderness. There is no acceptable use of motorized vehicles in wilderness.

Off-trail, cross-country riding may be the most destructive way to use a vehicle. It results in a spiderweb of ORV tracks subdividing wildlife habitat into small units and destroying the vegetation that holds the soil in place. That's why the Forest Service and BLM have closed most lands to cross-country travel.

OHVs drive out hikers and other environmentally-friendly users. The idea author wants to open more public lands to OHVs, noting that OHV riders will use these lands whether legal or not. Is this a good reason reduce recreational opportunities of those who wish to enjoy peace and quiet in our public lands?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of the worst problems any generation will ever face is the one we face now - global climate change. All forestry policy and wilderness policy should be shaped to protect the planet from further global climate change and the destruction that will come from it. We need to get OUT of our vehicles and we certainly do NOT need to be driving all sorts of little personal gas guzzlers all over what wilderness and wildlife habitat we have left. We need to guard against more pollution and more greenhouse gases - and most especially this is so in sensitive lands.

Over mining, drilling and logging yes but not over the preservation of species. Man has enough area to play on while wildlife has very little left to survive on.

Perhaps if trekking poles are needed the design could be changed, so that there is less impact on the environment. Again, too many people using the natural areas. We need to set aside more protected (national and state park) areas and national recreation areas.

Preserving land is a valuable use. That's the only way future generations will have access to wild land.

Protect Wildlands for the Benefit of Wildlife. Many of the comments on this forum talk about how we manage our public lands for different public values, whether it be for OHV use or experiencing the solitude that wilderness avails. Even things like watershed and habitat protection are often mentioned as a value for PEOPLE to have clean water and see wildlife... One of the challenges we face in land management decisions is to adjust our collective outlook to also value watersheds and habitat simply for other living things besides us. It is a valid "use" of some small amount of our landscape to simply protect it from human use, not just abuse or over-use, but any use.

Remember, it just takes ONE noisy, stinking, rut-making, plant-crushing, wildlife-terrorizing, irresponsibility-promoting, stream-muddying, tree-uprooting, topsoil-eroding, frog-flattening, wilderness-abusing, serenity-obliterating, fresh-air-polluting, all-intruding fossil-fuel vehicle to totally ruin a wilderness experience for NUMEROUS considerate and responsible admirers and advocates of nature, peace and wildlife. Wilderness should be kept wild and free from overt human and corporate intrusion, abuse and exploitation. Too much of the planet and its precious biodiversity have been abused, exploited and trampled by the inconsiderate, thrill-seeking, toys-and-amusement-addicted, self-absorbed minions of self, by the morally bereft corporate plutocrats who think the Earth is theirs to ravage in their greedy madness, and sanctioned by their servile lackeys in government. If their me-greed ideology were to persist, sterile eroded ruts, asphalt, concrete and neon perversions would cover Yellowstone and Yosemite and other magnificent splendors, and Earth's wildlife would soon diminish to flies, cockroaches and rats. Altruistic and ethical people must speak out and stand up now to protect and preserve our national parks, the remaining fragments of pristine wilderness worldwide, and Earth's precious biodiversity from all abusive and destructive intrusions and ravagement.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Since this is a comment from a New York State resident, I assume the comment was directed at the New York State Forest Preserve (Adirondack Park and Catskill Park). These areas were set aside as a wilderness preserve whose usage requires the vote of the full voting population of NY State to alter. For instance, when the NY State Northway (I-87) was proposed, it had to go through the entire length of the Adirondack Park's eastern region. Since the Adirondack Park is NYS Forest Preserve, the only way to allow this non-wilderness use was to have the entire state of New York vote on an amendment to the state constitution that would allow it. The idea was extremely controversial (conservationists did not approve), but the citizenry spoke, and the amendment was passed by the vote of the people. Every time you drive the Thruway from Lake George to Plattsburgh on the way from Albany to Montreal, you're getting full use of the land as defined by the will of the people of NY State. However, those large areas that are classified as Wilderness or Wild Forest are preserved and protected by law, as outlined in the constitution of NY State. No trees may be cut, no roads may be built, no trails may be cut or blazed unless they are approved by the APA and DEC, which is as it should be (in my opinion). No development may occur, no electrical lines strung, no pipelines dug, no structures built, unless an exemption is voted upon and approved by the people of the state as an amendment to the NYS constitution. People complain about it, but the results speak for themselves -- the Adirondack Park is a world class wilderness preserve in the most densely populated part of our nation. Individuals own about half of the Park, while the other half is owned by the state and is kept as Forest Preserve. The state also helps purchase conservation easements where the original owner can use the land for forestry or mining, but agrees to prevent development (sprawl, subdivision) of the land. I see that as a model the federal government would do well to imitate. If by "full usage" you mean the right to take your SUV out into the woods and dig ruts in old woods roads, then I do not agree. If you mean the right to take off-road vehicles of any kind into a wilderness area, then I do not agree. If by full usage you mean that you should be able to go cut down a tree to build your garage or remove some rocks for your back yard (as in our National Forests, the "land of many uses") then I do not agree. Wilderness in the vicinity of NY City, Boston, Montreal and Toronto needs to be protected, both for the people and for the natural resources.

So we should advocate increasing the potential of injury in remote areas that could lead to death in some cases. Hopefully the author is just ignorant of the importance of maintaining ones balance in challenging terrain. Otherwise we might suspect the author is affiliated with the anti-humanists that have recently found this site and supply ideas with a built in voting block in an attempt to fool those who read the results that Americans actually support these questionable ideas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I can see where your personal enjoyment of your OHV is threatened if this passes. Environmentalists are accustomed to being pariahs, although it's usually those with commercial/industrial interests who have a problem with environmentalists. It is difficult to comprehend your support of air pollution and noise in natural spaces. If you're so concerned about those who can't make it to the theatre, why don't you start educating them about the damage their OHV's cause long-term--air pollution, noise, habitat destruction, death--and teach them about the excellent feeling, and consequence, about enjoying nature without contraption. Yes, you will hear the, "It's our land, too, and we can mess it up any way we want to!" reply, among others. True, it is their land...it belongs to ALL of us...we are its stewards and must protect it forever. I encourage you to think very long-term. I agree that OHV users and non- have common ground--literally and figuratively. Elitist is a very charged word to inject into this argument. What do you invest in, Soren? Let's see, by promoting OHVs, commercially, one would be promoting the following: oil usage, gasoline usage, tire manufacture, engine manufacture, paint manufacture, plastic manufacture, OHV clothing manufacture, OHV trailer manufacture, trucks/trailers to tow the OHVs, grocery supply, alcohol supply. How many of these areas of commerce to you own stock in? Or are you just one of those free-enterprise guys? Libertarian? I'm sorry, but your rational sounding comment seems to cover something more visceral, or manipulative. The only people that use words like "elitist" and "pariahs" in their arguments have a separate agenda, usually political.

State and nation parks are refuges for the wildlife and make available for people to enjoy nature in its natural state. ATVs, snow mobile, and mountain bikes are an invasion of these areas and an attack on nature. These vehicles despoil the peace and tranquility to both the nature lovers and the wildlife that lives there. The least offensive are mountain bikers, most of which I meet are more respectful of nature. These parks must be kept as a sanctuary for nature and all wildlife. ATVs and snow mobiles are environmental nightmares and they must be banned from every local, state and national park and recreational area. Mankind does not own this planet, we share it with many other species and mankind must respect these species and safeguard them from those who do not.

I thought a roadless rule is already in place. But regardless, it is going beyond a roadless rule to a "removal rule" in all our forest now. Its even having an effect on non-OHV uses like family camping. "Forest Service Proposes to Close 500 Miles of Roads in Magdalena Ranger District" "The Magdalena Ranger District revealed its Travel Management proposal today which would ban the use of all motor vehicles on around 500 miles of the existing roads in the District. This will affect all vehicles includes motorcycles, ATVs, and 4WDs. It also affects all members of the public, including hunters. Per the proposal put forward, the nearly 1400 miles of roads currently available to the public would be reduced to just over 900 miles. The proposal also dramatically reduces the areas allowed for 'car camping'. The proposal would limit 'dispersed vehicle camping' to 300 feet either side of only 390 miles of roads, using a motor vehicle for camping alongside roads."

Stop being a hypocrite and never step foot in an automobile again. Sell everything with a motor and go live in a cave

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for promoting what many would consider foolhardy. Yes, leave wildlands for wildlife. Global population is escalating to the point where there isn't enough of everything for everyone.....much less our planets' wildlife. We are losing species at an alarming rate. We are losing forests at an alarming rate. We are losing rainforests at an alarming rate. We are polluting our oceans at an alarming rate. We only have our one planet.....doesn't anyone remember the picture that was taken from space in 1969? Ours is the only habitable planet so far in our galaxy. Let's not end up having to live under domes due to pollution.

Thanks, but I don't ever remember asking for OHV access to be given to national parks and wilderness areas.

That's kind of funny. I just can't picture it. How many bridges/tunnels would it take to be effective? Separating freeway lanes in some areas is just not feasible without a massive construction undertaking.

The gas-fume heads don't get it...maybe the fumes have affected their meager comprehensional abilities. Intrusive, irresponsible, noisy, polluting and destructive activities have no place on public lands, where responsible others enjoy the serenity of God's pristine, soul-reviving wilderness, and wildlife live and have homes. Let the irresponsible boys play with their destructive, noisy and stinking toys on their own properties. Then they won't mind when trees and other plants are torn out by their roots or crushed, and crystal-clear streams and other freshwater sources are fouled and rutted into filthy mud holes. And they won't mind when topsoil erodes and washes away, depriving wildlife of plant forage that once grew there. Or terrorized wildlife vacating their once-peaceful homes. The real problem is irresponsible selfishness, and self-absorbed promoters of such a depraved ideology can't comprehend that THE NATURAL STATE OF PRISTINE WILDERNESS ALWAYS TAKES PRECEDENCE OVER ABUSIVE, INTRUSIVE AND DESTRUCTIVE ACTIVITIES/BEHAVIORS. Following their attempts at reasoning, the intrusion advocates would be fine with drag racing down residential streets, or open, illegal drug use in public parks, libraries and schools. It's called wilderness for a reason; leave it wild. Keep your abusive, noisy, fouling, adolescent, destructive, irresponsible, self-absorbed intrusions to yourself, and leave beautiful, serene, untrampled wilderness to God's creatures and responsible adults, who know the value of unspoiled wilderness and will fight to protect and preserve it from the likes of selfish off-road abusers and other exploiters, who will despoil all wilderness into an eroded sterile rut if they have their way.

The huge number of animals killed on highways is a major issue. Highways need to be designed with wildlife in mind, and if that doesn't work, lower speed limits. Freeways should not be a wall to wildlife migration. Freeway lanes should be separated in heavy wildlife areas so animals only have to negotiate 1 lane at a time, and speeds should be reduced.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Idea is not just for the AT, but for all areas. The Appalachian Trail was used as an example for the verification on the article stated in a later post. There are so many people who want environmental change out there until it affects them personally. Anywhere Trekking Poles are used they have an impact! Just because it is listed as a trail mean you should not care about the environment impact of it? Start "Its only a trail and not Pristine" and that's a excuse for OHVs to start to move in on it!

The problem is people keep trying to add to the list, without considering alternative designations to protect land from development, but still leave it open for responsible recreation.

The title of this idea is contradictory if you believe in government of the people, by the people, and for the people. If our democratic government, consisting of representatives elected by the people, decide that land must be preserved, then "the people" are doing what they want with the land. If a minority of the people want to exploit the land, well, they're going to have to convince the majority that it's the right thing to do. Good luck.

There are plenty of places to ride ohv's already. Most of our trails accomodate them in some form. Because of the increased power to get places, folks on them think they need more and more trails.

There has to be some roade to get to the parks but limiting them is a good Idea. you have to put limits on what can be done and if this means limiting the # of camping spots that that is how it has to be done. parks may have to start taking reservations for spots. I enjoy camping but there needs to be some space between the camp spots to really enjoy your time with nature.

there is no need to spend money on "studies".....motorized vehicles only on existing roads through the parks and wilderness areas.....the wilderness is for the wild ones and not noise pollution, gasoline smells, tearing up the fragile earth.....we need to walk softly on the earth and respect it and the creatures whose home we quietly enter to restore ourselves.....as the signs already say, "Take Nothing But Photographs...Leave Nothing But Footprints"...

These are public lands, and as such, need to be available to all RESPONSIBLE usage. My biggest fear of off road usage is, probably, the same as most people's - We don't want to see the destructive side that can be brought out. After fighting for decades to keep loggers, miners, etc out of these areas, to see another group come in and "dog out" the areas that were meant to be protected, that is just as horrifying. All this being said, these are public lands and, as such, need to be available to those who will be responsible to the "nature"(pun intended) of the land and keep it for those others wanting to come in and enjoy it, study it, etc. Find a way to provide the balance so that everyone can enjoy them, e.g. unendangered areas that won't be affected by the bikes, atvs, etc.

This idea if properly implemented adds to clean water, clean air, and a clean earth. Great idea

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is a good comment on selected streams but it would be a tragedy to prohibit swimming in most of the streams in the east. That is one of the joys of experiencing the outdoors.

This land belongs to ALL the people however some use by us is destructive to our land and degrades the pleasure and use of others. Clear cut logging, drilling for oil or gas, Mining, commercial development and off road vehicles do not belong on our land. These activities do long term damage to the land. They damage streams, dig gullies, are noisy, polluting and even dangerous to other non destructive use like hiking, walking, bicycling, regulated fishing and hunting, photography and just viewing the wild lands and it's inhabitants that still survive our arrival. Save OUR LAND for the future, INTACT and WILD with the native trees and wildlife in balance with minimal disturbance by humans. This means that our native predators must also be returned to their native habitat where they have been extirpated. Humans do a poor job of keeping the wild life healthy as we choose the healthiest animals to kill but predators choose the sick and weak to kill, return our native predators, wolves, bears, eagles, wolverines, and cougars.

I LOVE your ideas. If people want to drive huge, gas guzzling trucks and suvs to make up for their tiny man parts then let them pay for damaging our environment to do so and if they want to live in a huge house they do not need just so they can show off let em pay for that as well!

Uh yeah as a taxpayer I want to pay for a cross country OHV path, NOT! There are way too many better uses of my tax dollars. IF you want to ride your OHV buy yourself a farm to ride it on.

We need to disconnect from our technologies and reconnect with the natural world. There needs to be quiet places for people to go - non-motorized please.

While I am 100% behind this idea what about damage caused by the fact that hikers are damaging in the first place no matter how responsible they are?

While I am 100% behind this idea what about damage caused by the fact that ohvs are damaging in the first place no matter how responsible the driver?

While I sympathize with those that are pro-ATV use, these land-destroying machines are not meant for our National Parks. These beautiful and fragile lands were designated for protection for a legitimate reason. Keep ATV's off of these lands is key to saving the land.

Why are they allowed to be there in the first place? Only park employees and volunteers doing trail maintenance should be allowed to have these. After all the original trails were put there for the nature lover who enjoys being out in nature and listening to what NATURE has to offer. Besides they are driving the wild out of the forests and into our back yards. What a stupid idea. Who wants to go on a sight seeing tranquil trip and have to listen to a lot of un-natural NOISE in the forest or wilderness? Bad enough already that we get shot at by hunters if you happen to get in the way or scare off what they were trying to shoot just for sport.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

With reference to comment, 900 is a lot of miles. It makes sense to reverse a trend that's gone too far in one direction. Yosemite Valley suffered decades of road, facilities and parking lot construction which created a blanket of smog and a proliferation of concession stands. I've read that, thirty years ago, 80% of visitors were overnight campers, now 80% are day users. Yes, restricting vehicles affects all member of the public, but so does degradation of wilderness areas.

You folks who say "get serious". Seriously, have you ever hiked on a soft-dirt trail and looked at hundreds of small holes? Unattractive. If you find poles help, please - use rubber tips, so you won't dig holes or scratch rock, and put the poles away when they're not needed.

New conservation policies and initiatives must be supported and informed by state of the art science.

An inherent problem with collaborative processes like this one is that they tend to lead to "middle ground" solutions. When the issue is Nature Conservation, middle ground policies and programs have led so far to the incremental and. ongoing degradation of nature to the point of crisis. Obviously, middle ground is not always the "right" ground for. protecting nature.

In my oral comments I mentioned the Mexican wolf (an endangered species) recovery program taking place on Forest Service Lands in the Gila and Apache National Forests. And I stated that the Forest Service was not doing enough to protect and conserve the Mexican wolf—only 42 wild Mexican wolves exist in the wild! And the population has declined over the past 6 years. The problem is that the Forest Service has no programs for recovering wolves and still gives higher priority to cattle grazing than to endangered species recovery. Cattle grazing on these forests is an out of date use. It is ecologically destructive and serves no necessary public good. If we cannot protect and conserve nature on our public lands, the America's Great Outdoors initiative is doomed to failure.

Protecting the outdoors is our greatest challenge. The competition by various users creates an unsustainable situation for the small amount of native California we have left. Public land needs to be protected for all of us. Allowing off-road play on public land is counter to that protection. The use degrades all that is important to the public—biodiversity, tranquility, clean air and water and native California. I vote for vehicular access and touring using street legal vehicles so that rules and regs can be followed. Speed would be kept lower than 20mph keeping roads safe for all users and minimizing road maintenance, soil erosion and air quality problems. If an off-roader likes speed and fun on his/her vehicle, private entrepreneurs need to respond and set those areas up. Those areas are not suitable for the general public's outdoor needs and should be in contained areas off of public lands.

Federal control of land is the reason there is so much OHV access in my state. More national forests (and parks) are exactly what is needed.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

in California's Wilderness Areas, Vol. 2 (pp. 221-2), promotes closing all of the dirt roads from the San Bernardino Mountains to the Colorado River, creating one vast wilderness area. As enticing as this sounds, it would effectively close this region to all but the most hardened desert backpackers. Sorry, five gallons of water and a block of cheese isn't my idea of a good time. Our challenge is to protect these areas while promoting informed access to them. In the absence of sound scientific reasons for closing an area, it must remain open and accessible the public. In SE California, this means open to Jeeps and similar means of off-highway travel. I therefore promote this idea, noting that the NE may require a very different approach to OHV management.

When OHV's neither pollute the air with effluent or noise, and the tracks destroy no more biodiversity than a foot-fall, I will stand in favor of their use on public land[with the similar restrictions to trail-breaking that hiking requires]. Instead of voicing consternation about the lack of access because of these vehicles' short-comings to fellow citizens, perhaps complaining to the manufacturers, for using 100 year old technology that should have banned decades ago, would advance the issue more satisfactorily for the vehicles' users.

I can appreciate the passion on both sides of this debate, but as I've grown older I come down squarely on the side of protection and preservation of the natural world. Off-roaders - you have no idea how violent, intrusive, and damaging your sport is. You are the nature's equivalent of a graffiti artist! I am always thrilled to find myself in a place where there are no sounds of engines or machinery. It's pretty rare these days. Most wildlife will avoid an area with people just walking dogs, let alone wailing two stroke engines. There is less land and resources for wildlife now - there are fewer, smaller places to retreat to. This leads to extinctions. Ecosystems are shrinking, and being dramatically impacted. I think we should keep more than enough of the natural world around because we actually depend on it for sustenance. Instead of tearing the place up, why don't we put some healing on it? Let's move away from activities that don't sustain the best world we've got. Love your Mother!

I am impressed with how many commenters cite an American citizen's "right" to access public lands. It might be helpful to draw a distinction... You do and should have the right to access public lands. But does your machinery qualify as an "American citizen"? I was raised in a culture where consideration of others - of not imposing yourself on others - was a highly regarded personal duty. This means no obnoxious smells, no deafening noises, no torn up landscapes - and no wild chaotic distractions. These are all impositions on others. This might explain why other posters are truly offended by their personal experiences with motorized vehicles in the great outdoors. That said, tread lightly and quietly, if you must.

After the OHVs are gone, the mountain bikers will be next on the agenda, then the equestrians, then the kayakers, then the hikers. In a few years we will have pristine wildernesses, protected from everyone and enjoyed by none. Please don't be fooled...

Please don't judge our community by the minority that you witnessed in your one location among this vast country. There are certain locations that will tend to attract a particular crowd. And yes there is room for improvement in the OHV community. But there is an equal amount of room for improvement in every user group that uses our public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Global Warming is definitely a national and international problem. I have just recently begun to visit national parks in the USA. In 2011, I plan to visit Glacier National Park. From information I received from Glacier NP, the glaciers have receded at an alarming rate. Not only have the glaciers receded, but polar bears are affected also with the global warming. Other wildlife are also affected by global warming. Legislation needs to be passed to deal with global warming.

I think if we don't get a handle on the direction our country and the world is going the matrix will look good. The rich will be living in air conditioned domes or headed to other planets, with the rest of us struggling to survive on a dying planet. Somalia, Darfur and the US Mexico border are the models of our future. We desperately need to rise up and get rid of NeoLiberalism, Regonomics, Supply side, whatever you want to call it. It can be done.

We need to also eliminate fuel resources that are basically outdated (i.e., oil).

Once again people the OHV crowd is not asking for access to the whole national park system. We want to keep the trails we have now. New trails would be nice to have but right now just keeping what we have would be great. As for the original idea. What do you consider plenty of room for the OHV crowd? In the whole state of IL there is not one state owned offroad park. The same can be said for many states. How many thousands of acres are in the state of IL for hikers and horseback riders? Would it not be fair for the state to set aside one thousand acres in Shawnee National Forrest for motorized traffic? I ride horses there and I am sure the land is there to be shared.

Setting aside lands as wilderness was a great idea at a time when we had none and every piece of public land was open for development. However, today we have adequate wilderness and with all the additional set-a-sides for monuments, special use areas, old growth reserves, etc. we do not need more wilderness. Especially now that study after study shows that use of wilderness areas is decreasing at significant rates. What we need is good holistic management of our public lands and resources. People who say we cannot do both have never worked in natural resource management. If they had they would know there are many many different laws and regulations which allow for the protection, management, and withdrawal from access and use for certain non compatible purposes when it can be justified. Setting aside large blocks of land for limited or no access to most of the citizens of the US is extremely selfish by a few elitists. Yes, I do use wilderness areas every year. I also use non-wilderness public lands every year. The difference is access. In the wilderness areas, once I get 1-2 miles from the boundary there are very few people who have the means to get there and use the public lands. The special protections for certain natural features, wildlife, or vegetation can be accomplished with restrictions at certain times of the year, or certain types of vehicles, etc. We have adequate wilderness now! We need good management on the rest.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I disagree. With all the land we have used and continue to use for development, I believe we should set aside both more wilderness and non wilderness land. I have never been able to use wilderness land. Someday, I hope to visit some. The knowledge that it exists gives me piece of mind. This is more true today than ever, with a growing population, oil spills, mountain top strip mining, large mining projects in prestine areas, oil drilling, logging, etc. I don't think I know of one area that isn't under pressure for some kind of development.

I believe with all we have already developed and the pressure for more development on any wild land remaining, most reasonable people would agree more land needs to be preserved. I don't know about you, Cory, but I can drive for hours and see nothing but developed land. Most people that don't want to preserve the land are in the business of exploiting it.

OHVers are quite the special interest group! For every acre set aside for current and future generations to enjoy: we get an acre to do our thing.

should North Face buy you a mountain to climb? Should Evian or AquaFina purchase or build a stream for you to wade through or fish in? Maybe the world doesn't revolve around you? OHV groups would love to share the land. You on the other hand want it all for yourself.

I like the 1 for 1 idea. Because closing areas to OHV uses does not releave the demand for OHV riding areas. When an area is closed to OHV use the demand or use that took place on the now closed area is just transfered to the remaining open areas thus compunding the impact on those areas. Maybe closures should require the agency closing the area to purchase the equivalent numbers of OHV's that used that area thus removing them from the use pool. Or we could all get along and share OUR PUBLIC LANDS.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I cannot believe the moronic reasoning that people give for not wanting OHV's in wilderness areas. Stop acting like OHV owners are irresponsible and would not stay on designated trails, or that their rigs are junk. Those who want to return the land to it's "before there were people" stage do not realize that is impossible. It will never happen! Why? Look at the "wilderness" areas the government now has and cannot police well, or at all. Two Examples: California -- Redwood Forest, marijuana farmers in the middle of this wilderness with wildcat trails and fields of this stuff growing where they have cut down trees. Arizona -- Wilderness Areas along the border -- wildcat trails from smugglers of humans and drugs, five to six feet wide "trails" of trash and human waste from the border to Phoenix -- we now have over 180 miles of wilderness area Americans are warned not to travel in or are kept out because of these illegal aliens, yet they continue to use this land -- what do you think is happening to these areas of fragile desert? I am sure there are stories about OHV abuse, HOWEVER, most MODERN OHV owners are responsible caring citizens, pick up their trash, stay on approved trails, and now have vehicles that are not noisy, smokey, or leak. These OHVs are no different than your huge SUV and travel trailer -- in fact most OHV's have Toy haulers, which have black water tanks, just like your travel trailer, only they cost twice as much. Your giant SUV driving down a small dirt road in the National Park, too large to fit on the road, causes the road to enlarge, then what happens when you meet another dinosaur of your own kind, one of you pulls to the side of the road, breaking baby trees and small plants that hold the soil from eroding. After you leave and it rains, what do you think happens? Talk about hypocrites -- take a look at what you are really doing when you go out there to get away from it all -- what kind of footprint and I don't mean carbon, are you leaving behind?

When I buy any recreational equipment, that doesn't give me the right to demand that the US government provide me with a place to use that equipment. I don't care whether it's a pair of hiking boots, an ATV, or an RV. Federal land managers should look at the capability of the land for different types of recreation, and provide opportunities for those that are consistent with that capability. When any form of recreation exceeds the capacity of the land, it should be cut back. That's been done with hiking for many years as trails have been closed or relocated. It's now being done with OHVs. Limits apply to everybody.

I spend a bunch of time in SE California, where Jeeps and OHVs are the rule. I cringe at the environmental damage I find almost every time out. Unfortunately, we must tolerate this state of affairs in a free society with an inadequate education system. The jerks are going to gain access regardless, so an outright ban on OHV travel on public lands seems misguided. I promote this idea, for discussion at any rate.

We are in dire need of a comprehensive approach to protect wildlife from climate change. Otherwise, our planet will become uninhabitable, not only for wildlife but for human beings as well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What regulations make it difficult to take a child backpacking? Is it the leave no trace which children don't understand and parents unable to enforce? Is it the pack in/pack out that would make it a burden on parents to actually think through what they bring with them so that it can be adequately packed out? While I'd fully support options to increase family participation in the parks, I do hope that the parents do their part to enforce the few rules that are actually there meant for resource and visitor protection.

This isn't about packing out garbage. Here's your list, from Mount St. Helens, where the rules are more extreme than most, but could be a glimpse into the future. 1) It is ILLEGAL to step off the trail. This doesn't mean no cutting switchbacks, it means no stepping off the trail, period. Has anyone ever seen a child hike over 1 mile without wanting to go look at a flower, bug, rock, or need a pottie break? At one visitor center over 70 signs were posted telling people they would get \$100 tickets for stepping off the trail. People must sit in the trail to rest, not on logs or on the side. (I know, I worked there) . I've seen groups sitting in the trail trying to have a picnic! Most of this area is now so grown up in brush and non-native vegetation, the rule is just plain stupid. When I bring my kids here (it's the closest trail to my house), I am constantly saying "don't chase the grasshopper, don't touch the flower, no picking up rocks". 2) The first campsites are 6-9 mile hikes, one way. How many kids can backpack 9 miles, (the first 6 not stepping off the trail). 3)The regulations limit groups to 4 backpackers, so if you have 3 kids, and two parents, you are not allowed. 4) One trail follows a lake shore, which is a few feet away, but kids can only touch the water in two places (mile 1 and mile 3) No, you can't go splash in the water. 5) In the winter, no playing in the snow. 6) And forget about taking kids fishing or huckleberry picking. Visiting Mount St. Helens with children teaches them that they are "bad" by just being normal kids. No wonder kids would rather sit on the couch! Is this what we want the future to be?

My point is: the environmental community must acknowledge there is a "cost" associated with over regulation. Not a monetary cost, but a true negative environmental cost. I know it is counterintuitive-- if you restrict use and don't let people in, nature will flourish and take care of itself. In fact, many think, keeping people out should be the ultimate goal. No people means no campsites, no garbage, no "sanitation" issues, no problems! But this is a naive world view. In reality, people are ultimately in charge, everywhere. If we push recreationists out, we lose PEOPLE WHO CARE. We lose votes, we lose tax support, we lose the next generation of conservationists. It is already happening: Hunting and fishing licenses sales down, Nat. Park visitation down (pre-recession), disconnected youth (eg. Last Child in the Woods). At Mount St. Helens, due to the added restrictions Park designation would bring, there is NO local support for making the Monument a National Park. How much more support for expanded wilderness areas would there be if they simply allowed bicycles? People who watch nature on TV, or are preached at about how "bad" people are, will never care as much as people who actually touch the land. Think about this-- what would America look like today if Teddy Roosevelt was never allowed to hunt, or John Muir was never allowed to hike off the trail?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Second Century Report recommended full and permanent funding for the Historic Preservation Fund - \$150,000,000 annually for State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices to administer the federal preservation programs nationwide, including grants, tax credits, and other programs that work to support private investment in our communities and neighborhoods. With full funding, local preservation commissions, working with city leaders, stand to benefit from a dramatic increase in federal funds to support the programs that make neighborhoods and Main Streets more viable and inviting for people to explore. The Great Outdoors begins as soon as we open our front doors, and in addition to getting people out into parks and trails, we should encourage the stewardship of the public spaces in our communities and protecting the things that make each of our communities unique. By encouraging local stewardship and community engagements, we encourage the stewardship of the federal inventory, as well.

So few natural places still exist in our nation that we need the expansion of our National Parks...and not just those modeled after Zion and Yosemite. We also need space like Hot Springs and the monuments of D.C. We need nationally owned and maintained property that Americans can know will be preserved for generations now and to come as a part of our heritage.

Mount St. Helens Nat. Monument, currently under USFS management, is small and has goofy boundaries. Logistically, if it was transferred to a different agency it would create a red-tape mess of two federal agencies managing and funding different sections of the same roads and trails. Look at most national parks in the west. They are surrounded by Nat. Forest lands, and most access roads to the parks, must first pass through the National Forest. The Park Service has a better supported budget, but they do not "share" with the USFS that must maintain many of the support roads that reach key park areas. This problem hits most Nat. Parks, and should be addressed with cost sharing or some other road-use agreements between agencies. Additionally, the Monument has strong recreational use by key groups (horseback riding, bicycling, hunting, fishing, snowmobile) that are not usually embraced by the Park Service.

Our National Parks are a unique and irreplaceable national treasure that should receive full funding.

Many people have fought to establish our National Parks. Other countries are envious. Of course we should fully fund them and celebrate in a huge way

We need to leave something beside concrete for future generations, this will be our way of preserving earth

When I visit other countries I see how they preserve and protect their natural and historic places, and then compare them with our seeming policy of benign neglect I feel we live in a truly third world country. We can and must do better!

Funding of our National Parks should be a top concern of our Representatives - restore full funding!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The BLM is yet another renegade Government agency. They slap the law in the face. The BLM has taken millions of acres away from America's Wild Horse. Their horrendous management of America's Wild Horse and the BLM's flaunting of the 1971 Wild Free Roaming Horse and Burro Act is staggering. I thought we were a Nation of law? Where is Congress in this? What is the Dept of the Interior doing? Our voices are being ignored, swept aside just like the law. We are no longer a Democracy. We are ruled by special interests. The management of our treasured wild horses is a shining example of our country being taken over by those with money. For whom does the BLM work as demonstrated by their management of America's Wild Horse? Where are the scientific facts that substantiate the BLM's actions towards this now threatened, vulnerable, suffering animal? Threatened, vulnerable and suffering at the hands of the BLM. What is the REAL reason America's Wild Horse is being driven from our public lands? President Obama, Sec'y Salazar and Congress, I demand an answer based on scientific fact. Nothing less than a study done by the National Academy of Sciences will suffice. Public hearings need to be conducted. All actions of the covert BLM need to have sunlight shone on them. Why are these roundups conducted without public observation? The whole thing rather reminds me of the MMS, BP and the destroyed Gulf of Mexico. By the way, speaking of environmental degradation, cattle will degrade our Public Lands horses do not.

I retired from a BLM office in which I worked for 29 years. Only once did I get asked by management to rephrase wording in an environmental assessment to not be so negative. I was only asked. I'm sure there are other offices under pressure from user groups to be less open. The comment seems to put the onus on Obama and Salazar. That's okay, but the comment still needs specific ideas on how to give managers more backbone to do the right thing. There is the Public Lands Foundation into which whistleblowers can blow. Any more ideas?

Housing or business developments must never be considered near our national parks. They infringe on the wildlife habitat. Nor should highways be constructed through the national parks if they do not benefit the park. Routes should be explored outside the national parks. Oil and gas drilling in or near our national parks must stop now. We have seen a national catastrophe with the BP Oil Spill that has affected lives, waters and wildlife. Government cannot and must not give in to the special interest groups such as the gas and oil companies.

We need further funding for park space, especially national and state parks and forests. Future generations are counting on us.

No child is educated enough to be a citizen if he or she has not experienced at least some travel to unfamiliar places. Could we make a class credit, and perhaps even a financial help, for family National park vacations if accompanied by a photo diary; or school guided trips, so that kids can experience the totality of this great country instead of just seeing it on a screen. This would be another advantage of year-round school: a summer semester for seminars on adventures outside the classroom.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our government should STOP letting big companies do whatever they want or should I say do what they want and face no really penalty if they get caught. Take a good look at BP right now. What banalities are they facing? Our own government has yet to file any federal charges or make them totally responsible in any way shape or form. If it was a small to medium business'; they probably would be in jail with outrageous financial penalties hanging over their heads. If our government started passing strong, tough, no loop hole or grandfather clauses; but real honest to goodness Conservation laws - then our government would collect a lot of money for the ones that can afford it and they could use that money toward Conservation programs. Bio Gems is a great resource and A strong, non-profit company that looks out for the Planet, wildlife, the environment, our Oceans, etc. I truly believe that our government can do a whole lot more. Heck, I am fighting to get recycling of Plastic and glass in my town. Plastic which is so highly used and they don't want to be bothered. Think if our Government made the recycling law; my town would have to follow it or pay fines. Which do you think they would do. And if you want a real kick-in-the-teeth - a great family had started their own recycling business and the town shut them down and charged them all kinds of financial fees. They were at the farmer's market every Saturday to take your stuff, pick up once a week at your house, they made a lot of people much more aware and encouraged them to recycle. I still can't believe it. Our family went from using 3 garbage cans a week to at the most 3/4 of a can a week. Big difference. Now if our Government made it Federally Mandatory and everyone started recycling; the money saved and/or could be made. Companies are looking for large loads of stuff to recycle and will pay for the used product and recycle it and make money. See our government could start and/or fund some new recycling companies (either collecting; distribution; recycling; etc.) There are a lot of possibilities and this would greatly help the dumps, wildlife, pest and bugs would decrease, general waste; just to mention a few. I really pray this idea gets off the ground. I see so much potential with little work but a few small changes that will really add up.

This seems like using public funds to help buy private land: too much potential for misuse, loopholes, not following through, etc.

I was neutral and voted "No Opinion" on your idea about third parties, but this seems like a good idea. In fact, while I was writing about the other idea, I was thinking maybe tax breaks would be okay, but giving public funds to private landowners just doesn't seem right.

Economic Development may go with conservation but Federal Transportation dollars are spent were wealthy political influences not only ask for it but can demonstrate a need. The various other items are considered in any environmental public hearing here in Texas. I've been to many of them to stop toll roads and custom designed Federal Highways (toll roads). Nothing has stopped the permits or what the Federal Government and their appointed Regional Mobility Agency (over 35% or more of those voting & seated have a financial stake in building this with 16 elected politicians not even included in this but greatly influenced by big business). Water Conservation, pollutions, climate change, historic losses and NO alternative analysis - even when done for the US, State and Local governments at NO costs - is dismissed. Government will do what they want to no matter what the public would like is my experience.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Please stop putting words in my mouth. Just exactly where do I say: "William Hoffman wants the only human activities allowed in this area to be walking & hiking ---!" What I said is: "There is an off-road vehicle plan, primarily for Cedro Peak, following an extensive two-year hearing process with local residents." Check it out: { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/cibola/travel-management/tm\_sandia/index.shtml." rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } It accommodates many competing uses and interests, especially among local residents who were badly conflicted and fragmented. Several years ago, I had the awesome experience of Bronco four-wheeling in Colorado with my son-in-law and daughter on Medano Pass, northern Sangre de Cristo (Rocky) Mountains, west to the Great Sand Dunes National Park, with an incredible view few will ever experience. Our public lands are just that -- for everyone -- not just someone's private property, with preservation, access and safety paramount for all.

Here is a prime example of doom and gloom irrelevant comments "there are more of us than mice or rats" First show us where your scientific data your using who exactly is counting the rats and mice. Next tell the the significance of humans outnumbering rats and mice. Here is more irrelevant negativity, "We are exceeding the planets carrying capacity" I am not sure where this person lives but I have seen hundreds of billions of EMPTY acres of land all over this world perhaps you need to fire up Google earth and take a look around.

Here it is. For an example, the federal government has paid millions of dollars to build a road so the local lumber company can extract about \$100,000.00 worth of timber. The one I'm referring to took place in the Tongass National Forest. Seems like a giant waste. This is one of the best ideas I've heard.

Here's the key, folks: "a CONTINUOUS supply..." Put that together with securing "favorable conditions of water flows," and it's pretty clear you can't do the high-grade logging of the glory days during the last half of the 20th century. SO - if we are to fulfill the prescription of our forebears AND the rulings of our highest court, we must first repair the damage done from failing to follow the plan, then manage the resource so it can fulfill the plan. Unfortunately, too many people use these "phrase selection" techniques to argue for continuing the unsustainable practices of the past.

I absolutely agree. I lived in Berkeley CA for years and saw view after view destroyed by big buildings - the views given to the owners/renters and taken away from the citizens, on foot or in cars, whose taxes pay for the streets and roads. Sound walls have taken away hundreds of wonderful views, to give sound protection to a view and make sound worse for those a bit farther away. It breaks my heart to see all that wonder removed from the view of people in cars and on foot - what will keep a sense of wonder alive if wonderful views keep disappearing.

I agree that OHVs should have access on roads and designated trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree that smaller ones are also important, but let there be a state-side version of the program that allows states to help prioritize the direction of some federal (and obviously state and local) programs toward conservation activities. I don't think this initiative is about not funding any of our existing investments, its about how to focus some portion of investments on what's most important.... and federal agencies have a huge challenge in working together across agencies and departments so a smaller list of important places - with strong accountability to perform there - has a better chance of breaking down some of those institutional barriers.

I agree that we need fees and federal funds. Donation drives on a needs basis would help also.

I am going to demote just because this is an illustration of the slippery slope of wilderness and similar designations. "Wilderness" is increasingly used as a tactic to keep certain groups of people out, rather than honest effort to preserve areas untouched by man. Be careful what you ask for, you just might get it.

I believe in recycling however I do believe in logging, mining, oil rigs, farming, fishing and other uses of the land that may disagree with.

I believe that existing OHV trail systems should be analyzed, improved, and allowed. Then enforcement of trespassing, trail-blazing, etc. should be ruthless to include the loss of the perpetrator's vehicle - permanently. There is enough room to allow many different uses.

I believe there needs to be many sources of funding for parks and recreations. We currently are using a mixture of all of these: Federal, State and local taxes, business contributions and maintenance of certain areas, local citizens, trusts, restricted government use such as land banks contributions & donations, local citizens fund raising for more anything more than maintenance of our parks and recreational areas. Business provide jobs and have supported teams, pavillions and maintenance here. Business, Government and Local Citizens are doing just fine but like everyone else - yes we'd like more money. However, we choose not to spend more or tax our citizens and businesses for more than we ABSOLUTELY NEED!!! Why would you want to bite your own hand (as a citizen/consumer you'll be paying for any tax hike which will be passed on to you as a price increase) Government & Business make them hit their hand futher out demanding taxes and send most major businesses overseas quicker by higher taxes?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe vehicles should be required to drive no more than 10 miles per hour in wild life areas. I think that vehicles should have there on seperate trails - since animal/bird watching, fishing and other nature activities are near impossible with engine noise anywhere around. Due to the popularity of vehicles I do believe they need more not less trails. However, they would be required to provide the following: A. Pay fees for the use of the trail, B. Provide governmental issued picture id (requiring I be at least 18 years or older) with full \$50,000 or more general liability insurance which would be copied prior to allowing on the trail, C, Have a helmet. D. Sign an agreement with fines, fees and laws that the driver of the vehicle on natural lands agrees to abide by or pay the cost of if violated. E. Be required to return to a designated checkpoint within a matters of hours on the same day. I had to do this just to rent a pedal bike - why should it be any different for a motor vehicle?

I completely agree, I personally know first hand that Nuclear power is safe, reliable, and far more efficient than any other form of energy besides fusion power which Obama recently cancelled any hopes of attaining for the near future. I've worked with nuclear power for a large portion of my life and know just how great it is, and also just how ignorant the general public is due to so little education and so many false rumors. I still don't understand how Obama could intelligently cancel the constellation project knowing just what can be accomplished by it. The project would have mined He3 from the moon to power clean, safe, and reliable fusion power plants. Just one shuttle load is equivalent to billions of gallons of oil. It's the only thing that beats nuclear power in efficiency, and nothing else comes even close to nuclear power! This was Bush's idea too, he also started the research on fuel cell vehicles. People need to quit listening to the Liberal politician's lies! Obama said he wouldn't cancel the constellation project, but he did. He was flat out lying just like Clinton did under oath. The economy didn't start to falter until congress was taken over by Dems and they started passing their laws. It didn't happen when Bush took office like the Dems would like you to believe. Bush didn't take office in 07' Pelosi and Reid took the reins of congress then. Vote for the people that work for you, not the ones that work for themselves.

I guess I don't understand. Most people chose to live in an area that is surrounded by federal land. There must be benefits. Could it be a tranquil setting? No crowds of people? With a gowing population and more pressure for development, some land use rules have to change. If not, eventually won't increased use and development change land use anyway? More land should be preserved. Both as wilderness and as multi use land. Soon the country will be one big suburb.

I have to agree with this. What's the old saying - One bad apple spoils the whole bunch. That goes for any group including non-OHV groups. I don't know why the OHV group was singled out, shouldn't everyone be included?.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I haven't heard anyone say that OHV's should be allowed on every acre of land. All we are asking for is to keep the trail system that is already in place, and not to close more trails. In some areas where there is overcrowding there does need to be a few more trails to lessen the overcrowding. It seems to me that the selfish ones are the environmentalists. They want the land to be used only by hiking, and sometimes for equestrian use. I look at a mountain range every day that is over 120 miles long. There are 3 OHV trails, and many many more hiking trails. That is fine with me, but there is a big push to close one of the trails that was originally made to access a cabin, and lake at the top. This cabin was built by my great grandmother, and the cabin has been there for over 100 years. Hikers have taken over this road, and declared it as theirs. You tell me who is the selfish ones?

I may not be an endangered critter, but I know how much it disrupts my day just to have a big bike or running competition which utilizes the roads and trails near my home for a day or two. It's not just the runners or bikers, it's their support people who clog up areas that cross roads and totally ignore traffic besides doing things like leaving behind trash. I can deal with the irritation, but it absolutely doesn't need to take place in wilderness areas. I can't imagine how bad that could be!

I say the land that is targeted for new parks should be left as wilderness. What upkeep is there for that? There is plenty of land left for development. Most of the country is in private hands. What would be wrong with these large companies that want to develop land doing so on private property. Is the reason they want to do it on federal land because it's alot cheaper for them or because the land that was protected long ago now has the only resorces left. Either way, it's a good arguement for preserving the last of our wild lands for the environment, people, and the other creatures that depend on non developed land to survive.

I see the extremist voters think of this as a pro-OHV idea. It's not. It's a diverse recreation idea. If you don't think there is enough room for diverse recreation activities on public lands, then well, you're an extremist. A few highlights from my weekend enjoying the great outdoors. A downhill mountain bike race, where many hikers were sharing the other trails (open to bikes) without complaint. A trip to a public park with a skatepark and dirt jumps. A scenic drive through a National Park, which despite the road, and traffic is one of the most beautiful places I've been. The bottom line is there are many kinds of "public land". It's not all Wilderness worthy. There is more than enough to spread the wealth among all the recreation activities be it hiking, biking, skateboarding, driving, OHVing, bird watching. Of course we could needlessly restrict everything and make it so boring to get outdoors, that no one would want to, but isn't the point of this to reconnect people to the outdoors?

I strongly disagree with the "fair market value" comment. Spending time in nature is critical for mental/emotional/spiritual health - it is not a "commodity". Private businesses can offer more services if they want to attract people at higher \$\$ rates. KEEP THE GREED MOTIVE OUT OF OUR PUBLIC LANDS. I find it despicable that some parks charge higher fees for "view" or "waterfront" sites. Talk about catering to the wealthy!! This is disgusting and should end immediately on all public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm a year older and a long time runner, and I agree with him. You can run anywhere. We have no need to use wilderness areas for racing events.

I'm not sure what this topic is advocating. I believe we need to preserve more wilderness and multi use land. I'm not an environmental extremist. I just can't stand the thought of our last wild areas being sold off for the quick buck. A growing population and pressure for development mean we either lose what we have or we choose to preserve it.

Instead of putting people's jobs on the line to fund the parks why don't we have a day use fee to fund the park? OHV parks in the mid west and east coast are mostly privately funded so it can be done. We pay upwards of \$50 per day to enjoy the parks we go to. That only gets you in the gate. The park can also make money on concessions and even merchandise. Not every want needs to be a burden on the already overtaxed taxpayer.

It seems that there is a huge divide between those who like OHV use and those who don't. We need to find a way to work together so we can all enjoy our wild spaces. Education, training, and respect are the keys. Towards that end, let's create a new class of driver's license for Off-Road Driving. It could include training in safety, technique and skills, rules of the (off)road, courtesy and respect, and conservation. This was a good idea, too bad it was withdrawn.

It's already in place on a FED level. Whether folks realize it or not all outdoors sporting goods, fishing gear and firearms have an excise tax above and beyond the state and city taxes and have been taxed since the 1930s for this very purpose.

allow sale of yearly passes or monthly use fees for locals and seniors. Keep the revenue from these passes in the areas where they are used. Note that the White Mts charge a parking fee at trailhead accesses and locals can buy a pass if they visit often. User fees are better accepted than taxes. Seniors get a lot for free and can mostly afford to contribute to the parks they use.

Congress cannot be trusted to fund the parks on a long range planning basis. States should help and volunteer orgs can add funding for special projects. Who gets cut first? Parks and recreation! Western states think they can regain the park land by being obstructionate.

tax only if dedicated to park funding or salaries and not subjected to Congressional grasp. I am aware that a small tax exists but a county tax to be used in that county could help people shop locally or choose where their tax would be dedicated by checking a park.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

First you say the vandals are a minority! "...communicate effectively with the vandal minority" Then you say many are respectful and do not return to private property once informed. "Many of the atv riding adults have been respectful. After hearing once that they are on private property, they don't return." Then you say - "However, based on my experience, most of the atv riders are vandals." Do you see the conflict with what you are trying to say? You're dealing with that very small percentage of ALL ATV riders, those that either don't care (minority) or are misinformed (and once informed don't come back). You go from "minority" and "respectful" and then you still can say "...most of the atv riders are vandals"? Credibility disappears with statements that are conflicting.

Let's just think about this one. You seem to think that hikers and hiking trails pose no threat to the environment. Allow hikers in and keep all other trail users out. That seems to be your motto. Let me in and keep everyone else out. This is the main thrust of the "me first" generation. You say you want to preserve our natural environment for future generations. Not my children, but yours. The main culprit to our natural environment is erosion. Trails erode because there is no vegetation growing on the trails. The presence of any type of vegetation with its root structure stops erosion. It is not the means of travel along these trails that causes erosion whether it is the soles of hiking boots, the hoofs of horses or the rubber of off road tires. It is the very presence of the trails themselves that causes erosion. Stop being such a hypocrite or I will personally sue to stop hiking in these areas because of damage to the environment and the destruction of habitat for endangered species. I know that the hiking trails near my home are bulldozed once a year after the rainy season where the soil is ground up and pushed into the ruts only to erode again during the next rainy season. These trails are only used by hikers.

LWCF is oil revenue. LWCF funds have been stolen by Congress for other things. This cripples it's ability to protect threatened farms, forests, riparian corridors and shorelines-especially the Stateside program. BTW-These are voluntary programs-the land owner must be a willing seller. LWCF should be fully funded and it should require 2/3's vote of the House and Senate to remove any oil revenue from it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many National Parks, National Forests, and BLM allow certified volunteer sawyers to operate chainsaws. Certification is usually renewed on a cyclic basis (1-3 years) and the majority are certified for cutting downed trees only (not falling). Certification includes other matters like communication plans (many volunteer groups have their own radios to communicate with park personnel) and evacuation plans. National Parks that allow volunteers to run saws do monitor them very closely, much like their own paid trail staff. The main issue that I know of is how the minimum tool exemption for administrative uses under the Wilderness Act applies to when chainsaws can be used in designated Wilderness areas for things like fire fighting or keeping trails open for firefighters, border patrol officers, and recreational access. While limited use in Wilderness areas is certainly not at issue, no use is (which is the prevailing USFS policy - not the NPS). Trails may stay blocked to access for decades unless a window of use being opened up for chainsaw operations - say a couple weeks each year for a specific trail. No one is trying to upset Wilderness character or change Wilderness law (which allows for this). It is difficult to administrate and access lands without some means to do so. And don't think that Wilderness doesn't need administration throughtout the world. In many ways, it needs more. There are a lot of people in this world (over 8 billion), and they all interact with the outdoors one way or another. If you truly want to protect Wilderness, don't hamstring the management of it.

you are the problem. But really what problem are you talking about? Blaming the US for the worlds pollution and ignoring other countries like China and India who polute more and have virtually no environmental safeguards in place. or The problem of an over politicized and bloated EPA that will not allow truly fuel efficent cars to be built or imported. Plus a governmental structure that takes so much money from oil companies that it is not in the oil companies or the governments interest to make fuel efficent cars. or The problem of letting our own timber rot in the forrests or burn in wildfires every summer. This while we are importing so much timber from Canada that most of the mills in the West have closed up and left entire regions of the rural West as destitute as an inner city.

No, I am talking about the Clinton Era "Roadless" rule areas. There are no wilderness areas in my county, as it was settled thoroughly during the Gold Rush. The rules do indeed prevent maintenance in a roundabout way. Road maintenance in a "roadless" area requires more paperwork. Protests often occur (Is it maintenance or the forbidden "reconstruction"?) These headaches mean road managers can hardly do their job in a roadless area and many give up in frustration. Once the road is unmaintained, then to reuse it you must "reconstruct" incurring the wrath of people who have never seen the area in question.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Nonsense. There are enough roads in National Forest alone to go to the moon and back (several times). No one is stopping you from using those roads that are open - which are in the thousands and thousand of miles. Plus motorized wheelchairs are allowed in many wilderness areas and elsewhere. I am sorry for you physical problems, We don't need to destroy the rest of the country to appease you. So what about the blind, should public lands be fitted with brail inscriptions or audio stations every hundred yards or so? How about those who don't have the physical capacity to scale halfdome in Yosemite, should we put in an escalator? And those who can't climb Mt Rainier, should we helicopter them to the summit? You guys just don't get it. We are running out of Mother Earth. Quit seeing what you want to see and open your eyes (somewhere other than a dirt bike trail).

do you know how they come up with the number of tags they issue the hunters? Overhunting is not a problem. Are you pulling these comments out of a hat or what?

Your opinion is just that an opinion. Calling hunters cowards is childish, and shows that you have no knowledge of the sport of hunting whatsoever. There are over 14 million hunters in the US who add Billions of dollars to state and local economies every year. We pay an extra 11% tax on firearms and ammunition which goes to state fish and game agencies. the money from all the licenses, tags, and use permits we have to purchase also go to wildlife conservation, hunters have done far more for wildlife conservation than any other group.

U are sooo full of non-sense ! We do not want more- more- more- like you say. This is what happens: We have been OHV riding in certain areas for years. Some do- gooder in Congress wants to leave a legacy, so they get behind a Wilderness Bill. This often times wants to apply "Wilderness Designation" to land that already has roads, trails and mines on it. (Shouldn't be "Wilderness") Thus the OHV groups must fight the designation, because it is not true "Wilderness" and shuts down land already in use by OHV'ers. We don't want More-More-More, we just want to keep what we got.

Some of the minimum maintenance roads here in Nebraska are already impassable for any normal cars or trucks

Not sure where you people are seeing all theses problems your crying about I have been recreating all over this great United States and never see these problems and damages your talking about perhaps you can be more specif with your allegations, as I drove thousands of miles to get to my off road destination I see billions of acres of EMPTY lands I have been recreating for more than 45 years and never see all this doom and gloom everybody is beating their war drums over you sound like Al Gore with his "hide the decline" global warming thing that only works when you use LEFTIST tainted science to LIE TO THE GENERAL PUBLIC. The more I read here the more I see that the stuff spewed by the anti off road groups DOES NOT MATCH what is really going on in the real world, just like the global warming LIES that were told for years and years. { <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftVDI8522p0" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Its a shame people have to lie to make their position seem plausible.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

O.K. This thread is all over the Map, so I'll go off on my tangent.... Bottom Line is: Too Many Humans. If birth control requirements to limit over-population, globally, is not established, we are doomed to "destroy the earth" whether from over use, depletion of resources, war over natural resources (Can you spell "Afganistan" ?) etc. There will NEVER be enough cheap energy. Boy, this is off on a tangent, I know ----- and has 'nothing to do with the subject' Riiiiight.

Off-road drivers and riders and pedestrians cannot be equally free or safe on parklands. The off-roaders threaten hikers and ruin the experience with noise and fumes.

Our ancestors literally shed their blood on these fields. Their memory and sacrifice by perserving these lands. We shouldn't bury their memory under parking lots.

Personally, at times I wish that the local lands could be voted on by those living and residing there as to how public lands will be used. Unfortunately, the Federal Government will always have the last and final say - so good luck working with the Feds. Normally, whatever they want they and their corporate interests get!

Rachel, the government will spend several million dollars to build roads so lumber companies can log in an area that will produce \$100,000.00 worth of lumber. Your point is it would be too expensive to pay someone for their property if the land was turned into a national park? I say it would be a worthwhile expense. What I was talking about was not every area needs facilities (park store, full time employees, new roads, etc.). What I've seen in my state is when the federal government creates a national park or forest, the people who have property there stay until they want to sell, then the federal government is given the first shot at buying the property.

Recreation!!? WTF!!? Humans are the most prolific mammal on Earth, now....there are more of us than mice or rats. We are exceeding the planets carrying capacity and you want yet MORE recreation? How about considering these "parks" protected wildlife/wilderness areas and denying humans any access to them whatsoever!

Responding to comment is at the heart of this issue. "This is one of the issues at the root of some of the OHV community's problems in getting organized. Most of us are by nature, not the type of individuals prone to joining groups." Neither were mountain bikers, of which I am one. You OHV users need to put aside your pride and elitism as we bikers have had to do, and realize that the only way that other user groups are going to be willing to discuss terms with you is if they can put a name to a face, so to speak. Get organized and get involved and you MAY in time earn the respect and understanding of other user groups, as we have done. As long as people see you as an un-organized band of noisy, fume-emitting full-helmet-wearing faceless rogues, who roam the public trail systems ripping, widening and rutting multi-use trails, you will be shunned and excluded. I promise you that. Start showing up at trail meetings and trail days to work on building and repairing trails, and people might see you differently. The ball is in your court. We do not have to let you have access to the trails we work on and maintain. If you want to come into the house, you ring the doorbell, you don't break the door down off the hinges and expect the residents to invite you to sit down to dinner.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ross does not say how trees growing or being "harvested" have anything to do with roads and their condition. The conditions of roads is due to how often they are traveled and how well they are maintained. And what does the ESA have to do with road maintenance?? The ESA protects endangered species, not roads. In fact, roads endanger wildlife. Maybe we should just do without them. Or should we just do without wildlife and wilderness? What gives us the right to cull forests anyway or invade wildlife ranges and corridors?

Running in wilderness isn't the smartest thing. Some of the wildlife that live there will see you as prey. We have MANY areas in our country appropriate for competitive events, many are near wilderness. We also don't have that much wilderness left, and when a runner is attacked by a cougar/mountain lion/puma that is only acting naturally, people then want to kill that animal. This isn't the best idea.

Running is already allowed in wilderness areas, and many runners are enjoying it every day. It's only competitive events that are barred, and there is good reason for that. I've seen the impacts left by competitive runners on non-wilderness trails. They run off the trail tread to pass other competitors, leaving trampled vegetation that may take years to recover in alpine or arid country.

in other posts you have said things like 'support your facts' and 'stick to the truth'. Well, I want you to know that I get the drift of your comment about the billions and billions of acres, but there ARE 1.8 billion acres in the US lower 48 and most of that is not government owned. There's railroad land and big timber company land and big ag land and big ranch land and big mining company land. You can drool about driving and camping on that land if you want. You probably didn't see the no trespass signs. Please, go talk with the owners.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is where wrapping yourself in the flag gets us all in trouble. Since you seem to pick on China did you know that this week China closed 2,087 factories because they did not meet environmental standards that they were given to make but made to effort to achieve? Did you know China has committed to plant 1 BILLION trees in an area the size of Ireland to help combat global warming and to help clean their polluted air? True India is a cesspool and very polluting but we still beat them and we have far less people. Putting the countries as a whole aside though you missed the point of the idea and that is that we all share in the destruction of our wildlands and WE ALL need to make lifestyle changes if we want it to survive. True government is in the pockets of big oil and coal but they are not forcing you to drive a gas guzzler or warm your home to 80 degrees in the winter. There are plenty of cars that get over 30 mpg and emit low emissions, I have been driving them for many years now and what is wrong with wearing a heavy sweat shirt around your house and keeping your thermostat set at 68. Responsible harvesting of trees can help forest yes but how often do you see that? Instead you see timber companies go in clear cut old growth, new growth and anything in between until it is completely gone and what is left is eroding top soil that cannot support regrowth in many cases and destroyed wildlife habitat. The point is the choice is yours to make and if you want to see this country return to the beauty it once possessed then you, me, your next door neighbor, your co worker and the guy who bags your groceries have to stop wrapping ourselves in the flag and stop thinking everything america does is right and we all have to make those changes together because the government is either too corrupt or too uncaring to do so for us.

Somehow, though, we need to figure out how to take ACTION when a plant or animal species is endangered. "Incubator" habitats need to be instantly created or something, where reproduction can still occur naturally - as opposed to the last poor gene-bearers of a species waiting for the end to come at a zoo; it's too late at that point! The Blue Karner butterfly for example is endangered. One of the things they need are Wild Lupines - the only plant their caterpillars feed and grow on (just like Monarch Butterfly's larval plant is Milkweeds only). It seems to me that there should be a way for an empowered agency to identify where these Wild Lupines used to exist, to plant a whole bunch of them, and make sure the Blue Karner makes a steady comeback. Then figure out ways to spread this habitat back into places it used to exist. I live in an area where Blue Karners probably existed at one time, so I am going to plant some Wild Lupines in my yard. A drop in the bucket, I know, but it's something! However, continued development (i.e. habitat loss) and suppression of natural fires (trees start taking over areas where the little Lupines grow) means the Karners probably don't stand a fighting chance. We need developments to prevent the loss of habitat (build around nature's envelope) or to replace the habitat as much as possible after the roads and foundations are poured. And probably most difficult of all, the average consumer would have to love nature much more than they love their turf grass, to plant more local native plants where their lawns would "normally" be.

Thanks for a reasonable thoughtful comment. You changed my mind as you are right, runners can run in thousands of other areas. My apologies for my not so well thought out comment. It never hurts to learn.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The damage that livestock cause to wilderness areas is obvious for those who visit. Furthermore, having livestock in those areas creates a mockery of all the other protection legislation: why should hikers not swim in rivers or lakes when a herd of cattle is crapping in them?! There are many other such incongruous examples, so it ends up undermining respect for the land and the laws associated with it. Many others have commented on the subsidized nature of grazing on public lands and that few (sometimes, but not always, wealthy) individuals benefit. Like many other progressive ideas, there is no question that grazing on public lands will end sooner or later. Let's start by phasing it out of wilderness areas. It makes the least sense there.

the funny thing is, I would have voted yes on this idea if the language was different. I'm definitely not opposed to nuclear, but sweeping generalizations about environmentalists and dismissal of solar and wind as potential sources without any evidence to support your claims, I have issues with.

The idea said we must stop compromising with the republicans on drilling.... It's not about Dem vs GOP, or liberal vs conservative, the lands are for ALL to use, that means ALL it does not mean exclude ranchers, miners, oil and gas companies, hunters, ATV/OHV users, it means work out a plan so ALL can use the lands! Hunters and fishermen/women, and all the groups formed by them have done more for land and wildlife conservation than ANY other group has, yet we are the first who the Enviro-whackos want to ban from using the lands!

The individual parks should charge what it takes to maintain themselves well like private parks[e.g. Longwood Gardens in S.E. PA]. Funding should also come from Friends of the Park Associations, especially businesses that depend on the park for their income.

The more land we conserve in the public commons the better. We need to have a national strategy of having as much development as possible be clustered around rail termini in places where people can live, work, shop and recreate within walking distance. Save as much land as possible in as wild a state as possible. Encourage low footprint access and recreation to all. Note that off road vehicles are not low footprint, they destroy the wild character and habitat capacities of our wild places.

The OHV crowd pays user fees. The money we pay should be used to keep the roads open. Our RTP funds need to be used properly.

Over-hunting and climate change is a tremendous problem. I am sure the nra, or any right wing news source, will admit that but it is true. I actually read articles based on science norm and that is where a lot of my comments come from. You should try it sometime, you might actually enjoy it and you might actually learn something.

The population went from 3 billion to 6 billion in a very short time. That is a first. I went to google earth, all the roads looked like a plate of spaghetti. I'm still looking for the billions of acres. You live in your own strange world.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The problem is, there are areas where vast expanses of land are publicly owned. There isn't private land available to support OHV recreation without trailering for miles, or causing excessive demand on a given area. Certainly, encourage private land use, but not by way of eliminating public land use.

The roadless rule stops new roads from being built. It does not eliminate existing roads. The reason the local road has not been maintained is probably because the federal government doesn't have the resources for upkeep on the large amount of roads it has on federal land. It seems to me the solution is to have less roads. Rachel, if you are referring to wilderness, I would avocate that more be designated in areas that have little to no private landowners, roads, etc. Also areas that are already federal land. Like areas in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, etc. I think more land should be preserved, both as wilderness and as multi use land. The only problem with private owners is the current owner may do a wonderful job at taking care of the land, but once the land is sold, someone in the furture may decide to develope it. Not that all development is bad, just that we should preserve the little wild areas we have left.

The time has come to repeal the multiple-use mandate for National Forests and establish a new management policy that favors preservation over exploitation. Since the passing of the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the guiding principle behind National Forest policy has been "to achieve quality land management under the sustainable multiple-use management concept to meet the diverse needs of people." This includes grazing, timber production, hydroelectric dams, landfills, utility corridors, and other invasive activities. While the multiple-use doctrine may be a workable management strategy in some National Forests far from major cities, it is becoming an increasingly unsuccessful and contentious model for National Forests near population centers. The four National Forests in Southern California (Cleveland, San Bernardino, Angeles, Los Padres) are a prime example. These "forests" are different from all the others in the National Forest System because they are almost exclusively used for recreation by a growing population. In addition, these lands are not typically covered by forests at all but by unique shrubland ecosystems, especially chaparral. These shrubland dominated landscapes need to be viewed and managed for what they are: urban parks that provide citizens opportunities to renew their enthusiasm for life as well as land preserves that protect the valuable wildlands found within. By continuing the current forest management model of multiple-use there is a significant danger these lands will be lost by multiple-degradation as they are exploited for a wide range of consumptive uses. We offer an alternative approach in our California Chaparral Preservation Plan. A copy of the Plan can be downloaded here: { <a href="http://www.californiachaparral.org/chappreservationplan.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

The title of this idea smacks of xenophobia, but the description of what's done overseas, at least in Europe anyway, is persuasive. I'm wondering about the logistics: I guess you can present your Driver's License/state issued ID at the counter, but what if you buy a ticket online (can you even do that)? I'm going to have to demote this idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are green conservation areas in my subdivision that preserve some of the land we are required to maintain. Unfortunately the rest of this preservation of land Kirk Manecke (author of this idea) isn't practical, realistic or economically feasible since we have to have buses, cars and at least a 2 way street and 2 exits. Texas, County and local laws requires platts and no by right permitted use options of any land. Based on what you wrote we'd have to have more than 80 acres to have no more than 20 homes with families here. Single Family Dwelling Houses would cost way more than from \$84,000 and up with that much land plus our home owners association dues would be more than \$261 a month - just to maintain that much more land. You forget we have to mow all this area to less than 4 inches to prevent poisonous snakes, lizards, mice, rats, and other dangers that are Governmentally required land useage - reducing fire hazards and dangers to households from animals already. At about \$1,000 per mow - where would you find the extra money from to own a home or maintain it plus how many criminal and civil charges are you willing to pay? Your ideas are totally ILLEGAL where we live and probably in most places for good reasons.

These concessionaires are taking control of our public lands.

This is another example of the power of the almighty dollar. People would be willing to sell one of the last truly wild areas to make the quick buck. I have heard the company proposing this mine is from a foreign country (I think China or Japan). Once this area is gone, it's gone forever. We can look back, just like the tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico, and say "we should have" or "we could have". Do we need to drill and mine in every last valley? Is there no place in already developed areas to mine? It makes me think either these companies save a ton of money going to pristine areas or we have used up all the resources in the developed areas. Either way seems like a good argument to protect the area.

I'll keep to the roads when you keep to the sidewalk. The tread on my tires is rubber, just like the tread of your shoes.

I grew up riding three wheelers and motorcycles. I still snowmobile. I'm not against roads. There are just too many of them. Maybe it's different where you live. I doubt it, though. The amount of roads in national forests is huge. So huge, the government is not able to keep up the maintenance. There is room for OHVs and wilderness, some roads are good. I say preserve more wilderness and mult use land. When OHVs have access to an area, it does degrade the wild character of the area, especially if there are a lot of users. That's why there should be more areas preserved for all types of recreation and for the health of the environment(clean water, clean air, habitat for other creatures that depend on solitude, etc.). I've stated before that most outdoor people making comments here, even though they may have differing opinions, still have more in common than they have not in common.

To find what's motivating these lawsuits, "follow the money" - What an eye-opener , if this is true ! Are the lawyers using the Eco-Groups as their Pawns to get billable hours? Is the government an unlimited source of funds for these lawyers ? Wow !

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"why should that "management" include logging and grazing? How does that serve us or the land?" It creates jobs for the people who live closest to the federal land, whose families lived there before it even became federal land.

"And in return for this fantastic volunteer help, off-road recreationists are first at the table when decisions about where to ride are made. When I hear the off-road vehicle groups have given a million dollars to the Susan G. Komen Foundation (breast cancer), then I'll have my first example that they act in anybody's interests but their own." So now we are going to judge people by how much money they have donated for your cause, you must be a US Congressman or maybe Rod Blagojevich one thing is for sure your part of some sort of self serving good ole boy network, you should be ashamed trying to strong arm people to serve your cause let me guess you keep 65% of the money you collect for breast cancer as a fee or bonus like all other charity's are run. Nice try.

"China closed 2,087 factories because they did not meet environmental standards" Oh wow, those factories would have never been allowed to open in the US. "Did you know China has committed to plant 1 BILLION trees" No I did not know that. How many trees will be planted in the US? The Arbor day foundation says their members planted 8 million trees last year. I would say that was pretty good for a private group. Who knows how many trees the USFS and BLM planted? "The point is the choice is yours to make and if you want to see this country return to the beauty it once possessed" Yes it is my choice to make thank you. I have lived in the Northwest for my entire life except for a couple years in Europe and have never noticed a degradation in the beauty you speak of. What I have noticed is an extreme limitation on the ways that people are allowed to access the outdoors. I drive vehicles that allow me to get the best MPG's in order to suit my needs, I do keep my thermostat below 68 degrees and I heat with a renewable resource (AKA wood). I do all this in the name of being self sufficient and saving money not to worship at the altar of environmentalism. "Responsible harvesting of trees can help forest yes but how often do you see that? Instead you see timber companies go in clear cut old growth, new growth and anything in between until it is completely gone and what is left is eroding top soil that cannot support regrowth in many cases and destroyed wildlife habitat." You are spreading typical environmental lies and disinformation. Where have there been clear cuts on public lands in the last say 20 years? The Forest Service has not allowed clear cuts for years except in very limited circumstances, such as fires or bug infestation. The only clearcuts you see now take place on PRIVATE land. As long as the land owners follow the rules as they are specified there is nothing anyone can do to stop what they are doing on private land. Your environmental emergencies feel fabricated to me.

"I agree, but some recreation should be only allowed in designated areas." Hello! Recreation is only allowed in designated areas already I am not sure what point your trying to make perhaps you can elaborate some.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"The forceful arm of the EPA" That needs to change also,too many times the radical enviros use the EPA in ways it was not intended to be used,to advance their position of no logging, no ATV's/OHV's, no grazing, no fishing, no hunting,no boating,no swimming,no horseback riding,no campfires,no charcoal grills,no hikng except on trails, no mountain bikes, no rock climbing,no hang gliding,no activities at all other than taking pictures,and sniffing the air. The intent of the EPA was to stop industrial pollution,not to stop all human activities.

"We used to do 4 wheel off roading but stopped after seeing all of the damage done by people leaving the established trails. OHV people need to understand that by many of them not obeying the rules in the already established OHV areas, they are shooting themselves in the foot. OHV areas also need to be located away from areas where people go to enjoy nature. Coral Pink Sand Dunes State Park in Utah is a good example of where the OHV activities disturb the enjoyment of the other visitors to the park because they drive fast in areas that are shared by people walking and the noise from the vehicles themselves can be heard all over the area." Tell us or better yet show us all this damage your talking about I would like like to see this, sounds pretty bad and you make it seem wide spread should be easy for you to show us. The "trail damage" if you want to call it "damage" I have seen looks horrific it might make some literally sick to their stomach its so bad, then you zoom out step back and look at the surrounding lands and REALIZE the damage is insignificant compared to what mother earth has been and is currently doing, I have seen areas where trails were all rutted up and the lands were "damaged" then that area was closed, 2 years later you cant even see where the trails are mother earth fixed them but you can still see all the other damage mother earth is still creating, then if you think about it you feel real stupid for closing the trail at least that is what the forestry employees has told me, they feel stupid closing trails and closing lands, step back open your eyes and look at the bigger picture.

Please ! NO 4 wheel vehicles in Parks ... except in very specific areas ! They destroy everything where they are ... Faunas as well as Flora ! Please show us all this destruction. Please define "destruction"

Ahh the slippery slope argument. The big difference is that a bicycle doesn't have a motor. A bicycle is "human-powered", just like canoes, kayaks, hiking poles, skis. No, mountain bikes aren't suitable for every trail in Wilderness, but some trails would be perfect for it. Interesting read about the exclusion of bikes in Wilderness { <a href="http://www.imba.com/sites/default/files/Penn%20State%20Law%20Review%20TS.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Air, Water are public resources that do need to be protect. The "Stake Holders" I understand are the owners of the land only. This writer does mention the Indian tribes and the US/State/Local Governments and there maybe other private land holders. Public hearings with written reports are normally required for any use of land - which is the real reason the writer made this suggestion. Understand that vehicles have and will be allowed in the area - please William Hoffman ---- Instead of insisting that these be removed from all activities allowed on these land. Seems to me William Hoffman wants the only human activities allowed in this area to be walking & hiking ---! We may not always agree with these decisions - but once decisions that have allowed vehicles -are made normally there is little we in the public may do. Greg Denzler Aug 17, 2010

All Federally owned and managed land should be open to public access except where there is a compelling national interest, Exceptions should be made to limit access to military installations or nuclear power sites. Access should include balanced opportunities for use on foot, equestrian and motorized off road vehicles. Hunting should permitted in accordance with state and federal hunting seasons and regulations. The carry and use of firearms should be permuted in accordance with state regulation.

An imbalance and multiplicity are the problems of preservation. Animals and plants are vulnerable to the momentary whims of the recreationist. The open space is used and discarded by repeated intrusions....and the damage is permanent. Once overused, fertile meadows or forests or waterways are damaged beyond repair. To scar it is to lose it., which leaves out motorized vehicles, getting off the path and leaving behind any trace of your presence. Leave it as pristine as you find it is a hard sell to those bringing in anything heavier than a boot or backpack. That speaks for treading lightly on the land. Just look at the places we frequent vs. places which are inaccessible. The evidence speaks for itself.

As the spouse of a Disabled Veteran who is unable to walk without a motor - I do understand. We live in an area of 20 miles per hour or less and have nature with walking/roads near by in a park. Now we have pedal bikes, skaters, skate boarders and those with pets and scooters on our walk ways. Those in New York City New York will spend hours to truly get to a quiet conservation wilderness area as you all are talking about. We understand this - but prefer the economic and social benefits of working/living here. Remember the parks are for the people. I too have picked up trash for over 54 years from the public area. At times I have searched for trash cans to find none. Why? Removing trash costs money - so I end up taking my and others trash many miles away - just so I'm not disturbing or polluting nature.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Bruce hemming Agree 100% The endless lawsuits by radical enviro-nazis,who have contributed nowhere near what hunters and hunting groups have to wildlife conservation,still insists that the wolves are not hurting elk populations. B.S. I have seen it with my own eyes,in NW Montana,wolves have killed elk,and not eaten even a bite out of them,same with mule deer,they have ripped a calf out of a cow elk giving birth,and eaten niether one,just killed the calf,and left the cow to die. Someone on this thread said wolves increase elk populations,more lies,let them come to Montana,or Idaho and see for themselves. More radicalo enviro-nazi news....The Center for Biologic Diversity has filed a petition with the EPA to ban ALL lead ammuniton. Lead shot is banned for waterfowl hunting now,lead fishing sinkers are a thing of the past,and the amount of lead from eating wild game has been proven to be below harmful levels, despite what the CBD says.

Check into what happened in CO along the front range and specifically in Boulder county over this issue. In the 1990s USFS/BLM took exception and told the folks either quit or pay because building a house on an old mining claim is not the intent of the law. Those that chose to pay had to pay current market value for the land they had essentially "squatted" on. Those that quit had to tear down the residence and put it back to original condition.

we live in Utah and right now we're trying to rally everyone to work together to keep decisions about Utah land use in Utah. We all have to work together: OHV riders, mountain bikers and horseback riders alike. We also have groups of OHV users who get together and volunteer their time not only showing up but organizing trail meetings and trail days and we're happy to let you have access to the trails that WE work on and maintain. Let's get together on this stuff! Know that we in the dirt biking community do our part as well. In fact, as I went on the local mountain biking forum I came across a post describing how to sneak into a local area and avoid paying the fees that are used to maintain one of my favorite riding areas! I was shocked. That's not responsible! We all have to do our part. Anyone can point fingers. Let's work together instead and accept the fact that there are good and bad in every group.

With statements such as this, you and other "hikers-only" users show your narrow-minded and selfish attitude towards other user groups. We all need to work together to build a community of responsible trail user groups who respect one another's PRIVILEGE to use public lands for their preferred method of recreation. Excluding and alienating other groups because you don't understand them, or choose not to, based on one or even several bad experiences is not right. People like you should be ashamed of yourself. Once the people who see themselves as entitled to first dibs on trail usage start seeing this issue in a new way, like the rest of us do who are relative new-comers to trail use in this country, we might start making progress towards a common goal of conservation supported by all user groups. By supporting out-dated exclusionary concepts such as yours, you only reinforce the walls that have seperated user groups for decades. This is not the way to promote "grass-roots" conservation efforts. I personally do not believe that ANYONE should be allowed in Wilderness areas, hikers included.

Competitive events have no place in Wilderness. IMHO.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Exotic invasive plant species are able to displace native plants only because those factors that control their spread in their original locales were not transported here with them. The serious problems caused by exotic invasive plants -- well noted in several other previous comments -- need practical, sustainable solutions...not bizarre hypothetical distractions such as your Comment #5.

Enough studies, already....it is clear our activities are exceeding the earth's carrying capacity.

Erosion is a natural process, what do you think made the Grand canyon? There are enough restrictions on OHV/ATV users as there is, those who enjoy these activities should not be banned from using the lands. Some of the lawsuits are absurd, like prohibiting ranchers from using 4 wheel ATV's to herd sheep/cattle on BLM lands, get a grip here, the land have been used for grazing for over a hundred years, now all should change because some enviro- whacko group says so? Excessive runoff from logging roads, or even in the few cases where it is from overuse by ATV's can be stopped, so work to fix that, not to ban certain groups from using the land to enjoy their preferred type of recreation.

Exactly - a perfect illustration of the effects of keeping people out of an area. Multi-use or no-use.

For those of us that are middle class wage earners, this tax incentive is a tremendous incentive to conserve our family forests or farms. Our local land trust has conserved thousands of acres, thanks in part to this tax incentive. Lets make it permanent!

For too many years, too many people have spent too much time watching the shallow local "news" on tv, which portrays an unrealistically awful, violent picture of our communities. Turn off the tv and come outside!

Forest fires do not disappear once they hit thinned areas. If you want to thank anyone in the IAB system, thank the Hot Shots, members of numerous tribes who go headlong into the forest fires and put it out. Their methods may include clearing some brush and trees, as well as setting backfires, but ask any Hot Shot in New Mexico if they think that thinning the forests in Lincoln County would be preferable. Forest fires are a problem, but before you assume that tree thinning would help, or that all the pressure can be put on Tribal Councils (who already have no money-how would they do all this? Simply out of the goodness of their hearts in a system in which they live in abject poverty?), move to a state where forest fires and IAB are actually prevalent, so you understand what happens in those situations.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Geez, if you're worried about not having tax dollars for basic services, perhaps you should let your Congressional reps know they should stop spending A TRILLION DOLLARS (!!!!!!!) on endless wars! With the money we're handing over to the military industrial complex we could have free health care, beautifully managed national parks & forests, free college educations for our children, a healthy Social Security system, and on and on. Our military budget is MORE THAN ALL OTHER COUNTRIES ON THE PLANET COMBINED. Think about what else could be done with that money to benefit all of us.

Get in your car and drive coast to coast using any major interstate and you will see billions and billions of acres of empty land, if you cant make the drive and I suspect you have never done so or you would not be asking us, then fire up google earth, zoom in and follow the interstates from coast to coast billions and billions of acres of empty lands. Have you seen how much land is already in control of the government. { <a href="http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/1749440/posts" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } The population has been growing since the beginning of time its nothing to get all worked up about sooner or later something will come along and greatly reduce the worlds population again its happen many times before, it might not happen on your time table but you seem unhappy about so many things I doubt it really matters.

Give me a break, guys. I'm 67 now, but was a long-distance runner most of my life, including Imogene Pass and Pikes Peak competitions. Have you ever actually run in a trail race? The Imogene Pass run is NOT is wilderness and is run on roads. But picture the hundreds of runners in an almost continuous line for several miles traversing wilderness. Think of the trail damage, and the degradation of the qualities that people seek in wilderness. There is NOTHING stopping you alone or you and some friends to go running in wilderness if that turns you on. You just can't do it as a sanctioned event. And there are thousands of miles of roads and trails OUTSIDE wilderness. So go to it! Run, and quit complaining. It's better for you!

To lay down, give up and let large corporations have all the tax exemptions and subsidies they want is essentially flushing our country down the drain for good. If you look at the countries that were least affected by the economic crash that destroyed us, you will see a pattern. Their politicians don't take money from those companies like ours do. They also have much higher regulations and taxes and WAY more social programs that support their average citizens. Big oil and coal cost the average American more than they benefit us. The top 10 percentile in the world controls something like 90% of the economy. Why is it that the no tax, no regulation and trickle down fantasies have done nothing for us in the last 40 years but create a greater disparity between rich and poor? Why have we continually fallen down the ranks of education and our money is devalued amongst top nations in the world? Taxes on the rich and the corporations MUST be GREATLY used to dig us out of this hole. Our population will not disappear, therefore the demand for those services won't either. Let the rich and the corporations run away and leave. They will lose all the business from the 350+ million people still living here and it will open up the market to new companies who care about the triple bottom line. During the greatest economic times the US has ever seen, taxes were upwards of 90%. Almost everyone was doing well back then. TAX THE TOP, it's the only way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To paraphrase Ben Franklin-If we do not all hang together, than surely we will all hang seperately. Creating division between dirt bikers, atv/utvers, Jeepers, and even mountain bikers opens the door for even more restrictions. Face it, the tree-huggers want everyone out of the forests.

Turning management over to state and local governments is the wrong way to go. They lack the national perspective and don't really appreciate the value of long-term sustainable management of the land. In their hands, "threat of catastrophic wildfire" could become the latest excuse to log off roadless areas and leave them with a spiderweb of roads.

Uninformed support will lead to this re-plumbing of the Glades having more water stored deeply then ever before in history. Even some factions of the local conservation community in So Fla is very concerned over this. Beware when the gov't. comes to you with 20 billion dollars of money saying trust us we are to help. The agencies had to do extra EIS's due to the public exposing serious highwat design safety flaws in the original project that they knew would result in a faulty DANGEROUS Tamiami Trail post construction. Without citizen study of every sentence of a 5 inch thick EIS document the 2 sentences exposing safety issues would not have been discovered which at least led to a safer design not that the project will work for the Glades.

Unlike the "other" I actually own horses nd I dont belive the government should be in the horse business. Even at 200 horses I would hate to think of what the cost to the taxpayers would be.

Us hunters already contribute an 11% tax on firearms and ammunition,you want us to pay even more? We pay our share,besides the tax,we pay for licenses,tags,land use fees,etc. Hunters,fishermen/women and all the hunting and fishing groups like Ducks Unlimited,Whitetails Unlimited,Pheasants Forever,Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, National Wild Turkey Federation, Trout Unlimited,and on and on. These groups,and hunters/fishermen have done more for wildlife conservation than any other group has. Tax the rest of the people who use the land.

Using brownfields, rooftops, parking lots, abandoned shopping centers, etc. for renewable energy is the best idea. These areas can also be used for electric transmission. Energy conservation as the first energy will also help us move in the right direction.

VOTE (DEMOTE) PLEASE &gt; CONSIDER BEFORE VOTING.THE PROCESS IS A BIT SLANTED IN MY OPINION AND CONFUSING. I have visited the area in question and saw the beauty of those who have lived there many many years and love the small town feeling of some communities. This would be interrupted by promoting a monument being constructed in this area. It is costly and will be the ruin of many families homes and solitude. The current times we are living in do not promote still another tax and expense for unnecessary ventures. PLEASE Think before you vote about how you would feel if your home for many years was in jeopardy.

We need to keep open land for all forms of recreation. We will also need to preserve these lands through programs like out Tread Lightly organization.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We're trying. But the truth is that if there is nowhere legal to ride, then those who don't care about the law will ride where they want to. Gates will only keep out the responsible riders. It's really had to promote responsible OHV use if there is nowhere for responsible OHV use.

What if the US joined other countries where the losing party had to pay the legal costs of the winning party. I agree we need checks and balances. Some lawsuits are extreme conservationists who want no multiple use land. Some of these lawsuit have real merit. However, most of them are civil matters about following the money and corporations with sometimes the full knowledge of the government forcing the public to do something - the public really doesn't want in my experience.

Why make everyone pay for something they don't necessarily use? I don't think I want new visitors who may not appreciate the park system simply there to extract their pound of flesh. If you use the park, pay for the park. Otherwise, it just becomes another societal tax because the system can't responsibly manage its resources. Considering the financial crisis that CA is in overall and their state park system specifically (yes, we used to live in Norcal), I wouldn't support this option of funding. I agree, though, with other park plans (really of the very large parks, i.e. Grand Canyon, Yosemite, etc.) that already have public transportation systems to encourage leaving your car parked centrally or at your campsite in favor of other means of getting around.

Yes, rural areas need jobs. One of the problems is growth from people who live in rural areas but work in town. Rural should not mean suburban, but it is quickly becoming that. Further exploitation of the resource base will not solve the problem. Preserving rural space by preventing conversion to homesites is critical and can't be done if we continue the "log and sell" policies of the past few decades. The biggest growth in rural employment I've seen is from tourism, sustainable agriculture, and local markets for rural products from food to crafts. "Growth" is not a solution for rural problems.....unless you consider eliminating the rural areas as a solution.

Yes, Stop privatizing our national parks and forests

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You cannot have your cake and eat it too. Parks are created to preserve a bit of Nature before it is too late..Remember the song"The Big Yellow Taxi" by Joni Mitchell? Do we want to make a parking lot out of our Parks? OHV are damaging to our environment and to the parks. As a Travel Facilitator-Interpreter for foreign visitors for over thirty years, I see the damage caused by reckless visitors and even just the visiting cars and tour buses to the trees along the road. So why even bring more pollution? Here are the words of The Big Yellow Taxi to make you ponder. They paved paradise And put up a parking lot With a pink hotel, a boutique And a swinging hot spot Don't it always seem to go That you don't know what you've got Till it's gone They paved paradise And put up a parking lot They took all the trees Put 'em in a tree museum And they charged the people A dollar and a half just to see 'em Don't it always seem to go That you don't know what you've got Till it's gone They paved paradise And put up a parking lot Hey farmer farmer Put away the D.D.T. now Give me spots on my apples But leave me the birds and the bees Please! Don't it always seem to go That you don't know what you've got Till it's gone They paved paradise And put up a parking lot Late last night I heard my screen door slam And a big yellow taxi Took away my old man Don't it always seem to go That you don't know what you've got Till it's gone They paved paradise And put up a parking lot I said don't it always seem to go That you don't know what you've got Till it's gone They paved paradise And put up a parking lot They paved paradise And put up a parking lot They paved paradise And put up a parking lot

You say that OHV use consumes public land resources more than any other use. This is the myth you use to banish a sport you don't like. In California I pay \$50 every two years to ride my off road motorcycle at public parks, plus I pay an entrance fee each time I visit my park. With over a million OHV users paying into that fund there is a lot of money to maintain our trails. Trails used by hikers in the Bay Area where I live are bulldozed once a year to fill in the ruts caused by the rainy season. The cost of this maintenance is covered by the general fund unlike the cost of similarly maintaining the motorcycle trails also subject to erosion during the rainy season. If you repeat a lie often enough it enters the public discourse and becomes fact, except that it is a false fact. There are many examples of false facts including the ideas that are espoused in this site, specifically that OHVs consume more public resources than other uses. Other examples of false truisms are everywhere these days. Think electric vehicles having no carbon footprint. The lie is that when it is plugged in it has a very heavy carbon footprint considering that nationally one half of our utilities are powered by coal.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It will reduce roads which will reduce access which will further reduce recreational opportunities. It will eliminate thinning, even to reduce fuel loading. The proponents are quick to claim otherwise, but this is the undeniable net effect of 50 years of environmental activism in all our national forests, including those in the Siskiyou. Furthermore, catastrophic wildfire danger is increased by the reduction in road access that I mentioned earlier. The only possible reduction in fire danger comes from the reduction of recreational opportunities that I also mentioned earlier. It will stifle tourism by reducing recreational opportunities (see above) thereby damaging local economy. It will eliminate thinning (see above) thereby damaging the local economy. It will eliminate grazing (just like thinning) making local ranches financially unviable thereby damaging the local economy. By eliminating thinning, the forest will lose its biodiversity by reverting to monoculture brush fields (after fires) or chokingly thick timber (before fires). As evidence, consider that in California, Sierra Pacific Industries has more documented mating pairs of spotted owls on its lands than does the USFS, even though the USFS owns half of all the land in the state. You don't know of which you speak.

Electric and hybrid vehicles SEEM environmentally friendly because we're a step removed from the damage, but a great deal of our electricity still comes from COAL - one of the most environmentally hurtful fuels there is. Nevertheless, public transportation could be more fuel- & emissions-efficient than individual vehicles, and it could cut down on damage done by careless drivers.

This is an excellent idea, how would it be funded is the problem. Then tie it to welfare is not practical, as most on public assistance are from urban areas, most of the parks are in rural areas. The idea is great, just need some more input, and more ideas about how to make this practical, so it can work, and not cost much money from the parks budget.

Wonderful idea. I will also post a sister-idea about noise pollution as well to potentially control flight paths over selected parks. As a current SE Utah resident, you really appreciate the dark skies around Monticello, UT (for example).

When the criminals stop roaming around at night, I will stop leaving outside lights on. The idea of dark skies is a good idea, but it just is not something that will happen. There are some areas with minimal light pollution, and these areas could possibly be used to make a few select areas, that no more lights can be added. The biggest light polluters that I see, and I have travelled the country extensively, are the neon signs that are advertising for businesses. Maybe attempt to enact laws that limit the time these can be on, turn them all off, by 10pm on weeknights, midnight on weekends? I can remember seeing large areas of the Rockies with little to no lights visible at night, and huge areas on the coasts, the best was the Outer banks of NC, years ago, about 80 miles of beach, no city lights visible at all, now you can see maybe half of the stars that you could see back in the late 60's early 70's. While I do somewhat agree with your idea, it just is not very practical.

I would support this if I didn't already see this act get abused and exploited. Too many lawsuits pervert this act with falsified animal studies by groups with alternative motives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The law should be restricted to its intent, which is to help endangered species. To comment on the animal you specifically referenced; I have lived in the upper midwest my entire life - wolves are not endangered here, they have not been endangered here for any portion of my life (I'm still fairly young). The populations here in Northern MN and Northern WI are very, very healthy. Wolves need to be delisted, and would have been long ago if not for the political perversion of the endangered species act. I love and respect wolves, and I see them and their sign constantly. I want them as part of my world, but they do not need the protection of the ESA.

It's vital to keep family camping affordable. Get the concessionaires out of our national forest campgrounds! Rehire USFS employees to manage them. It's distressing to see some forest service campgrounds now costing more than \$25 a night! Get the profit motive out of a nature experience!

Good luck with that! In 2010 urban America, how many of us are fit for labor? Where would you find men who know how to work with pick and shovel? In some states, more than 30% of the population is obese. At Yosemite National Park, I heard, 99% of the tourists never go further than 100 yards from the pavement. Would you waste scarce resources on building materials for lodges to compete with private sector hotels?

I can't advocate building more facilities in many of our National Parks, or even our comparatively sparsely developed National Forests. Don't forget that every new trail or structure comes with the burden and cost of ongoing maintenance. We'd be better off better funding our land management agencies so that they can get a better handle on upkeep of the existing infrastructure. They'd have to hire folks to do the work... I'm not sure we need a government program teaching young men construction skills either. This is not the career field we need to be investing in right now. Where will they work when they go back to the private sector?

let's not forget the whale population in the Arctic Seas, also Polar bear. Another "accident" such as BP's fiasco this summer would destroy the eco-system in the Arctic Seas and lands, as there is no way to clean oil from the ice. There should be no oil and gas drilling in ANWR or in Arctic waters.

As with other issues pertaining to earth's natural resources and wonderlands such as national parks, conservation is the key to saving ourselves by preserving and caring for all the earth. There is little time to waste to turn things around and put the brakes on our rush toward "hell on earth".

Our government needs to take care of domestic concerns, and stop funding foreign businesses, foreign investments, and foreign countries. This would provide the money necessary to care for our National Parks.

the horrendous maintenance backlog in our national parks is a national disgrace. the time has come to fully fund repair of our nation's best idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with #27. I do not want guns in our parks nor OHV's. Even bicycles can do damage in the wrong places. We need to protect the areas around our parks. I was appalled at the changes outside Bryce in just 10 years-Bryce City, what a joke. Just a bunch of tourist traps. I do like the buses though, they help hikers. What about Yellowstone??

The area I live in would be devastated if all of our parks were shut down. Northern CA. Last year we had the threat from Gov. S. of closing the (state) parks down. It is a gorgeous area but very poor. (370 miles north of San Fran) It's dependent on our State and National parks for much of it's income. (tourism) Residents and tourists alike has seen the results of cost cutting. Some of the parks are both State and National, so the cutting is coming from both entities. Some area's were damaged because of lack of manpower to police the area. Please fully fund these treasures. Not only for the "locals" but for the nation to visit and appreciate along with all the international visitors.

It's an embarrassment to visit a National Park and see rotted steps, broken hand rails, trails closed etc. We the people should take better care of some of the most beautiful places in the world, the United States National Parks. Fully fund our Parks.

Until we get the deficit under control, we should not be spending more money on the parks. Visitors should clean up after themselves. Parents can, with a little research, or using park pamphlets teach their own children about the importance of caring for our National treasures. There should be opportunities for tours supplied by private contractors who are supported by fees. It is not possible for all of these functions to be supported by tax dollars when our nation is so massively in debt to China and Saudi Arabia.

I love our national parks, state parks and local parks. We are in a recession and \$13,000,000,000,000 in Debt. How much will this cost and where is the money going to come from each year to pay for it? Government spending needs to decrease for while until we get the debt paid off. Then we can talk responsibly about increases to staff and funding. Is it true that there is currently about a \$10,000,000 backlog on existing park projects? If that's true, we have the cart waaaaayyyyyyy before the horse in talking about expanding our parks and programs. Think Responsibly, Act Responsibly!

This is a good idea, and I would normally support it enthusiastically. But the idea seems to deliberately exclude motorized uses, so I am demoting it. It is not necessary to exclude the public from public land in order to "protect" it.

If Mississippi has 80% wildland remaining to this day, then you better keep hush about it, because it won't stay that way for long!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Petroleum is handy - but it sucks! Back in the old days... It is said you could wade into the Penobscot river and shovel the fish out with a pitchfork! I have heard and read many similar accounts of the natural bounty of our Country. WAKE UP!! These stories tell us what a healthy ecosystem looks like - what our land was like and the Life it is capable of supporting. What we have now is so diminished from what it was. With an growing population and a belief that we can/must constantly expand our economy, Nature is in serious trouble. Not only should we be protecting everything that is remotely worth it - we should be working steadily to return this land to the naturally abundant place that it once was. You need to set aside land, and reduce or eliminate human impacts. It is amazing how nature rebounds when we just get of her back.

I am stunned by some of the comments here... Example: Equating urine with gasoline. Urine is a waste product - but it's sterile, and mostly water. If you had to, you could clean an open wound with it. I appreciate that sooner or later you are "going to take a leak". Go ahead. Spilling even "two ounces" of gasoline in a clear-running healthy stream is a crime against God and Nature. Off-roaders - you so discredit yourselves with the many short-sighted comments you post. And yes - as others have pointed out, s-e-l-f-i-s-h! It's just sad.

When I was growing up in SW Florida Gulfcoast, there were only 3 golf courses in our County, everyone had a boat and used it, fish were plentiful, the water was pristine and full of live shellfish and baitfish and hatchlings. All of the non-developed land was fence free with a noticeable absence of No Trespassings signs. Now there are over 150 golf courses in the same county since they are designated 'Green Areas' and developers use them to meet environmental requirements. Fertilizer runoff from these has killed the entire bottom life of the back bay areas out to 30 miles, everthing on land is fenced off or behind gated walls in the entire county. Almost no one uses their boat anymore because there are no fish to catch that you can eat because of the mercury levels. It is pointless to own an ATV since you can only ride it in your yard. We all need to clean up our own back yards first, plant ten trees for every house including existing ones, then worry about the rest of the planet.

I live in Colorado. This used to be a seven street dirt road town. We could hear and see, coyetes, raccoons, deer, and an occasional badger. It used to be a place where there was very little traffic, no air traffic, and if we wanted more variety in wildlife, we could drive across the road (Now I-76) and be at Bar Lake. However, progress began moving in. Our streets are paved, there's more developement, DIA in which we are in a direct flight path, and most of our wildlife has either been shot, hit by cars, or hopefully, found new, more suitable places to live then around here. Bar Lake is now off limits unless you have a pass. Off roaders have destroyed most of our free space, irreponsable people with gun are out there shooting in the middle of the night. The reason that we moved here is very simple, we enjoyed the peace and quiet. I hate progress and the damage that it so often brings.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live in Nebraska, and have been to all the states west of the Mississippi. Much of that "open space" in the Great Plains is used for agriculture. The pheasant population, for instance, suffered tremendously when thousands of acres of farmland were taken out of CRP programs. Now fields are planted fence post to fence post--even ditches are mown for hay in bad years. Also not all areas are suitable for all animals. I wouldn't want a wolf population or a grizzly population living near Omaha or Fargo or Sacramento. Such sweeping generalizations demonstrate a lack of research and knowledge.

Wildlife are lacking space and they should have more space, especially the Wild Horses that should left to run free and the BLM should stop rounding them up. They are part of our past and should be left alone to run wild and free.

We need to assure that wildlife will survive long after we humans have killed ourselves off with our foolish ways.

this depends on your definition of wildlife. If you include pigeons and rats, or even coyotes (which can live anywhere) then yes there is enough habitat. If you include black bear, moose, elk, etc, then it is a ridiculous claim that there is already enough usable habitat.

"If all you know about wildlife corridors comes from some black-helicopter-private-property-rights-UN-conspiracy type web forum, you might want to check some of those "facts" before you make this kind of argument again" The wildlife corridor map, and the agenda 21 stuff just keep going around the net. A few seconds of research can prove it to be false. The problem with this forum is that at this point it does happen to be dominated by the eco/enviro whackos. ATV/OHV use does not destroy the land as much as most of the commenters claim, A horse does as much damage as an ATV. No one should spill gasoline in a stream, and the majority over 99% off off road vehicle users would not do so. You are just so dead-set against the use of ATV's/OHV's that you just assume all users are lawbreakers, and out to destroy the environment.

Honestly I haven't read all the posts in this war of words, however I like to ski and hike in Northern Wisconsin and the UP of Michigan and have also visited national forests in No. California, Alaska and So. Dakota where I did those things, also canoeing and biking (on old RR trails). It just doesn't work well to have motorized vehicles on paths with non-motorized users. Why? Because part of the thrill for the motorized user is speed. And when you are barreling down a relatively narrow trail at 40-60 mph, it is difficult to avoid crashing into a "pedestrian" unless that person leaps out of the way (which they might know to do because the motorized vehicle is quite loud)--although on some trails the only place to leap to is down a mountain. It is not especially easy on water either, although at least most lakes and rivers have enough clearance to avoid getting smashed into by the powerboat or jetski user. For the same reason I don't ride my bike on the sidewalk.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It simply amazes me when some people can read so much into what is written. I don't see anything of the kind that would have indicated that I was "... you who feels entitled to more than your fair share as well"! If you would take the time to read the Idea you would have noticed things like "I am not suggesting opening all trails up to multi-use ..." In reading your comments "...will the government buy me an OHV vehicle to use at the parks?" - YOU are asking for something in an entitlement way! I am suggesting "... many trails can be adapted or new ones made for multi-use and enjoyed in an environmentally safe way by so many more people rather than single use users." BIG DIFFERENCE THERE! Your comment of "You want full and equal access since you have the means to enjoy it all." Just amazing how you came up with that one! You are way off base. I believe in True Wilderness Areas where there should be no motorized access at all! I get to enjoy the solitude along with everything else the Wilderness Area has to offer. So could you point out to me where I stated I want "FULL" and equal access? I don't think I gave any indication that all trails are created equal. I gave you an example of just one of a few trails I travel on that does give equal access to an area, for everyone that wishes to use it. It's a multi-use trail I use to get to a Pacific Crest Trail head, where I backpack into a Wilderness Area, where there is limited access. The Slickrock Trail is a prime example of a single use trail (Motorcycle only at one time) that was changed to a Multi-use trail now (added Mountain bikes)! I'll differ with you on "...part of our park that is only reasonably accessible to those with high-clearance 4WD vehicles" as well! It has been a couple of years since I was in Moab and things may have changed. But I never saw anywhere that would have fit your statement at all! People backpack in Death Valley and Moab roads and trails are easily more accessible than backpacking in DV! And at least when I was there – hikers were there as well. Here is a statement from the BLM Moab web site – "Other users of the roads--miners, ranchers, riders of pedaled or powered cycles, and hikers--..." But then again perhaps there are some people out there that feel "they are the only ones that are entitled" to be in a certain areas.

I agree with your comments. Off road vehicles must be restricted. Corporations that have grazing rights on public lands should be removed or at least charged more with the fees going into mitigation funds. The family farm needs to make a comeback and corporate farms need to disappear. If this makes our groceries more expensive, so be it. It will be better for the earth and the economy in the long run.

Our semi-arid lands west of the 100th meridian were dominated by grasses that retained their vitality when grazed by bison and other, earlier, native herbivores. In many places these grasslands have been wrecked by years of intensive cattle grazing. Federal lands management should become less about cattle grazing and more about ecosystem restoration.

There is a big difference from a cattle drive and a few people walking off a trail. Mountains are the way they are from rain and erosion. Flat deserts have their flash floods. This sure looks like typical conservation taken way too far.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Perhaps if it could somehow be ensured that motorists would be responsible, then this would be a viable idea. However, it is incredibly difficult to enforce proper use of off-highway vehicles (OHVs)... and, sadly, we cannot depend upon the conscience and common sense of the individual. The mistakes of campers and hikers are damaging to a national park, but not half so much as the mistakes of a motorist. (Not to mention, of course, that even responsible use of motor vehicles only further impairs the environment.)

You had me up until "OHV." I'm sorry, but for all the talk about OHV's being sustainable, they seem to do an amazing job of tearing up the places I've seen them. I'm certainly not against OHV use, but it should be done on private lands where they can charge a reasonable usage fee to build trails that can survive OHVs and to combat the erosion inevitably caused by their use, and where the noise won't disrupt the experience for other users.

How many of you drive electric cars to your trail heads to "get away"? Ill bet most of you have and drive SUV's. Before blasting the OHV crowd look at what you are doing and what you can do to help before condemning the rest of the world. I just returned from the Serras and only seen 5 hikers total in 12 days-they werent more than a mile in off the main highway. I seen 3 of them while on horseback and 2 while 4 wheeling. I covered more than 500 miles in that time in a 4x4-I could have never walked that far in 30 days considering the terrain and elevation changes. I got to see than most will see in a lifetime. I enjoy the outdoors just as all of you do but maybe in a slightly different way-whos to say which way is right? I also picked up 2 bags worth of trash someone left out there.

There is an attempt to control the debate by using misleading language. Looking at this site, the first thing it says is "conservation". There is no mention of "multiple use". "President Obama has launched a national dialogue about conservation in America to learn about some of the smart, creative ways communities are conserving outdoor spaces." I saw a bobcat, a deer, turkeys, grouse, and wild pigs yesterday at Hollister Hills OHV park, while on a 3 hour ride. So obviously the animals are thriving with dirt bikes all around. There are trees, streams, bushes, flowers all around. Yes there are some trails and dirt roads, so what? Making dirt bike parks obviously "conserves" the land! Say goodbye to places like Moab and many others if the radical "wilderness" and "national monuments" legislation go into effect. No mountain biking, horses, SUV's on dirt roads, etc. Only walking/hiking will be allowed on millions of acres of land. Personally, I can only hike about 5-10 miles max in a day and that's pushing it. And I don't really enjoy it, it often feels too much like trudging on a death march. Making places like Moab "walking only" will effectively lock out millions of people since the distances are so vast (hundreds of miles) and since most families can only walk short distances of a mile or two at a time. It's really sad that the radicals want to lock the people out of their land... and that the Obama administration is following their lead, making secret plans.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For me the most critical aspect of trails and roads isn't whether it is for hiking, biking, riding or OHV; it is whether the trail/road is well constructed to avoid damage to the environment. It's far better to have ohv's on well constructed roads and trails than have them making their own tracks straight up the hillside, causing massive eroision. Even the light local ohv traffic in my local area, by local residents is causing major erosion damage on the blm land close to me. Trails need to be well constructed and popular ones need to have rules enforced. It doesn't do much good to have laws in place and have them ignored because they aren't enforced. I'm thinking particularly about damaging short-cuts and users crashing forbidden trails.

Logging of younger trees in Old growth forests makes them much more like their natural state than totally protecting them ever would. Without intrusion by the Park Service and BLM, these so-called Old growth forests would be much more sparce, and healthier than they currently are. Sid Goodloe, a New Mexico rancher, has made great strides at returning portions of his land to its natural state by clearing the younger growth of the region, much as fires would have done in the past if not interfered with my the forest service. He knows what the land used to be like because he was able to locate some very old photos. Through his land management efforts he has seen a much livelier ecosystem emerge and the re-emergence of several species to the area. Many seem to have a false belief that dense, moss-laden, Old growth forests are natural. They are not. Nature would have thinned that land regularly much as the loggers are doing today if left alone. I personally know of many forests where grass no longer grows because the forestation is so thick that it doesn't have a chance. This was not the way it was before we began "protecting" it. Leave this policy alone before we end up screwing things up again like we did with the no-burn policies of the past.

There are many miles of Arkansas rivers that are not able to be developed with ut massive excavation. This is killing our aquatic life at all levels. There needs to be incentive to place this land in conservation easements and not worry about trying to get it in before the current law expires.

The Great Outdoors is impacted by what happens in cities, for example: 1. When you wash your car in the driveway, the toxic dirt from tires, brake pads, engine oil, etc. drain into the storm sewers, which drain directly into the streams and oceans without treatment. 2. Acid rain from coal burning impacts trees and lakes. 3. Smog covers views and damages vegetation. 4. Real estate development replaces what was there before.

Well in 2000 in the domeland wilderness in the Sequioa NF a hiker caused a wildfire that caused 70,000 acres to be burned down. That was nearly 60% of the entire wilderness designated area. That wasn't legal or ethical. So the question of "Why should one user be able to degrade the public land more than another?" is a good one.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Nice idea written on pure emotion their seems to be a trend of these ideas that are just simply someones emotions, feely good ideas, some sort of guilt trip someones feelings has given them now they want others to abandon the good common sense GOD gave them and blindly follow others emotions, how about an idea based on hard verifiable facts. Dont get me wrong I respect your good intentions but as we all know good intentions usually when not carefully thought out and properly executed end up creating all kinds of problems of their own. If their is a shortage of life please show it to me I cant go in any direction more than a few feet without being bombarded with life forms of every kind and every size. Pollution is easy to see and easily verified drive down any road in America and at random stop get out and walk the ditch you cant go more than 20' and not find pollution, the people running our government want to lock up land to preserve it but has not lifted one finger to combat the REAL pollution problem they could easily, efficiently clean up heck we have enough FREE convict labor we could clean every ditch in the USA and recycle all the garbage, we could have a GREATER ecological impact cleaning up our ditches than if we completely locked up every acre of public land, be honest how many people here has went out and picked up garbage in a public area, while were being honest with ourselves when was the last time you tried to teach someone the importance of pickup up trash when they see it.

I am especially concerned about those parkes located in the state of Florida as that is where I live. The restoration work that has been done on the Florida Everglades has been outstanding. But the great work of the Army Corps of Engineers and the South Florida Water Management District is far from complete. We need to continue funding this project until the Everglades is restored to the pristine ecosystem that it once was!

Thus far, the Great Lakes have been promised far more than has been spent. Recently we have seen the reemergence of dead zones in Lake Erie, the shallowest of the lakes, likely a consequence of fertilizer runoff from farm fields. Many cities are having difficulty separating storm and waste sewers in this toxic economy, leaving the lakes' beaches impossible to use after heavy rainfalls. Most of concern are the Asian carp, which are on the doorstep to the Great Lakes now and could easily soon enter the system if we do not disconnect the rivers and canals at Chicago from Lake Michigan. We need to spend the money now to rescue the greatest source of fresh water on this planet and save it from the decimation that would result if Asian carp get through the existing inadequate barriers.

Our nation's wetlands are in critical need of further protection, especially the Great Lakes and even more especially the Everglades, as they minimize flooding damage.

Living in Green Bay, we see the effects of the urban and rural environments on Lake Michigan on a daily basis. The struggle to protect the Lake is fundamental to our life here and to the national interest. Every summer, beaches are closed, rivers browned, invasive species introduced to the Lake. We need urgent action that continues the good work of the Great Lakes consortium of Governors and States and Canada to save the greatest watershed in America.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Even with water crossings, not all cases are equal. In areas with waterways with soft, muddy bottoms and muddy hillsides, motorized crossings can do significant damage, there is little argument to that. But in western areas, most creeks and streams are either coarse gravel, rocks or boulders. I specifically discussed the issue of stream crossings with the federal F&G biologist in charge of endangered bull trout restoration. HIS statements were that, unless ORVs were driving across active spawning beds (rheeds), or were in muddy areas (not much of an issue in this terrain), they posed no harm to the recovery of this endangered species. So, in this case I'd choose to listen to a highly trained professional in this field, rather than uninformed opinions posted on the internet. A (small) number of trails designated by the forest service in my area do cross waterways, and always in rocky areas. R Holloway, do you have any pictures or documentation of ORVers "pouring hazardous waste into water"? I have yet to meet any ORVers that haul their hazardous waste into the backcountry to dump into waterways...perhaps things are different where you are. In all honesty, my on-road vehicle contributes more to water pollution than my ATV. I have a slight oil leak and get the occasional drop of oil on the garage floor, I expect many if not mostmost on-road vehicles are comparable. These contaminates eventually run off into waterways. The seals on my ATV have no such leaks.

For many years the National Parks have been the playground of white America. It is great that a more culturally diverse park system is emerging. This needs to be supported in the expansion plans of the parks. New park space should reflect the diversity of Native Americans and the many immigrant people who have made this country their home. Our rich tapestry is one of the unique identifiers of this country. Our park system can tell that story as no other entity can.

I agree that this is an excellent suggestion. For three years during the 1970s I worked as a crew leader or environmental education staff member for the Youth Conservation Corps. I got to observe and participate in helping teenagers grow in their appreciation for the natural world while developing cooperative abilities and while accomplishing valuable and important conservation projects. Given the backlog of unfunded conservation projects, the critical need for items such as invasive species removal, the high rates of youth unemployment, and the difficulty many recent college graduates and skilled tradespeople have in finding jobs, a reinstatement and dramatic expansion of the YCC would provide tremendous benefits to our nation, in both the short and long term.

I live in a small town in S.C. and this is just the thing I have been looking for. I moved here thinking the job market would be good, living between two large cities. Things are worse! If I could get any information on getting a green space/community garden started in my community I would be forever grateful!! This is what ALL towns, large and small need!!!

When the deer start applying for permits, then we can talk about allowing ATV's in the National Parks, until then: NO!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Citizens of the USA already contribute via the tax system to the upkeep of National Park infrastructure while foreign visitors do not except for the nominal entrance fee that is required. Our National Park system should increase entrance fees for all guests because they are artificially low and introduce a tiered system where citizens are charged one fee that takes into account their contribution as a citizen and a higher fee for foreign guests.

I agree that humans are completely overpopulated and are destroying the planet. I don't agree that it is a right to have as many children as you want. In nature, most offspring die. Humans have removed themselves from nature and made their own rules up resulting in massive overpopulation, a decline in the overall health and well being of our species, and the gradual destruction of our only planet. Drastic steps need to be taken to stop this disastrous progression and to reverse the effects it has had on the Earth. Laws need to be passed to restrict who can breed as well as how many offspring they can have. Mandatory sterilization needs to be put in place. Humane euthanasia must be an option for hopelessly ill individuals. This entire belief system that revolves around human life being sacred and valued above all else needs to change. Humans need to be forced to realize that we are not the end all and be all of the planet. We are but one species on it. We should have no special rights or privileges. We need to be humbled, or our arrogance will be our undoing.

I disagree we need more conservation areas not less. Instead of building suburbs that spread out for miles build up save space, I know people have to have homes and we have to have shopping. The wildlife has to have a home to. Humans are creating a toxic world not only for wildlife but for people to. I can't even drink the tap water in Fairfield Oh it tastes like chlorine which is a known toxic chemical. Find ways to clean the water up without toxic poisons to do it. By using toxins to kill germs and bacteria you are poisoning the population and the wildlife. We need to find non toxic, non harmful to man & animal ways to clean up our water. Man needs to learn from nature how to do this. The Native Americans did it for hundreds of years before money, greed, and selfish humanity ruined it. We need to get back to the basics of what is important and that is life man animal fowl all forms of life,

Of course wildlife are lacking habitat, all man has ever done was to take more and more land away, fence it in and claim it as his own. Have we completely forgotten that this used to be natural wildlife corridors before we arrived? There are better ways of using the land than what we do even though sharing is not a national trait, it would behoove to start realizing that this is one earth for all of us to share and not any one has a greater claim to it than any thing else.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is time to start cleaning up what we and our forefathers disregarded. The air is so bad now that there are hardly any places to breathe freely. Having lived all over the world, in some of the worst allergy climates, I was completely distraught to be diagnosed with asthma at the age of 30 after 10 years "back home"; in the land of the free and the brave I found discrimination and hatred at a level I had not seen anywhere else, the environment is a total example of greed and excess. Since I have lived in Texas the last 30-odd years it simply blows my mind that everyone builds low and flat, no one builds up to conserve land. Utility companies take new land to put new superstructures on, instead of replacing existing poles with more adequate poles. We build roads but few sidewalks and wonder why there are such obesity problems.

Keep in mind that in many cases, landlocked public land is landlocked because the surrounding land was a free or nearly free gift from the public through homesteading, mining grants, etc. While I don't advocate renegeing on the transfers of ownership of those lands, I do feel that the current landowners owe some consideration for the public's interest in the landlocked public property. Possible approaches are 1. Deny grazing or other rights for landlocked public lands to owners of surrounding lands who do not allow public access across their lands. Granting the access doesn't cost the landowners anything substantial, but restores the balance of fairness for public access. 2. Grant property tax relief for land dedicated to public right-of-ways across private land adjacent to public land. The Federal Government would compensate local governments for the loss of revenue that results.

Some people don't mind limiting others use of the land, but have a real hard time thinking there's a place they can't hike into. Wilderness designation should mean no people(except those willing to go in naked with no food water or gear).

I guess we need to ban all handicapped and elderly from our parks. What is wrong with electric off road vehicles. They make very little noise. Their soft rubber tires if driven responsibly would do less damage than a steel shoed 1200 lb. horse or a 1500 lb. moose on the trails. I can't understand the narrow minds that want limit use to only " muscle power " I have a proposal lets limit use to those willing to go in naked with no gear, food, or water. Lets keep our parks pristine and natural. There are thousands of places in the western states where you can hike for days see spectacular country and if you screw up you don't come out. Muscle power, adventure and danger, no people no orv's no trails...TOO SCARY WYATT?

If you truly believe only 5% of the us is wildlife habitat you need to visit AZ., Ut., Nv., Wy., Co., Id., & Mt.. I could take you places in these states where you could walk for days without seeing another human. And this is a good thing in my opinion. If you want to see alot of people just go to a designated primitive area; what a joke. Thats where city folk go to get away from it all. If you want a true wilderness experience go where John doe had to cut off his arm to get out in Utah. That was just one semi remote canyon of thousands that you can die in if you screw up like he did. Or go rafting down Black Canyon on the Gunnison in Co. Its a self rescue canyon. If you don't make it out they won't let anyone go in to look for you. Its a wild ride and a 3,000 ft. plus free climb out if you screw up. Not much fishin done there.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Also, to respond to \_\_\_'s comment above, our school does not teach anti-hunting or fishing; there are actually many activities that discuss population control and responsible use of natural resources.

Get such a kick out of people such as yourself that make statements like "What does that accomplish, except to disgust people like me." When your comments help to throw fuel on the fire! Simple as your comment in item d). When in fact The Wilderness Act clearly states "...no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment..." is there any need for comments when the fact is ATVs and OHVs are already not used in Wilderness Areas? Is it a lack of knowledge or that you wish to create a higher level (as you put it ) disgust?

I think the #3 comment for an exit fee to help fund the national parks is a great idea! If the government also cut its overspending on unnecessary and ineffective programs and advertising, recouped monies from overpayments and owed funds, and simply kept a more stringent control and review of given loans and grants, we would have plenty of money for our parks!

There should be areas for OHVs (and areas without them as well). Presently, there are enough roads in national forests to go around the Earth 17 times. I'm not for closing all the roads, but I don't want to see more roads built into roadless areas. I agree we should protect the land, allow access with some roads, just not have roads everywhere.

I think it refers to wind farms and solar networks with transmission lines on public lands. I don't think this idea was demoting renewable energy.

I agree IF you add National Wildlife Refuges.

I am pretty sure we are ALL part of the public in "PUBLIC LANDS" mentioned. We simply need to control all of the a-holes. Can't we all just get along? The amount of land used by recreation is minimal. In California deserts, it is less than 2% and that is for ALL forms. I am not happy to be disallowed from the 98% but lets be realistic. There is so much land. Lets figure out how not to be the strip

I know a lot of people go to the forest or wilderness to get away from everyone. I do also. I just happen to enjoy riding my dirtbike in those areas. I am quiet and always think about the others around me. I/we try to be part of the solution instead of part of the problem. These problems are evident in society today. It does not matter where you go. I feel many go to these places to get away from a-holes. I am trying to get away from them too. As society becomes overengorged with people and we create more idiots and irresponsible trash flinging slobs, think of this> All of what you do; tailgating, failing to use your turn signals, being a jack ass in a parking lot, littering, is an insult to your fellow man. I challenge any one of you. Stop acting like a martyr or prophet. Let us try and work together to solve these issues. " Can't we all just get along?"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

And there are millions of acres of land never close to a motorized vehicle. Public lands mean just that

Too many parks are noise polluted - city dwellers have forgotten not only what dark skies look like, but also what quite nature sounds like. Buffer zones separating parks from cities, freeways, railroads, and airports are essential!

I believe the above comment is more an issue of badly designed and built trails than horse use. I've been on several trail builds out West where we're trained to build the trail right to last and for heavier animal use as well as route it away from water flows that the damage the trail. I switched my belief long before owning horses when building trails in Utah's naturalist basin, Grand Canyon and lake Tahoe area's.

Short answer is that there are better methods and more flexible machinery than the large equipment you describe. Steep terrain is very accessible with smaller harvest vehicles. (I've done it.) Removing the harvest is, indeed, a consideration. These smaller type operations would not require the fleet of trucks used by larger outfits. In my area a lot of the family forestland owners deck their harvest and then contract with a self-loader. There are too many roads on public land as it is; we should not be building permanent roads, as the BLM and USFS have done for the past few decades, to accomplish a management practice that won't require that kind of access for another 50 to 80 years. The surplus of roads I see in the West has resulted in fragmentation of the landscape in many ways. As late as the 1960s many loggers put in skid roads for a harvest, then ripped and re-planted them. Fifty years later many of those temporary roads make for a nice right-of-way harvest. Building and maintaining permanent roads in these situations is not cost-effective. Unfortunately, timber sales are contested because they are poorly developed. The government too often fails to present the kind of balanced management necessary. The motivation also comes from a distrust of the agencies because of past bad practices. I agree that facts and common sense are often overlooked, and it's my hope that this site will inspire the government to increase theirs.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

I purchased a UTV from Bristers in LA in 2007. bristers.com will re-direct you to their new name, American Sportworks. It's a 13HP Honda on a stout frame with independent suspension, differential lock and, of course, 2WD & 4WD. At the time, it was the most reasonable machine I could find that was designed strictly for work. With a winch and block-and-tackle, I've pulled logs down mountainsides that make San Francisco hills look tame. From a skid road made to match the 50" wheelbase. I have also done testing support for a local company, Barefoot Motors, who have developed electric ATVs for vineyards and orchardists and are soon to come out with a UTV. You can see it in action at { <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YJnGTEv6CQI" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Unfortunately, in my area, in 1-2 years the skid roads are rutted by off-road vehicle traffic, in 3-5 years they're spewing wash-outs down the hillside, and in 10 they are left trashed and unused because they're no fun anymore. During my forestry studies I learned that many old-style skid roads in the northwest were built to be stable and re-planted. My experience with agency roads over the past few decades is that they are put in for convenience first and integration with the landscape a secondary consideration.

"Unmanaged recreation, particularly off-road vehicles, are one of the four great threats to our National Forests." Forest Service Chief Dale Bosworth, March 2004 "Off Road to Ruin", 2001. George Wuetherer's "Thrillcraft." I could name a dozen more publications that contain study after study, photo after photo, showing the destruction from off-road recreation. It is not personal, folks; what we see on the ground is why we are compelled to limit the impact of this form of recreation. "Most people either can't or don't want to backpack." The latest study I've seen (2008) shows hiking as 30% of public land usage, backpacking at nearly 20....and OHV use at 5%.

Thank you for your educational and thoughtful post. The comments I make deal with the forests I am familiar with in the inland northwest, I make no attempt to speak about other areas and conditions. In much of the West, fire was historically the dominant force that shaped our forests. Forests often consisted of widely separated, mature Ponderosa Pine, White Pine and Western Larch (Tamarack). Every few years wildfires, set by lightning and native Americans, would burn through these forests, consuming ground fuels (grass, brush, small trees). Mature trees would typically not be damaged by this type of fire. Since the early 1900's, the forest service's primary response to fire has been suppression. The goal was to put out every fire by 10:00 in the morning the day after it was reported. These efforts were often successful...too much so. Most national forests now are choked with very thick, dense stands. These stands are also species that would typically have been consumed in ground fires. They are generally unhealthy and prone to disease and insect attack. As anyone that spends time in our National Forests knows, many entire mountainsides are covered with dead and dying timber. This fuel load leaves these forests susceptible to a destructive, high intensity crown fire, not the low intensity ground fire historically seen. Careful management, including thinning via logging, can help get these forests back to a more natural and healthier state. Ideally, this would be a state where low intensity ground fire could be used to maintain these forests. This isn't necessarily the solution in all areas, but it's ignorant to rule out properly managed logging as a tool to restore a healthy forest.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In principle, I agree with you. I hate to see the loss of a resource, and the devastation that occurs as a result of the type of wildfire you describe. If the area in question is National Forest, this is a resource for all people and should be protected as you describe. However, if this is National Park or wilderness, I would support leaving it "as is". A "300 year" fire, while intensely destructive to timber, wildlife, habitat and watersheds, will also provide a vital educational experience and provide an area to study as it regenerates...perhaps over the course of centuries. Look at St. Helens for example. While not preventable and therefore not comparable, the resulting destruction has been related to the forces of 2500 Hiroshima-type bombs and obliterated a huge area, extending as far as the eye can see. The level of devastation and recovery time are proving educational, and may be similar to your scenario.

I've seen the same situation you describe in Yellowstone just last weekend. We were on the McGruder Corridor, a primitive road that runs between 2 wilderness areas in central Idaho. At least a third of that road ran through burns, many 20 years old. The vast majority of the trees left were still standing. While there was some natural regeneration taking place, it would seem like the high fuel load of dead, dry timber would put that regeneration at extreme risk should another fire sweep this area. It was pretty depressing seeing these mountains, even in unburned areas entire hillsides were covered with dead and dying timber. As you say, a fire in these conditions is very destructive, burning any organic material out of the soil, and creating massive issues with mud flows and uncontrolled runoff. I'd like to see more of these dead trees harvested for some useful purpose. Heat production and perhaps power generation come to mind. It's questionable if this can be done economically.

While I promoted the idea, and like it, I'm not sure how applicable it is in our Western forests. I strongly agree that fuels reduction efforts are critical, as is replanting with suitable species, not necessarily those that bring the quickest harvest cycle. The difficult part in my area is that the steepness of the terrain requires specialized equipment to harvest. While some areas are suitable for feller buncher operations, or wheeled skidders, most are too steep and require hi-line operations. I don't know that these scale down well to the smaller equipment you anticipate using. Another issue is removal of the harvest from the forest. This typically requires "full sized" logging trucks, with the resulting infrastructure. Did you anticipate anything different here? Our area is investigating biomass utilization. Some fuels currently use logging slash to power their boilers. This is only marginally cost effective as it is, due to the cost of transportation, I'm not sure how your idea impacts that. I like the overall concept and would enjoy discussing implementation.

The other thing I should have brought up is that, in my area, virtually every timber sale is contested in court by some of our well meaning, but often ignorant, environmental organizations. Many fuels reduction efforts have been halted this way. A proper harvest, with replanting with species suitable for the site results in a healthier, less fire prone forest. Yet common sense efforts are being blocked by an emotional response akin to a phobia over a chain saw, rather than by facts and common sense.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

do you have any links to the type of harvesting and transport equipment you're describing, as used on steep hillsides. I'd like to learn more. At some point I hope to have enough timber to justify a harvest on my property. Some I can skid with my tractor or quad, some is just too steep. It'll be a while, currently a root rot infestation is turning my timber into firewood faster than I can keep it cut. Self loaders are common around here, I'd anticipate decking it for one. With regard to skid roads vs permanent roads, they are still common in my area where practical. That would be places a wheeled skidder can traverse. Much of our terrain is too steep, hence the line machines. Helicopter logging is also pretty common around here, especially in areas that are more remote. From what I have seen, skid roads are rarely removed in this area. However, it's sort of a moot point. In 1-2 years they are covered in grasses, 3-5 in brush and in 10 they have pretty well filled in with small trees and Alder. Some areas where roads were obliterated they did more damage with sedimentation and soil disturbance during the obliteration process than the road's existence ever did.

thanks for the information on the Brister UTV. These days there are lots of choices for UTVs in this size range. If you are seriously looking at an electric one, Polaris now has one out. IIRC it has about a 50 mile range. I'd really wonder if any UTV is rugged enough for day to day use as a skidder. I've been pretty impressed with what I can pull with my quad, it's been helpful getting downed timber out of places I can't take the tractor. Just the same, I don't think it would hold up for day-to-day use. Someone really needs to come out with a more useful, universal tool for the small-scale land owner that can be run on hilly terrain. I'd really like to see something like a small wheeled skidder, set up with a cat 1 3-point hitch and a front end loader. Some European tractors are really cool, they have 4 equal sized tires, and a low center of gravity for hillside work. What's really cool is that the operator platform can be turned 180 degrees so you are driving "backwards" with a good look at what your implement is doing. This would be ideal with a snowblower or brush mower. Unfortunately, they don't have much ground clearance, don't come with a FEL and don't have good US distribution.

I'd also add, in most logging areas in my area, a UTV wouldn't be able to traverse the slopes, they would flip over due to the steepness of the terrain. In this country line machines are commonly used. They lift the logs off the ground while bringing them to landings, minimizing as much as possible the ground disturbance. (think Ax Men) . This is done in places too steep to work with a wheeled skidder, which itself can operate on much steeper terrain than a UTV. IMO the bad part of line machine operations (high-lines) is that they are best suited for clearcutting or at least very heavy logging within a given area. It's hard to take just a few scattered trees this way.

I can see some of these people's points. We have literally thousands of miles of trails where motorized use is banned, and that avoids conflict. Perhaps it is time to ban hiking, horse and bicycle use on trails built by and for OHV use, with OHV funds. Since the OP is dealing with funding provided only by OHV use, this perhaps isn't a problem. I would hope we could all be adults and play together, but perhaps that's not so.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have attended park staff talks at all the major nation parks. A few times we have gone to commercial activities. The park staff has always been more interesting and better informed than the commercial offerings. Funding for staff should be expanded and upgraded. It is for all Americans and for the future generations. The best investment possible.

Love this idea except I think that unemployed should receive compensation for their work just like you suggested that the military be "retained".

Overpopulation is a myth. There are huge areas of available land. People just don't want to use it. They all want to cluster around cities. If we stop urban sprawl and instead populate rural communities, a lot of the problems attributed to "overpopulation" will go away.

I'm not a OHVer, but I think quiet OHVs should be allowed on all NF and NP roads. I'd guess you can enjoy nature at speed from a distance and when you stop (to eat and/or camp).

Too confusing. I'm voting no opinion. PS: OHV users are not all lazy. Some couldn't hike if they wanted to.

I'm all for reducing pollution, but not in an effort to reduce global warming. Everyone takes it on faith that the warming is caused by human actions. It is far more likely that such a huge global affect is natural. Yes, we should deal with the fact that the earth is warming, and yes we should reduce pollution, but let's not get bent out of shape thinking that our efforts at cleaning up the environment are going to prevent the inexorable flow of climate change.

I'm not an OHV user (though I'd like to be), but if electric OHVs were used on designated trails I can't see anything wrong with it. Responsible OHVers shouldn't have everything ruined for them by a small group of idiots. Make the penalties for irresponsible use more severe - and enforce them.

I believe they call them off HIGHWAY vehicles now because they are usually responsibly used on park dirt/rock roads. Yeah, they shouldn't stray from those roads, but that's not what you said. Demoting...

OHV use that just tears up an area (the sort that happens in areas like you are describing) is not what is being discussed on this site. These discussions are more to do with OHV use in natural areas. I don't think anyone has a problem with OHVs in areas that have been ruined already (strip mines and the like).

Why don't they open up more land for OHV use -AND- make punishments for irresponsible use of the land more severe? That, it would seem, would make everyone (except the irresponsible idiots) happy.

I'm for responsible quiet OHV use, but only on designated trails. Sharing the trails with hikers and horses is a bad idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We saw dated stands of timber planted by paper companies when we were in Washington state a few years ago. That kind of tree "farming" seems pretty responsible to me. America is far from perfect regarding the environment, but we do a lot right too. Let's just keep working on it and getting better.

From reading this site, I'd agree with you. The responsible OHVers need to tell the idiots how stupid they are being. Unfortunately, I doubt it will have much effect on morons like that. Too bad it ruins it for the responsible OHVers...

Develop electric OHVs and only use designated trails. Make the penalties for irresponsible use more severe - and enforce them.

I'm fairly conservative, but Irene Schmidt makes a good point. We do spend way too much on defense. Being the only remaining superpower, you'd think we could cut back a bit now...

I can demote this idea (already did) because the warming we're experiencing is too large an effect to be anything but natural. We can remove pollution of any kind you want to mention (and we should), but it's not going to stop the warming. We need to get used to the idea and figure out how to deal with it.

Sure - as long as people aren't allowed to sue the gov't when they pick the wrong mushrooms and end up sick or dead...

Well said. My two cents: Some things are too important to put them in harm's way. Harm's way in this case being the vagaries of profit, power grabs and selfish destructive use. Yes, science is currently being made into a villain. Al Gore was perceptive in using the title "An Inconvenient Truth" for his film. Those who are inconvenienced by competent research are fighting back with everything they've got--and some have vast corporate wealth to invest in this. The view among some on the political spectrum is that people must be stopped from listening to anyone who is a scientist, or who works for a university, or who has witnessed the damage being done. Call these dedicated people "elites," and devalue their information before it is taken in by the ordinary folk.

We all have to act responsibly. On most of the dirt roads I travel, it would be foolhardy to exceed 10 or 15 mph most of the time. (Sometimes its 1 or 2 mph!) The problem is that when the roads are closed, no one can enjoy the land because there is no access. I first got excited about exploring the California desert after buying and reading the book "Adventuring in the California Deserts", published about 20 years ago by the Sierra Club(!). Today, about half of the roads listed in that book are no longer open to the public. Let's protect the land, and also allow people to continue to enjoy and appreciate their lands by keeping the existing roads open.

To encourage camping, keep the existing roads open. Allow people to explore and enjoy their lands using the existing roads. Let's protect the land, but keep it accessible.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The BLM has been mismanging our public lands for decades. Foreign corporations such as British Petroleum rule. They are right now removing thousands of wild horses from several states to make way for the Ruby Pipeline. All at taxpayer expense. They allowed the BP Gulf disaster to happen and they are allowing mining and drilling on public lands without environmental studies. They do make money on mining and drilling leases but they are not at fair market value. They are at fees that were set decades ago. When the West was vast and unpopulated. They've blown hundreds of millions of dollars on wild horse and burro "control". They are feeding 38,000 stuck in pens in the Midwest right now. They've emptied lands set aside by Congress for horses and burros of horses and burros. They paid one family over \$12 million dollars to round up horses using helicopters in the last ten years. They lose hundreds of millions annually on the cattle/sheep grazing permit program. Yes, I said LOSE. Large corporations, some foreign owned graze over ten million cows on public land for pennies. Not even close to fair market value. Producing less than 3% of US beef but at a ecological cost and taxpayer cost of billions. Family ranchers hold a small minority of permits. Ted Turner has permits though. He could certainly afford to pay fair market value, ya think? The Myth of the Cowboy and Good Old Boy politics has ruled the BLM for decades. The General Accounting Office (GAO) has documented their excesses and waste but nothing has been done. Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar is a Democrat but has acted like a Reagan/Bush Republican during his time in office. Oh yea, he is a cattle rancher....



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Horses did evolve in North America. This has not been in question look in any textbook on the subject. Horses spread to Asia and Europe via the Bering Sea Land Bridge. Humans came to North America via the same land bridge. Horse bones that have been dated to long before Columbus have been found in North America with spear/knife marks on them. Recently, cliffs in Canada have been found with hundreds of horse bones with tool marks on them below, indicating that early Native Americans drove whole herds off the cliffs to their deaths for food. While climate change may have played a part in the possible extinction of horses in North America, human predation did too. When the Spanish brought horses to our shores in the 1500's they were re-populating them not bringing an invasive species. Regardless they've been here 500 years which is far longer than most of our ancestors..... The Bureau of Land Management has been in the horse business for thirty years. They have spent hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. They have 38,000 horses in pens in the Mid West right now. More than on the range. There are tens of millions of cattle on our public lands in the West and about 30,000 horses. Do the math, cattle are destroying the ecosystem, not horses. There are scientific studies that prove this yet the BLM persists in removing horses spending hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars in the process. The BLM grazing permit program loses over \$100 million annually. Most permit holders are large corporations not family ranchers producing less than 3% of our beef. Foreign owned mining and drilling corporations are raping our public lands as well. British Petroleum is part of the Ruby Pipeline going through several states and thousands of horses are being rounded up this summer to make way. Horses with nowhere to go but feedlots in the Midwest costing the taxpayers millions to feed as they stand nose to tail in misery. Madeline Pickens has proposed to buy land for a sanctuary with her own money and donations not taxpayer money. She has proposed to take all of the horses now in pens. She has asked the BLM for grazing leases surrounding the sanctuary to pay for horses grazing instead of cattle and they have refused. They have refused all offers from all groups to have grazing leases to let them go to wildlife or horses. The BLM is lying in the first place about them being over populated. There are only about 150 mustangs in all of Montana. How can that be over populated? Look on a map. Lands set aside for mustangs by Congress in 1971 are being emptied out. The BLM is zeroing out whole herds all over the West. Colorado is close to losing every mustang. There is no cost to leaving them be. It would be a huge savings and if the BLM spent a few million on parking and signage and advertising tourists would come by the thousand to try to see a wild horse. American Mustangs are fantastic riding horses that are very trainable and very healthy, their feet and legs are far healthier than modern horses. There are multiple groups and programs working to get some trained and adopted but the horse market is terrible now due to over breeding by pros and back yard breeders. Slaughter was a dirty little secret for many professional breeders and now that it has been stopped breeders must cut back. Mustangs should not be caught in the crossfire. We should be advertising these healthy hardy horses to the world not treating them like worthless plugs. They are just as much a symbol of America as the bald eagle and the bison.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

FYI Madeline Pickens is a long time horse owner. She isn't some do gooder with no clue. Her former husband was Allen Poulson and together they bred and raced some of the top Thoroughbreds of the last twenty years such as Cigar, Azeri and Rock Hard Ten. She has a website and a Facebook page detailing her plans for a mustang sanctuary and is taken seriously by everyone but the BLM.....

There is no comparison between the population of white tailed deer in the East and wild horses in the West. There are 30,000 horses left according to the BLM covering a far larger area. (Oregon, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, California, Utah, Arizona) Pennsylvania alone issues more than 100,000 deer tags (hunting permits) annually. 150 horses in all of Montana. In the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Refuge. That's it.

54 Congressional Representatives sent a letter to the BLM in July of this year asking them to stop the round ups but they were ignored. The BLM insists they are "saving" the horses and they have convinced many including Congress, the Senate and several Presidents that this is true. There are about 150 mustangs in all of Montana. Look on a map and see that saying they are over populated is ridiculous.

Please fully fund these National Treasures!!!!!!

The BLM is a rogue agency that is managing OUR wild horses and burros on OUR public lands into extinction in order to pander to special interests in their incessant land grab of rangelands designated by law to our wild equines as stated in the 1971 Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act. The BLM refuses to be transparent, they lie about EVERYTHING to justify this shameful equicide, they waste taxpayers' money, they break one law after the other and they apparently answer to NO ONE and all the while the will of the American people to preserve these national treasures is completely ignored. THIS MUST STOP NOW! It is time to clean house!

This opportunity needs to be available to all of the nation's K - 12 students, not just title 1 schools. This may also provide a good opportunity for the private sector to help with the funding of the TRT salaries. The more people that have a vested interest in the education of our children the better.

I am strongly opposed to the government closing more federal lands to multiple use and even more against the government purchasing more private lands. Wilderness type of lands are nonproductive lands and with the economy so bad these days it would be the wrong thing to do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

National parks are supposed to be natural, they are supposed to rot and burn, and can always be used as a bad example, in my opinion. The same problem exists on National Forests, where something like 50 million acres are at high risk of conflagration. These areas should and could be salvaged. In some cases, trees can be salvaged even after a fire. However, the Forest Service has a system that delays salvage for at least a year, when most of the timber is spoiled. Areas that are heavy to standing dead timber create a huge risk of fire, and these are not nature's groovy way of rejuvenating the forest. Take a look at Yellowstone on Google earth, and after more than 20 years (I'm not sure how current the photos are) you can still see vast areas of gray ash with dead trees. The fires have sterilized the soil and killed the seeds. Logging in these areas is far more controllable, allows much of the carbon to be sequestered, can leave buffers along streams and critical wildlife habitat, and creates income that can be used for replanting and other conservation efforts. These are all things the fire will not do. Meanwhile we import wood from places like Russia and South America. Wood is good. Think globally, act locally.

It is my understanding that the USDA is planning cruel and inhumane wolf killing tactics such as gassing wolf cubs in their dens and shooting them from helicopters. Such behavior is unconscionable, scientifically unsound, and an outrageous use of Americans' tax money to attack and destroy our wildlife heritage. The USDA needs to support methods of constructive interaction between wolves and human interests rather than cruelly exterminating wolves, which as other posters here have noted, just harms the entire ecosystem.

I know it's already said in those many comments, but let me say it one more: OHV, and enjoying nature does not go together. Motorized recreation is NOT healthy, walking is!

I too, have never seen any ATV, dirt bike, jetski, or snowmobile that was quiet enough to not disturb any wildlife around. For those who cannot hike, or use a bicycle to travel on trails, most can walk or use a golf cart. For me, it would *\*have\** to be a golf cart, since I'm no longer able to hike very far at all. RV parks would be great, and you can bring along your bicycle or golf cart. ATVs, dirt bikes, motorcycles, and snowmobiles are not only loud and intrusive, but they do so much damage that it does take years to ever resemble what it was before they were introduced. Golf carts also use rechargeable batteries, are quiet, yet allow one to get around in many areas, IF there are trails. I do agree there should be areas set aside for those who enjoy those hobbies, but it should not be where it would drive off the wildlife, or others who wish peace and quiet. Noise should also be limited to no loud music, etc. Sadly, most people cannot be inside a home anymore without having the tv or radio on. What ever happened to plain old conversation? Don't interrupt the show until time for advertisements. Everyone in natural lands needs to be aware of not leaving a footprint, e.g. no trash thrown out (carry a bag with you), have enough Park personnel to maintain quiet areas, versus areas where motorized vehicles are used.

Of course, but it is difficult to impose this on private lands. How could we protect the old growth on private land?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I support the idea of this park, but I agree - the Eastern US needs more public lands - particularly more old growth forests. Please see my idea for an Old-Growth Forest Network (America's Next Idea) that would preserve a forest in every county where forests can grow. This is not either/or. Let's do both of these!

thank you for your support. I have read up on actual ancient forests and I have been in many of them. Unfortunately I have to drive very long distances to visit various old-growth forests. In most cases the reason they are so scarce is LOGGING and not fire. Currently less than 5% of our forests are old-growth, and in the east that figure is around 0.2%. These figures were much higher before industrial logging. Different forest types have different levels of susceptibility to fire. I realize that "protecting" a forest on paper does not mean that fire, or insects, or wind are no longer a threat; but it does improve the odds that the forest will attain or keep its ancient old growth status.

This is a really good idea! The broadest threats to biodiversity are now (1) invasive weeds together with (2) overbrowsing by deer and their relatives. There are many local threats to biodiversity -- local losses of habitat -- which are important. What has now emerged are the two broad threats that cross property lines and cross roads -- that are slowly destroying the possibilities to grow forests in much of the US. People who work for solutions will be doing a great service for sustaining nature in the US. Governments have been absurdly slow to react because the problem is not sudden. It emerges over months and years, and can be stopped only in its early stages.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Ok, hello: everyone is hopping mad at everyone else. What does that accomplish, except to disgust people like me. Here's what I think: a) Wildlife corridors are essential to maintain a healthy gene pool in the species now contained in National Park areas, and to ensure the safe migration of myriad species who do not know about "boundaries". They deserve safe passage, and don't deserve to run amok of trophy-hunters outside of the protected boxes we've stuffed them in. b) MORE wild land needs to be kept from development, the petroleum and mineral industries' greed, and from rampant hunting. (Sorry, boys; telescopic point & kill ain't my idea of a reasonable relationship with our wild companions -- unless you can't afford to buy your protein sources at the local Piggly-Wiggly. How about spending that money on groceries instead of buying an assault weapon and bullets?) c) Where on earth does our arrogant species get this idea that the whole world is here for our benefit alone, and thus is exploitable at our whim? We call everything we want a "resource", and what we don't want (e.g. which is inconvenient for promoting our enjoyment, profit, or "progress") we eliminate, like the Wolf. Frankly, I look upon humans as a sort of noxious, rapidly-increasing, bacterial growth that is strangling all in its path. d) ATVs and OHVs do not belong in wilderness areas. Period. They make a helluva lot of intrusive noise; they smell terrible and pollute with their emissions; they mash down plants and destroy delicate ecosystems. Trust me: our local ATV/ORV/Snowmobile Club members destroyed a large part of a small meadow we own. They got disinvented. E) GUNS DO NOT EVER, EVER, BELONG IN NATIONAL PARKS. Why do gun-owners want to take guns into the parks in the first place? I question their motives. Forget it; leave the Kalishnikov at home. Firearms in national parks are completely unnecessary, dangerous, and inappropriate. If you're worried about a face-off with a Grizzly then walk in Grizzly-free territories; guess who was there first anyway? IT'S THEIR HOME. As a life-long NON-gun-owner I do not want to even walk past a gun-totin' visitor and you know what? I have my rights, too. My tax dollars help pay for the Parks. F) The beautiful National Park in my state provides low-impact, "green", bus service to enable visitors to see the Park without driving their cars through it. I applaud this, and urge more services like ours in all wilderness areas, and State and National Parks. G) Parks need more funding. Park rangers and conservation officials need higher salaries. Their numbers should be increased. More must be provided by the feds for the upkeep and maintenance of park facilities (trails, bridges, shelters, et cetera), and interesting educational opps should be provided for the public. They ought to -- they deserve to -- know about, and learn to respect, the ecologies and wildlife they are visiting. Oh -- and p.s. -- I do not live on +/-1200 acres of selfishly-guarded private land, nor do I have a "redwood-lined" study. Nope; I live a desperately frugal life on 2.3 acres, in an old house that lets the wint'ry winds in. But I do drive a car that gets 32mpg and I love Mother Earth.

In Washington designated "forestland" gets a huge property tax break, with the property tax bill for 1,000 acres of timberland about the same as a medium sized home. This tax break is in place because forestland has public benefits, including outdoor recreational access. Since this tax break was put in place, many large timberland landowners have closed their land to recreation, even charging a fee. These type of property tax breaks should be reduced if private landowners insist on keeping the public out. The resulting revenue could be dedicated to providing recreation on public land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

biodiversity in the Ancient Forest National Park Proposal is considered to be a 10. Also, scenic resources and recreational opportunities are a 10. Water and air quality in the proposal are also a 10. I support an old growth forest network, but ancient forests take hundreds of years to grow.

...and what on earth is the evidence for "renewable energy may do extreme harm to our public lands and wildlife?" This I can assure you of: global warming will do extreme harm to our public lands and wildlife.

I agree that there should be some public lands where ATV enthusiasts can do their thing--it's their land, too, and hey, it's fun! However, the thing that people proposing 1:1 and similar solutions forget is that the noise of those vehicles spreads far beyond the actual space they use. You can be miles away from the fumes and the erosion, and still not be able to have a quiet outdoors experience when OHV's are active, especially in natural areas with large bodies of water, where sounds travel farther. For those who go to public lands for quiet relaxation in a natural setting, a nearby OHV trail can completely ruin a camping, fishing, hunting, or nature-watching trip, even if they never come across a vehicle in person.

As a non-hunting hiker, I give a big thumbs-up to this idea. I've often felt hunters and anglers put us backpackers to shame on the "put your money where your mouth is" front! Most wildlife enthusiasts I know voluntarily donate to conservation organizations, but I doubt the average casual weekend backpacker is putting up %11 of what they paid for their boots, tent, pack, and camp stove. (should be aware that most tent-camping and hiking gear not related to hunting or fishing isn't included in current federal excise tax programs.) Granted, some hikers aren't going to use their gear on public land. Well, some hunters belong to private hunt clubs, and some anglers fish on private property, but they're still paying the excise taxes on their gear.

Work for renewable energy sources, beneath it all, because if we can't get off coal plants, our natural places will be destroyed along with our lungs and general health. The coal plants have nearly destroyed the Great Smokey Mountain National Park. We need a national energy policy that includes an huge tax for producing carbon dioxide! Please read up and contact your legislator. Everyone's afraid for their re-election in November and don't want to LEAD in this direction, but we need to show them we're all serious about a clean energy future! Thanks, Dina Nash, Little Rock Sierra Club and Ozarks Society Mbr.

You should not group all user groups into such a bad category. I recreate off-highway, and make sure to clean up after myself and others when needed. I follow the tread lightly of leave no trace that I was there. Can others say that? Not always. I have helped on many OHV trail cleanups, and not once have I seen someone from the Sierra Club or other group that wants to close the trails present. If they think we are such bad people, they should come out and meet us in the fresh air and on a trail cleanup to see how nice we really are, and how we respect the environment for the natural beauty that it provides us and others. Public lands are here for all to use, no matter how you recreate on them. If you use motorized recreation, it needs to be done responsibly all the time.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

wrote that no one had ever actually suggested opening up vulnerable areas to OHV use, but that is not true. I just found a bill currently pending in the Michigan legislature that would allow persons who are 60 years old or disabled to ride OHVs anywhere on state-owned land -- on or off trails -- specifically including areas where nursery planting stock is being grown, dedicated natural areas, and other environmentally sensitive areas. Under that bill, so long as you were at least 60 years old or disabled, you could ride an off-road vehicle anywhere on state-owned land, on or off the trail, apparently without regard to the consequences: { <a href="http://www.legislature.mi.gov/documents/2009-2010/billanalysis/House/pdf/2009-HLA-4411-1.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I am sympathetic to people who have physical limitations, but some places should be off limits to motorized vehicles. Apparently, some politicians think otherwise, influenced, no doubt, by vocal OHV enthusiasts.

At the very least, the federal government should prohibit children under the age of 16 from driving ATVs on public land because that practice is simply too dangerous according to the American Academy of Pediatrics and other medical, safety, and health groups. Pediatricians and neurosurgeons who have to deal with the deaths and the brain and spinal cord injuries to children on a regular basis want to see this practice stopped. Young children do not have the physical or mental abilities needed to safely drive these vehicles. The federal government should take the lead by banning this dangerous practice on federal lands since the Consumer Products Safety Commission and other agencies are well of the risks.

Strenuous, perhaps, but very dangerous for children under age 16. Nothing so dangerous (killing or injuring over 40,000 children every year) deserves the "family friendly" label. Family friendly should be reserved for activities kids can do with their families without such a high risk of injury.

Haven't people read about the horrible off-road accident that just occurred in the Mohave desert on federal lands? A off-road truck driver killed 8 people and injured dozens of others when he lost control of his vehicle. So there are major safety as well as environmental issues involved with this sort of thing. It is already allowed in some places, and rather than being expanded, a moratorium should be placed on all racing events on public land while the safety and environmental issues are studied. Perhaps someone could propose this as an idea here?



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Me, My family, My Club and friends operate OHV's and ATV's on Federal Land in California. Every able member of my family is certified by the ATV Safety Institute and we are truly stewards of the land.... land that you simply cannot access without an OHV! And I say, Unbelievable! I can't believe that a group of people (like those leaning here) would want to pull down an entire industry and recreation activity by "Banning OHV use on federal lands". Last month, on my ATV, sitting atop a dune on federal land, I started up a conversation with a man parked next to me. After a bit, I learned that he was from Oregon where he did a lot of trail riding. He then showed me a scar across his shoulder and told me of his injuries from a Steel Piano Wire that was strung across the trail between two pine trees, each containing carved text stating "Tree Hugger". The wire pulled him off of his bike ultimately causing extensive damage to him and his bike. No question about it, his tall height saved his life, as the wire was placed at height to hit someone in the neck... and take their head off! He was on Federal Land, on an open and legal riding trail. I was blown away! I had never heard of that kind of thinking! I see now what actions these kinds of discussions spawn. Not cool folks!

So you want to isolate your MC sport from others OHV users? This, at a time when Off Road Enthusiats needs to unite? No thanks!

Where in America is there land still available for animals? I highly doubt there is any land in America that has not been spoken for, owned by individuals, corporations, federal, state, and local governments. Wildlife knows no boundaries. This is evident as we read news accounts of more frequent interactions between bears and people. Usually, these interactions result in the relocation of the bear and many times, the death of the bear. Some will have you believe this is happening because there are too many animals and therefore, they should be culled usually by hunting. The real reason, I believe, is because there is not enough land for wildlife and it is not contiguous to support their roaming patterns. In my mind, we need more land for conservation of wildlife.

Here we go folks more proof the environmentalist that want to keep everybody and everything OFF Public Lands just dont know what they are talking about. This is why I keep insisting you deal with FACTS and not their emotional driven ideas that never never backed up with FACT Speaking of health and OHV recreation, a new study coming out of Canada was just released on August 26th. We all know how strenuous OHV recreation is, but this study, conducted by York University, proves this very point. If you would like to learn more details about this study, please read the ATV/ORM Health Benefit Study Fact Sheet. Here is a link to the FACT SHEET -----&gt; { <a href="http://www.arra-access.com/site/DocServer/2010\_ATV ORM\_Health\_Benefit\_Fact\_Sheet2.pdf?docID=321" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Light shields to direct light where it is needed rather than up in the sky and over to my property should be mandatory. This simple idea to keep light where it's needed and on the property that benefits rather than all over the place shouldn't cost much. Conserve light, energy and be considerate of your neighborhood which includes the whole globe when it comes to putting light just where it's needed.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our natural beauty should be protected at all costs. People who say that Global Warming is not happening are hiding their head in the sand. If something isn't done soon we can lose all the beautiful places in this country.

We have a unique opportunity to use the 150th Anniversary of the Civil War and the attention it will draw to make a difference probably for the last time to preserve the battlefields of that conflict. Whether it is to support increasing land preservation or fighting to keep urban sprawl and traffic from interfering with tourists visiting those hallowed grounds (i.e. Walmart at Wilderness or Casinos at Gettysburg to name a few.) Mr. President, please support any efforts to at least maintain current funding for preservation and the National Park system if not increasing those budget items. Even taking 1% of what you are attempting to save in Defense spending and putting towards these efforts can help. If it was important enough to the veterans of the Civil War to work together North and South to preserve the battlefields of that conflict, its the least we can do and the current generation to do the same.

Exercise of the body rather than the fingers and thumbs on video controllers is a great idea and we are nation of obese people - but Off Road Vehicles and killing animals don't strike me as either a very Green or compassionate way of solving the problem. Get people off their butts and out into the great outdoors yes, but not to destroy the soil, plants and the wildlife. What is it with our attitude? I don't understand the destructive needs of people to show their power and superiority with bigger louder machines and guns killing small creatures. Go run off the excess macho energy.

I wonder what effect all this light pollution has on night time creatures such as owls trying to hunt and who need the dark to be just that - dark? I cannot imagine it can be a help to them. I totally agree that lights are polluting. Like grey noise. Imagine if cars were all electric - how peaceful it would be.

There are enough wilderness areas now. Closed lands are not public, they are just that closed. Responsible management is the answer. To many people will never be able to see some area's of this great country because there is no access. Education is a better answer. Tread lightly.

Nonsense. Roads and motorized vehicles kill the wild. Check the science.

One only has to look at the successful rebuilding efforts in New Orleans to understand the difference between government initiatives, however well intentioned, and the better model: community based non-profits who can channel funds where they are most needed to do the most good for people who live in the region.

How do we trespass on public land?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wildlife ARE lacking habitat. This author's ideas of open space must be corn fields, soybean fields, and wheat fields. Approximately 2.5% of the lower 48 contiguous states are designated as wilderness. And unless you go to a zoo, you will find that different species live in different areas, requiring protected land sprinkled across the globe. Leading biologists estimate that we need to protect vastly more area from development than we are currently protecting, particularly in species-rich habitats.

As a person with a disability, I think that there are a lot of places that could be easily accessed and those areas should be expanded for those with disabilities and leave the more remote places wild with the option for those organizations that help people go where they normally wouldn't figure out how to get them there safely. I live near Highland Lake in Windham, Maine and even though by living here I have right of lake access, there is no handicap access so living 100yard or so from the lake doesn't let me enjoy it or go in it and it would not take a lot to make a ramp to a dock here. I'm sure there are a lot of places like this. We just need to use our "common" sense.

"self serving greedy Environmentalist" The last thing environmentalists are is self serving and greedy, the self serving and greedy are the absolute capitalists. Those who want to make as much money as possible without any regard for future impacts to anybody or anything. "The other things everyone forgets is these far left wing extremist hate Humans." Says the human loving far right wing non-extremist? (insert sarcastic tone here) I don't hate humans, but people who don't think about long term consequences and don't take facts into consideration are really annoying. People like you. "Make that 63 realistic people vs 8 human hating FREAKS." Didn't your mom teach you manners? You guys make no sense, you call people these hateful names while calling them hateful. But you are not trying to make sense are you, just trouble. If you have a point to make then make it, but keep your hate to yourselves, we don't need your feces.

During the great depression our society supported the unemployed by creating programs such as the CCC. The unemployed were hired to build and maintain parks, roads, and other infrastructure for the betterment of our society. What do we do now, we spend billions of dollars providing extended unemployment benefits for 70 to 100 weeks so they can sit at home and do nothing while our parks are closed and deteriorate due to lack of funding. Get a clue and push for constructive support of the unemployed by giving them a chance to "payback" society for the support they have been provided over the last 2 years. Limit unemployment benefits to 20-30 weeks and any additional support after that comes with participating in a supported employment program like the CCC. The individuals benefit, parks would benefit and society as a whole benefits.

As technology advances and as we grow more accustomed to the indoors for so much, we lose sight of nature. Even if personally, someone doesn't enjoy going to parks and what not, we can't just be selfish and say no. We have a responsibility as human beings; what about animals? Parks are a breath of fresh air in urban areas. We should take advantage of these opportunities. Parks should be everywhere.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have seen much destruction by snowmobiles like chasing the deer in the snow off the trails and even running over some of them. I live in Florida and everyone knows The Villages. Their concept is quiet golf carts to everything because everything one needs is accessible. I am very much against OHV's not for responsible users but I have seen the irresponsibility. So one has to way both sides. I also live on the Homosassa River and see many boats who are to travel at low speeds in the rivers because of Manatees. No such luck. Many are killed by reckless boat runners. Rangers should not have to patrol the trails for violaters just like teachers should not have to be disciplinarians, they should be using the time for teaching. Speed should not be the issue and they should be manufactured with reduced speeds. If you want to speed with these vehicles you have no right to be in the wilderness. Speed limits would help but they have to be built in to the vehicle.

Oh and by the way I pay my dues to ride my ATVs. How many of you of clean up your poop? do u use a pooper scooper? bet not. You know that puts your scent out and the animal's won't come close to it, they run from that too.

We've evolved into a 24/7 society addicted to light, and as a consequence the true, pristine magnificence of the night sky has been lost to 99% of Americans (P. Cinzano et al, 2001). So the National Parks serve as an important and increasingly critical refuge where we as humans can reconnect with the night sky. There are economic and environmental issues for keeping light pollution minimized, as others have commented, but there is a need to preserve the night sky as part of our natural heritage. As naturalist Henry Brewster wrote (The Outermost House, 1928): "Our fantastic civilization has fallen out of touch with many aspects of nature, and with none more completely than with night . . . With lights and ever more lights, we drive the holiness and beauty of night back to the forests and the sea . . ."

I find such waste and much anger at our Government is the BLM is from taking our wild horses from the wild which is where they belong, But they take them by the thousands each year and send them to slaugh to Mexico and Canada for food, This is plain wrong!!! The lease out the land to cattle and sheep to graze on it so whats up with this. To me this is very undermining the people of our Country plus they want to start drilling again thats why they took the horse's to run the Ruby pipeline, They thing we are stupip but they need to know too that we know of there dirty deed too.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I disagree. The Obama administration came into office with a deficit, two wars, and this country's infrastructure on the verge of collapse. The previous administration instigated policies, internal and external that nearly ruined us, and whaty did it matter to them, they would be gone and leave the mess for the next President. In one year he has accomplished, against all odds, what others could only dream. Our tax dollars are finally being used for the good of the people, and our country's crumbling infrastructure rather than lobbyist or corporate interests. We are fixing problems that have been ignored for decades. I wholeheartedly agree with everyone here and am uplifted by all of your remarks. It gets abit unsettling and discouraging at times when we seem so gung ho on destroying or compromising our planet at such a rapid rate. Once these protected lands are gone, they are gone; no amount of human endeavor would ever be able to make them right again. Not in the way they were made. These majestic parks are our young nations monuments, cathedrals, and museums. We can do this. look at all we've accomplished once we have set our mind to something. We can do this. Fully fund our national parks before its too late.

From the sounds of it, the most strongly opposed to OHV's have the least first hand knowledge of them or there users. I'm not talking about the yahoo's spinning in circles in the parking lot or the guy tearing up a creek bed, everyone shakes there head at them, even other OHV users. The people who get out and enjoy the trails and forest on there OHV's are no different from you so why should they be treated different? You didn't walk to the trail head did you? You most likely drove 30-100 miles to get there while dumping "fumes" in the air the whole way, maybe we should limit city folk from venturing out the city, how about that? That's basically what your saying when you want to limit OHV use. I'm from rural USA, and I think everyone should have the freedom to enjoy our country's freedom and having free & open access to national forest, BLM, and state land no matter how they choose to use it. Locking it up from OHV users just limit's people access, and why would you want to restrict anyone from enjoying the outdoors?

Its simply incredible that states - "OHV stickers I've seen are most often torn and illegible". That means it's the majority of all - now why could that be? I see hundreds of riders and have yet to see this problem. Is it that everyone that rides OHV's in that area do this? Or could it be that the one person making this statement sees only what he wants to see to make a point! But then again maybe point of view is based on "...a whole lot of enthusiasm, but not a lot of intelligence."!

I think this idea is requesting a LARGER plate or sticker than the "Green (or red) Sticker" that California now uses for non-street legal OHV's.

If the National Parks are not preserved, then future generations will not be able to see the beauty of America. Please save our National Parks and all Wildlife. Wolves are a necessary part of our ecosystem.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For anyone's information, on 08/05/2010 a federal judge ruled in favor of Defenders Of Wildlife. By this ruling he has put the wolves back the Endangered List. This ruling came in the Federal Court in Montana. Judge Molloy was the judge who ruled to protect the wolves. Idaho and some other states still want to kill the wolves. Even though the ruling was ruled in favor of the wolves. Wolves keep the herds of wildlife healthy by weeding out the sick, weak, lame and old. Ranchers and farmers say they are going after their livestock. If (they) the ranchers and farmers would dispose of the carcasses of the dead livestock. Then the preadotrs would not come after the carcasses.

As beautiful as blue L. Ontario is, we know that there's more to this than its obvious scenery. There are chemicals still in the lake sediments, invasive mussels, snails, fish, eels, fluctuating lake levels which affect shoreline animals like mink and otter, as well as the marshes, impending wind farms and hydro-diversion in the Niagara R. and constant runoff from agriculture, lawn chemicals, waste water treatment. Blue-green algae blooms, giant green blobs of floating algae and now water lily beds which were never there before. Where have we been sleeping while the great lakes just seeped in this and we along the shore let it go on over the past decades since Lois Gibbs pointed out the birth defects at Love Canal?

This is a hidden, community-building resource which if ignored. It is supported by public school systems, but often is self-sustaining. This vast area is rarely tapped for its potential to work cooperatively with state/federal/non-profit environmental organizations.

I noticed your comment focused on coal mining. We need to start moving away from coal to more green energy sources. Things that don't pollute, like wind and sun. I know the technology is not there yet for all our energy to come from green sources, but it is something we should be working toward. Countries like Germany are far ahead of us with the amount of energy they produce that comes from these sources.

When I moved to my current residence in rural north central Massachusetts, the night sky was dark, and the Milky Way easily seen on a summer evening. In the three decades that have elapsed since then, I've seen an alarming increase in light encroachment, as the Milky Way is no longer readily visible from my residence. We may not be able to control rising human population and development, but we can control the use of lighting to preserve the legacy of a dark, star-filled night sky.

Continuing with the lawn travesty, don't forget the fertilizers, weed killing chemicals and pesticides that are used to maintain this killing field! They all end up going down the drain and into our sewage treatment pants where they are then recycled into the water we drink without sufficient removal of the chemicals! Next time any bald person begins to re-grow hair without the use of products specifically developed for this purpose think of lawn fertilizing chemicals. If you are rapidly losing your hair think of weed killing chemicals. If you are considering Viagra think of pesticide chemicals! When you flush your expired prescription or over-the-counter drugs down your toilet, think of how stupid you actually are!!! When you open your mouth about how destructive responsible, legal, historical motorized uses of Publics Lands are . . . see the items listed above.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Posted elsewhere but belongs here too given the whole digression above - Wilderness Designation LOCKS PEOPLE out. DO not lock us out of OUR public land. I hike, I mountain bike, and I explore remote areas, all with my children that cannot endure week long expeditions. It is not necessary to designate "wilderness" simply to prevent development and protect wildlife. I have found solitude even in the non-wilderness forests of NJ for the past 30 years, it is possible and it is easy if you try, and it is not necessary to lock people out of the lands they collectively own. It is incumbent upon those people who want more wilderness to visit each one of the existing "Wilderness" areas before asserting that we need more. How would you know if you have not even taken the time to experience the entirety of what is already there. If you abdicate more wilderness in an area that you do not frequent or at the least have not even visited first hand then you are nothing more than a one dimensional, fear mongering, keyboard jockey.

Thanks to the Obama administration, this country is totally broke. I do not support additional funding to fully staff national parks until the country is on the road to financial recovery; that will have to come after the change in administrations in 2013.

Thank you, my family loves to recreate on public land with our ATV's. I am super discouraged about the future of public lands recreation for my kids after reading all of these forums though.

Wilderness areas are not something the BLM should be allowed to unilaterally create. Only Congress has the authority to create wilderness areas. Wilderness means you can't bring anything with wheels in. More than six percent of Arizona (and that's a huge state) is already in Wilderness designation. Coincidentally Arizona's wilderness areas are also drug cartel-controlled and the 'pleasant' hiking experience is at the risk of getting shot in cold blood like Rob Krentz. The area where Deputy Puroll was shot is just 30 miles south of Phoenix. It is in the Sonoran Desert National Monument where there are already 3 National Wilderness Areas. Puroll was shot in the Table Top Wilderness area. This wilderness area is 65 miles north of Mexico. Now the BLM has posted signs saying it isn't safe to enter. So creating wilderness areas in our border states is just another way to create no-man's land corridors for drug smuggling. Just say NO to more wilderness.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is no jaguar "population" in Arizona and in recorded history there never has been. Perhaps back in the early Pleistocene but AZ was tropical then. Occasionally a jaguar from Mexico crosses over the border. A lot of historic "sightings" of jaguars in past history in Arizona are several people seeing the same jaguar. Back in the 1960's hunting guides were transporting jaguars up from Mexico and releasing them for clients in Arizona, Texas and New Mexico. Some got away. Also people thought it was cool to have baby jaguars as pets-these fads would spring up from time to time but faded quickly when the pets matured- people discovered their "kitty" was one of the most vicious cats on earth. Such happened to the famous Lily Pons, a famous NY opera star back in the early 1930's. But jaguar hunting and live capture were being done all the way back to the start of the 20th century and so was jaguar transport world-wide. This was not governed by law at the time, so no permits or documentation exist other than old news articles. Prior to that, all the historic documentation back as far as 1867 confirmed that only occasionally a Mexican jaguar wanders over the Arizona border. Look up what Eliot Coues wrote. The jaguars seen in the last decade or two in AZ were manipulated. The camera traps were baited with scat of a pregnant female jaguar collected from the Phoenix zoo. So a jaguar that might have gone back to Mexico hung around the camera trap fooled into thinking a mate was nearby. The same dishonest biologists that set scat at the camera traps were also responsible for deliberately baiting mountain lion traps with female jaguar scat and have been thoroughly discredited.

The drug cartels love your idea! Arizona wilderness areas, nature connectivity corridors, national monuments, etc. have restrictions on law enforcement that restrict them from traveling freely and make them ideal corridors for drug and human smuggling. Federal lands in Arizona are THE entryway of choice for murderers, rapists, and terrorists. More than 50% of all illegal entry into this country is through federal lands in Arizona. There are restrictions on BLM employees telling them where they can and cannot go just to protect their lives because of all the thugs out in the National Monuments protecting their drug loads and have no respect for human life. Ranchers are getting shot. Not just Rob Krentz. Ranchers 50 miles north of the Krentz ranch have been shot at while just minding their business. The cartels will always have guns. They are murderers. My home is on the smuggling trail. There is a rape field near my house, a whole roadless area full of rape trees. In the Sonoran Desert National Monument just 30 miles south of Phoenix and 80 miles north of Mexico, there are signs warning citizens not to travel there because that land is owned by the drug cartels. Border Patrol Chief Aguilar called the area from that point south to the border a "third country. And you want to take guns away from law abiding citizens? People live and work in these areas. They have the right to go on living!

that is an ignorant statement. We go through hundreds of hours of planning with state, local and federal agencies to plan any new ORV trail.

I'm an ORV user. I pick up 1-2 bags of trash every time I'm out playing on the few legal trails we have. The trash is left there in camp and at hiking, biking and horse trails. Have you ever seen the amount of horse crap left behind by people riding horses? Have you ever seen the trail cut through from Canada to Mexico call the Continental Ridge trail? garbage everywhere. I recently stayed near Timothy lake in Oregon, the hiking trail was more abused than any ORV trail I have ever seen. Get off your high horse.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Getting kids out into urban parks is a great idea. For those kids lucky enough to live close to an existing park, class field trips work well. And it would be great if those field trips could occur often, perhaps monthly. For those kids who don't live near urban parks, let's create some. One way to create urban parks is to purchase private property either with federal and/or private funds and turn it into an urban park. The private property could be a few city blocks in need of improvement, perhaps an abandoned factory, a lifeless downtown with empty storefronts, or an area in a redevelopment district. Buying quasi-distressed property would presumably both keep purchase costs down and improve the neighborhood. And while we're creating parks, why not set aside some of that property for an urban garden? This way kids can work in the environment while studying it. Perhaps a few schools could share the responsibilities of one park/garden, which would also teach the value of personal responsibility. Caveat: I've seen urban parks turn into hangouts for gang members and other people whose presence is incompatible with classroom parks/gardens. A barrier should be considered. I hate to recommend a fence with a locked gate since this keeps kids and their families out during non-school hours. Anyone with ideas on how to handle this issue? Another method of creating urban parks/gardens is to locate it on the school grounds, either on existing school property or acquiring adjoining property to build a park. Then funds could be gotten through a local bond measure, which would presumably give schools more control over the park/garden. This solves the 'hangout problem' since schools would be allowed to fence their own property. BTW, thanks to NPCA for creating this website and making it so user-friendly!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I agree with the idea to increase staffing in the national parks, the phrase "fully staffed" needs to be defined. It is not like a given park, if given carte blanche, could only hire x number of people and no more. Any superintendent with creativity and vision could hire virtually every applicant with the relevant skills to aid the mission of his or her park. For example, so much is unknown about the biota which live in each park, NPS could hire every available specialist in the world to study each park's lifeforms and the biology of most lifeforms would still remain little known. In interpretation, for example, would full-staffing mean that everyone who visits the park has the opportunity to attend a ranger talk or walk that is suited to each visitor's schedule and ability? Or would it mean that a ranger has had the time to personally talk with everyone who visits the park about the needs and features of the park---even if they didn't want to? (After all, the people who are the most likely violators of park values are those who don't feel the need to talk to a ranger.) Would full staffing for maintenance mean simply that the park is on the way to catching up with the backlog of replacing or renovating deteriorating structures, is able to keep trails reasonably safe and clear, and essential services such as water, sewer, and electrical are functioning and safe? Or does it mean that the park is also able to build and maintain additional structures such as restrooms and shelters that meet current and near-term projected demand; that the park is able to survey and build new trails that help visitors better experience the park? Would full staffing for fee-collection (a role I've filled for NPS) mean adding additional booths so that no one has to wait in line longer than, say, five minutes? Or is twenty minutes OK during peak times? Does it mean that you would have an entrance gate staffed earlier in the morning and later at night, so that the park collects fees at most hours, so long as the volume justifies paying the fee collector? If so, how much extra risk from nighttime duty do you want to lay on the staff? For law enforcement, does full staffing mean that in the developed areas, there will always be a ranger less than five minutes away to respond to any emergency? And in the backcountry, less than an hour away? Or what? We need, therefore, to create goals for each of these park functions. Once you set desirable numbers, which will almost always (and perhaps always) be higher than the existing staffing levels, you then have to concern yourself with where to put new staff. In many parks, housing for staff has long been a problem, even with lower staff levels of the past. Many parks are in remote locations, and gateway communities may have little or no private housing available. With more funding, this can be increased both inside and outside the park, but to be done correctly, in an environmentally sensitive manner (e.g. no ten story apartment blocks just outside the park or within the park), this takes time. So when you are talking about increasing staffing, you are almost inevitably talking about increasing housing and associated infrastructure. Office space is also often limited. Not everyone needs their own office, of course, but many functions do require office space at least part of the time, and in some parks this is already shared to capacity. So you might need to build more offices (using portable buildings temporarily), and if the park's electric and water grids are already at capacity, this, too, could require upgrading that infrastructure. In summary, I'm all in favor of increased staffing, but understand that this is not a simple matter of upping the NPS personnel budget 30%, or whatever number.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Great discussion. Glad to note most of the comments stay on wildlife corridors and what they mean to the health of our planet and our own health. Interesting to watch the usual suspects from the OHV crowd try to turn the focus on their issues. I am not a scientist. I do have a forestry degree and training as a land steward. So my observations are based on 40 years of living, working, hiking, and studying a small headwaters in southern Oregon. In my travels I have compared this small ecosystem to other areas. In the little mid-elevation migratory corridor where I live, 40 years have seen a lot of changes. There are no more pheasant. The timber wolves are gone. There are fewer hawks, more ravens. Both grouse and quail are in decline, while flocks of turkeys now roam the hills. There are fewer porcupines, more raccoons. Fewer bobcats, more cougars. I have no illusions that these changes are the result of changes in this one drainage. The landscape is changing, and changes in the valley bring changes to these mountains. The real problem is that no one is asking why. Our government is doing a poor job of protecting our health by failing to protect the health of our planet.

I spent a decade working for an electric utility. This idea was promoted, albeit poorly, as part of our conservation plan. A great deal of research has been done on both natural and artificial lighting. We are not going to eliminate "night lights," but we can change how we use them. Sensors, downlights, task specific lighting, etc. etc. can substantially reduce light impacts on the night sky.

O.K., Sonny, I'm trying to follow the logic here. You don't like rich people who live extravagantly. Got it. Have to agree. They are the ones telling you your activities are ruining the planet. If so, that is, of course, hypocritical. But - are they the only ones telling you about the problems they see with your activity? These minions you speak of.....would that be the government employees that (supposedly) work for all of us? Not just the rich.....although maybe their bosses just work for the rich. Admittedly, our citizenry is a bit confused on that point. Now here's where I'm having trouble with your logic. You want to strike back at rich people by spending ten to fifteen thousand dollars on a play machine, a couple thousand more on a toy hauler, and then rip up the public commons? That, my friend, is not logical.

Here's the deal. As a caretaker for private land, I have been confronted with guns, threatened with tools (crowbars, wrenches), and once had a dirt-biker try to run me down. Even those I catch say "I don't carry identification when I ride." OHV stickers I've seen are most often torn and illegible. As for "facts" concerning OHV views on legible plates, I make the conclusion based on what I read on off-road enthusiast web sites. Their message boards have a whole lot of enthusiasm, but not a lot of intelligence.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've read your spew on other topics. You make a great many assumptions about people. Let me address the ones you make about me. I do not work for the Susan G. Komen Foundation or any other non-profit. I am, in fact, retired. I'm not judging people on "how much" they give to any cause. What I'm saying is that, in my experience, the off-road enthusiasts trumpet their horns about cleaning up trails (for their own use) and the trash left in the woods by their own crowd. They call that community service. They hold events and make money.....which they plow back into buying land, lobbying and promoting their cause. Horseback riders, mountain bikers, hikers, joggers and a whole host of other groups regularly hold similar events.....and donate a portion of the proceeds to area non-profits. The off-roaders act only in their own self-interest, while the majority of other groups show consideration for the broader community. As for you, I think you should try some sensory deprivation before shooting off your mouth again. You're shooting blanks.....lots of noise, but no impact.

Ask and you shall be told. I live on private property. I confront trespassers. I am a Vietnam veteran and, according to the government, crazy. If that makes me a "bad MoFo," so be it. You want I should maybe just lay down and let them trespass? I've been shot at and run down. I will continue to confront lawbreakers whenever I can. There is a special fund for the ATV folks in Oregon administered by the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department. Go to their website and read the numbers for yourself. It's this kind of special interest feeding at the public trough that needs to be undone. BTW, I own a "quad." I use it for mowing fields, harvesting timber, keeping my gravel driveway smoothed out, blading snow in the winter, hauling firewood, etc. etc. etc. I consider my machine an investment. Most of the "I want to ride" crowd consider machines toys. Sad.

UPDATE: Notice of Intent to sue: { <a href="http://www.sharetrails.org/uploads/NOI\_Final\_05-03-10.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } From reading the complaint, the reason the trail became so eroded is the fact that the Forest Service was responsible for maintaining the system, yet failed to do so. The state of North Carolina gave the Forest Service money to maintain the trails, yet the money was returned. \$49,000 in 2007 alone. It also appears that the supposed turbidity levels were taken under questionable circumstances, i.e., right after a storm event when all streams were running with high levels of turbidity. It also looks like there were multiple procedural errors involved in the whole process of closing Upper Tellico. The OHV trails were not the only ones not maintained. The foot and equestrian trails did not meet the USFS standards either. Yet those are being upgraded. I still find it extremely odd that there was no money to maintain the OHV trails, yet over \$2 million was found to reclaim them. Money was also found to rehabilitate the other trails. If even half of what was filed in the lawsuit, then the anti-OHV movement has just taken a huge black eye and lost a considerable amount of credibility. Not that they had much to begin with. Nice how the Forest Service can break the law and then close a trail system by making it look like it was the OHVer's fault. This will NOT turn out well for the Forest Service.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I completely agree with suggestion #15. At Yosemite, a wildly popular and overcrowded NP, a mere \$20 per car entrance fee allows ALL the occupants of the car seven days in the park. So if you arrive with 8 people in an SUV, it's still \$20, although those folks certainly use more resources, even mundane ones like toilet paper! Since many people treat the park like entertainment, charge them accordingly. People are willing to pay \$10 a pop to see a 2 hour movie or ridiculous prices for one day at a stupid theme park. Charge each person in the car \$10 to enjoy a breathtaking natural resource.

Stuff your tea party back into your pot. This is a forum for suggestions on funding for NP's, not a forum for baseless political rants. And guess what? I don't have a job, but I want to see the NPs funded. And part two, I would adore working in a NP. Thanks for the suggestion.

I agree that this program should be for all students not just Title 1 schools.

The statement is incorrect. Many Off Road groups care for the lands that everyone uses. My family enjoys driving on the legal public trails. Our group host work parties and clean-up to keep areas open. My 4 little kids race to pick up trash others left behind. You want to take something away from many responsible ORV families by banning off road use.

First, why is O'Bama to blame for everything? He inherited the majority of our nation's problems associated with his presidency. I blame the oil companies and Wall Street for our financial woes, not O'Bama. And, oh by the way, I believe that George Bush got us into this fiasco of a war. Now, to the matter at hand. Have you people ever even visited a national park? We have enough hotels, casinos, and Wal-Marts, which don't need to be built in, on, or near park boundary lines. We don't need ATV traffic or snow mobiles left to run rampant through pristine wilderness, destroying fragile Eco systems and harming wildlife. I totally support park funding. I volunteer annually at two separate national parks and I've seen good park employees lose their positions due to budget cuts. I've seen interpretive programs cut. I'd much prefer some of my tax dollars go to park funding, than to financing an expensive war. Our parks and waterways are crucial to preserving our environmental legacy. If you aren't part of the solution, then you're part of the problem. We voted these people into office, beginning at local levels. If you're unhappy, show it at the polls. Don't punish the park system. Educate yourself about the environment. Spend time at a park. And, thank you NPS, for providing free admission days to help families escape into an environment without chaos, if only for a day; providing a lifetime of memories. I'm proud to be an American and an NPS volunteer. I appreciate the opportunity to witness the awe inspiring vistas of the Grand Canyon, the vast sand expanses of Sleeping Bear Dunes and Indiana Dunes, the extensive cave system in Mammoth Cave's Biosphere, and the sandy shores of the Gulf National Seashore, just to name a few. Preserve our parks for our future generations. Maintain our environmental legacy. Please, support national park funding now. By the way, I'm a registered Republican. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Livestock can only spread noxious weeds that were on the land in the first place. The ranchers do have the right to have continued access to the lands that have been historically used for grazing. Because a vocal few want grazing leases to stop, is not a valid reason to stop allowing ranchers access.

"again you choose to make this about your own personal crusade against OHV's? Ridiculous" Glad to see someone else notice this, any mention of OHV use, and a good idea gets voted down. "As usual the OHV crowd is killing another good idea. It is a true shame that such a good idea as this forum is being ruined by right wing loons and organized OHV groups" But it was okay, as long as radical enviros and left wing loons controlled the forum? The OHV groups do contribute a lot, and most, if not all groups do cleanups, and trail maintenance. Hunting needs to be allowed when it is used as a wildlife management tool. Hunters also contribute a lot, between the extra 11% tax we pay on firearms and ammunition, and all the license, tags, stamps, and land use permits we pay for, Hunters contribute far more to wildlife conservation than any other group. Plus all the hunting orgs. Like Ducks Unlimited, Pheasants Forever, and many, many more all contribute to land, and wildlife conservation. More could get done, with better results, if the various groups worked together, and each side compromised some, and it would be better for all of us, and our children.

The people who don't want firearms in the parks are mainly those who get all of their firearms info/knowledge from places like The Brady Center, and other anti-gun groups. The law has been passed, people carry in parks, and no one has been shot or killed due to allowing firearms in our parks. The crazies with guns are the criminals, and they will carry a gun into a park whether they are permitted to by law or not.

People trap for a living, and for extra income, because you do not agree with it does not make it wrong.

What about other users such as hunters, fishermen, trappers, OHV users? Because some do not agree with these activities, the groups who represent them should not be allowed to have a voice?

A wise man once said, 'In Liveable Cities is Preservation of the Wild' -- Michael Houck, Urban Greenspaces Institute, originating co-creator of the Connecting Green Alliance in Portland, OR. 'Build up, not out' will only work when we make it green and liveable!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are factors at play that supersede for me the conflict between hikers and off road vehicles. Climate change will have a huge effect on all of nature, and how we address those immanent changes may be the deciding factor on our ability to enjoy it in any recognizable way. It is hopeful to me that innovative thinking is a human faculty, and that this man, Tony Barnosky of the University of California at Berkeley, is making an effort to 'see' how nature (and that includes human nature) itself might continue to exist. Here is a short interview from June 2009, in which he acknowledges that, yes, we all need to examine the challenges inherent in reconciling conflicting interests in wilderness preservation and further suggests that, 'nature, especially the wilderness aspect of nature, and now the climate on which nature depends, is a moving target.': { <a href="http://news.discovery.com/earth/end-nature-wilderness-lost.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } A new paradigm is needed for thinking about preservation. And (even relatively) free interactions of species protected in interconnected wilderness areas are increasingly being seen as crucial to the survival of the diversity that all life depends upon.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I want to help define some terms and clarify some thoughts on this contentious issue. Wilderness (with a capital W) is federally designated on Forest Service land for essentially no human change. There is no firefighting, timber cutting, mining, motorized vehicles, etc. There are over 100 million acres in the US, with a large part in Alaska, but quite a bit in the western states. Smaller portions in the eastern US forests. wilderness (small w) is whatever we think it is, usually land without houses. Some is private, or public. Some is managed for timber production. There is something like 600 million acres of forest land in the US, plus hundreds of million acres of open/desert/range land that provides wildlife habitat. West of the Mississippi, over 50% of the land is owned and controlled by the federal government. Total for the US is something like 43%. Add the state and local government land, and conservation easements, and well over half of the nation is protected from development already. How we use that land (timber, wilderness, wildlife habitat, mining, ranching, etc) is open to constant debate and change. Over the last 30 years I have seen that change more and more to Wilderness and semi-Wilderness use. We are a wealthy nation that can afford to "not use" our land, as long as we can import food and wood from other nations. The Nature conservancy is a non-profit multinational corporation that has accumulated over 2.7 billion dollars in assets. Most of the species of wildlife in America are doing just fine. Black Bears for example, which use huge swaths of habitat and are an indicator of healthy landscape ecology, are on the increase in all the northeastern states. When we discuss perishing species and loss of "biodiversity", this is mostly in developing nations and not a huge problem in the US. There is an extreme proposal called the Wildlands Project, which has published maps of huge areas of land as basically off limits to human use, with connecting corridors and buffer areas where farming and forest management might be "allowed". Several states use these maps for their long term planning. They promote the government taking these lands and designating them as they have proposed. The federal government has a track record of either taking huge swaths of land from citizens, or creating conditions where the land become valueless, (such as losing water rights,, access, or development rights) and the owners become "willing sellers" or willing donors to groups like TNC. A quick cruise through google earth will show any interested party the extent of undeveloped "wilderness" that is available for wildlife. The USA imports a large proportion of wood products from other countries, while our western forests burn and eastern forests rot. Wood is the very best raw material on environmental grounds, using less energy and creating less pollution than almost every other raw material. Think globally and act locally.

I agree and I am completely for full, if not additional, funding for NPS. If you look at NPS funding over the last 10 years, it hasn't even kept up with inflation, while the agency finds itself facing a growing \$8 BILLION in maintenance backlogs. However, I would point out that in addition to NPS, even more importantly is funding and support for state and local parks. Accessibility to outdoor recreation areas is a top factor in addressing issues such as obesity, stress, depression, ADHD, and living active lives. Simply put, people get out in the outdoors more often and experience related incredible health benefits - when and if access is nearby. Unfortunately, national parks are not a 10-20 minute drive for most people. Local, county and state parks need more funding, as quite honestly, they serve more people, more often, and likely have greater impacts than NPS (although I would never want to lessen the impacts of national parks - they need our support too).



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with a recent article by Kurt Repanshek, the basic premise of which is that its not we/USA/Fed gov't doesn't have the money (we do, as we have a budget every year) its that many of us believe the priorities are out of whack. And while I agree the deficit is an issue and we need to reduce, if not abolish it, I STILL believe we should fund national parks, a new CPCC, etc. Again, its about priorities, and mine lie here. Here is an excerpt from the article: "The chronic underfunding of the National Park Service is not now and has not been for the past 50 years a matter of money – it is a matter of priorities!" Dr. Pitcaithley told those who attended that conference back in April. "Five billion dollars amounts to 0.002 percent of the president's 2008 proposed budget." For the sake of comparison, while the National Park Service slogs along with its insufficient budget, the Defense Department is funded at roughly \$550 billion, the professor points out. Just one B-2 bomber costs \$2 billion, he adds for emphasis. "Do you really think the American people would notice if this country's military industrial complex held one less bomber than it does today and that those funds were transferred to the National Park Service?" he wonders. "The president and Congress took less than ten minutes to determine that the economy needed an economic stimulus package totaling \$150 billion. Do you think anyone would have complained if it were \$148 billion? And the resulting \$2 billion saving were given to the National Park Service?" Over at the U.S. Marine Corps, Dr. Pitcaithley points to the Osprey aircraft that cost \$110 million apiece. "They are currently being sent to Iraq even though military analysts believe they don't work as designed," he says. "Here's the punch line: Several branches of the military are planning to purchase 400 of these flawed aircraft! Four hundred times \$110 million equals \$44 billion!" The money is there. The problem, though, is we let Congress get away with more than a few decisions that are terribly misguided. The problem is that there are not enough advocates for the National Park System. "It's not a matter of money, it's a matter of priorities and the National Park Service over the years has not developed a constituency that will lobby on behalf of it. The National Park Conservation Association is simply not enough and clearly no match for other park interest groups. If you doubt that in any way, consider the recent ... effort by the National Rifle Association to change decades-long NPS policy on guns in parks," says Dr. Pitcaithley. "A goofy idea by any measurement, but one that went unopposed except by a handful of editors. "In the world I envision for the National Park Service, the 50 congressmen who endorsed the (gun) proposal would have been instantly balanced by 50 congressmen and women who opposed it – delegates in Congress who had been cultivated over the years to support various pieces of legislation that benefit the national parks and, through the parks, the American public. Where are those congressmen and women? Why don't we do that? The Department of Defense passes up no opportunity and spares no expense in cultivating congressmen to support its programs. Why doesn't the National Park Service do the same?" When you realize that a single B-2 bomber retails for \$2 billion, is it really far-fetched to want to believe that the National Park System with its 391 units stretching from Acadia National Park to Zion National Park is worth at least three bombers?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While at first glance the idea seems worthwhile, I recommend you read the chapter in *Made to Stick* by Chip and Dan Heath on the "Don't Mess with Texas" anti-littering campaign. The main point - not all programs (such as bottle deposit) work everywhere. Each region/sub culture/state/etc is different - and sometimes all you need to do is tap into existing value systems (for instance in TX the campaign promoters tapped into Texans pride). Nothing prior to this worked, but once this campaign started everything changed. Hence, perhaps a deposit isn't what would work in Virginia.... Just throwing out suggestions. The entire book is interesting, but that chapter alone bears relevance to this discussion.

While I agree with the main intent of this comment, I'm unsure about one portion of a comment above - that is "no timber cutting even around them". How can we do this? I agree viewsheds are critical to the impacts and benefits of our national lands. But how do you stop adjacent private land from developing? The only true way is to outright purchase it (which I am for - that is, the expanding of national parks), but then that simply moves the "issue/concern" to a new border, or to place it under a conservation easement (another method I'm well aware of and favor). But in the end, you'll still have a boundary where the public lands end and private begins. I know there are on-going issues w/ drilling proposed literally outside the gates or within sight of some parks. I hate to see this, but I just don't think there is an easy answer (again, unless we the people buy the land or buy the development rights/place a conservation easement on the land - which the landowner needs to do).

While much of what you say may be correct, I simply disagree with your vs. approach. That is, you believe or make the argument that land set aside for recreation, wildlife benefits, watershed/drinking water protection, etc. is land "out of production" and hence not worth it. I would argue that that is not the case. Tourism is the #1, 2, 3 business in every state in America - the large majority of which depends on natural areas, scenic vistas, lands free of pollution, and opportunities for outdoor recreation. These lands DO provide jobs, and I'm betting more so that you realize. For instance, here in NC alone outdoor recreation (which needs these wild, open space lands) is responsible for \$7.5 BILLION to the state economy, and supports 95,000 jobs across the state. It also produces \$6.1 Billion in retail sales. Just because open space isn't being used for mining, resource extraction, or some other industrial use, doesn't mean it doesn't provide valuable public services while creating jobs.

The point of National Parks is to provide as natural an experience as possible for visitors. This includes a dark-night experience without unnecessary outdoor lighting. This is very important since dark skies are becoming more rare as outdoor lighting becomes more the standard. Do we need extensive outdoor lighting in our national parks? No! Very modest lighting- fully shielded and of low intensity- should be used strictly for safety related purposes. It should be subdued lighting directed downward and applied only to specific areas- paved sidewalks and building entrances where significant numbers of visitors walk at night. It should not be used for "decorative" purposes to "improve on nature". Nor should trails far from visitor centers be lighted. Driving on roads should rely solely on the car's headlights, which work fine- no roadway lighting should be used. Visitors will learn that very low level lighting works fine if there are no other bright lights in the area to spoil our eyes' natural dark-adaption.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Creating a "toolbox" to assist with preserving cultural heritage would indeed be very helpful. Oftentimes people at the local level in the field are well intending, though do not necessarily have the resources, time, or patience to be fully effective. The Preservation Briefs and NPS Bulletins are helpful to a certain extent, though what you are suggesting would be far more specific and provide assistance at the level of needs. One community might not have undertaken a cultural resource survey, for instance, so guidance on how this might be started would be helpful. Likewise, when working on a specific type of property like a bungalow, it would be really helpful to know more about this building type, its structure, and qualities of craftsmanship, so maintenance and preservation work may be done in the most responsible manner.

FYI, 4-stroke vehicle noise tends to carry much further than that emitted by 2-stroke vehicles. Obviously there are many other factors to consider but purely based on noise your statement is false.

If you have ever seen the damage of OHV in the Nanahala National Forest you would support the banning of all OHV from public lands

Right now Cape Wind is planning to build approximately 300 wind turbines smack off the south coast of Cape Cod. In the middle of Nantucket Sound, within view of the coast for miles and migratory path of numerous birds, fish and sea creatures, these turbines will forever blight the horizon and destroy a unique and pristine place forever. The facts are this "green" project will not only cause harm to environment, but will forever raise the rates of customers to rate levels that will break the backs of Massachusetts rate payers and tax payers. Land based turbines in Falmouth, MA neighborhoods are creating physical problems not only for wild life, but for the residents near these turbines. They are experiencing numerous physical problems due to the noise level. Exposure to these low level, audible fixtures needs to be researched thoroughly. Hundreds of these turbines, immediately off the coast, will not only blight the eyesight of residents and tourists, but will have an unknown affect on the health and welfare of wildlife and humans exposed to these turbines. We need to thoroughly examine the effects on ratepayers, taxpayers, wildlife and humans never mind what color they should be painted. In our desperation to reach out away from fossil fuels, let's not create yet another hazard despite the good intentions or politics that are designed to enrich one company at the expense of all. After all the profits that went to oil companies, let's not create the same scenario with companies taking advantage of the current "green" initiative.

Interestingly, The contractors who were awarded the \$1.8 million in ARRA monies are obliterating the Tellico OHV trails are not using any erosion controls. None at all. The loose dirt is literally pouring into teh creeks and streams with no silt fences, no hay bales, nothing at all. The Forest Service's "Forest Plan" states that no visible sediment is allowed to reach the water resources. The contractor who is doing the work has stated that no one from the Forest Service is monitoring the trail obliteration. The water quality is worse than ever after these ground disturbing activities. Too bad for the brook trout...

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I have to agree with others that Native American ownership/management of the natural resources/land should have the standards of agreement spelled out. I do think there is a very strong ethic amongst Native Americans about the preservation and improvement of the land, but as with any immigrant group, assimilation brought corruption of core values due to the poor values of the dominant culture. I do support the management by Native Americans and would seek to ensure their supremacy in this position. Too often the source of money attempts to impose control over the direction of the project. That is my major concern.

LA's backyard Yosemite! The San Gabriel Mountains are an exceptional resource for Angelenos, but are overstressed by visitation. Proper planning could expand recreation while improving protection of natural resources.

casinos are everywhere ..there is only ONE gettysburg..and it's an awesome, peaceful tribute to the history that happened there. i agree there is enough development around our ntl parks/battlefields, and living near several casinos, the traffic congestion that occurs is NOT what i envision when i think of visiting this site. haven't voted on this one as i can't tell if i vote FOR IT i'm voting for or against the casino. but i vote NO CASINO built near gettysburg!!!

Your points need to have some validation... Not just because you say it's true... Like this statement... Many ATVs are inherently unsafe due to the lack of a differential. Who told you this? Was this a scientific study that you conducted or is this just your OPINION??? Your first Paragraph makes No sense? Have you ever tried to do these activities on an ATV/OHV? If not then these are just your opinion... I on the other hand have done both the Hiking and ATV'ing! Some Places are more adept for Hiking, smaller places, easier access by foot. Some places are just so Large the terrain is easier to see while on an ATV! That is my OPINION Based on my Actual experiences, not something I read on an eco-site... It is reported that usage of the area is causing multiple plumes of visible sedimentation in the Tellico River and its tributaries. Reported by WHOM? Someone sitting creekside taking measurements? Are these same scientist sitting creekside EVERY TIME IT RAINS to see/measure the same Sediment flow? Are you suggesting we stop the RAIN ALSO? 2 Stroke Versus 4 Stroke motors... Again, I am sure this is something you are familiar with? I bet your weedeater smokes as bad as the 2 stroke Motorcycle my son rides... I have both a four stroke and 2 stroke ATV's and when tuned properly, they will not pollute any more than the SUV that drives the kids to school... Are you willing to give the SUV up and let the kids ride the school bus, you know a 20 year old diesel bus like most rural districts use because our tax dollars are being waisted fighting lame lawsuits from eco-freaks... "Based on some calculations, the pollution due to one ATV equals the pollution due to fifty automobiles." Whose calculations??? Please state your sources for us!! IN FACT WE DEMAND YOU GIVE US YOUR SOURCES!!! The SKY IS Falling! As reported by Chicken Little... That is something we can look at a research, and then see for ourselves that This Chicken Little guy is either quite knowledgeable or just a "Quack" Paron the piun!

OH and until you actually ride one of these ATV's don't assume the reason the world is FAT is because we are all riding around on an ATV! I am 47 years young, and every muscle in my body is well used after a good ride thru our Parks! Enjoy your next happy meal thinking about that!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

yes it is about the money!!! Look at the coffers of these large groups and tell me this isn't about money!

Slavery??? So now as a responsible atv owner I am in the same class as a Slave owner... Would you people PLEASE bring facts and figures to the table!!! Leave the name calling to the kids on myspace... IN theory an ATV or OHV trail actually uses up twice as much per foot ground as a hiking trail... only because they have 4 wheels not two... and that's if the hiking trail is a one direction loop. In reality I see 20 times as much of natures beauty because I can cover so much more ground than you can... I am not an industry insider, but a end product user. I found this site after receiving a link on a message board regarding the Government taking something that is mine away from me! This land is our yours and mine and until you are named eco king we will have to quit fighting like school kids and come to the table and learn to share... In my opinion OHV's and ATV's deserve MORE land than hikers because we volunteer many hours in trail maintenance (Blue ribbon coalition) among others, pay taxes on the fuel we use... and provide jobs to not only the ATV manufactures but trailer and camper manufactures, apparel and safety gear retailers where as a hiker buys some shoes and a walking stick??? Now that is how silly an arguement as one can get, but remember what you learned in grade school it is best to share...

500 lol where did you get that figure from??? I don't see many ideas with that many pro ATV votes period... much less all at once... now if you look to the right and see the "top innovators" there are people who have posted 6-7 thousand times??? Go read there views and see who they are...

My dog was caught in a trap once. If I had not been there right away to take the trap off, he would have been seriously hurt. People do not need the pelts of trapped animals anymore. There are alternative materials.

I love Civil War battlefields for their historical significance and their natural beauty. It is ironic that one can find so much peace in a setting that once witnessed so much violence and carnage. Civil War battlefields should be preserved and protected, because of their priceless legacy to our nation's heritage. Housing developments and shopping malls can be built anywhere, but there is only one location where each of these battles was fought. It would be a terrible tragedy if we were to lose the timeless virtues of honor, duty, courage, and sacrifice that these battlefields symbolize for so many Americans to the short-term economic gain by a few. We can do better as a nation and a people and we should do better. Thank you.

When animal behaviorists discover that human presence is enough to cause a female wolverine to abandon her offspring, then people should stay away from those remote mountain tops where trails do not already exist and wolverines likely use to have their young. We need to share. Also, some of us humans think the EPA does need to act on new knowledge about how to preserve ecosystems. Industrial pollution can be generated in small amounts by individuals whose activities with industrial chemicals produces industrial waste. 'Forceful arms' come from all kinds of entities. While we sort it out amongst ourselves, the victims are the residents of the forests and parks. I can take the criticism and debate, but ecosystems still need to be protected for future generations no matter what the reason for the establishment of the EPA.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Perhaps we need a new political party that respects the public nature of the environment and the need to respect the work of scientists while still holding individuals accountable for their own personal needs and for budgeting independently. I don't think the government needs to provide everyone with everything, but we don't have a private company creating air, water, and wildlife for individual sale. No, we do share some things in this world and must manage them with the understanding that one cannot create scientific principles the way we create art or ideologies. No, science is something that has to be understood and accepted. It is not like the fashion industry, politics, entertainment, poetry, etc.... that has cycling trends. We can't just 'will' oxygen to be produced with the shake of a magic wand. We can't avoid food shortages or desertification by putting all our trust in the charismatic twinkling smile of a talk show host, corporate CEO, or scientifically illiterate conservative or liberal politician.

I agree. Furthermore, we need to have more people study the impacts of off-road vehicle noise and activities brought about by increased access to remote areas. I envision more waste dumping, more illicit drug growing, more wildlife breeding disruption, and more water and air polluting with increased access to wilderness designated areas via off-road vehicles.

"While the multiple-use doctrine may be a workable management strategy in some National Forests far from major cities, it is becoming an increasingly unsuccessful and contentious model for National Forests near population centers. "So, there is no need to change the policy for the entire Forest Service. The forests near population centers just need to do a better job at management.

As the climate changes...???? Are you kidding me. Global Warming/Climate Change as the Vehicle for the expansion of the Federal Parks System? You are a Sidewinder.

NP is the only thing standing between industrialization and a world of processed medal. I rather not go to see a monument stating, "this is where the National Park of New York City WAS"

What? Totally false statement. Since there is no/limited funding for ORV parks and FS land....who do you think volunteers their time to keep these places open for all to enjoy? That's right Offroader's volunteer many hours so that you can enjoy your outdoors.

While volunteering with an inner city school group outing at a state park, I learned that one of the 5th graders had never seen an aspen tree and another didn't know that the yellow dandelion flower comes before the fluffy seed head. But they enjoyed learning about them. Connecting kids to nature is absolutely critical to creating future stewards for the parks. But, equally important, I think it helps kids blossom. Urban parks that are easily accessible would be an invaluable resource for urban families.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHV recreational use of public lands should be preserved for the benefit of current and future American families.....Do not agree. For the benefit of future American families OHV users should be educated about how to develop a healthy less impactfull recreation that the the whole family can enjoy, without a motor. What did people do before they had engines??OHV use is a legitimate, sustainable use of appropriate public lands, particularly on National Forests and Bureau of Land Management Units..... What exactly is sustainable about riding an OHV??Motorized recreation is a healthy family activity and provides a great opportunity for families to “get away from it all,” and to experience the great outdoors.....What exactly is Healthy about motorized recreation. I agree that you can see some sights, but why not do it on a bike or hike? No need to pollute the environment and disturb others with noise in the process. OHVers, like other recreationists, seek opportunities to not only enjoy the riding experience, but also opportunities to learn more about cultural and historical context, take in scenic views, observe wildlife, camp, hunt, fish and other activities.....Agree.The overwhelming majority of OHVers are conservationists, who seek to preserve the same outdoor experiences they enjoy for children and grandchildren.....In my experience the greater majority of OHVers are not AT ALL conservationist. They only seek to sustain the woods as a hunting farm for unsustainable hunting practices such as shooting only the trophy animals and leaving the small and sick to reproduce (the opposite of natural selection). ATV and off-highway motorcycle riding encourages and promotes physical fitness..... YOU HAVE TO BE KIDDING. Hop on a mountain bike sometime and you'll learn what physical fitness is. HMG!OHVs provide the opportunity for Americans of all ages and physical capabilities to enjoy the outdoors..... Agreed. There should be some exceptions for those that can not walk or ride a bike due to physical problems (not due to obesity which is there own fault) so that they can ride a 4 cycle ATV in certain areas.

There are bad apples in every crowd. That's just a fact of life. Take for example the people that hike into pristine alpine lakes and leave their trash and human waste behind them. Does this make all hikers bad? should we ban all hikers from the forests ? Of course not. There are many (most) ORV users that simply use their vehicles as their way to enjoy our nations forests. We are respectful of nature (by staying on the trail) and we are respectful of others (by not trying to ban access) Blaming all OPRV users for the actions of a few is just ignorance and intolerance at its best.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ah, here we are again with the discussion having degraded to an online shouting match and digital hate-mongering. So much for the spirit of cooperation. Maybe we should all take a breather for a moment and examine our own personal agenda (and we all have one) for our vested interest in this topic. If we are being honest here, each one of us has our own skewed view of very other user group represented here, and consequently our own opinions of why our viewpoint is more valid than everyone else's. In order to make any progress towards the goal of better management of the wild undeveloped lands that are publicly owned in this nation, we all have to learn to at least try to understand other people's views and needs FIRST. Once we have all put down our knives and pitchforks, may be then we can gather TOGETHER and make reasonable, logical decisions as to who gets to do what activity and where and when. Every user group needs to be humble enough to admit that their use should not be allowed in EVERY circumstance. Not because the other user groups condemn them as destructive or invasive, but because IT JUST MAKES SENSE not to be there. It does not make you less of a man to admit that you and your horse, or your mountain bike, or your OHV should not be using a certain trail. You are not surrendering in some sort of battle. You did not lose the fight. There is no fight. The Native Americans who occupied this continent before "we" came here held the belief that no person could "own" the land. Even though our European-based way of thought has us brainwashed to think otherwise, perhaps if we thought more like the indigenous people of North America did and still do, that we would think of the Land and its needs to stay "alive and sustainable" before our own wants and desires to use the Land as WE see fit. Is there a line in our Constitution or any of its Ammendments that states "All citizens shall have the in-alienable RIGHT to use publicly-owned land as they see fit for whatever uses they so choose"??? Did I sleep through that part of CIVICS class?

I agree. I think Title 1 school programs get way too much as it is All children should be able to benefit from this

Every second you have your computer turned on your destroying fragile Eco systems and harming wildlife! You ever seen the carbon foot print of a computer, you have any idea what the carbon foot print is for all the worlds computers, you have any idea how much bigger the worlds carbon foot print is since Al Gore invented and popularized the internet, SHAME ON HIM just think of all the environmental DAMAGE Al Gore has caused just by making the internet popular. Google built their new computer building next to a POWER PLANT it consumes so much power supporting your computerized self gratification habits. Al Gore personally has the carbon foot print of what 35 average Americans. Someone please list the campaign promises that O'Bama made he has lived up to I cant find any. O'Bama inc. knew all about the government oversight controlling the oil company's in the gulf was flawed, they made a limp writsted non effort to correct this problem shame on them, shame on them for not taking the bull by the horns and fixing the known problems Bush created.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No money left because \* The federal government cannot account for \$24.5 billion spent in 2003. \* A White House review of just a sample of the federal budget identified \$90 billion spent on programs deemed that were either ineffective, marginally adequate, or operating under a flawed purpose or design. \* The Congressional Budget Office published a "Budget Options" book identifying \$140 billion in potential spending cuts. \* The federal government spends \$23 billion annually on special interest pork projects such as grants to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame, or funds to combat teenage "goth" culture in Blue Springs, Missouri. \* Washington spends tens of billions of dollars on failed and outdated programs such as the Rural Utilities Service, U.S. Geological Survey and Economic Development Association. \* The federal government made \$20 billion in overpayments in 2001. \* The Department of Housing and Urban Development's \$3.3 billion in overpayments in 2001 accounted for over 10 percent of the department's total budget. \* Over one recent 18-month period, Air Force and Navy personnel used government-funded credit cards to charge at least \$102,400 for admission to entertainment events, \$48,250 for gambling, \$69,300 for cruises, and \$73,950 for exotic dance clubs and prostitutes. \* Examples of wasteful duplication include: 342 economic development programs; 130 programs serving the disabled; 130 programs serving at-risk youth; 90 early childhood development programs; 75 programs funding international education, cultural, and training exchange activities; and 72 federal programs dedicated to assuring safe water. \* The Advanced Technology Program spends \$150 million annually subsidizing private businesses, and 40% of this goes to Fortune 500 companies. \* The Defense Department wasted \$100 million on unused flight tickets, and never bothered to collect refunds even though the tickets were reimbursable. \* The Conservation Reserve program pays farmers \$2 billion annually to not farm their land. \* Washington spends \$60 billion annually on corporate welfare, versus \$43 billion on homeland security. \* The Department of Agriculture spends \$12 billion to \$30 billion annually on farm subsidies, the vast majority of which go to agribusinesses and farmers averaging \$135,000 in annual income. \* Massive farm subsidies also go to several members of Congress, and celebrity "hobby farmers" such as David Rockefeller, Ted Turner, Scottie Pippen, and former Enron CEO Ken Lay. \* The Medicare program pays as much as eight times the cost that other federal agencies pay for the same drugs and medical supplies. \* Congressional investigators were able to receive \$55,000 in federal student loan funding for a fictional college they created to test the Department of Education. \* The Army Corps of Engineers has been accused of illegally manipulating data to justify expensive but unnecessary public works projects. \* Food stamp overpayments cost \$600 million annually. \* School lunch program abuse costs \$120 million annually. \* Veterans' program overpayments cost \$800 million annually. \* Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) overpayments cost \$9 billion annually. \* Better tracking of student loan recipients would save \$1 billion annually. \* Preventing states from using accounting tricks to secure additional Medicaid funds would save several billion dollars annually. \* Medicare contractors owe the federal government \$7 billion. Keep creating more government programs America! Keep sending Washington MORE MONEY! Intelligent people would solve their perceived problems in the private sector where they are forced to make a profit and are held accountable.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You have probably been reading a bunch of mindless replies please read them all very carefully look for FACTS there are a bunch of literary experts that like to write with emotions but these replies contain you guessed it no solid facts they are just feelings. They feel OHV's are doing damage it sounds good anyways, ask to see the damage they clam up and never reply, more often than not the "damage" they are talking about is 50' of trail in the middle of 20 million acres of land, the "damage" is erosion something that all 20 million acres has been enduring for the past 5 + billion years, please use your head when reading about their OHV complaints made by environmentalist .OHV's foot print is actually just a fraction of one percent of the land thats open for OHV's this needs taken into consideration when teaching others about land use, many imply that OHV's foot prints consume the entire allotted land, simply not true. Where as 100% of the acreage that is closed to OHV's can not be used, that is the entire 100%. Can you also provide verifiable data on how OHV's affect the wildlife and the habitat, from what I have seen everybody just assumes this happens, it sounds good anyways but I need to verify that it actually does happen.

I think we need to use Obama care to open up free liposuction clinics we can kill two birds with one stone. Suck the obesity right out of all these over weight people then convert the fat (stored energy) you sucked out into bio-diesel. Lets take a dent out of our energy shortages, improve the health of Americans reduce our dependence on foreign oils, recover all that stored energy. In another 5 years bring them back in to harvest more of their stored energy to fuel Americas needs. Win win for everybody no more having to worry about wasting those leftovers you have after each family meal you can stuff yourself and then spend that energy at a later date powering your car. I can just imagine what you would want to be teaching these kids with your forced education.

Is this why almost a hundred percent of the forest land in the US under private ownership has been clearcut? Is this why most of the private rangeland and farmland in the US sheds polluted water? Tell the rest of the story, out of ALL the land that has been clear cut EXACTLY how much has NOT been restored or replanted? We need verifiable facts.

Due to modern medicine humans are living longer than ever, thank GOD. Now we have national health care (thanks Obama) we ALL will live longer, Canadians have national health care they live on average 5 years longer than Americans. Better get use to your perceived overpopulation problem its hear to stay breed baby breed! The more GREEN this world goes the LONGER more populated this world will be (thanks AL Gore/ Obama Inc.) the reduction in the use of fossil fuels will lead to a huge longevity boom in the near future hooray !

Currently tracking 4,767 airborne aircraft with 115,731,326 total flights in the database. FlightAware has tracked 52,981 arrivals in the last 24 hours. { <a href="http://flightaware.com/live/livemap.rvt" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } we really need all these planes flying over head dumping their spent gases all over us? In June they consumed over 1.5 billion gallons of jet fuel. { <a href="http://airlines.org/Energy/FuelCost/Pages/MonthlyJetFuelCostandConsumptionReport.aspx" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Any my OHV is causing "global warming"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Study blocking events -----&gt; { <a href="http://www.google.com/search?q=blocking+events&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&client=firefox-a" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Natural cooling cycle based on reduced solar sunspot activity That is why, in the midst of a new and natural cooling cycle based on reduced solar sunspot activity, we are having a very warm summer and possibly even a very warm year thanks to a jet stream experiencing "blocking events." We all need to get passed the notion that humans have anything to do with the weather. It is too vast, too chaotic, and too unpredictable to rationally suggest that a little bit of carbon dioxide is driving the whole thing. It has virtually nothing to do with the climate whereas the Sun has everything to do with it. There are rumors that the Senate will attempt to take up yet another version of the Cap-and-Trade bill passed in the House during a lame duck session. Based on the bogus global warming, it is a total fraud, a scheme to sell "carbon credits" and make a few people rich while the rest of us are fleeced by rising energy costs. If it passes, those that vote for it will truly be traitors because they will have doomed any economic recovery. It is a nation-killer. "Green is the first socio-political movement in which every single leader and spokesperson is filthy rich."

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

If you stand by ANY water way and wait for it to rain you will see multiple plumes of visible sedimentation, this is why water has cut into the earth and created the water way, now if you zoom out and look at the big picture its been happening for BILLIONS of years its called erosion its what cut all the ditches, valleys canyons.If what your seeing is affecting the wildlife then that means you have done a study please give us the details of your study so we can view them and independently verify the results, your bleeding heart liberal emotional findings are completely meaningless we need to see verifiable scientific studies, we also dont need to see any of that "junk science" the left wing has been using either.Obama used more than 9000 gallons of jet fuel flying around for nothing (some popularity contest thing) on EARTH DAY now someone here wants to convince me to give up using my OHV because of its emissions.Obama created MORE CO2 in ONE DAY than I have enjoying my OHV for 40+ years and MORE than I will if I continue to use my OHV for another 40 years so why are you trying to punish me?Al Gore has the carbon foot print of about 70 average Americans I havent seen him make any move to reduce his foot print in the past 20 years every year his carbon foot print gets BIGGER! Now your going to come here and demonize OHV'sEvery second you have your computer turned on your destroying fragile Eco systems and harming wildlife!You ever seen the carbon foot print of a computer, you have any idea what the carbon foot print is for all the worlds computers, you have any idea how much bigger the worlds carbon foot print is since Al Gore invented and popularized the internet, SHAME ON HIM just think of all the environmental DAMAGE Al Gore has caused just by making the internet popular.Google built their new computer building next to a POWER PLANT it consumes so much power supporting your computerized self gratification habits.People on this site complaining about overpopulation Obama is giving everybody FREE health care for the sole purpose of MAKING PEOPLE LIVE LONGER.GREEN is all about making the world cleaner so we all LIVE LONGER die from less toxins this has to have those anti-overpopulation people puking buckets of blood.What is wrong with the message you people are trying to send to the world, you look at the big picture the left wing looks like they dont have a clue as to what they really want other than to complain and butt their nose into everybody else private lives and to run everybody else lifeAnybody that owns a ATV or OHV can plainly see your completely clueless if you think you know something then show the world the FACTS we have heard enough bleeding heart liberal crapola to last a lifetime. If your REALLY a environmentalist and are really CONCERNED about the EARTH and health and welfare of others why have you NOT addressed the litter problem in this world? How come we never hear a peep out of these so called environmentalist when it comes to REAL issues you can make a HUGE IMPACT on when you correct these problems. Drive down any road in the USA stop any place you like get out and walk the ditch you cant go 20' and not find trash, the learned behavior is to throw all your trash out the window dont leave it in your car until you get home then carry it into your house for proper disposal.Trash is thrown right into the ditches and thats throwing poison right into our worlds drinking water.Their is billions of tons of trash in our county's ditches yes you never see a environmentalist say one word about this global problem that could easily be cured and billions of tons of trash cleaned up.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your all nuts for even trying to argue with these so called environmentalist look at what they have been typing on this site. Everything they type is all bleeding heart liberal crapola unsupported by FACTS, we need to make land use decisions based on FACTS. You use feelings for decisions made to YOUR PRIVATE LANDS, FACTS and science for Public Lands. If you want to reply to these bleeding hearts then ask them the questions they don't have the guts to ask themselves as I have done in my last reply, when you STOP defending their stupid unfounded ideas and ask for FACTS to support their position they all run and hide. Look at the global warming thing, that's long from over, they used junk science and LIES to fool the whole world, the world took them for their word they proved they CANT BE TRUSTED.

Obama can do a \$328,835 publicity-photo shoot destroying the planet with his 757 jumbo airliner but I can't use my OHV -----&gt; { <a href="http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=newsarchive&sid=aHJkHaApn4o" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } They use more fossil fuel starting his jet than my OHV consumes in 4 years of use. How about this 8,000-mile, fossil fuel-burning fun raiser that cost TAX PAYERS 2 million dollars I bet there is a underfunded park some place needing that money and can't get it. This is one trip how many trips has he taken so far every time I turn on the news he is getting on a plane to fly some place, I bet some environmentalist here can produce these numbers, Obamas carbon foot print for flying a plane since in office, well? ??? Here is your chance to show the world just how much you really care produce the numbers. Do they really care? Can't use Al Gore's internet to stream cast some of these events to help SAVE THE EARTH by NOT burning thousands of gallons of jet fuel. There are how many THOUSANDS of jet airliners in the air over National Parks dumping how many TONS of carbon on the wildlife 24 hours a day 7 days a week 365 days a year? How come we never hear environmentalist showing concern for land that has a constant stream of jet fuel dumped on it, where is the CONCERN? And your worried about a OHV's running over crickets.

Al Gore has the carbon foot print of about 70 average Americans, take a close look at the Obama foot print he spent more than 9000 gallons of jet fuel on Earth Day, I haven't burned 9000 gallons of fuel in the past 30 years now I am suppose to give up my OHV change needs to start with men at high places.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Another nicely written emotional cry for help, please provide some factual basis to support your idea. I think there should be a world wide ban on lawn mowing, have you ever seen the destruction caused by mowing lawns, have you ever witnessed the death and harassment of the wildlife, you can see bugs fighting for their lives trying to escape the suction of the massive steel blades turning thousands of revolutions per minute. Some are able to escape death's grip but sadly enough many don't make it, THOUSANDS die just so these greedy nature hating evil lawn owners can impress their neighbors with a manicured lawn, you can hear the grass in pain as it's cut, you look close you can see each blade of grass bleeding and crying out in pain it has to be suffering, you see body parts of insects litter the ground like a battlefield, mice, frogs, toads and baby rabbits are also caught up in the fight for life but more often than not the lawn mower wins and they meet a grizzly painful death. Millions of insects are crushed to death by the massive weight of the mowers weight. Then if it's not bad enough they terrorize the land with a lawn mower they spray it with all kinds of chemicals to kill bugs and weeds and to make it grow faster so they can terrorize nature more frequently with their mowers of mass destruction. Oh the humanity please make them stop.

The sound does not impact the wildlife if it did there would have been facts supporting this made available to the general public by now. How many different forms of wildlife do you have to see on the trail not scared by your OHV before you understand this. Why does every form of wildlife natural in my area walk across my yard or fly over me whilst I am on my OHV or mowing my yard, or running my chain saws. Why do honest hard working Americans continue to allow themselves to be brain washed by environmentalists come on I know we're not all this dumb.

The Clean Water Act does not conflict with recreational pursuits. Try reading it.

I strongly support and applaud this idea. There are many BLM roadless areas throughout the West with identified wilderness characteristics that deserve and need interim administrative protection until Congress makes a decision on their ultimate fate. The Bush/Cheney administration was openly hostile to such protection, and that's why former Interior Secretary Norton jumped at the opportunity provided by the State of Utah's lawsuit challenging such protection. The infamous Norton/Leavitt Utah "no more wilderness" lawsuit settlement reversed a longstanding legal interpretation, and not only prevents new BLM interim protections but also voided some previous BLM wilderness inventories, as well as a long-established BLM wilderness handbook. However, now the shoe is potentially on the other foot. There is a similar, current opportunity for President Obama and Interior Secretary Salazar to reverse this "no more wilderness" policy and put things back where they were before the Norton/Leavitt settlement. There is pending litigation challenging some recent BLM RMPs that applied these "no more wilderness" requirements. Thus far, I think that the federal attorneys have been defending these RMPs and the Bush/Cheney status quo. Why? Most American voters voted for change, and repudiated the Bush/Cheney trainwreck on federal lands and environmental policies. Obama and Salazar can and should revoke the "no more wilderness" policy through settlement of this pending litigation. That would truly represent "change we can believe in."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I strongly support the Endangered Species Act (ESA). I also share the concern that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has not adequately fulfilled many of its ESA duties. For example, it has an abysmal track record of greatly delayed and backlogged processing of ESA listing petitions, and it excessively uses the "warranted but precluded" finding on those petitions. This poor track record not only occurred during the eight Bush years, but sadly it is also continuing thus far in the year and a half of the Obama administration. In addition, FWS officials often fail to do what is actually needed to protect and recover ESA listed species. There are many examples of this lack of courage. In southern Nevada, FWS officials have been aware of chronic trespass livestock grazing in Mojave desert tortoise critical habitat for many years, in apparent violation of the ESA, yet they do not intervene. Developers have also destroyed Mojave desert tortoise habitats, and likely killed some tortoises, in Mohave County Arizona without having a FWS approved habitat conservation plan and incidental take permit. Again, the FWS takes a pass or looks away. ESA may be strong law on paper, but it is weakly enforced. FWS needs a strong backbone, not one made out of jello.

Closures of OHV trails on public lands are about protecting sensitive environmental areas from continued degradation -- they are *\*not\** about some sort of "collective punishment" for the bad behavior of a few that is imposed upon the innocent, particularly upon the mobility-impaired (there is no mechanism or justification for collective punishment in our laws). Since you posted your idea, by the way, there's been much discussion about how the mobility-impaired can gain greater access to natural areas (such as the idea "make handicapped access a priority when reducing OHV traffic" [on August 17th])...please return to this conversation with your further thoughts.

wrote at the top of this discussion: "Keep track of all the ideas I post." As of August 22nd, you have not submitted another Idea, a single Comment, or a single Vote! Particularly given the lack of follow-through -- I'm concerned and hope that you're well, by the way -- I was disappointed that your idea included no actual mechanism to increase recycling, and so it generated only a few actionable policy recommendations in the Comments that followed. My advice is that we write clearly, concisely, logically, and factually about practical solutions to real problems (though the occasional humorous comment should be allowed) at every opportunity. For example, there are machines that exchange certain recyclable items for cash and these could be placed next to the vending machines that deliver those items (particularly in higher-traffic areas). Care to comment (anyone)?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Great idea! Everyone should be able to enjoy the sky at night as part of our national heritage. In the northeast there are many cultural sites which are unidentified or unstudied. These sites were meant to be viewed at sunrise, sunset and during certain night events, such as the Perseid Meteor shower. These ceremonial landscapes played a 'lost' role in our nation's history. The federal government could now play an important role in supporting the identification and protection of these sites. The federal government could also play a role in reforming our nighttime lighting - inefficient fixtures, wasteful timing and overuse of lighting. 'Dark sky' street fixtures are no more expensive than traditional fixtures. Residential lighting can also be manufactured to be 'dark sky' friendly - I own several. The federal government could provide incentives to states and towns to become more lighting efficient. Public education could go a long way. A one night national 'dark sky' event could bring partners together to raise awareness of the beauty of the night sky as part of our great outdoors and to generate support for more year round changes. In the recent National Geographic issue, a nonprofit in New York working with community farms asked children who had participated in their programs if they had seen the stars - sadly only two children who had recently immigrated from Africa could answer 'yes'. Viewing the stars should part of the outdoor experience for every child. Consider starting with a 'Big Star Night' on August 11th each summer to coincide with the Perseid Meteor shower. Partners around the country would offer local family oriented events (a sort of 'Trails Night' similar to Trails Day). When everyone realizes what we've been missing, it'll generate excitement for restoring our national night sky.

The tallgrass prairie has been called the most endangered ecosystem in North America by the Nature Conservancy. Only 3 percent of the original tallgrass prairie remains unbroken. It is also one of the most misunderstood systems. Since the time pioneers emerged from the eastern forests onto the tallgrass prairie, they wondered why such a large expanse of land would remain treeless. Even today, the lack of trees in the prairie causes misunderstanding and low levels of appreciation. People equate trees and forests with healthy ecological environments and view prairie as a big empty field. This is unfortunate. We need more prairie conservation and education on the significance of the prairie.

I say bring it back and get them working on our national infrastructure. We need to invest in our own country and stop sending hush money to these other countries. National Defense needs an overhaul and needs to have some pork trimmed out of it's budget. So much money is being wasted that it's absolutely appalling. As far as problems with sexual harassment or civil rights, this is baloney. Just pre-screen the applicants and ask for references. Make everyone sign a liability release and a form saying that they understand this work has inherent risks and that they will not hold the US liable.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Light pollution control in the National Parks system is needed for the following reasons: 1. It wastes energy, all the light that does not go where intended (such as up into the sky), is wasted energy. 2. Glare from bad lighting design is a safety hazard to automobile drivers, especially seniors. 3. wasted energy contributes to greenhouse gasses, global warming, and wastes tax dollars 4. light trespass onto neighbors' property is rude and unwanted 5. excessive nighttime lighting is bad for the environment and to humans. It upsets circadian rhythm in most species, especially birds. 6. Sky glow near federal lands prevents the viewing of our natural heritage - the night sky and the Milky Way. The sickly light glow over most towns and cities prevents children from seeing the real sky.

Who is this person???? Where exactly is this mysterious open land that does not need to be recognized and protected? I think today we need to have everything in writing when it comes to protecting our environment and what is left of our wild places.

I am amazed at how all the naysayers of OHV use, speak from ignorance. I would bet a dollar to a donut most of them have never once ridden an ATV. My family has 4 ATV's and we ride them thousands of miles a year in the National Forest. We have had to stop countless times to let deer and other animals "walk" across the trail not 20 feet in front of our running ATV's. They sure did not seem scared. Riding clubs have taken over many areas and volunteered their time and money. Making the trails cleaner than they have ever been. Seeing trash on the trail is now the exception where we ride. Obviously these ignorant folks believe you start an ATV and it drives itself and requires no effort. You come ride 150 miles a day at 100 degree temperature on mountain trails with us and we will see how physically fit your are. You better pack some Ben-Gay and Gatorade. Our family loves to ride and it brings us closer. Where is your son or daughter on Friday or Saturday night? Ours are across the campfire eating marshmallow and telling stories. No cell phones, computers, video games, or TV. Just family. You have a lot more chance of getting hurt or killed driving around in you Smart Car than we have riding our ATV's responsibly. The more OHV areas closed the more pressure put on the ones that are open. The so called solution only increases the problem. Typical government response. We currently have less than 1% of the National Forest opened to OHV's. No way we are going to destroy the forest while only accessing 1% of it. If you do not want or like OHV's thats great. Do not try to stop us from riding ours. Once they start restricting use they never stop. If you think your recreation activity is safe because it does not have an internal combustion engine. Think again. If you once went to an area where OHV use is allowed and you saw trash on the ground and some moron doing donuts in the parking lot. Sorry, but that does not make you an expert on the subject. True anything can be abused, and there are bad seeds that participate in every outside recreation. Punishing the majority because of the minority is ridiculous.

Forest roads are not trails. If I wanted to ride on forest roads I would just drive my truck. We are talking about OHV trails. Yes, less than 1% of the National Forest is actually OHV trails. Check out the BRC website and educate yourself.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The "Elites" fly around the world on private jets. Live in huge houses with thousands of dollars in electric use each month. Drive their entourage around in SUV's and tell us we are ruining the planet. Meanwhile their minions sit behind computers and tell us, OHV riders, that are 1% of the National Forest access is too much. Give me a break. Your arrogance makes me sick

Community support is essential. In Gettysburg, PA, the Park Service and the Foundation will not express an opinion as to the negative aspects of placing a proposed casino 3000 feet from the National Military Park along the Journey Through Hallowed Ground, a scenic byway extending from Monticello to Gettysburg. It dishonors the 51,000 casualties suffered in that epic battle that helped to define us as a nation, and will cannibalize the existing vibrant heritage tourism economy that has supported the area and kept it charming (not without other such conflicts) for 147 years. We community groups do all the heavy lifting with our own time and money....we need some help to ward off the ongoing attacks from predatory, inappropriate and greedy developers who only see lining their pockets as a goal.

I might add the caveat - put forests where forests should be. I appreciate trees where they belong; however in Nebraska people believe that forests should be planted in areas that were historically tallgrass prairie. Grasslands are a vital part of the landscape in many areas of the midwest and should be encouraged as well. They hold soil from eroding better than trees and they store as much or more carbon in the soil while providing copious amounts of oxygen, just like trees.

Yes it should be a park not a zoo, but there must be a balance between protecting the animals and protecting the animals for people. Ideally a roadway would not be fenced but if the choice is between that and risking the death of animals, I would go with the fencing. But with proper planning it should not be an issue.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Endangered Species List is being used like a club for the federal government (under threat of lawsuit) to maintain control over the wolf population. The problem that was unforeseen (or unheeded) is that with wolves there is a cultural/societal population limit. I would love it if wolves were found in all of the areas they did pre-settlement; however in this day and age with so many more millions of people in this country it's not feasible, at least not in the large numbers they had before. The wolf populations of the Northern Rockies are recovered as indicated by numerous wildlife biologists who live there. Ranchers and others who have lost animals are indicating that the numbers are too high in some areas. Allowing the states to have control gives them the freedom to manage the population as they see fit, while allowing for the long-term survival of the species in that state. Keeping the wolf on the ESL does not provide for their long-term survival because it: 1. Cheapens the ESL by keeping a species on the list that no longer requires protection to survive. 2. Increases the angst and frustration of local landowners who cannot deal with livestock losses without fear of legal proceedings and fines. The only way that wolves will have long-term survival in a locality is to get the local landowners to understand and value them as part of the ecosystem. Some will never understand and will choose to demonize the wolves regardless. However, if a majority of the people in an area value wolves the consensus will turn to discourage the hatred that wolves currently espouse. This situation is also being replicated in the Great Lakes wolf population that has been recovered for the last decade; to no avail.

your base assumptions are just incorrect. You make assertions of your opinion sound like fact when they are not. Properly placed leg-hold traps are not dangerous to humans and are seldom problematic for pets. And while at its most basic level a trap is indiscriminate, the placement of the trap will most often dictate the species that is caught. A basic leg-hold will capture an animal and, if it is a non-target animal, will allow for it to be released - often undamaged. Your comparison to cockfighting and dogfighting is foolish - you compare trapping which utilizes fur from the trapped animals as a commodity; to pointless bloodsport that is purely recreational "entertainment". Trapping has a value and a place on all public lands. It's too bad that you choose not to see that.

It saddens me to hear anyone say we have plenty of open land. Population growth in the US and around the world has destroyed so much.. cutting down trees, laying pavement, building homes (esp those McMansions !!) -- anyone just needs to take a look around, REALLY look, to see that animals and birds are being squeezed out more and more. Please, open your eyes, travel a bit so you can understand the enormity of the situation for wildlife.

Easements are not, however, a "free-ticket" to open space conservation. Using conservation easements to protect working forests requires the administrative oversight to enforce and manage these often-complex agreements. Recent DEC experiences in the Adirondacks with large scale working forest easements have shown that major time and staff investment is necessary to verify that the easement agreements are being followed by the parties and that unauthorized public use or private actions are not taking place. Publicly-held conservation easements require a corresponding investment of resources for staffing and non-personal resources for administration and management to protect all parties' rights and interests.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Forestry incentive programs have been used in New York to promote and facilitate preparation of Forest Stewardship Plans for private forest owners, and implement various forest and environmental improvement practices including timber stand thinning, invasive species removal, reforestation, riparian buffer establishment, wildlife habitat improvement, forest road stabilization and water quality protection. Demand for these practices from NY forest owners and managers has always well exceeded available funding, indicating a far greater potential for applying conservation practices on the ground.

Currently, the large majority of the funding available under EQIP goes to farmers for legitimate conservation practices on agricultural lands, which diminishes the funding available for the implementation of sustainable forestry practices on private land.

Community forests can provide outdoor recreation and education, forest products for community use, sustainable biomass for community based energy systems and carbon sequestration. The USFS is preparing to roll out the program soon, but the initial appropriation of \$1 million for the program is woefully inadequate. Here in New York alone, there is great interest in this program, and increased assistance from the USFS Community Forestry Program will leverage significant local and private resources for this exciting new program.

While much work has gone into this effort, there is no national standard or program that has yet been developed to provide direct financial assistance to forest land owners for the significant carbon sequestration and ecosystem benefits forest lands provide to society at large.

New York and the rest of the Northern Forest and New England region also are on the front lines of the battle against invasive forest health pests, including the Asian Long Horned Beetle (ALB), and the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB), among others. These destructive forest health pests pose grave risks to the integrity of the region's forests. New York State is facing huge costs to slow the spread of the EAB, discovered for the first time in New York last year, with new outbreaks reported this year within 50 miles of the forests of New England.

I'm pleased to say that an overwhelming number of DU supporters are outdoor enthusiasts and participate on a regular basis in activities that bring them close to nature. Whether it be hunting waterfowl over an early morning marsh, hiking a mountain trail or simply enjoying a peaceful moment in a natural setting, they understand and support with their time and money DU's important habitat work and the relationship between conservation and the added value it brings to their lives. It is that kind of connectivity and passion for all things wild that needs to be generated in greater numbers of people, young and old alike, if we hope to kindle the political and financial support it will take to conserve enough of our natural heritage for the use and enjoyment of generations to come. Those who enjoy sport hunting and fishing know this first hand and have always been at the forefront of conservation efforts in this country and thanks to their financial contributions and strong advocacy efforts, we all have more places to visit and enjoy in America's great outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For example, the prairie pothole region of the United States and Canada remain our number one priority for conservation in North America. It is where 80% of all waterfowl are produced. Tragically, native grasslands and wetlands -- the natural resources that make the Prairie Pothole Region a national treasure -- are disappearing at an alarming rate. It is imperative that we conserve enough of this unique grass-wetland landscape to secure a viable future for waterfowl. If we fail here, it is unlikely that we be able to meet the population goals established by the North American Waterfowl Management Plan-an international effort set forth in 1985 between the US, Canada and Mexico, that provides a blueprint for the recovery and long-term sustainability of the continent's waterfowl.

A Governors Task Force on Northern Forest Lands some time ago warned that changes in land ownership from the timber industry to property development for second homes and the like, would likely have an adverse impact on open space, forestry, farming and recreational uses on private lands. As downturns in the economy of the forests industry occurs, millions of acres of timber company lands are often offered for sale. When this occurs at time of a strong regional economy, working forest land is at risk to developers and prospectors interested in recreational developments.

Here ten district ecoregions converge, making the 24-county southeast Texas region one of the richest and most environmentally diverse in the nation.

This is a key stopover habitat for millions of migrating North American neotropical birds.

Our metropolitan region, currently homw to over 5 million people, is expected to grow by 50%, reaching 7.4 million by 2020. The need to set aside green space today is urgent.

The LWCF state assistance program has helped to develop thousands of trails, recreation fields, and other park facilities for Americans to use in their daily lives, as well as acquire new parks and recreation lands in every state in the nation. It was created by congress in 1965 and is authorized to receive \$900 million annually from a portion of the federal revenues from oil and gas leasing of the Outer Continental Shelf. This amount was to be divided equally between federal funding and stateside projects. Unfortunately, thge program has been woefully underfunded in recent decades. As a result, all the states report a huge unmet need for local parks and recreation resources totalling more than \$27 billion in eligible projects.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just last Friday, the latest opportunity to provide substantial, dedicated funding for the state side portion of this program was again lost. The Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic Resources Act, or CLEAR Act was passed by the House, including language on dedicated funding to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. That's the good news. A proposed amendment to this Act would have provided a guarantee of no less than 40% of funds for the stateside program. The day before the vote, this amendment was withdrawn by its sponsor, Representative McGovern of Massachusetts. Coincidentally, in a July 29 letter from Secretary of the Interior Ken Salazar to Rep. McGovern, he indicated that the Obama administration was committed to full funding of the LWCF by 2014 through the budget process, but there was no assurance that the stateside program would be guaranteed funding. Based on this letter, it appears that the withdrawal of the amendment was based at least in part on the administration's lack of support for dedicated state-side funding for this program. That's the bad news...

In the same letter, Secretary Salazar refers to the President's America's Great Outdoors Initiative, saying "we are hearing from state and local governments, recreation advocates, non profit organizations and other supporters about ways to enhance the State-side grant program" If you are indeed listening, this is my strong message to you today -- Fund the State-side portion of the LWCF, fund it fully and fund it consistently.

As a professional in the field for 26 years and a member of the National Recreation and Park Association, I have gone to Washington annually with my peers and have listened to lip service to fully fund this program going back many administrations, and in all candor I find it frustrating when an opportunity such as the one I just described comes up and is not supported by the administration.

I hope these listening sessions provide you with many examples of the value of recreation in reconnecting people to the outdoors as well as fighting obesity - I also hope you come away from these understanding that we need your help to make this happen. Committing to consistent, dedicated state side funding in the LWCF would go along way to showing me as a parks professional that the America's Great Outdoors Initiative is willing to put its money where its mouth is.

4. Environmental Justice Parks. Low-income neighborhoods and especially the children who live there often do not have access to green space; many of these places are located next to noxious factories, sewage plants, waste transfer stations or landfills. A special program to bring the amenity of parks can go a long way to making these areas healthier and raising them economically.

Last year the General Assembly passed a law making it harder for local governments to condemn properties that have conservation easements on them. Similar bills could be introduced in other states.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a long time resident of Yellow Pine, Idaho. I am deeply concerned with destruction of certain cabins by the USFS Payette National Forest. I've studied the 106 National Historical Preservation Act and believe the USFS has knowingly and willfully violated it on multiple occasions, at Stibnite, Idaho. I have called and asked for the forest archeologist. He denies all knowledge of the USFS destroying any cabins at Stibnite, on the national register of historical places since 1982. I have watched the USFS many times, destroying historical parts of a historical ghost town, with much of their destruction on private property. Through FOIA, all I have obtained for documentation thus far, is a receipt (attached) where the USFS paid \$6990 to destroy \_\_\_\_\_' residence. No documentation has been provided as to the destruction of the cabin built by the Boy Scouts of America in 1942, along with several others, possibly as many as 100 total. Many witnesses can be provided to prove the USFS burned down the cabins, although the USFS deny any knowledge of the destruction.

Obtained through FOIA, I have proof that the Payette National Forest knowingly and willfully falsified documents regarding Bill Timm's cabin, located in the historic town of Roosevelt, Idaho, named after Theodore Roosevelt. Review of the structure and testimonies suggest the cabin was built around 1901, when the town of Roosevelt was named after President Roosevelt. A landslide in 1909 dammed up Monumental Creek and turned the town of Roosevelt into Roosevelt Lake. Bill Timm's cabin was above the water line and is likely the sole surviving intact structure remaining from that historic town. Most people in the Payette National Forest do not like the current claims owner Jack Walker. Therefore it is my belief they falsified the documents so they could destroy a historical structure while the very elderly gentleman who owns it lies fighting for his life in the hospital. The USFS has let a petty argument cloud their judgement, and have a stated agenda to destroy an excellent piece of history, simply to settle a score with an honorable elderly man who can't defend himself. Which is selfish, ruthless, and unethical.

Thank you for initiating this invaluable effort to reconnect our people with conservation and the outdoors at a national scale. Given the massive & multiple challenges facing our society and world, it is tempting to overlook the power and importance of our environment. Yet when we don't respect and care for it, civilizations fall. I live in Montana, but won't be able to attend any of the listening sessions being held this Wednesday. How long to I have to submit ideas/comments on line? What is the timeline for moving ideas into action?

There are two principal issues in the Chesapeake region that serve as barriers to getting more citizens outdoors and more engaged in preserving our heritage: 1) a lack of adequate resources for land conservation; and 2) a lack of public access to our rivers and the Bay. We believe that these issues can be addressed and the goals of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative can be best achieved by:

Fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund and dedicating a portion of those funds to a public-private Chesapeake Treasured Landscapes Fund that leverages private and other public financing. The Chesapeake Fund would be used to acquire lands targeted by a new Federal-State GIS-based conservation planning tool that is modeled on state platforms such as Maryland's GreenPring program

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Establishing a new 21st Century Chesapeake Bay National Park, as recommended in the Chesapeake Executive Order and the Special Resources Study submitted to Congress in January. A new unit of the national park system in the Chesapeake would not only help address critical needs for landscape preservation, but improve opportunities for public access to the Bay, education, and ecosystem protection, in partnership with State and local governments, and non-profit organizations.

Fully funding the activities called for in implementing the comprehensive management plan (CMP) for the Captain Jon Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail, and the Chesapeake Gateways and Water trails Program. With funding support, these model initiatives will greatly increase targeted conservation, engage citizens in environmental stewardship and expand heritage tourism throughout the 64,000 square mile Chesapeake watershed.

Public access to waterways should be given due consideration in the transportation planning process and in conjunction with new construction, reconstruction or repair of road and bridge transportation facilities, except where such use is unsafe, not permitted or inappropriate.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recreation areas should be established in the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education should be fully engaged in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative and should support policies and fund programs to ensure that all students - from pre-K to 20 - have the opportunity to learn about the environment and natural world around them.

The state's fiscal situation has eliminated funding for these two important partners recently; federal waivers for reduction or elimination of partner matches would help restore these important stewardship collaborations on state lands.

New York faces environmental a range of problems that will require a greatly expanded and diversified workforce to manage: stewardship of 4.4 million acres of state conservation land; dilapidated state and municipal parks; homes that need weatherization to conserve energy; a growing list of invasive species and damaged ecosystems. With funding from the U.S. Department of Labor, NYSDEC and our sister agencies could initiate a summer youth employment program focused natural resource conservation and stewardship projects. We would envision placing unemployed young adults at as forty regional facilities such as field headquarters, fish hatcheries and education centers to where participants would work as part of existing DEC crews on projects such as trail maintenance, campground upgrades, invasive species removal, tree plantings, and ADA enhancements.

Much progress has been made in ensuring cleaner estuaries and natural shorelines in Rhode Island over the last forty years. But with continued development pressure compounded by threats from climate change, our estuaries are as threatened as ever.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

On Thursday, July 8th, I was in the audience at the Listening Session held at Occidental College in Los Angeles. I listened with interest to those who were chosen to speak to the panel during the entire afternoon, but not one of those who were chosen to speak addressed my concerns. It seems shortsighted of those who arranged the event did not arrange for any opposing viewpoints to be aired and considered by the panel. I was also concerned that those who spoke asked for money from you for their special interests. We ask nothing but to enjoy the multi-use designation of the land that's still there.

was there in the 1990's when it was decided to close off additional vast areas of public land to the public. It's important to note the growth in population at that point, as opposed to the shrinking amount of areas available to the public to enjoy.

am here in 2010, and we have yet another Desert Protection Act! I believe they have come to take the last public land that is open to the public and keep it from the public to enjoy.

First, the talk force asked what is working effectively in our strategies for conservation, recreation and connecting the public to the outdoors. In our experience, the answer is partnerships. We attribute our successes to our full embrace of public and private partnerships, including those with local, state and federal organizations, for conservation activities and initiatives that make sense, improve our economy and protect and restore our environment. Strategies that marry responsible, predictable funding with sound local and grassroots planning with partnerships that engage all levels of government and private organizations are at the heart of our long list of successes.

Future listening sessions should be announced well in advance so people can plan their calendars and so interested organizations can assist in spreading the word. The website needs to be kept up-to-date. It also needs to be kept simple. I have heard some complaints from people who find it hard to navigate. And while I understand and support the need for registration to make comments and to vote, I think it is not a good idea to have one's votes linked to one's personal profile for all other users to see. ( I have no problem with the comments themselves being linked, however.)

Of course, AGOI does not exist in a vacuum, and there are other issues which affect it, but which were probably beyond the scope of the listening session. But without an examination of these other issues, AGOI cannot be totally successful. Most important is funding , although population (which was mentioned at UCD) needs to be taken into account as well

This is a big issue, but the main issue is really one of national priorities. There is money available for programs, but the Administration and Congress need to push much harder to shift spending priorities toward programs that directly benefit Americans and our environment. That might mean, for example, that departments that have huge budgets, like Defense, have funding shifted away from them.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Also, our system of government subsidies needs to be overhauled so that money is not going to support activities that harm the outdoors, like to oil and gas companies (which seem to have no problem being very profitable).

Agriculture and transportation subsidies also need to be examined for their environmental impacts.

We can't hope to make outdoors accessible to everyone if the population keeps growing. We need to come up with a policy to minimize population growth and even reduce it. It's not just a matter of immigration, either, although projections seem to show that the bulk of future population growth will come from immigration and descendants of present immigrants. This is important for both urban outdoors issues like city parks and recreation areas and facilities as well as wildlands.

Land managers must remember that users of public lands are the owners of those lands. There is an increasing trend in which land managers view the public as customers, when in fact, American citizens are the owners of the land and the employers of the land managers. Even if the idea behind this thinking is to promote "good customer service," the thinking is backward. Land managers need to see themselves as "public servants" and act accordingly.

It was disconcerting to see Secretary Salazar say that land use decisions would be made at the local level in Utah when politicians and others in that state, representing a minority of Americans, voiced opposition to the possibility of new national monuments. This is not to say that local opinions should be ignored, but federal public lands belong to all Americans. Only a small minority of Americans lives in those states having the most vocal anti-public lands attitudes, and this minority should not be allowed veto power over proposals and management policies that benefit the majority of Americans.

Not everyone can go everywhere. People need to face up to this fact. Therefore, not every group of persons should be given the same level of access-- not because they are less deserving as people, but because some methods of access are destructive of other important values. There have been proposals in Yosemite National Park, for example, to build tramways to the tops of Glacier Point and Half Dome so people can get up to the summits more easily. High levels of motorized access should not be allowed everywhere, because they are destructive of wilderness values, for example. Not every trail should be paved

Off-highway vehicles should not be allowed free travel everywhere. In fact they should be severely curtailed, as they are destructive of habitat, solitude, and quiet. Furthermore, quiet recreationists-- hikers, hunters and anglers, photographers, rafters, birders and wildlife viewers, cross-country skiers, and others-- make up the majority of the users of America's public lands. Their desire for peace and quiet in the outdoors should take precedence over the noise of OHV and snowmobiles. OHVs and snowmobiles ruin the experience for them, but the reverse is not true.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Resource management decisions must be made on the basis of sound science and not private desires

Concessionaire fees must return a fair value to the agency since it is a public resource being exploited for private gain (even while providing a public service). But charges to the public (citizens) should not be exorbitant, either, such that average citizens are priced out. Prices for lodging in the national parks are becoming far beyond the range of ordinary Americans to enjoy. A quick look at some lodging shows the following examples: Yosemite Lodge, mid-week, after Labor Day, \$208 minimum for 2. Awahnee Hotel, Yosemite, 2 adults, mid-week, after Labor Day, \$498 for 2. High Sierra Camps, Yosemite, (tent cabins, including dinner & breakfast), 1513/person. Zion National Park Lodge, mid-week after Labor Day, minimum \$158.95 for 2.

Secondly, concessionaires are closing "non-profitable" campgrounds earlier and earlier every year, whereas the Forest Service used to keep campgrounds open, with bad weather being the more decisive factor. The trend toward concessionaire operations is depriving people of opportunities to enjoy their public lands in an inexpensive manner.

It was disturbing at the Davis sessions to hear OHV proponents say that OHVs are good ways to get kids away from their computers, and that as a consequence, more public lands should be made available for OHV use

OHV recreation may get children outdoors, but it does not get them close to nature. Instead the thrill comes from driving the machine. And OHV use does not promote physical activity. Far better for both purposes is to get children out hiking. (OHV use also exposes children to pollution from exhaust and to the risk of accidents.)

Overall, OHV use is not good for our public lands. The temptation to go off-trail is great, and user-created trails, once established, are hard to eradicate.

OHV use contributes to soil erosion, and increasingly, there is evidence that the dust blows away, sometimes on snowpack, causing earlier and more rapid snowmelt.

Although, with the rapidly changing culture, society has shifted its' focus and has instead advanced in ways that impact our lifestyles. It is proposed that the introduction of technology like video games and construction development in communities have restricted today's children from wanting to explore nature hi their backyards. Children in today's society think that "playing in nature seemed so....unproductive. Off-limits. Alien. Cute. Dangerous. Televised." (Louv, 2005) These, factors can possibly lead to what Richard Louv (2005) calls "nature deficit disorder".

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In the article titled "The New Relationship Between Children and Nature" Richard Louv (2005) describes "nature deficit disorder" as a problem that involves children who have little to no desire to play in nature. Louv (2005) believes that this can be detrimental to the development of a youth's childhood. The author states that being outdoors can stimulate children's curiosity and imagination; essentially nature can calm, focus and excite their emotions (Louv,2005). Within both of the articles Nabhan, Trimble (1994) and Louv (2005) agree that being outdoors is beneficial. In many ways, solitude in nature "enhances children's creative play and encourages the presence of adult supervision" (Louv, 2005).

The greatest challenge is the trend to lock up the outdoors in order to preserve it instead of allowing wise use. These efforts to decrease rather than increase access are seen by many only as an effort to eliminate their sports and have created a polarized battlefield between two sides whose ultimate goals are the same - healthy, vibrant rivers, streams and oceans, forests and fields, with habitat for all living creatures.

This rush to preserve without use is advocated on many fronts. Government, often under cover of insufficient funds, is also a culprit. For instance, the Pacific Southwest Region of the US Forest Service manages 20 million acres in California or almost 20% of our state. If one looks at its Mission, Motto, Vision and Guiding Principles however, the word "recreation" does not appear.<sup>1</sup> Whatever happened to the motto "land of many uses"? It is no wonder that we are losing touch with the outdoors when access is not a priority for one-fifth of the entire state.

There are enormous stresses on our natural resources today. What was acceptable years ago is in not possible with our current population. But the answer is not in locking these resources up. Efforts to do so have dissuaded Americans from enjoying their resources and have been seen as a threat by those who do get out. Instead, what is needed is a forum for users and nonusers to work together to develop solutions that include appropriate use of public lands. We thank you for an opportunity to come together and work together.

Studies have shown that preserving habitat on waterfowl breeding grounds is extremely critical for both maintaining and increasing waterfowl populations. Areas such as the PPR are being converted to agricultural use every day, and thus many endangered prairie plants and wildlife species are losing key habitats. While gains have been made in many areas of the country, over the last century, much of the PPR has been converted to intensively cultivated cropland and heavily grazed or hayed grasslands. This loss of habitat has caused steeper, more consistent, and more widespread declines in grassland birds over the past 25 years than any other North American bird group.

As a lifelong resident of Eldorado National Forest, I object to spending over \$2,000,000,000 of my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations

The majority of their public recreate on Non Wilderness lands. Designating more Wilderness only discourages the public from enjoying the outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness and Monument designations are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple-Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. The President needs to include the two largest forms of recreation as a priority in his plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors: Off Highway Vehicle recreation and Mountain Biking. More areas need to be opened to people who enjoy these most popular ways to enjoy the outdoors. The Back Country Designation championed by the Blue Ribbon Coalition is vastly superior to Wilderness Designation because it provides the same environmental protection without locking up the land from public access. please take the time to learn more about this alternative a land protection plan:  
<http://www.sharetrails.org/backcountry>

Over 80% of lands west of Mississippi are open space. Wildlife have plenty of land to prosper. There is simply no need to create Wildlife Corridors or designate additional Wilderness Areas, unless the purpose of this initiative is to further the goals of the United Nation's bogus Wildlands Project by forcing people from rural communities and pushing them into urban areas.

The Creation of Wildlife corridors will have a disproportional and severe negative impact on rural communities. It appears that organizations such as the Nature conservancy stand to make huge illegal profits by swapping lands to the government for Wildlife Corridors.

The President stated that he is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple-use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special-interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. Those who live, work, play, and protect our public lands are the ones who should be consulted -- not those who simply want to lock up public land from public use.

The coalition group that formed to sponsor this event represents diverse interests both on a national and local scale on issues such as wilderness protection, diversity parity and equitable access to parks for all of our communities, urban parks, river parkways and wetlands restoration just to name a few. We fully expect to continue our collaboration to insure that the policy and funding opportunities we have identified are reinforced with our Federal agency partners through on-going dialogue with agency and political representatives as appropriate.

We invite you to hold one of the public meetings here in Seattle. We believe that the Puget Sound area and its surrounding watersheds and forests present an ideal opportunity of the kind of area that has tremendous natural resource values, significant and growing public use, and need for a more comprehensive and coordinated level of protection and management. This important and sensitive eco-region is anchored by three national parks (Mount Rainier, Olympic, and North Cascades) and a number of designated wilderness areas on the national forests. The watersheds that drain into the Puget Sound sustain salmon and steelhead, however, most of the runs are listed as either threatened or endangered and face real challenges for recovery. The lower elevation watersheds and working forests are mostly privately owned and contain a key part of the ecosystem and are important for corridors and connectivity for fish and wildlife - particularly in a climate changing world.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The challenge to engage outlying and rural communities within the Mississippi River watershed is encouraged by any local organizations and leaders who recognize the importance of stewarding the natural resources of America's River. There exists a need to engage local communities and empower them with the resources and information they need to fully realize the recreational and environmental benefits the Mississippi River has to offer. In response to the challenge put forth, we have attached a concept paper for a "Great Rivers Stewardship community of Practice," outlying a path forward and recommendations for advancing the efforts of America's Great Outdoors Initiative and the positive impact it can have on the resources and people of America's River, the Mississippi.

The lack of predictable, reliable funding, ORRG concluded, has been a major stumbling block to effective planning and implementation. We argued in our report that the long term solution to a chronic scarcity of funds would seem to entail dedicating by statute a percentage of revenues from energy development on public lands offshore to land and water conservation -- drawing on the precedent for a 12.5 percent set aside for stateside LWCF in the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. The rationale, in effect, a quid pro quo: as public resources are exploited, something is invested back into conservation. This rationale has become more pronounced in the wake of the oil spill in the gulf, with which you and others are now contending.

More funding is the only part of the issue. As we suggest later in this memorandum, America's Great Outdoors could be a catalyst for change. The federal government must spend more wisely what is currently available from disparate programs. Better targeting and widespread leveraging of state, local, and private sector financial resources are needed. So, too, are clearer, easier, more coordinated processes by which partnering organizations can apply for and secure funding to further land and water conservation and publicly accessible outdoor recreational opportunities.

the pursuit of greater funding for land and water conservation -- even if it takes longer to reach the desired level of support -- and more effective use of currently available federal dollars should continue vigorously

Resurrecting the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program, created in 1978 to rehabilitate critically needed recreation facilities in more than 300 localities but which has not been funded in several years. Funding for urban parks and recreation has not been a priority for most states with their share of stateside funding under LWCF, too few dollars to spread around, making the requisite planning effort by localities not worth it. Yet observers, including the Newark Mayor Cory Booker, have noted that close to home parks and recreation are the destination of choice for great numbers of Americans in urban areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Locally, we have seen movement in Emery and San Juan counties in response to the possibility of new National Monuments, but those efforts have stalled out, and they are in danger of being poisoned by parties who are hostile to the federal government and do not want meaningful protection. They are acting in these counties now, Secretary Salazar, to get you to leave them alone, not to advance important and lasting protection. These are the places where we still need your help – to help us see that shortcutting real protection can have real consequences. Locals can only drive the process when they do so with respect given to the national interest, and that is where we need your leadership. We need the power of Interior to help spur us along. With that help, I know we can

We have a once in a lifetime opportunity in San Juan County in the southeast part of the state, and we have a chance to do it right. We need to expand Canyonlands National Park and Hovenweep National Monument so that their conservation vision can be realized. We need to protect BLM and Forest Service Wilderness on Cedar Mesa, on Elk Ridge, near Natural Bridges and in the Glen Canyon region; we need to protect the wild and scenic Colorado and San Juan rivers. Cultural resources deserve protection too. Southeastern Utah is unique in that a longer slice of human history is better preserved there than anywhere else in the world. We need to make sure that these internationally significant cultural resources are not lost forever due to either malice or neglect.

Nationally, we need you to rescind the Leavitt/Norton No More Wilderness Agreement, we need a new Roadless Rule for National Forests from your administration, and we need robust and full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund at \$900 million of OCS proceeds annually as Congress intended. Further, we need science to resume a leading role in guiding land management decisions. We need sound decisions based on sound science without conflicting politics getting in the way.

Given the SCOPE of your outreach, I'm going to limit this to the National Parks even though the GREAT OUTDOORS covers BLM land, farms, ranches, the Gulf, and much much more. I was a conservation chair, and I was always brought back to the same cause and effect. People. Too many people. You can't protect the land when there are too many stresses on the resources. Over use, development, pollution. You NEED to include the Department of Education in this endeavor. Kids are our future. You can reach them through the schools.

It is difficult to get young people involved. What is amazing is that people will spend money with outfitters, when they can have a free event with the Sierra Club. I would say the average age of our group is 55 or older. The Desert Peaks was declining, but we are now, through outreach and monthly potlucks that move around Los Angeles, increasing our numbers. We also have a great new website which is updated by one of our members. All the Desert Peaks events are volunteer. We have some awesome, responsible leaders.

Many people carpool. For many of our peaks you need 4 wheel drive to get to the trail head

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

We are a small group within the Sierra Club. We have roughly 300 members. We sell a Road and Peak Guide which generates most of the money we make. We are nonprofit.

Keeping the Park wild, but letting people in. For the animals and plants sakes it is a double edge sword. With a few billion and counting, this does NOT bode well for the wilderness. Population and conservation in ANY form is an oxymoron. I know. I w

I don't see a lot of young people in the parks. I do however, see lots of Europeans. They LOVE our parks which I'm sure you are aware.

The railroad used to be connected to many of the parks. That era being bygone; you are left with bussing people in. A hook to get people to take mass transit. I am a railroad enthusiast and the railroads are a part of the Park's history. The railroad association / community is huge. You have a huge ready-made audience.

1. At Disneyland, my FAVORITE ride is the California Adventure Ride. This ride gives the sensation of flying over California. Not only do you see the tops of mountains and fly through canyons, you also smell the air (pine, orange, ocean water). Why can't you do the same at ALL the National Parks and keep changing and updating the footage? One of my comments at the breakout session was many young people don't go to the parks because for the kids the static displays and format is "lame" (I'm quoting the kids here).

a. For kids, the Ranger Programs are old and out of date. They want something new. They want what they get at Disneyland and Sea World. Although they want to touch the animals I strongly am opposed to this, you end up caging the animals in zoos, and that is not a good thing. Instead, offer video showing where the animals live and why we should protect them. Many will never (and this is a good thing) hike the wilderness and experience firsthand, to see or touch these animal's habitats. Too many people in the wilderness is not a good thing for the plants or the animals. But with the video, it would be a way to help get the kids connected.

a. I have talked to several people in all walks of life. Their comment is, you have too many restrictions which puts people off and makes them NOT want to visit the parks.

MANY PERMITS / RESTRICTIONS / LITIGATION to participate

NO DOGS ALLOWED – do you have any idea how many people have dogs?

Government bureaucracy and red tape continues to be obstacles to effective and efficient partnership response to enhancing conservation and increasing opportunities for outdoor recreation. While adding another layer to the federal bureaucracy seems counter-intuitive, collaboration among federal agencies would probably improve with the establishment of an inter-departmental coordinating council or committee. The Secretary of Interior would likely head said council.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To be a better partner, the Federal government needs to be more responsive. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have been slow to react to stewardship contracting authorities. Some of this is no doubt due organizational culture and structure; leadership perceptions; lack of initiative; fiscal constraints, limited funding and inadequate knowledge of or availability of personnel. Even with the slow response to embrace this new tool, there have been some notable successes.

The Oconee Stewardship agreement project is one of 22 stewardship projects NWTF is currently working on. This project started small and over the past 3 years has leveraged Forest Service funds (\$60,000) with a Corridor of Flight Grant (\$70,000), NWTF Stewardship Agreement (\$200,000) to do: Timber Sale (thinning), 320 acres of midstory control, 24 acres of wildlife openings, 16 RCW inserts, RCW Monitoring, 2000 acres of prescribed burning

Currently, we have the tools necessary to inform, coordinate and collaborate; what is lacking is long-term commitment, in terms of both consistent funding and available human resources, to making a difference, especially when you are talking about conservation at the landscape scale.

The potential of IRS denials of legal and proper tax deductions for conservation easement donations

1. The perception that the federal government will control property protected by conservation easements

1. Funding for conservation easements

1. Funding for land trust capacity

1. Lack of accepted practice for valuing the services that intact ecosystems provide such as clean water, clean air, carbon sequestration etc.

1. Lack of understanding by the general public of the value of protecting private lands even when physical public access is not allowed.

1. Don't let funds get swept for single species initiatives like NFWF monies

1. Require the IRS to honor the intent of the law in allowing federal tax deductions for conservation easements.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our major concern is rapid erosion runoff, which causes river bank and lake bank collapse, plus the resulting siltation. This siltation is clogging the necessary flow paths in the river at several locations, and causing reduced water quality and pollution. We are actively seeking assistance in addressing these problems through the federal Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA) and various grant programs.

Although much has been accomplished, more work remains and more collaboration is needed. In order to build upon this success it will take increased funding to meet the backlog of interest. America's Great Outdoors Initiative will bring much needed attention, funding and cooperation to help protect and restore the important natural resources in New Hampshire, and most importantly, yield critical benefits to its citizens

People come from great distances to snowmobile, white water raft, sky dive, hunt, fish, camp, and hike. They also come to see wildlife and the beautiful scenery. We are currently trying to develop an all-terrain vehicle component through the construction of multi-use trails that will bring a huge increase in outdoor tourism and boost our economy. The success we are having in these areas is due primarily to one major factor: our major private landowners. What works for Maine? Its working forests.

But today, we find the great forests of Maine and our way of life being challenged by those who would take both away from us. The forests of Maine have been privately owned working forests for almost 400 years. These forests provide owners their livelihood as well as the livelihoods of thousands of Maine families. This private ownership has provided the public wide-ranging recreational opportunities, chances for appropriate economic development, and many other benefits. These have occurred without intrusion by the federal government and without the interference of environmental groups who now seek to use funds from America's Great Outdoor Initiative to make drastic, negative changes to our forest industry through expensive, restrictive, and unneeded conservation easements and other options. Please respect the people of Maine by rejecting the use of these federal funds to support the environmentalist schemes over the history, tradition, and needs of Maine's working forests and working people.

This initiative and its components such as the Treasured Landscapes and All Lands Initiatives are viewed by the extreme environmental lobby as their newest piggy bank to finance themselves and to effectively bring private ownership of Maine's forests and thousands of jobs to an end by controlling these private lands through restrictive conservation easements that freeze in place current uses and generally prevent the development of new opportunities, such as the ATV trails mentioned earlier. Freezing in place today's status quo via conservation easements is to sentence the Maine forest products industry to no future growth by socializing our private forests and ceding control to the environmentalists who seek to shut down this critical Maine industry.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Conservation easements have become a trendy growth industry for those who seek further control over privately owned land. These easements end economic growth, block or restrict public access, and cost taxpayers huge sums of money for no public benefit or gain. These easements are in perpetuity. No one has a crystal ball to know what our needs will be in 25, 50, or 100 years. Easements placed today could have terrible impacts in the future as times and priorities change. The Town of Millinocket is not willing to support such efforts that could bring such great hardship to our State, our major industry, and our people based on the shallow promises of certain environmentalists that they are here to help us. History clearly demonstrates that they are not.

Nighttime satellite photos of the United States show a great dark void where the woods of Maine are located and it is the largest uninhabited area east of the Mississippi River. It is dark because it is a privately owned working forest. Environmentalist plans to “preserve” it are not necessary as the landowners themselves keep it this way because they make their livings there.

While some of the environmentalists adamantly deny it, we believe that these efforts are intended in the long-term to create a 3.2 million acre Maine Woods National Park that would eliminate the core of Maine’s most productive forest land. This newest initiative presents them yet one more financial opportunity to realize this goal. Millinocket rejects the park, the key political leaders of Maine reject it, and the people of Maine reject it.

Given these major challenges that face us, taxpayers would be much better served by a program that enhances the various uses of the Maine forests. Recreational activities continue to be a major part of our economic base. Federal monies used to enhance these opportunities through grants for things such as publicly funded multi-use trail development can help Maine, especially when done in working partnership with Maine’s private sector. Conservation easements that impose a status quo and stop any consideration of growth take us in exactly the opposite direction of where Maine needs to be. While there may be specific, limited land parcels that are worthy of purchase, landscape scale conservation easements are simply not necessary and are, in fact, a direct threat to our economic well-being and future.

On behalf of the Town of Millinocket, I urge you to reject the use of America’s Great Outdoor Initiative and its related funding programs to economically lock down our State’s major industry and destroy our economy in the process. Rather, use these funds to directly enhance recreational opportunities and forest practices that actually encourage people to partake in outdoor activities, create jobs, and improve our economy. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

TPL and the western water collaborative Carpe Diem now seek to partner with DOI and USDA to develop a comprehensive new collaboration that can address the growing challenges of watershed adaptation and working lands conservation in this region. Climate change projections show major potential impacts, including loss of snowpack and major forest health challenges for the region's forests that would impact forest products and habitat values alike. TPL will synthesize a range of vulnerability assessment from public water supplies to coldwater fisheries to forests and then seek to work with DOI, USDA, the Washington State Department of Forestry, Washington State Department of Ecology, municipal water utilities, and a range of other partners to design integrated land conservation, restoration, and stewardship response. This will include actions such as continued consolidation of federal holdings in checkerboard lands where that ownership pattern impedes effective watershed management, and conservation of impaired watershed lands to gain site control so that restoration actions can be initiated. This will also include collaboration with private landowners to support easement conservation of important working lands that can be managed for climate resilience using DOI and USDA incentive funding.

#### USDA/USFS/Forest Legacy Program

As revealed by the compelling new U.S. Forest Service report, *Private Forests, Public Benefits*, communities across America are threatened with loss of access to forest values through accelerating conversion of private forests. These threatened forestlands are often needed for essential community and tribal purposes, including water supply protection, the timber-based economy, wildlife habitat, youth outdoor education, and recreational opportunities, including hunting and angling.

The Forest Legacy Program was established in 1990 to provide federal funding to states to assist in securing conservation easements on forestlands threatened with conversion to nonforest uses. Over the past 20 years, the Forest Legacy Program has prevented the loss of almost 2 million acres of forestland in 42 states and Puerto Rico and has leveraged an equal amount of state, local, and private funding for every federal dollar spent. In FY 2011, 39 states submitted proposals for 60 FLP projects and a robust President's budget of \$100 million will provide full funding for only a portion of these identified projects, leaving thousands of acres of important forests in many parts of the country at risk. TPL urges the Administration to increase its investment in this program in order to ensure the permanent protection of the myriad benefits provided by our nation's private forests.

#### USDA/USFS/Community Forest and Open Space Program

The new Community Forest and Open Space Conservation Program (CFOSCP) provides another means for individual communities and tribes to address threats to the forests that sustain them. CFOSCP is a 50-50 matching grant program established in the 2008 Farm Bill to give communities, tribes and non-profits funding to take a leading role in local forest protection by purchasing economically, ecologically and culturally important forestlands for community and tribal owned forests. The program also funds technical assistance through state forestry agencies to help interested grantees to plan for and implement outstanding forest management. Despite the urgent need on the ground and broad support for the program, it has not yet gotten off the ground due to administrative delays.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In FY 10, Congress allocated \$1 million to finish rulemaking for the program with an eye toward opening the program for grantmaking in FY11 or FY12. Delays in rulemaking over the course of FY10 have delayed program start-up despite a strong community of 130 interest groups and government entities that has written to the U.S. Forest Service and Congress in support of the program over the last two years. As a result of these delays, there are many deserving projects that urgently need funding now to ensure important forestlands are not developed and can instead become sustainable community resources. The CFOSCP is well-designed to help implement the goals of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative if the rulemaking were completed, and if funding of \$10 million or more were allocated in FY12 for a first round of grants from the Community Forest and Open Space Conservation Program.

This is a critical moment for land conservation in America: projected population growth will put additional pressure on existing parks and reduce remaining open space, an entire generation's health is at risk from a sedentary lifestyle, and climate change threatens to alter many of our important natural systems.

Over the past three decades, childhood obesity rates in America have tripled, and today, nearly one in three children in America are overweight or obese. One third of all children born in 2000 or later will suffer from diabetes at some point in their lives; many others will face chronic obesity-related health problems like heart disease, high blood pressure, cancer, and asthma. In order for children to live a healthy lifestyle and become connected to the outdoors for its myriad benefits, they must have access to places to play, hike, bike and run. LWCF provides a direct means to that end perhaps more than any other single federal program.

Nevertheless, creating great city park systems, or upgrading older rundown ones, is a major challenge that cities have formerly been tasked with on their own. There are needs for trees, irrigation, water management, sport facilities, lighting, erosion control, restrooms, fountains, pathways, playgrounds, benches, signage and much more. Some cities have an even more basic need: more parkland for growing populations or underserved neighborhoods.

In addition to funding for planning and park system analysis, cities need help funding land acquisition for new parks, site clean up, and park design and development.

There is currently no federal agency that has full responsibility for urban conservation projects. Numerous agencies have partial interest and partial jurisdiction, such as planning, acquisition or development. But completing an urban conservation program today is often so bureaucratically challenging that many communities give up or don't even try. Thus, we call for the creation of an urban department within the Council on Environmental Quality to streamline and coordinate funding by multiple federal agencies for urban park and conservation programs to help accomplish these national goals.

The ranchers in northwestern New Mexico are suffering grievous harm through pollution of their water and soil by the chemical used in hydraulic fracking in oil and gas drilling. It is imperative that the DOI seriously control this business considering the thousands of drills along the Rockies. Our Rockies.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Conservation service can be a strategy to address youth unemployment. Young people (age 16-24) face the highest youth unemployment rate -- 19.6 percent -- since the Labor Department began compiling the data in 1948. For low-income and minority youth, the job prospects are worse. By providing paid and stipended service positions, young people are able to receive hands-on training and life skills to help prepare them for careers in conservation. Again, we recommend scaling community conservation summer jobs program across the country.

Childhood and adolescence obesity have reached epidemic proportions in the U.S. More than one-third of children and adolescents are estimated to be overweight or obese. Obesity is a key predictor for many future health problems, including diabetes. Youth conservation service can help tackle this epidemic. Indeed, many existing conservation programs by SCA and the Corps already get young people moving outdoors by, among other things, building trails, restoring habitats, and building boardwalks. In addition, many of SCA's programs, particularly residential programs, help young people make informed choices about nutrition and how healthy food connects to the land. We recommend piloting initiatives as part of SCA and Corps programs that incorporate nutrition education for participants, provide healthy meals for economically disadvantaged youth, and allow nonprofits to develop or use tools to measure and evaluate the exercise, nutrition, and recreation components of such initiatives.

Many workforce challenges, including diversity recruitment and retention, loss of critical skills, and impending retirements, confront public land management agencies. The impending retirement of interpreters, visitor services staff, and senior firefighters, for example, comes at a time when demands for those positions are growing within the agencies. Yet, SCA and many of the Corps receive training in these areas through a variety of our career training programs. Many want jobs with the federal land management agencies, but are not eligible for noncompetitive hiring status. As recommended above, these participants and other SCA/Corps trained participants and interns should be used as a key workforce pipeline by federal land management agencies.

The American Motorcyclist Association (AMA) is disappointed with the ongoing America's Great Outdoors "listening sessions" currently being held nationwide by the Department of the Interior. These meetings were originally billed as a chance for all citizens to meet and speak with their federal officials on numerous public lands management issues, and possible public-private partnerships. However, these "listening sessions" have turned into pep rallies to urge public support of the administration's preferred pre-determined disposition of public lands.

Information and a comprehensive list of "listening sessions" are not being noticed properly for the general public prior to the pre-registration deadlines. For example, a recent meeting held in Davis, California was never listed on the official website. Despite this lack of a public invitation, organizations, such as the California Wilderness Coalition, sent e-mails to their members promoting this "listening session" in advance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is no way to make important decisions about our public lands. A fair, honest and transparent process is paramount, not a meeting of like-minded individuals and well-connected insiders. Indeed, each of these important issues deserves full public consideration and input.

There may be a lull in development in the natural areas of this country right now, but it will not last. As soon as the economy improves, the cost of open space will go up. We need to secure public outdoor spaces now and make them integral parts of our communities.

While recreation, economics, and personal connections are *\*very\** important considerations when encouraging people to get involved with the great outdoors, we must ensure that there is sufficient natural habitat for those people to enjoy when they get there *\*and\** for wildlife to enjoy when and where humans give them some space of their own.

Don't let people define "the only true camping experience." Different people have different needs, yet still should have access to public lands. Making them tent-friendly only is NOT in the best interests of our nation.

We have plenty of land already designated as wilderness, all this does is prevent most people from actually enjoying it, and reserving it for a select few. This is not freedom.

ORV's are permitted on many "Public Lands"... so what broken law would justify confiscation? This 'idea' needs to be clarified. If it is, even I (a law abiding off-roader) can agree to it, that is until all Public Lands are closed. At which point, Off Roader's "machines" become worthless and you will see a "I'll ride it where ever I want, as long as I can" mentality. Economic impacts aside, if you take everything away from the ORV community, they will have nothing left to lose.

Any taking of personal property, or life, or liberty, for that matter, can only be done in accordance with the Constitution after due process. The punishment has to fit the crime.

We sure don't need any more wilderness here in western Colorado! Plenty of designated wilderness already exists. I'm appalled at what the NPS & USFS have done to our cultural & local history landmarks to try to make multiple use lands into "wilderness". Both the NPS & USFS have burned buildings. Previously grazed land has been eliminated, with fences and stock ponds removed. The USFS has closed off & obliterated roads, denying access to thousands. What we need is better, longterm, scientific management of our natural resources without the forces of the current political party interfering!

OMG! We already have plenty of un-enjoyed wilderness. Have you seen it? Not if you couldn't drive 200 miles to see it. Try hiking for 50 miles into the high mountains to enjoy the serenity of the wilderness. What are you going to eat? Where are you going to sleep? For heaven's sake, where are you going to go to the bathroom? I couldn't enjoy nature if I couldn't ride an ATV or 4X4 into it, if I had to hike. And I don't sit behind a desk in a city.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While it seems that there are good intentions behind your idea, you wrote, "(Wilderness Protection) is important for the enjoyment of future generations". Congress designated Wilderness Areas remain just that until an act of congress re-designates the Area. In the meantime, access is substantially restricted. Hiking is permitted, but like another poster stated, a 50 mile hike half way into a wilderness area is not feasible for most of our society. Something else to consider, is will the ground permit your foot travel for such a distance? A good example here is the North Algodones Wilderness Area in the Southeast corner of California. This 26,000 acre Area was designated by congress as part of the California Desert Protection Act of 1994. As holds true with any designated wilderness area, you are permitted access either by foot or horseback (if you haul in your own feed). Neither current nor future generations of the human species will see any enjoyment from the 26,000 acre North Algodones Wilderness Area! You see, 99% of the area is covered by towering Sand Dunes which are impassable by horse. Hiking brings to mind the expression "taking one step forward, brings you two steps back". As a result, no one has hiked more than a mile into this Area's perimeter since it was designated as wilderness area. It was "protected", and human access has been completely restricted since the Wilderness Area designation hit the ground in April of 1999. (The above statement in no way implies that the author is seeking, petitioning nor advocating unauthorized recreation in a designated wilderness area, nor does it condemn any current standing Wilderness Areas or restrictions thereof. The, author seeks to illustrate the ramifications of such designations and illustrate that it's impossible for "Wilderness Protection" to bring anything to future generations of the human species. )

mixed use. Motorized access is more restricted then any other group. Yet if you look at the factual data, we give the most back. If the liberal agenda wants to take away from one, then take away from all and shut the whole area down to ALL recreation

There are plenty of designed "Wilderness" areas for you to enjoy peacefully. I am glad you enjoy it. But don't try to take away my right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I along with millions of others enjoy riding ATV and enjoying the great outdoors. I also can ride all day and not see another human except my group. BUT, I do see deer, elk, and bear. I have seen more wildlife from the back of my ATV for the last 10 years, than I have in 40 years prior as an outdoorswoman, walking in the forest. If you don't like ATV go to Yellowstone or any other national park, or any designated wilderness area, there are millions of acres. Good luck getting into the center of that wilderness area. That alone tells me we have too many acres designated already.

If the places to ride are taken away then people will just ride illegally. I know I will because I love to ride!! But if we have the outdoors to enjoy then the likelihood of places getting destroyed are a lot less because people will stay in the designated areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Are you promoting illegal riding? The problems that exist today have come about because most public land has been "open unless designated closed" and trails have been created for no other reason than that someone wanted to go that way. As an earlier poster said, when this happens with hiking trails, they get closed. The OHV crowd has been prolific at pioneering trails because they can cover more ground more quickly. Now land managers must do what they should have been doing the past forty years (Executive Order 11644, February 8, 1972), which is to determine the compatibility of OHV trails. That means trails you have been using, created without adequate study, will be closed. Just because you want it, doesn't mean it's right.

Off Road Use is already limited and restricted on Public Lands. Exactly what is the proposition here???

I am not an off-road user and I have a seriously high regard for the environment. Sometimes though I think the issues can be much more complex than simple yeas and nays. It does seem on this forum that to say "OHV" is a sure bet for a bunch of negative votes. Guess some folks have their minds made up. Once I was in a USFS area with single track trails and a somewhat inebriated quad user was illegally driving his machine down the trail when he lost traction and it rolled down the nice watershed and landed in a tree above the stream. Fortunately for the fellow, he came off between two logs on the trip down and was not seriously hurt. He was determined to rescue his machine from the tree, and I didn't want either the thing to end up in the creek.....or for the rider to end up in traction. So we somehow got the still running quad out of the tree and back up the hillside to the trail, and from there back up to the road. Okay, the thought "Darwin Awards Candidate" came to mind. On the other hand this fellow and his friends were enlisted men on vacation between tours of duty (this is a true story). So the rest of the time they weren't hanging wheelers up in trees.....they were off defending my right to type this.....and all of our rights to save the environment. They were keeping Wildernesses from becoming nuclear winters where nothing could live. They were defending our rights to be free and to vote, even cast the slew of anti-motorized votes for this idea. So, I won't promote this anti-motorized idea. In fact, I have a non-motorized trail on my land that I built and many hikers, bicyclists, equestrians, and environmentalists use. If you are a vet, you may use your ORV on it. It's the least I can do. Don't expect mercy though from those greeners who are disconnected with how fragile their safety in this nation is.

Responsible OHV use is a means for many individuals and families to develop a relationship with the outdoors. Many OHV users that I know believe strongly in conservation and sustainability. By saying that these people "have no respect for nature and the rights of others", we're alienating a group of people who could strengthen our national movement to protect public lands. We're also making a statement that is baseless and probably a little stupid.

All public land use should be managed responsibly. Hikers, bikers, OHV users, horses, logging, mining, and cattle can all cause damage. Sounding off on OHV use sounds like a personal bias. We should focus on managing all forms of use in a way that balances access and protection.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A local OHV area is a checkered private land with BLM, who occasionally contracts with the private land owners-logging companies. It is pretty laughable that environmentalists are worried about a 20in swath of trail that is maintained VOLUNTARILY by OHV users, when 1/2 mile away the area is shut down and being ravaged by logging companies. But we need paper and the government needs funds. A much more relevant argument for public land is responsible logging. Some bikes are too loud. I can hear my cell phone ring over mine. I do not lose sleep worrying that I have traumatized deer, either. They bound a few feet away, then turn around and look at us creatures with those funny looking, colorful heads.

5% off the environmentally conscious rule breakers don't harm the planet? really? The majority of forest fires and brushfires are not caused by a missing spark arrester on an ATV or an RV camper using a propane stove or lantern. They are caused by an environmentally conscious hiker cooking over an open flame or dropping an ash from a cigarette in a non designated area that they hiked to. Staying on the trail is a responsibility for everyone to follow and you shouldn't condemn the responsible OHV drivers with the irresponsible ones. I don't condemn the responsible campers along with the irresponsible ones that feel the wilderness is theres to ravage because they are on foot, those that feel they don't harm anything by hiking out off trail where they are trampling protected plants and animal habitats.

This Idea appears to sidestep the scientific evaluation of what impact is environmentally sustainable in any given habitat.

Your comment about the fact that OHV and environmentalism cannot coexist is a joke. Hitler thought Jews could not coexist with Germans. You have the same kind of perspective, control everything and your point of view is the only one that matters. I know my example is extreme and the comparison of killing jews and riding a dirtbike in the woods seems stupid but I have heard environmentalists talk about how all OHV user should be shot. I have seen that exact statement on bumper stickers. I have never heard an OHV user mention how a hiker should be shot for hiking. Fossil fuel is a fact of life it is the cheapest form of energy at this point and we need to use is responsibly butt to say don't use it at all is rediculous. And this isn't even mentioning the seudo science used to show that fossil fuel even has an impact on global warming. Try reading up on Solar effects on global warming. On the quiter OHV I agree I even talk to people who are riding that have overly loud vehicles and try and use peer presure to get them to be more resposible.

yes and this idea especially those trails that are historically for OHV recreation also need to be preserved for future OHV recreation, Mnay historic OHV trails are in jeaprody, alot of these roads have been used since the invention of the first OHV the motorcar, or stagecoach

These inland seas are the largest supply of fresh water on the planet. How could anyone NOT want to preserve and protect this precious supply?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with you that all users should be able to share trails. It seems like such a simple thing, and I know of no ATV users that really oppose such an option. However, as you see, some members of the non-motorized community don't want to share. I guess they weren't taught to play well with others when they were kids. I would propose trail sharing to a point. Once there is conflict, the limited number of designated OHV trails, which are currently shared with the non-motorized community, should be closed to non-motorized use. Non-motorized already has vast trail systems and far more cross country areas they are allowed to use that the OHV community is prohibited from. Many users that complain about motorized use on motorized trails do so only to create conflict.

Who elected you king & gave you the right to tell me I cannot use public lands, which I own just as much as you?

An "agriculture professional" is not the same as a "farmer" and "how food is really produced and how natural resources are managed" in industrial 'agriculture' today is not the same thing as "sustainable agriculture" yesterday, today, or tomorrow

A model that would support this idea can be found in New York's Hudson River Valley in the state sponsored Hudson River Estuary Program Action Agenda. This regional collaboration brings together stakeholders from diverse backgrounds to inform a regional restoration plan and action agenda. It then provides incentive grants for municipalities and not-for-profits to implement the agenda. Visit { <a href="http://www.dec.ny.gov/lands/5104.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } for more details.

I would like to see *some* recognition of environmental impacts in the presentation of this Idea -- while recreation, economics, and personal connections are *very* important considerations when encouraging people to get involved with the great outdoors, we must ensure that there is sufficient natural habitat for those people to enjoy when they get there *and* for wildlife to enjoy when and where humans give them some space of their own.

If we the people had an input as to what is taught then maybe this would work. However enviromentalist with flawed information should never be allowed to teach anything.

Yes we have save the animals from disasters. Its awful what happen in the Gulf. Alot of marine life are endangered there. The former President of BP should pay for this.

SP: What's wrong? Is your idea not getting enough attention? Banning Children under 16 from Driving OHVs on Public Land = { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/0CAB12FFE50095A686257791000C5FD8?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Establishing an Ancient Forest National Park is simply a matter of re-designating the land. The vast majority of the proposed park is already established wilderness. What would be needed? Some infrastructure in the front country? Environmentalists need to have a higher consciousness of the rural poverty that is endemic in many of these areas. A national park designation immediately raises the stature of the land, it brings significantly more tourists, and allows for some benign economic development in these rural enclaves. The National Park System needs to be significantly expanded. The excuse that other units in the system are underfunded therefore we should not add more is fallacious. Many of these potential national parks are under constant development pressures, national monument status still allows many of them to be exploited by timber, oil and gas, grazing, mining and agricultural interests. If you want more money for conservation, parks, and environmental initiatives then it will be imperative to re-task money already in the budget, 52% of which goes to "national security" in the form of the budgets for DoD, DHS, and various intelligence agencies. That's an abomination, we spend more on "national defense" than the next 30 countries combined! As for the notion that ranchers are responsible stewards of the land, that is a dubious statement at best. Most ranchers are a subsidiary of Big Agra, they exploit federal lands, exhaust the resources, socialize all external costs, then internalize the profits. I dare anyone survey a grassland after it's been invaded by tens of thousands of cattle. The evidence just doesn't support the notion that ranchers are responsible stewards of the public commons, they may be better at caring for their own parcels of land where they cannot pass off the external costs to taxpayers, but I've seen what's happened to grasslands in Oregon after grazing interests ripped the hell out of the place, and it wasn't responsible stewardship. Ranchers masquerade as free marketeers, but in reality they're just free loaders.

I believe you want to eliminate OHV's all together. Tell us what you REALLY think. Stop making a mockery of this process.

We must ALL come together on the climate change, government, non-profits, and the people at large. Can't anyone realise that as we kill the climate we are forcing our great-great grand children to find an off earth home? Will the technology be there to find one or do we doom them to a horrible death here? As a world, we are one but to argue and push each other away for fear and loathing we ALL loose!

Note: We are protecting humanity by the protection of wildlife and habitat/ecosystems. This action needs to involve all functional and restorable systems, including ALL federal lands.

All forests should be very carefully stewarded, as they protect our water supply, sequester carbon, provide habitat, etc. None should be allowed to be clearcut. Certainly old growth forests need to be maintained in the healthiest state for them to thrive.

I'm afraid there days are numbered. Like the Indian pony, the covered wagon. It's called progress. I'd like to see them from my ATV. I don't want them logged either.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

they used some of the same tactics to keep the wild nature of an area in my state on state land. I'm all for it. I think most reasonable people would agree that overall, as a country, we have far too little wilderness and too much land open to development and land that has been developed. 50% of our national forests are currently open to development. I would say that is more than enough. Don't forget, there is still state land and private land open to development. I think most people are leaning toward preserving more of what is left.

Why am I even wasting my time with this? Why should the NPS have even more land to mismanage? Right now, the Crown Managers are planning on a conference about how they are going to "protect" Glacier by encouraging buffers around the park. As in, let it burn, don't allow access, let the wolves eat everything, close all the roads, kill all the non-native fish, blah blah. This Treasured Landscapes initiative is a scam.

I am one who believe wildlife should be protected at all costs. The problem in my opinion is , big bussiness has taken over our government, no lobbying on either on either side of the room. We must break up busseness like goldmen sachs, BP etc, this must be done for our country to survive.

Lower taxes.

Don't charge picnic fees for a family to picnic in our N.M. forest during the day. If you want families with children to go to parks that would help.

Our metropolitan region, currently home to over 5 million people, is expected to grow by 50%, reaching 7.4 million by 2020. The need to set aside green space today is urgent.

The nation's most populous state needs your help to preserve its remaining wild lands that give us clean air, drinking water, open space, beautiful recreation areas, and wildlife habitat. From our old-growth forests in the north, to the rugged Sierra Nevada, to the vast desert in the south, California's enormous population growth puts some of our most precious outdoors destinations at risk. Development, increased visitation, and budget cuts are impacting some of our most iconic and important places.

By restoring our northern forests in the Sierra and the Klamath, or the San Gabriel Mountains in Southern California, we can spur economic growth by providing needed jobs, and improve recreation opportunities. Green jobs can include removing illegal roads and forest restoration projects in northern forests, and cleaning up San Gabriel Mountains and River areas that lack enough trash cans and restrooms.

Create a comprehensive "Quiet Recreation Strategy" for federal lands in Colorado. This strategy should variously provide for non-motorized activities such as hiking, mountain biking, fishing, family camping, wildlife photography, and more. A formalized acknowledgment should create more sustainable use of our lands while encouraging things like stewardship, trail maintenance, volunteerism, and getting youth outdoors. Using Colorado as a pilot project for a Quiet Recreation Strategy will also provide a sustainable use model for the rest of the country to follow.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

New Mexico, the birthplace of wilderness, is home to some of our country's wildest remaining public lands. From the southern desert grassland Otero Mesa to the wild and scenic Rio Grande, our vast public lands support native wildlife and plant species, significant water resources, and imperiled desert ecosystems. These amazing places are beloved by New Mexicans and many more Americans for their hiking, hunting and fishing opportunities. But they are constantly under threat from oil and gas development, and many pristine lands and important habitats have been destroyed.

Utah needs your help to preserve its precious wild lands that give us clean air, drinking water, open space, beautiful recreation areas and wildlife habitat. From Cedar Mesa to Red Cliffs, Utah offers an extraordinary home to wildlife and outstanding recreation opportunities. However, development, increased recreation and climate change has put some of our most precious outdoors destinations at risk.

Wilderness designation for vast San Rafael Swell in southeastern Utah would protect this unique and spectacular geological region which supports a wide array of rare plants and wildlife, including the big horn sheep, antelope, bald eagles, pronghorn, peregrine falcon and Utah prairie dogs. The Swell is also a popular destination for hikers, river runners, hunters, horseback riders, and climbers. Emery County is currently working on a public lands proposal in partnership with conservation organizations, ORV users and ranchers.

The San Gabriel Mountains soar above our homes, from Santa Clarita to San Bernardino, providing much of our public open space. These mountains benefit our quality of life and the health of our families by providing us with clean air and water and incredible natural beauty. Our region's youth obesity and diabetes crisis has brought new urgency to connecting our people and communities back to our mountains and rivers. I urge you to recommend the creation of a robust San Gabriel Mountains National Recreation Area that would improve the visitor experience in the mountains and better connect families to the recreational opportunities inside the forest.

I object to spending over \$2 billion of my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations.

Multiple Use lands are where the majority of people recreate, as well as where much of our timber and beef products come from, but these lands have been closed at an alarming rate. The President must protect these precious lands by designating them permanently as Multiple Use.

The creation of Wildlife corridors will have a disproportional and severe negative impact on rural communities. It appears that organizations such as The Nature Conservancy stand to make huge illicit profits by swapping lands to the government for Wildlife Corridors

Government Landscape Wide Planning beyond the borders of public lands is inappropriate, costly and complex. The agencies managing our public lands have more than enough problems managing the lands currently under their care.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The President is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands.

The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas, we need less.

Over 80% of lands West of Mississippi are open space. Wildlife have plenty of places to live. There is no need to create Wildlife Corridors or designate additional Wilderness Areas, unless the purpose of this initiative is to further the goals of the United Nations Wildlands Project by forcing people from rural communities and pushing them into urban areas.

Also, the proposed Wildlife Corridors along with the proposed Wilderness and Monument designations would harm rural areas, push people out of their homes and force them into cities. This destruction of our Rural Communities, also known as the United Nations Wildlands Project, is detrimental to the interests of all Americans and should not be supported in any way by the Outdoors Initiative.

Ducks Unlimited, in partnership with the federal and state agencies, numerous NGOs and private landowners, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, have worked to curb habitat losses in the Prairie Pothole Region to ensure the future of migratory birds and related natural resource conservation opportunities. Despite these efforts, the native grasslands and wetlands of this cultural and ecological treasure continue to disappear faster than they can be conserved. For these reasons, I urge the administration to recognize the Prairie Pothole Region as a Treasured Landscape.

We take pride in our treasured landscapes and share a responsibility to leave the next generation healthier and better connected to the natural world. A changing climate, pollution, and poorly planned development have put a growing strain on our wildlife, our waters and our lands, and we must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support.

A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of our national parks to our people in difficult economic times.

We applaud your effort to promote and support innovative community-level efforts to conserve outdoor spaces and to reconnect Americans to the outdoors. Stakeholders from across our region have been involved in exactly these types of efforts for many years. Whether it is connecting residents of the New York City metropolitan area to one of our country's greatest landscapes or working on regional-level through the Greenway to conserve our historic, cultural and natural resources in the face of persistent population growth, the Hudson River Valley has been at the forefront of promoting innovative and cooperative solutions to our challenges.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I invite you to consider scheduling a public meeting in Seattle. I believe that the Puget Sound area and its surrounding watersheds and forests present an ideal model for your Treasured Landscapes Initiative. This important and sensitive eco-region is anchored by three national parks (Mount Rainier, Olympic, and North Cascades) and a number of designated wilderness areas on the national forests. The watersheds that drain into the Puget Sound sustain salmon and steelhead, however, most of the runs are listed as either threatened or endangered and face real challenges for recovery.

However, all of the efforts to protect the environmentally sensitive areas of western Washington would greatly benefit from a higher level of integration and attention. I believe the mountains, watersheds, forests, and Puget Sound provide an ideal place for realizing the full potential of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative.

New Jersey is home to a myriad of unique natural landscapes, from the Pine Barrens and Barnegat Bay in the south to the Harbor Estuary and the New Jersey Highlands in the north. New Jersey also hosts many state parks and forests, five national wildlife refuges, Morristown National Historical Park and portions of the Gateway National Recreation Area. Even with these natural and recreation areas, however, it is important to note that New Jersey is the nation's most densely populated state, where more than 40 acres of open spaces are lost each day to development.

In our country, only one in five homes have a park within a half-mile and this number is even higher for New Jersey's cities, which are some of the country's most densely populated. All Americans are adversely affected by limited green spaces, deteriorating community facilities, health problems, and juvenile delinquency. Research shows that healthy and vibrant urban areas play key roles in improving the economy, health, and quality of life in our communities. Urban parks are instrumental in helping our nation achieve important national goals of increasing exercise, providing safe, healthy alternatives for at-risk youth, and spurring local economic development. Providing cities with outdoor resources is a necessity and will reconnect people to the great outdoors.

Located along New Jersey's Atlantic coast, the 660-square mile Barnegat Bay watershed drains into the 42-mile Barnegat Bay estuary. This region, a national treasure that includes the Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge, is home to a multitude of plant and animal species. Unfortunately, intense development and population growth continue to degrade the nation's delicate habitat and compromise water quality in the bay, a shallow estuary where pollution is filtered out very slowly. Contamination threatens the Kirkwood-Cohansey aquifer, which replenishes the bay and supplies most of the region's drinking water. Researchers have already confirmed the decline of various plants and bird species.

Twenty million people live around the New York/New Jersey Harbor Estuary, an area that is also home to a broad variety of plant and animal species. There is a great need for protection of underdeveloped land in densely populated communities where open space is scarce and public access to the estuary and its tributaries is often limited due to past industrial use.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One potential initiative that we would like to explore through this listening session is how we can more effectively meet the existing unmet demand for grassland and wetland easements, which are particularly popular with our agriculture producers in the Prairie Pothole Region. This area includes significant expanses of native prairie upland grasslands and abundant wetlands, and provides habitat for hundreds of species of upland birds, waterfowl, and other wildlife. There are currently over 800 interested landowners representing roughly 360,000 acres of habitat waiting to be considered for a grassland or wetland easement on their property. Since its inception, landowners have enrolled 1.8 million acres in the easement program, and it is anticipated that demand for easements is sufficient to enable conservation of many additional acres of this unique habitat in the future.

The same scenic, recreational, health public values that federal dollars provide for, on federally owned lands elsewhere need to also be protected, with federal dollars on important private and state owned lands in Maine, in a way that works with Maine traditions. Much high public value land in the Western states is federally owned, and federal dollars continually acquire more federal land and pay for the management and infrastructure needed to derive the most public benefit from those lands. Those of us who work protecting public values on Eastern conservation are left to fend for ourselves, with comparatively little federal money available to us.

Forest, like humans, can be classified as young, mature, or old. Because of past disturbances old forests are the rarest. Sometimes disturbance comes in the form of a tornado, or an intense fire; but most often the disturbance has been from logging.

Old-growth forest acreage has declined every year since European settlement of this continent. In Western States the percentage of old-growth forest area is measured in single digits, while in Eastern States old growth is measured in tenths of a percentage. Consequently, the ecological and cultural attributes provided by old-growth forests are not being fulfilled. If we are able to reverse the decline in old-growth forest acreage we will be the first generation to have done so.

In some counties that have no State or Federal lands a county or city itself may have some property that could become part of the network. It is impossible to determine without further research, but perhaps two-thirds of the network can be built by identifying forests already existing on public lands. Although it will be more difficult to build the network in counties with no appropriate public lands, those are the very places where forests are most needed, and this process will help identify them.

Where no appropriate public forest lands exist, organizations such as land trusts or The Nature Conservancy may consider adding one of their forests to the network. In the less common situations where there are no public lands and no non-profit organization lands which can be included in the network, a county may appeal to a private donor or apply for federal grant funds.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many children growing up today have no idea of what the natural appearance of the land surrounding them would be if it were undisturbed. What species of trees would grow? What animals would live there? We speak of "nature-deficit disorder" but how is it to be remedied if there are no places to show these children, but only stories in a book about what their town "used to" look like and the animals that "used to" live there?

Connecting people to nature is a core objective of America's Great Outdoors. From urban communities to rural working landscapes, the challenge for our nation is how to connect these diverse interests that are in their own way connected to their local landscapes but not connected to each other. If our nation is to address the enormity of threats to our natural heritage, from climate change to habitat fragmentation to invasive species to polluted waterways, we as a country have to work together to conserve nature at the landscape scale and promote conservation innovation that sustains "America the Beautiful" for future generations.

Although this model consists of many parts, the most basic and important portion should be the fact that Science is the proper tool for the discharge of Wildlife Policy. Herein lies the rub. For the most part, I feel that hunters, ranchers and politicians have taken the lead in what has become the 'driving force' in Agency management decisions, leaving Science secondary to their interests.

What I have witnessed many times over is that there is a growing sense of 'entitlement' among hunters and ranchers. This results when the hunters 'pay' license fees and taxes on hunting paraphernalia and ammunitions and the farmer/rancher at times seem to be 'raising' the animals who live on their land.

During meetings regarding the wildlife and decisions regarding policy, it is overwhelmingly obvious that these two groups feel that they alone OWN the animals and managing agencies give little attention or concern to the general public, which is of course a larger majority, yet for sure is much less 'vocal' or demanding. Such attitudes and undue influence must stop!

One of the biggest problems we have is Agriculture's control over the Natural resources. We must insist on all levels, a separation of Agriculture and Natural Resources committees and commissions...some states have this, many do not, with SD being one such. Agriculture, now just another horrendously large business cannot be allowed to have the final say in wildlife or natural resource management. One of the best ways to accomplish the removal of this strangle hold held by agriculture is to place the USFS under the Interior Department, similar to the BLM, and remove it from the influence of the USDA and APHIS.

With the Keeping Maine's Forests initiative and others all looking for federal funds to obtain forestland in northern Maine, our challenge is to maintain the well-managed, working forest that is the backbone of the rural economy in Maine. The private landowners have a vested interest in managing their land for the long term and with less government regulation and intervention they can continue to do that.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our challenge in northern and eastern Maine is the plans of the environmental community to save the woods from ourselves. Since our outcry of opposition to the first public announcement of a national park, the plan for a takeover of the northern forest has taken several avenues and rewordings, but it's still the same plan – to preserve between 3 and 4 million acres of our working forest. This idea has been extensively promoted on the web sites and print publications of the environmental organizations active in Maine today. These groups make no secret of what they want to do to landownership in northern and eastern Maine.

If you hear nothing else that I say here today, you must know - although the terminology has been changed from “national park” to “Treasured Landscape” the intent is the same – to lock up the Maine woods from the people who live and work here.

The Maine Woods Coalition has been joined in our opposition to the Keeping Maine's Forests plan by many municipalities in northern Maine, including the counties of Aroostook, Penobscot, Franklin, and Lincoln, at this point in time, and we expect more to sign on.

At the Chesapeake Bay Regional Listening Session this summer, representatives from TWS were disappointed by the lack of attention given to climate change. To protect America's Great Outdoors and the wild places and animals that people love from a changing climate, Congress must pass comprehensive climate change legislation that reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

The administration must also do its part to encourage lawmakers to put aside partisan politics and address this pressing threat to our natural heritage. We can make natural resource conservation efforts even stronger by directing revenue from auctioning emissions credits to an adaptation program. Climate change is the backdrop against which all conservation activity must take place.

One of the principal barriers to effective and efficient conservation of fish and wildlife species the lack of dedicated funding for the full array of fish and wildlife. For decades, the Pittman-Robertson Act and Dingell Johnson Act have provided critical funding for states to conserve game species, successfully bringing back wild turkeys, striped bass, elk, and many other species. However, they do not directly address the needs of over 90% of the nation's fish and wildlife that are not hunted or fished.

For nearly a quarter century, conservationists have advocated for dedicated funding for all species, particularly those at-risk. Although the plans are being implemented in all fifty states and six territories, current federal funding through the State Wildlife Grants Program, averaging about \$1.2 million per state/territory, is insufficient to meet the needs of the 12,000 species that states determined to be at-risk. A steady funding stream allows states to make long-term management and conservation plans. The State Wildlife Grants Program and Teaming with Wildlife Act can provide that security for the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Preserving and strengthening our great outdoors also depends on science-based decision making; when policy and management plans are not based on the best available science, our conservation goals suffer. Science is the bedrock upon which natural resources management must stand to responsibly and objectively manage and sustain this nation's limited resources, including fish and wildlife populations. It must guide natural resource management and conservation decisions; the information supporting these policies should be available to the public, and the process used to make the decision must be transparent.

The public deserves to be fully informed about resource decisions and to understand the role science plays in the decision-making process. While we understand that natural resource decisions must take many other factors into account, we feel strongly that all options should be identified, the potential consequences fully understood, and the final decision justifiable.

In an open, democratic society, it is never appropriate to suppress or alter scientific findings to reach a predetermined decision. This country's professional natural resource scientists and managers deserve to work in an environment where scientific findings are appreciated and valued, and where decision-makers apply them properly.

American Trails sees three formidable challenges in regards to reconnecting people to the outdoors; the need to improve the health status of Americans, the need to better educate the American public regarding the great outdoors, and the need to provide a consistent stream of funding for acquisition and trail development.

1) Health: We are concerned that adults and youth are becoming more disconnected with the outdoors as evidenced by a Center for Disease Control and Prevention report that over 60 percent of Americans are overweight or obese, and that nearly 20 percent of children are obese. With such a vast array of natural resources, how do we entice the public to break away from their cocoon style of living and re-discover the great outdoors.

2) Educate: We believe that successful achievement of number one above is highly contingent upon a strong public education component. With today's technology promoting a less active lifestyle, there is a strong and urgent need to create innovative programs that will entice the public into the out-of-doors. This education approach must begin in the early years of childhood in order to instill a consistent lifestyle.

3) Funding: Of course achievement of both 1 and 2 above would not be possible without the effort to preserve and create more outdoor places to enjoy. Continuous, long-term funding for trail development needs to be permanently established at the federal, state, and local levels, which would help to establish trail master plans at the community level, and collectively provide a larger network of trail connectivity across communities. This is a challenge that would enhance the livable community concept, create more non-motorized transportation opportunities, and conceivably reduce the level of pollutants in the environment.

We know America's farmland is under threat from continuing urban development throughout the country. Steps must be taken to protect this land and we look forward to the America's Great Outdoors Initiative identifying definitive measures to do so.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most recreational riders do not have access to large tracts of private land to ride on and depend on public land to ride. Recreational riders also need well maintained trails, trail heads for horses, access routes, picnic and camping facilities, restrooms and stables to make use of our nations public lands. In recent years a reduction of trails, trail heads and the closure of federal lands to horses and pack animals has been a growing concern for recreational riders around the country. There is a feeling among riders that access to trails historically open to equestrians is being lost.

In 2009 the AHC launched an effort to collect information regarding equestrian access issues on federal lands and earlier this year released the 2009 Report on Equestrian Access on Federal Land. This report was intended to provide a brief overview of the responses the AHC received from equestrians to its ongoing access survey in 2009 (the report is included.) In all, the AHC received 45 reports of issues on federally managed land from 26 states. These reports primarily fall into several general categories of access issues; loss of access due to maintenance issue, instances where access has been restricted or a trail closed and reports of trails or areas that have become unusable due to user conflict.

It is the experience of most equestrians that land managers work with all user groups in good faith; however, that is not always the case. Respondents to the access survey report some instances of seemingly arbitrary closures. Often they did not know the reasoning behind these closures. Some reported new management plans that resulted in the loss of trails, and some reported rumors of bias against horses by local land managers or pressure from other user groups for the closures.

It is certainly true that equestrians need to engage and build relationships with the managers of the land on which they ride before there is an issue and work with other user groups. However, if the goal of the President's initiative is to connect more Americans with the outdoors, policies should be explored to ensure land managers accommodate all recreational users where appropriate. It is clear to the equestrian community that there are some areas not suitable for equestrian use. However, access should not be denied based on the personal bias of a land manager.

The AHC hope the Administration will explore all options to educate federal land managers on equestrian issues and encourage state and local governments to do so as well.

Maintenance issues are a major concern for equestrians and all recreational user groups. Many of the access issues reported by equestrians are maintenance related. According to A look at the future of trail access on our National Forest System Lands; written by Dennis Dailey, BCHA, the Forest Service alone has a huge backlog of trail maintenance and capital improvement work - in excess of \$450,000,000. The need to adequately fund our federal land management agencies cannot be understated.

Today's children have had less contact with nature than any generation in human history, spending more than six hours a day plugged in to TV's, computers and video games. They are spending half as much time outdoors as children did just 20 years ago.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While this is a troubling trend for the future of American conservation, our economy, the health of our children and the well-being of our communities are also at stake. Over the last 20 years childhood obesity has doubled, adolescent obesity has tripled, and instances of ADHD have increased. The childhood obesity epidemic's impact on our health care system, coupled with declining sales of hunting and fishing licenses and waning visitation to public lands, will have an increasingly negative impact on our nation's economy.

Without economically viable markets for the services and values that forests produce—from sawlogs to recreation opportunities to carbon sequestration—many private landowners are increasingly led to develop their forests for other uses.

Demand for each of these and many other uses for Maine's forests has ebbed and flowed over the years as technology, competition from other places and other raw materials, and new transportation routes (like the Panama Canal) have continuously challenged and effected markets for Maine's timber. Indeed, the markets for Maine's forests today - pulp, paper, lumber, furniture, biomass energy, and forest-based recreation - have never been static.

By all accounts, the results have been striking: five major mills have re-opened with the assistance of this position, directly saving nearly 2,000 high-paying jobs. Also, new investors have been connected with Maine mills (e.g., Old Town Fuel and Fiber, Moosehead Furniture, etc.), and many mills have successfully implemented new energy strategies, becoming more financially and environmentally sustainable. Unfortunately, and despite the success at keeping rural jobs in rural places, the patchwork funding for this position is inadequate and not sustainable.

Furthermore, many of Maine's rural mills are not eligible for REAP funding because of ownership restrictions, which disallow foreign-owned mills and include the size of the parent company when determining if an applicant qualifies as a "small business." Therefore, we encourage USDA Rural Development to increase the cap on REAP grants to \$5 million and allow foreign-owned mills to participate if they employ mostly American workers and use wood primarily from US forests. To further allow Maine mills to participate, the size of the parent company should not be used to determine if an applicant qualifies as a "small business".

Poor access to broadband is constraining economic development and community revitalization in rural places. Business leaders say that increasingly, the solutions for today's rural businesses - from forest-based tourism to natural resource - require high-speed broadband access and that they are less likely to invest or locate in communities without broadband.

Maine's rural destination and experiential tourism businesses need access to broadband because many potential customers expect it and take their business elsewhere if it is not available. In fact, a 2007 report from the Brookings Institution found that for every one percentage point increase in broadband penetration in a state, employment is projected to increase by 0.2 to 0.3% per year.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Maine has recently received three awards from Rural Development's Rural Utilities Service Broadband Program funded through the second round of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) totaling \$9,404,866. However, the State has never received an award from the Rural Broadband Access Loan and loan Guarantee program or the Community Connect Program (in fact, despite extensive outreach on availability of the programs, there is no record of applications being submitted). Many of Maine's rural communities with a critical need for broadband are not eligible because some broadband access may exist in the area. Also, many of Maine's businesses with the talent and determination to connect communities to broadband do not meet program requirements for cash-on-hand.

Ninety-five percent of Maine land is privately held, and private landowners provide significant public benefits by allowing the public to use their land for forest-based recreation. But Maine's unique open access tradition imposes significant costs on these landowners, including loss of privacy, increased road maintenance, property damage, etc., and many landowners feel unappreciated despite the benefits they provide and the costs they incur. As a result, more landowners, particularly in the southern part of the state, are posting their land, limiting many outdoor activities that are important to Maine's forest-based economy.

Tourism industry leaders say that a stronger relationship between the forest-based tourism industry and private landowners will help create jobs and revitalize rural areas dependent on outdoor recreational opportunities, and keep land open for current and future generations of outdoor recreationists. Landowners say that carrying costs for allowing the public to access their land must be mitigated.

Leaders of Maine's forest-based tourism industry say they need well-maintained recreational trails to deliver a high-quality experience for their customers. However, landowners who provide the public benefit of public access to recreational trails often carry significant costs associated with trail use. Maine's businesses and communities must find ways to minimize the costs to landowners and concentrate the development of trails and other important infrastructure (trailhead facilities, trail signage, safe and accessible parking, GPS mapping, and visitor centers) in landowners' preferred areas, and to reward landowners where public access has been secured.

Like you, we are concerned about the rate at which our nation is losing its natural heritage and losing touch with the outdoor places and activities that help define the American spirit. We have witnessed this firsthand in North Carolina, where the population has grown by 40 percent while developed acreage has increased 65 percent over the last two decades.

At a time when our nation is facing new environmental threats and budget constraints, it is crucial that we establish a conservation policy that is better suited to our current needs and helps maintain our environmental legacy. Fortunately, communities across the nation are developing new and innovative approaches to conservation.

Economic Impact of Preserves

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Keep in mind that people are selfish

Rid plastic bags and styrofoam

There is no such thing as balance

Adequately fund national estuaries to protect our waters, connect people with nature, and protect local jobs

America does not work

America's commitment to growth at any cost

ATV and OHV use on Public lands and National Parks should be in restricted areas

Better conservation in the city and connection of wilderness

BLM should end the "culture of secrecy" in some of its offices

Bring Animals to the Discussion

Can OHV's (trail bikes, ATV's, snowmobiles) be quieter?

Challenging Opposition

Clean waters

Comprehensive approach needed to protect wildlife from climate change

Create and Maintain more singletrack for Mountain Bikes

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Create Larger Group Sites at both National & State Parks

developer subsidies

disproportionate impact from resource intensive users

Diversity Outdoors

Dust, Soil Protection and Recreation

Electric OHVS

Encroachment

Enhance OHV opportunities on Public Lands

Exclusion of certain user groups

fake wildlands maps circulating - don't be misled

Farmland Preservation

Federal Land management Decisions impact local communities

Feds should place more emphasis on Conservation and Restoration

Full Cost Accounting (FCA) and Triple Bottom Line (TBL)

fund removal of marijuana garden trash and infrastructure



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

gas guzzling recreation should be discouraged. Please no more public lands given over to ORV (or OHV use) American, get out and walk, for heaven's sake. Have these people ever heard about lowering our carbon footprint? Are we going to have a future or not

Get Local Communities involved.

Get our National Parks Green and Off-Grid

Global Airconditioning against Global warming

Global Warming and Fossil Fuels

Greatest Challenge

Happy Birthday, Global Warming

Healthy Ecosystems Include Healthy Rivers and Waters

Improve Web Resources

In wildness is the preservation....

Insurance costs

Inventory outdoors

Investment in New Technologies: Creating the Smart Park

Investors want a casino licensed just 1/2 mile from Gettysburg military Park

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Is recreation more important than basic services?

KEEP THE PEOPLE OUT OF OUR NATURAL STREAMS

Land Use Challenges

Leave Old Growth Forests Alone, Log new growth instead

Leave The Klamath Basin Alone

LET'S FILL IN THE EXISTING WILDERNESS HOLES!

Levy an excise tax on all outdoor recreation gear

Like oil and water, OHVs and water should not mix

Maintaining funding and interest in our national parks

Make it convenient not challenging to teachers

Make our water swimmable, fishable, and drinkable again

Mountain Biking Has No Place in Natural Areas

Need More Time for Families to Spend Outdoors

Needs of Many vs Desire of One

No disruption of soil

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Non-Gov Organizations holding Forest Legacy conservation easements

Obstacles to conservation

Off Road Vehicles Ruin Natural Beauty

Offroad racing on Public Lands

OHV groups and riders need to do more to cultivate a responsible environmental ethic among all OHV users

One main obstacle: Having to get in a automobile each time you leave your house.

One Size Fits All National Planning Does Not Work

Opposition to drilling inside Arctic National Wildlife Refuge

Outdated subdivision ordinances and land use codes require cookie cutter subdivisions that pollute water, destroy natural areas and wildlife and harm property values

Overstocked Forests, non-aggressive management creates dead sticks

Ownership

Population - The Elephant One Dares Not Mention

Prioritize the protection of soundscapes

Protect Wilderness before it is too late

Railtrail proposal,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Re: Southern Utah -- Kow-towing to Local Political Delegations Undercuts the Federal Management of Federal Public Lands

Reaching Youth of all Demographics

Reawaken the Great Lakes Basin

Recreation conflicts with Clean Water Act

reduce park access by private cars

Reinstate the Roadless Rule

Restrict Bicycles and Other Vehicles to Paved Roads!

Rivers Alive at Wall Street

Save Mattawoman Creek: Poster Child for obstacles to Chesapeake Bay restoration—Compass toward a solution

Save Wild Salmon

separation among ohv groups and use areas

Sharks

Shifting Demographics

Ship Smog Pollutes All of Our Recreation Lands

Slow down

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Stop Banning Runners from Wilderness Areas

Stop FRACKING for Natural Gas

Stop mountaintop removal

Stop Using our Taxes to Sue Ourselves

Sustainable Funding/REVENUE Source

The challenge of protecting Wilderness areas in the coming century.

The value of wilderness

this is my idea

Threats to Western Private Forests

Unrestricted ATV use fouls trails

Urban Safety To Be Able To Go Outside

Volunteer Groups Require Experienced FS Staff for Project Coordination

Volunteer Land Managers

We Have Wilderness designated through out this country. When do we stop designating new wilderness that doesn't fit the definition?

We must stop cheatgrass and other invasive species from gradually destroying the West

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness Conservation vs. Economic Development

Youth in virtual reality, not outdoors and not interacting with adults

Difficult for Youth to Obtain Federal Conservation Jobs

Landscape Wide Planning is Counterproductive

Lewis and Clark have no where to go

SOLAR AND WIND ARE SUPPLEMENTAL NOT ALTERNATIVE ENERGY

We need more places to Mountain Bike and ride Off Highway Vehicles

Ranchers: The First Environmentalists, now an Endangered Species.

Access to OUR Public Lands and Protection of my Private Land Rights

Don't commercialize the parks

Enough is Enough

Remove financial barriers to nature

The Process of Demoting an Idea Discourages Participation from Everyone

We have met the enemy...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Challenges associated with reconnecting habitat are growing as infrastructure ages, and culverts that were designed to last for 50 years are deteriorating and becoming impassible for fish. Inadequately sized or designed culverts and poorly maintained road/stream crossings plug up then blow out during intense storms causing massive landslides and debris flows.

TU has worked with private timber companies to replace impassible culverts, and to remove roads and culverts that are no longer used to access timber. Inadequate funding for the Open Rivers Initiative and Fish Passage Program are considerable challenges. We recommend increasing funding from these programs while using partnerships and careful prioritization to maximize the impact of available funding.

The need for these programs is growing, not diminishing. Historically, as many as three-fourths of the eligible producers seeking conservation programs have been turned away due to lack of program funds.

Another limiting factor is the new payment cap under EQIP (\$50,000 per individual or legal entity per year). This cap unnecessarily restricts our ability to complete habitat restoration projects in cooperation with some landowners.

A prominent challenge associated with habitat restoration is the effective coordination among the various state, federal, local and private entities engaged in restoration work. Only through a concerted, scientifically-driven approach to restoration can resources be effectively leveraged and impact maximized. The National Fish Habitat Action Plan is helping to ensure that such coordination occurs, and the National Fish Habitat Conservation Act would provide a necessary set of tools to help ensure the success of the Action Plan.

The Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Clean Water Act (CWA) are outstanding tools for holding polluters and other potentially responsible parties accountable for their actions and for preventing water pollution. But on many of the sites where we work, there is no potentially responsible party, or the area is not high enough of a priority to warrant federal funding or enforcement actions.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, "More than 218 million Americans live within 10 miles of a river, lake, or estuary that is considered impaired because it cannot fully support its aquatic biological communities or other designated uses or conform to fishable/swimmable water-quality standards.

If we are to clean up our nation's waters, we need strong public awareness of the factors that influence water quality and the measures that can be taken to restore our lakes, rivers and streams. Yet the amount of environmental education occurring in schools has leveled off and may even be in decline for the first time in three decades. Further, lessons that are confined to the classroom "remain abstract and irrelevant, beyond the experience of the learner and inconsistent with cultural norms.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are numerous demands for the time and attention of our nation's youth that compete with outdoor activities. These can be overcome by taking advantage of existing academic and extracurricular programs to deliver outdoor activity and education. The examples named above draw on existing school programs, mentoring programs, and introduce environmental education and hands-on outdoor activities to students.

Another persisting challenge is that of access to places to enjoy the outdoors. As more lands are developed, the places to fish, hunt, and enjoy nature dwindle. This is a challenge that must be met through habitat conservation and access initiatives such as the Open Fields program in the Farm Bill and smart planning for safe access through infrastructure development.

Too often, such access is overlooked during road and bridge construction. Many bridges and roads along waterways lack shoulders, pull-off areas, or parking. More often than not, they are constructed or reconstructed without consideration of how safe access to the waterway from the roadway or bridge could be accommodated or improved for fishing, kayaking, or other recreational uses.

Competing demands for the use of backcountry areas and low funding for land protection programs are recurring challenges. There are also challenges associated with the management of existing protected areas. The maintenance of trails in designated Wilderness areas using traditional tools and techniques is one such challenge, and must be addressed through programs that educate the next generation in the use of Wilderness trail maintenance methods.

Another challenge associated with the management of existing Wilderness is the prevention of illegal uses such as motorized and mechanized access in vast expanses of land. Partnerships with local law enforcement and more effective deterrent penalties must be used to discourage such illegal use.

A number of interests compete for the use of backcountry areas, from extractive industries such as timber, oil, and gas and mining to incompatible recreational interests such as off-road vehicle use. With time, we have learned of the tremendous value provided by roadless backcountry lands through watershed health, recreation, and biodiversity. These irreplaceable values make it imperative that priority is placed on the protection of backcountry lands. There are more than three million acres of national forest lands currently recommended by forest plans for Wilderness designation. The Wilderness characteristics of these lands are threatened by mechanized and motorized uses that could undermine their suitability for future inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

Finally, under-funding of land protection and public access through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, NRCS Conservation Reserve Program, NRCS Open Fields Initiative, and USDA Forest Legacy Program have limited their effectiveness. Even in challenging budgets, the value of these programs must be matched by funding levels.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One such watershed exists in the area surrounding Bristol Bay, Alaska. The area is currently threatened by plans to construct a massive open pit gold and copper mine in the headwaters of Bristol Bay. The administration should do all that it can to prevent harmful impacts of mining on this vital resource. In addition, we recommend the management approach taken in the Pacific Salmon Stronghold Conservation Act of 2009 by identifying and protecting a network of wild salmon strongholds and empowering voluntary, incentive-based actions to achieve salmon conservation goals.

Open spaces are essential to the functioning of nature's systems that support not only the quality of life but life itself. The greater the reduction in natural open space is the less will be the ability of nature to sustain us and our children.

does not say how trees growing or being "harvested" have anything to do with roads and their condition. The conditions of roads is due to how often they are traveled and how well they are maintained. And what does the ESA have to do with road maintenance?? The ESA protects endangered species, not roads. In fact, roads endanger wildlife. Maybe we should just do without them. Or should we just do without wildlife and wilderness? What gives us the right to cull forests anyway or invade wildlife ranges and corridors?

Running is already a part of wilderness areas, and many runners are enjoying it every day. It's only competitive events that are barred, and there is good reason for that. I've seen the impacts left by competitive runners on non-wilderness trails. They run off the trail tread to pass other competitors, leaving trampled vegetation that may take years to recover in alpine or arid country.

This is where wrapping yourself in the flag gets us all in trouble. Since you seem to pick on China did you know that this week China closed 2,087 factories because they did not meet environmental standards that they were given to make but made no effort to achieve? Did you know China has committed to plant 1 BILLION trees in an area the size of Ireland to help combat global warming and to help clean their polluted air? True India is a cesspool and very polluting but we still beat them and we have far less people. Putting the countries as a whole aside though you missed the point of the idea and that is that we all share in the destruction of our wildlands and WE ALL need to make lifestyle changes if we want it to survive. True government is in the pockets of big oil and coal but they are not forcing you to drive a gas guzzler or warm your home to 80 degrees in the winter. There are plenty of cars that get over 30 mpg and emit low emissions, I have been driving them for many years now and what is wrong with wearing a heavy sweat shirt around your house and keeping your thermostat set at 68. Responsible harvesting of trees can help forest yes but how often do you see that? Instead you see timber companies go in clear cut old growth, new growth and anything in between until it is completely gone and what is left is eroding top soil that cannot support regrowth in many cases and destroyed wildlife habitat. The point is the choice is yours to make and if you want to see this country return to the beauty it once possessed then you, me, your next door neighbor, your co worker and the guy who bags your groceries have to stop wrapping ourselves in the flag and stop thinking everything America does is right and we all have to make those changes together because the government is either too corrupt or too uncaring to do so for us.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Seeing all the anti-everything but hiking ideas, one would think that hiking is the only accepted activity in the great outdoors. Doesn't that seem like an extremist view? We're all different. Not everyone likes the same music, the same food. So why should we like the same type of recreation? Recreational uses should be managed at a local level. Just because a certain type of recreational activity doesn't work in one location, doesn't mean that it's not perfectly suited to another location. I think it's safe to say that all recreational users want to preserve land. Most people don't want to see condos going up at their favorite camping spot, or a road going in over their favorite trail. Doesn't it make sense to have as many people on one side fighting that kind of development as possible?

Simply doubling all fees for RVs would ensure that they pay their fare share. RVs use many, many times as much resources as other campers, and require expensive facilities such as "dump stations", electrical hookups, and electric pumps. They need to pay their fare share.

So which of you all wilderness, no recreation proponents will volunteer to haul my disabled rear end around in a litter so I can visit the woods after you ban my only transportation into the forest?

So who should be allowed to use the land only hikers with soft soled shoes? I guess the hunters are really hurting the land as well right. Wellum you are wg.

So you're saying my grandmother and grandfather should ride their mountain bikes to their camp and sleep in a tent? Remember "Recreation means different things to different people." By the way OHV riding, particularly off-road motorcycling, burns more calories and gets the athlete's heart rate up higher than any other sport except soccer and it's a tie.

Sorry , I don't buy this. In Nevada we have to beg the hunters to give the wildlife and the landscape a break by actually getting off their OHV's and hunting ethically. But wait, they can't because they are gly obese, caught up in the moment and could care less about the mess they are leaving behind. As for history, destruction of history is what happens when OHV's are tearing acc the landscape and destroy Native American artifacts without even knowing it. While clubs may groom and maintain trails, not enough people are educated in proper handling of an OHV and the etiquette that goes along with riding. It may be the minority that gives OHVers a bad name so I suggest a little more outreach and education on your part.

Species diversity is crashing throughout the hemisphere as more and more populations become isolated, fragmented or otherwise denied the resources they need for successful reproduction. 1/3 of the worlds species are facing extinction in the coming century. The notion that threatened or endangered or wildlife in general can just go somewhere else is two-dimensional thinking. Wilderness and wildlife corridors are essential in mitigating the damage being created by the ever-expanding human footprint.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Stable wildlife populations require healthy and connected ecosystems. Some species migrate seasonally, others require large territories to hunt, and many--especially predator species--need to be able to move ac great distances to maintain the genetic diversity that is key to their survival. Human encroachment on intact ecosystems leads to habitat fragmentation, recognized as a primary cause of the decline of species worldwide. Roads and highways, in particular, are a principal cause of habitat fragmentation, creating barriers to wildlife movement and resulting in animal-vehicle collisions. Global climate change will alter ecosystems and force wildlife to shift their range, underscoring the need for wildlife to move ac the landscape. The issue of habitat fragmentation needs great attention now, in order to protect key remaining habitats and restore crucial linkages between habitat areas.

Staff at National Parks need to be increased for both maintenance and for teaching. While many of us go to a National Park to peace and quiet, we also go to learn. I'd would rather interact with staff than read a sign.

Staffing must be maintained. Many California State Parks are deteriorating due to decreased funding and staffing. We cannot let this happen to our national treasures.

State and nation parks are refuges for the wildlife and make available for people to enjoy nature in its natural state. ATVs, snow mobile, and mountain bikes are an invasion of these areas and an attack on nature. These vehicles despoil the peace and tranquility to both the nature lovers and the wildlife that lives there. The least offensive are mountain bikers, most of which I meet are more respectful of nature. These parks must be keep as a sanctuary for nature and all wildlife. ATVs and snow mobiles are envimental nightmares and they must be banned from every local, state and national park and recreational area. Mankind does not own this planet, we share it with many other species and mankind must respect these species and safeguard them from those who do not.

Stop watching Fox, read some books by real live scientists and check out some independent media sources....though it will scare the hell out of you. We are definitely the frog sitting in the pot of water, slowly boiling to death. Ask the folks in Moscow dying of heat and fire induced smoke inhalation if they discount global warming. Absolutely agree with a tax on all carbon used. Massive subsidies for nonpolluting renewable energy sources (and build those manufacturing plants in the U.S.). No more subsidies for oil & gas.

Substantial, majority support from the government makes sense. However, some support "out of pocket" makes one personally more aware responsibility for the parks. At the same time, this personal responsibility should not be such that anyone is barred from the parks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Texas has limited time and funds which are mainly dedicated to providing testing and teaching skills for most of the students to pass these educational level tests starting at age 4 until graduation. Teachers here have no funds or normally not add school hour time to transport students during the school hour days to "field trips". Any non school approved transportation, field trips or outside activities must be funded and sponsored normally by the parents of the students. I'd encourage this Watershed Education Coordinator to contact via web sites & e mails Parents, play groups, Day Care, Day Camps, Churches, youth groups, etc to get the word out and educational session appointments.

Thank you for contributing your 5 years of experience to this conversation. I also have seen the damage these off road vehicles do to the environment. As for family fun, while I'm sure there may be some responsible adults out there, the ones I know of who are into this "sport" fit your description of irresponsibility. "Families" really means "the boys" and if their wives knew they were putting the younger children's lives in danger, as the injuries and death statistics show, I doubt this would be legal. The only reason it IS legal for young children to drive these vehicles is that the automotive industry makes out like bandits on the sale of these mac. Of course the lack of available law enforcement in the wilderness plays its part also. These vehicles are unsafe for EVERY living thing, environment AND people.

Thanks for exposing some folks for distributing false info on this site that The Wildlands Project (TWP) is not real. Apparently you know it is real and are one of its high level promoters. I must say that I hope all of the worst for TWP and Spine of the Continent projects since they seem to be elitist and economically discriminatory with its support of horsepacking over any consideration of OHV use even in a managed manner. Looks like you and your kins have counted folks out prior to the completion of the public process. Nothing new for folks out to totally control others and hoodwink them. That will not have a positive impact on re-connecting Americans with their Great Outdoors ( not exclusively yours). My hope is that folks in the great State of Utah and elsewhere will deeply and repeatedly penetrate TWP and the Spine's core areas with numerous long trails for their OHV, Snowmobiles etc. by their participation in the public process should others such as fail at stacking the deck against them as DOI and their accomplices have already attempted. Have a good day and say hello to Reed Noss alias Diamondback for me.

The "roadless" areas in my county all have roads on them- not sure how they were designated when they already have roads, but so it is. One of the roadless areas has been a traditional woodcutting area for the nearby town (less than 2 miles away). The roadless rule has made access and maintenance of the roads difficult. these roads were used to protect the town during the last wildfire. What will we use during the next fire? I am sure there are some genuinely roadless areas on the list, but not any I've seen. Can we sort through and pick out the ones that are real?

The bad economy is probably not helping them much right now I am sure funding will return when economic conditions are better, tighten the belt, reduce spending, make cuts, we will all make it past these rough times.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The big ones are very important. But what about the smaller ones? There should still be places accessible to those on a limited income who don't have the resources to drive or fly hundreds of miles away. Its also hard to put a price on bio-diversity, some smaller parks, such as the Okeefenokee Wildlife Refuge, though small in size, are home to the most diverse ecosystems. Some of our smallest National Monuments, though not as large or well visited, are also important to preserve for future generations. I don't think we can afford to lose any of our National Parks, Monuments or Refuges. They all need to be funded.

The BP Deepwater Horizon oil disaster in the Gulf of Mexico is a tragic reminder that oil and water should not mix. After viewing Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) recreational uses in California, Wisconsin, and Utah over the past many years, I've come to a similar conclusion: that OHVs and water should not mix. Water tends to be a natural attraction for people, especially on hot summer days. But there is a stark difference between people getting into water, versus bringing in heavy mac. I've seen clear streams turned into turbid, muddy waters by the churning tires of OHVs. I've seen deep rutting in wet meadows from OHV trails. I've seen a rare temporary pond in the desert, fragile home to tadpoles, salamander nymphs, and other aquatic life, turned into an OHV "splash zone" and destroyed. In these and other cases, I'm appalled that people who tend to defend their recreation as responsible act so irresponsibly. Even the media glorifies this conduct, with OHV advertisements often showing uses in or through streams or wetlands. With most aquatic habitats in the West already in degraded condition, and the prospect of prolonged droughts from climate change further stressing these habitats, the challenge will be to educate OHV users that they need to park their mac before going to play in the water.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Bureau of Land Management loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually on grazing rights leases on public land and what they take in for mining and gas leases doesn't even out the loss. Both grazers and miners are paying fees that are decades old and not fair market value. The BLM is also losing hundreds of millions on wild horse and predator control when both are not needed. In Montana there are only 200 wild horses left in the entire state and that is on a refuge but they are emptying the refuge too. Small family ranchers are being blamed but it is big corporations like Hilton and millionaires like Ted Turner who own most of the grazing rights and who are taking advantage of the system. Less than 3% of US Beef is produced on the range yet most of the public lands in the West are managed for cattle grazing. The West does have a lot of open space but not pristine open space. Desert soil is very fragile and off road vehicle use does cause permanent damage in some areas. When you fly in or out of Phoenix AZ for example you can clearly see all the damage. This damage to the top layer of desert soil causes erosion and dust in the air. Of course, ATV users should have access to ride and enjoy but so should everyone else. Motor vehicles ARE noisy. Unfortunately, some that use ATVs also bring guns with them and not only do they increase the noise level but they are dangerous and what is up with shooting every sign and tree in sight and leaving shot up beer cans all over the place? You also should consider that some of the biggest cities in the US are West of the Mississippi. Population counts only the cities themselves, not their surrounding suburbs. All of these cities take up huge portions of land. Miles and miles in many cases and they run together in some states with little to no wild open land in between for wildlife movement/migration. Los Angeles (2), Houston (4), Phoenix (5), San Antonio (7), San Diego (8), Dallas (9), San Jose (10), San Francisco (12), Ft. Worth (17), El Paso (22), Seattle (23), Denver (28), Portland (30). From Seattle to Portland there is city or suburbs almost the entire three hour drive. From San Francisco to San Diego same thing. From Los Angeles to Phoenix, same thing. The Northwest is clear cut and farmed in a checkerboard pattern that does leave wildlife nowhere to go in many cases. You don't see most of the clear cuts from the roads because they are required to leave trees along them in most areas but from the air it is horrifying. There are roads everywhere. Yellowstone National Park is surrounded by ranchers who are afraid that bison will transmit a disease, Iosis which causes cows to abort their calves so the government pays to have hundreds of bison shot every year when they migrate out of the park during winter. Bison don't understand park boundaries. They go where they have water and forage. There has been not one case of a cow catching this disease from a bison yet hundreds of bison are shot at the taxpayer's expense every year. If more wilderness areas and wildlife corridors are not designated our National Parks are going to end up like Disneyland, surrounded by commercial interests as little islands of nature consumed by city.

The federal government should fund our parks to a certain degree, but we should also involve the public thru the initiative that allows tax-paying Americans the privilege and opportunity to donate any portion of their income tax refund to the park system. Let this replace the useless Presidential Election Campaign fund on the ft of every IRS 1040 tax form. I am aware that this initiative has been tried and has failed in the past, but it is a "grand idea" and worthy of continuing attempts until it is adopted.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

the funny thing is, I would have voted yes on this idea if the language was different. I'm definitely not opposed to nuclear, but sweeping generalizations about environmentalists and dismissal of solar and wind as potential sources without any evidence to support your claims, I have issues with.

The future of the Siskiyou Crest area (national monument vs. no national monument) needs to be decided by the people who live there, not by government officials and/or by the input of "outsiders." Yes, wild areas need to be protected, but maintaining healthy forests and other natural areas over the long haul is a complex process and the locals understand best what is needed, based on decades of living right in the middle of it, and caring DEEPLY about the area's "well-being" in all ways. Declaring a national monument in the Siskiyou Crest area might sound like a popular idea to a politician, but it is fundamentally irresponsible, as it works directly against the best interests of the local environment AND the wishes of the people who call the area home. Please "Just Say No"!

The great wild areas of the west are in peril of being lost to off-road vehicles and I strongly agree that they need to be banned from our most sacred areas. I also couldn't agree more about the importance of maintaining and re-establishing ecological resiliency, including reserve connectivity. We can not do this with off-road vehicles chewing up and destroying the soil and permanently ruining the hydrology in an area. EVERYTHING is connected and without functioning soils or stream systems, we can never achieve ecological resiliency. Save our lands and ban off-road vehicles!!!

The idea of promoting "all forms of recreation" is without discretion. Despite the hard facts of science, there are some people who want to enjoy parks their way no matter how much damage they do to the natural environment. Discretion is necessary because there are people who don't understand, or refuse to abide by, the importance of protecting animals, ecosystems, and views. Just for one example, there are people who want to ride snow mobiles anywhere they want, including in areas in winter where animals like bison usually don't run too much in order to conserve precious energy--as their food supply is not plentiful in winter--yet these animals would be made to run away from snowmobilers who don't care about such hard facts. These people also don't care about the air and noise pollution they would introduce into an otherwise pristine environment, where the natural silence of winter is a part of the natural experience others come to enjoy. The fact can't just be conveniently overlooked that our parks are also the homes of wild animals/entire ecosystems. Science-based knowledge about the facts of the conditions these animals need to survive, or ecosystems in general, as well as views, need to be protected from being indiscriminately damaged.

The idea said we must stop compromising with the republicans on drilling.... It's not about Dem vs GOP, or liberal vs conservative, the lands are for ALL to use, that means ALL it does not mean exclude ranchers, miners, oil and gas companies, hunters, ATV/OHV users, it means work out a plan so ALL can use the lands! Hunters and fishermen/women, and all the groups formed by them have done more for land and wildlife conservation than ANY other group has, yet we are the first who the Enviro-whackos want to ban from using the lands!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The lakes and streams of the upper midwest are generally in sorry state due to some agricultural practices, specifically non-point pollution sources. Since wetlands are the sponge that filters these contaminants and we have lost over 90%, I think more needs to be done with state and federal partnerships to restore much needed wetlands.

the letter we are commenting on states in part, "OHV'ers, like other recreationists, seek opportunities to not only enjoy the riding experience, but also opportunities to learn more about cultural and historical context, take in scenic views, observe wildlife, camp, hunt, fish and other activities". My position comes from years of observation of mixed use, designated or restricted use and , and areas where there are no signs or regulations on public land. Every area that has motorized use has no wildlife near it other than crows and squirrels. The 'trails' have turned into mud or sand depending on rainfall amounts, and the noise and litter make them useless for anything else. My hikes and photography or quiet observation of wildlife does not take away the opportunity of others. That is the big point here. Does what you do on public land make it impossible for others to do what they would like? Stop being selfish.

The most respected AND most democratic nations in the world realize the value of their natural landscapes and treasures. I want my country to be counted among them !!!

The OHV crowd pays user fees. The money we pay should be used to keep the roads open. Our RTP funds need to be used properly.

The OHV people should ONLY be allowed to use land which their ilk have already destroyed and degraded. What sort of brutality does it take to go into peaceful, serene land and tear it up and make a lot of noise and pollute the air?

The OHV riders refuse to acknowledge their noise and damage and how offensive it is to everyone else. They remind me of my noisy neighbors at home. If you truly want to bond with your family and introduce them to camping, you need to get off of your vehicle and sit, listen, and share. Today, people don't share and communicate. Sitting together, reading the newspaper, watching tv, playing games, etc. is about being in the same room and not communicating. Sitting at the dinner table and talking about what happened today and how it affects you and your family is sharing. Teenagers do not need to be talked to. They don't listen. It's too late. You need to listen. Listen. Listen. OHV is not about family. It is about noise and destruction. When you invade the forest with noise, engine roar, and destruction of the forest ground, it terrifies its inhabitants. It offends campers. Camping, wilderness, woods is about QUIET. Sit still and listen. Be. It is not about motion, noise, destruction, erosion, terrorism. QUIET. Be still. Take in the environment. How you think that engine roar and QUIET can be compatible, you are in denial. I wish there was a way. Wilderness does not equate to engine roar.

The other -Over-hunting and climate change is a tremendous problem. I am sure the nra, or any right wing news source, will admit that but it is true. I actually read articles based on science norm and that is where a lot of my comments come from. You should try it sometime, you might actually enjoy it and you might actually learn something.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The promotion of OHV use in the formerly pristine outdoors is proof positive that the American education system is in general, a failure. OHV'rs believe that the earth was created for them and them alone, and it's too bad if there's water, air, or earth remaining for the next generation. What a selfish bunch of no-minds these folks are. ME ME ME! My entertainment! My pleasure! OHV = ME sigh... Folks, sorry - but it really ISN'T all about you.

The Siskiyou Crest is an area of high botanical and geologic diversity. It is of utmost importance as a genetic bridge between the Siskiyou Mountains and the Cascades. Humans roam nearly every inch of this planet, and will continue to have access to this land even when it becomes a Monument. Let's humble ourselves and think of the needs of other creatures and life forms that are being pushed to the brink by human encroachment. It's not just about US!

The study in the link from comment 11 concerns outdoor activities in ALL settings including urban, suburban, rural, etc. Therefore, the statics comment 11 cites are misleading: "Scroll down to Table 2, which shows a comparison of the different types of recreation for ages 16 and up, revealing that 17.4% enjoy ORV, ATV or Motorcycle use, which is actually exceeded by hiking (32.7%), birding (31.8%), and a number of other outdoor activities." Of course the percentage of all participants was higher for hiking, the study did not limit what locations were considered for the activities. Hiking is available basically EVERYWHERE from city sidewalks, city parks, and all the way out to Wilderness trails. So hiking participants in ALL locations would outnumber OHV participants who are extremely limited on where they are allowed to ride. The same idea applies to birding - you can go birding in any environment. I am an avid motorcyclist but if I count how many miles I walk, it far outnumbers the number of miles I ride because I walk everywhere and only ride where I am allowed to.

The true agenda of this question comes through when you get to "We need more trails of all varieties, but especially motorized ones ..." I disagree: this is not consistent with conservation. As says (#37) they cause erosion (which I have seen first hand) and degrade trails. There is no way vehicles, especially motorized ones, can be considered consistent with conservation. Once destroyed, these lands take a long time to recover. We're spending down our 'biological capital' every time we open wild lands to such use.

There are already plenty of places to use OHV. Too many of OHV's are irresponsible and cause much habitat destruction.

There are already way too many 'motor' access areas. i.e. Most of the country.

There are forms of "recreation" that damage the environment (including wildlife), are not safe (for humans), and destroy the tranquility normally associated with the great outdoors. It seems inappropriate to promote these forms of recreation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are green conservation areas in my subdivision that preserve some of the land we are required to maintain. Unfortunately the rest of this preservation of land Manecke (author of this idea) isn't practical, realistic or economically feasible since we have to have buses, cars and at least a 2 way street and 2 exits. Texas, County and local laws requires plats and no by right permitted use options of any land. Based on what you wrote we'd have to have more than 80 acres to have no more than 20 homes with families here. Single Family Dwelling Houses would cost way more than from \$84,000 and up with that much land plus our home owners association dues would be more than \$261 a month - just to maintain that much more land. You forget we have to mow all this area to less than 4 inches to prevent poisonous snakes, lizards, mice, rats, and other dangers that are Governmentally required land useage - reducing fire hazards and dangers to households from animals already. At about \$1,000 per mow - where would you find the extra money from to own a home or maintain it plus how many criminal and civil charges are you willing to pay? Your ideas are totally ILLEGAL where we live and probably in most places for good reasons.

There are still many stream cings on designated OHV trails in national forests and BLM public lands. Damage is still being done to aquatic and riparian habitat. Water cings should be closed and replaced by bridges or by rerouting.

There in lies the problem. Just because a person is able bodied doesn't mean they should be ald exclusive use of the outdoors. This is anti-American and discriminatory against those of us with various forms of handicaps. Due to an injury I incured while serving this nation and defending your right to use public land, I injured my back and hence have a very difficult time accessing many areas to share time with my sons fishing or camping unless I am in an area that accomodates ATVs. I even work as a volunteer to help maintain many many miles of motorcycle and ATV routes while educating my fellow recreationists as to respectful use of the forests. As was mentioned in another thread, all of us who use the back country are all conservationists to one level or another. None of us want to see the access go away nor do we want to see the backcountry destroyed. We can all share the same resources but I also agree that some areas should be set up so they are more attractive to various groups but not exclusive.

There is no Planet B. We've just about completely wrecked Earth, so let's do everything we can Right Now to preserve what is left of our beautiful Earth.I want my grandchildren to experience at least some of the flora and fauna that I so love.We should stop the insane developers NOW, before the planet is nothing but concrete, stupid shopping malls and ugly houses.We should be working to make every space not currently "developed" into National Park land to be cherished by all; to leave some wildlife habitat; to provide us with air...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is no responsible use of OHVs in parks unless you are a park ranger. I keep seeing vast scars and "Doughnuts" and mud bogs created by driving repeatedly through mud and destroyed fields at our parks here in Texas. We go to the parks to get AWAY from obnoxious machines that rule the Earth and non-stop bombard us with noise and more noise. When I go to a Park, I want to let Nature rule and I don't want to see machine tracks marring up the land and hear them approaching. It's hard to tell where they are coming from and hard to walk far enough away from the sound. Sorry OHV'ers, but the reason you have no trouble sharing with others but others have trouble sharing with you, is not because we are selfish and don't like sharing, ... It's because we literally CAN'T share with you, we just basically have to give up on our experience altogether... Because your fun ruins our nature walks with muddy scarring and deep tread marks--sometimes worse like huge ruined fields of ferns and bunnies--and of course, you are LOUD and we cannot get away from it, so there is no sharing. You dominate wherever you go... when you show up there is no sharing, just you and your mess and noise and the rest of us might as well give up.

There should never, never, never be any motorized vehicles allowed on wilderness lands. They disturb wildlife, destroy peace and silence and damage the environment.

There's more than enough privately held timber land in this country. I would imagine that the reason the timber companies prefer to take timber from public lands is because the taxpayers build their logging roads for them and they've already done the damage to the private lands and want to clearcut our lands too. Time to transfer our National Forests away from the Forest Service, make it a division of the Park Service, and transfer those employees who have shown sensitivity to the new NPS division. Ban all future corporate logging on public lands.

There's no way this is true. A private landowner can divide, develop, pollute and degrade the land in any way he/she sees fit. All of our wide open spaces are being turned to ranchettes because of the stewardship of private landowners. Like businesses they have no other concern but the bottom line. This is not stewardship.

These vehicles destroy trails. Vehicles should be on roads, not trails. Any increase in the use of vehicles should be resisted.

They should all be rejected. We do not need any new wilderness areas. You already admitted that they are doing just fine as is. When land is changed to wilderness it becomes both a non-used area and a fire hazard as well as a beetle hazard. We do not need to create any more fire hazards or lock up any more areas from oil leases.

This is an off-road enthusiast suggesting that we give their special-interest group a tax write-off for doing what they want to do.....building and maintaining trails. My view - ANY group or individual that invests time and energy (and money) into the optional activity of recreation.....in whatever form.....should receive no special consideration for that investment. Optional means choice.....and what the bean counters call "disposable income." Spend it how you want, but don't expect me to pay more in taxes because you want a break.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is complete nonsense. OHVs whoop their way through the woods leaving a trail of butts and beer cans and garbage, ruining the place for those who come to enjoy it.

This maybe is not a bad idea. What I don't think works is the idea of "multiple use," as the motorized by the nature always dominate.

This sounds really stupid to me: these vehicles do a heckuva lot of damage. What is so great about tearing up the countryside? Do you know how long it takes for desert to recover from this kind of damage? Just so some guys can hot rod around? Do this on private land, not public.

This summer I signed in at a trail head in a remote area. They asked where we were from. In our party were 4 locals and 2 from ac the country. The trip was mainly planned for the visitors. If using that for a survey, how would you record it? Like most trailhead sign-ins, it had space for a name, number in party, where from, day in (but to my surprise, no day out.) I don't know of any hiker/camper who would like to spend much more time filling out a survey when they are anxious to get going. And you are correct about the way questions are phrased. They are usually designed to get the answers they want.

I grew up riding three wheelers and motorcycles. I still snowmobile. I'm not against roads. There are just too many of them. Maybe it's different where you live. I doubt it, though. The amount of roads in national forests is huge. So huge, the government is not able to keep up the maintenance. There is room for OHVs and wilderness, some roads are good. I say preserve more wilderness and mult use land. When OHVs have access to an area, it does degrade the wild character of the area, especially if there are alot of users. Thats why there should be more areas preserved for all types of recreation and for the health of the enviment(clean water, clean air, habitat for other creatures that depend on solitude, etc.). I've stated before that most outdoor people making comments here, even though they may have differing opinions, still have more in common than they have not in common.

To find what's motivating these lawsuits, "follow the money" - What an eye-opener , if this is true ! Are the lawyers using the Eco-Groups as their Pawns to get billable hours? Is the government an unlimited source of funds for these lawyers ? Wow !

To paraphrase lin-If we do not all hang together, than surely we will all hang seperately. Creating division between dirt bikers, atv/utvers, Jeepers, and even mountain bikers opens the door for even more restrictions. Face it, the tree-huggers want everyone out of the forests.

So, after you 'take back the country', what will you do first? Put black people back under slavery, take women's right to vote away, or finish killing off the remainder of the first americans? Always amazes me that you corporate apologists hide behind patriotism, when what you're really saying that anyone who doesn't like what's happened to our public lands in the name of sheer greed or ignorant nonchalance must be unpatriotic. I'm not using the language that you deserve because women or little kids might read it, but that language would include every swear word I know, in at least 5 languages.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Too many youth in this country grow up never spending time outdoors. Better funding for services and educational opportunities for youth are important if we are to raise healthy, responsible adults.

Trail riders and hunters who utilize this equipment would not be served well by this idea but it would and does provide a place for what I refer to as ACTIVE OHV use such as high speed operation, donuts and intentionally challenging operators skills against the terrain. It can be very profitable for landowners without governmental edicts and bans. One 640 acre place like this in Fla draws 10,000 people on a weekend at \$25.00 per head to enjoy camping, drunkenness, mud fun with mac and big name country bands. It is kind of red neck heaven for the young folks that participate even though parents would worry about their kids being there if they knew what goes on. One needs to understand that the old homestead will not look the same where they allow this fun to happen. Lots of money out there for private property owners willing to chip in the aesthetics of their property while the bucks roll in.

Trail riders should ride on designated trails and should carry feed that is certified weed free and yes, they do exist. Horse hooves tear up trails far less than OHVs do. Most OHV users that I've come into contact with out camping or hiking don't even use trails they just gouge their way through. I have been to a state park recently that has a section set aside for horses only and the trails in it are in exct condition. Sadly, I can still hear OHVs screaming through the forest while riding in this park.

Turning management over to state and local governments is the wg way to go. They lack the national perspective and don't really appreciate the value of long-term sustainable management of the land. In their hands, "threat of catastrophic wildfire" could become the latest excuse to log off roadless areas and leave them with a spiderweb of roads.

Uh, , one of the biggest causes of cheat grass expansion is hot wildfires in areas that are overdue for burning. Actually, most ranchers work very hard to reduce cheat grass on their range because it is poor quality feed. You may not wish for grazing on public lands for whatever reason, but let's at least be factual not emotional. Also, invasive species generally are brought in by ATVs and highway mowing equipment (thank you, anti-herbicide folks), judging by the pattern of spread I see in my area. - judging by your posts, you are filled with such rage that you are unable to talk politely with people of different views, and thus are unable to persuade them. Mr. Spotts has a point. I assume you don't want more cheat grass. Why not be polite and find a way to communicate about things you might have in common?

Unfortunately, however, wilderness areas as enacted are not always roadless. As an example, the Coconino National Forest in Arizona is currently considering an attempt at wilderness designation for 10 areas. Most of these areas are roaded and several have motorized recreation as the primary ROS. Some of them even contain structures from ranching and mining. This is why so many of us have concerns with wilderness designations. Most of the areas offered up for it don't fit the definition of it and are currently used for activities that do not fit within a wilderness area. Keep the appropriately designated areas as they are. Just make sure that future designations are what they are supposed to be.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Unlike the "other" I actually own horses and I don't believe the government should be in the horse business. Even at 200 horses I would hate to think of what the cost to the taxpayers would be.

Utah politicians are able to get away with anything, even organizing mass motorized invasions of wilderness study areas. The BLM and Forest Service offices are staffed with long-time Utah residents unwilling to stand up to local politicians.

Very good point, I believe most of our parks should be used to preserve wild areas. If you want to go to an amusement park somewhere else, you have that option.

VOTE (DEMOTE) PLEASE &gt; CONSIDER BEFORE VOTING. THE PROCESS IS A BIT SLANTED IN MY OPINION AND CONFUSING. I have visited the area in question and saw the beauty of those who have lived there many many years and love the small town feeling of some communities. This would be interrupted by promoting a monument being constructed in this area. It is costly and will be the ruin of many families homes and solitude. The current times we are living in do not promote still another tax and expense for unnecessary ventures. PLEASE Think before you vote about how you would feel if your home for many years was in jeopardy.

We all want the same thing; to have plenty of places to enjoy the outdoors. To do that, we'll have to work together and stop the infighting. I've been hiking and seen people go off trail damaging the tundra and I've seen OHV's doing the same thing. I agree when I'm camping, I don't want to hear an OHV whizzing by, but at the same time it's not fair to selectively open the wilderness to certain groups. What about people who can't hike? Are you going to lock them out because their only means of access has 4 wheels? Environmental preservation (not isolation) is the first priority, then fitting our activities into it should be next. After all, if people can't get out and enjoy the wilderness, what reason do they have to preserve it?

We also need to be able to get to the parks, so the CCC should include transportation infrastructures.

We are putting increasing amounts of CO2 into the air. The CO2 does not stay in the air forever. Some of the CO2 is absorbed by the ocean. The ocean is becoming more acidic. The increasing acidity of the water harms life forms that build shells. Whatever the cause, the atmosphere is warming. The heat does not stay in the air forever. The biggest heat sink is the ocean. The ocean is becoming warmer, more slowly than the atmosphere. As the ocean warms, the volume of the water expands, raising the sea level. The rising sea level covers land that people used. The warmer surface water prevents the upwelling of cold nutrient-laden water that supports phytoplankton. The loss of nutrients has caused the phytoplankton to decline by 40% since 1950. Phytoplankton is the base of the food chain. The smell of the sea is the respiration of phytoplankton. Phytoplankton breath includes sulfur. Sulfur particles are a nucleus of raindrops. Phytoplankton produced 50% of the oxygen in the atmosphere. The warming atmosphere melts the tundra, releasing methane, a more powerful greenhouse gas. The warming ocean melts the methane hydrates locked in the continental shelves, releasing more methane. Methane caused the extinction of the large animals once before, leaving the world open to the dinosaurs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

we can see from experience in the klamath nat'l forest (the area of the proposed siskiyou crest monument) that since all or most of these extreme environmental policy's have been put into effect things have just gotten worse. there is less game, less fish, much more fuel loading, fires have been left to become giant brush patches. there is no logging going on in this area on public land, there is no mining except for a few hobby miners, the grazing is minimal. so ks wild is trying to hype this proposal by telling people the lie that all these so called destructive practices are happening. what groups like ks wild do to our public lands is truly destructive come see for your self what a mess the forest are. they protest and appeal every effort by the usfs to do any restoration or rehab on burned areas and will continue to protest any positive activity even after it becomes a monument. so please think objectively and research this for your self. we need sustainable forest and we need to manage them properly. thanks

We could easily go very far afield from what's intended here, so I'm going to do my best to make this my last comment on this issue. The government often has a role in drawing attention to things. The problem I see with this, though is where does it end. Smoking is a great example. In my state it is unlawful to smoke in business establishments. My problem with this is that it infringes on private property rights. If I own a business and desire to smoke in it, others are free to avoid buying things from me and free to not work for me. If I own the building, I shouldn't have to kow-tow to the desires of others when they can avoid the situation entirely. That's a fictional example. I enjoy a good cigar now and again, but I also find it refreshing to go into an establishment and not have to deal with cigarette smoke. It just makes me nervous about where this type of intrusion ends. At what point does someone else get to control my television, reading material and anything else. I understand what you are saying about bringing attention to the issue, but what happens when the issue being attended to is something that you feel differently about? I just think that areas like this are best left to parents, families and private organizations. People making poor life choices is one of the hazards of living in a free society. But, I still think it beats the alternative.

we need to keep everyone out of the wilderness areas. We can look in through the razer wire

We need to keep our Wilderness pristine. Everyone should stay out and just look in through the razer wire.

We need to restore our national parks to the status and condition they were in before "tle down" was conjured up and corporatization began its abuse and plundering of our national natural resources.

We needed to protect more land to provide more green space.

We should be ashamed in the way we have funded and maintained our national treasures.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We should expand our National Parks Project for our future.

We spend almost all of our vacations in National Parks and are upset to see how many visitors do not know how to properly behave in the park. We spend hours picking up other people's trash when we could be enjoying the park instead. We have had to rescue people from dangerous situations because they did not obey posted signs. We have stopped potential accidents from happening when we have warned people not to feed or get too close to the wildlife. We have been bombarded by the sound of loud music playing when we are there to enjoy the sounds of nature. While many parks have embraced the Leave No Trace organization and have included the LNT ethics in their park materials such that visitors are introduced to these ethics, other parks either have not LNT information or hide it in a back section of the newspapers they give out. The public needs to be exposed to these ethics not only while they are in the park but also in schools.

We that live here care more for the land than any of you "people" that want to try and save it. What are you trying to save it from? There is no road building, logging, mining, or anything else going on that "might" have an adverse effect on the land. Oh, and you know why nothing is going on? Yes, that's right. Thanks to you dogooders that think you are so much smarter and care so very much for OUR land there is no more logging, mining, or any other jobs for people to do around here anymore. The schools are going to pot, with enrollment way down and no money to fund things such as sports, etc.. By the way, timber dollars went a long way in funding for schools, roads, etc.. Once again, thanks to the enviro whackos there are no more timber dollars. So thanks to idiots who think you can "restore" the land, maybe he will use a cotton ball to push dust around with so he doesn't leave a "footprint" on the land, we have no jobs, schools are going downhill, and our forests are tinder boxes with dead trees and being overgrown by brush. We DO NOT want or need a siskiyou crest national monument.....

We used to do 4 wheel off roading but stopped after seeing all of the damage done by people leaving the established trails. OHV people need to understand that by many of them not obeying the rules in the already established OHV areas, they are shooting themselves in the foot. OHV areas also need to be located away from areas where people go to enjoy nature. Coral Pink Sand Dunes State Park in Utah is a good example of where the OHV activities disturb the enjoyment of the other visitors to the park because they drive fast in areas that are shared by people walking and the noise from the vehicles themselves can be heard all over the area.

Well its clear you do not live in the 90% of rual america that is affected by these strange anti ATV UTV rules because I have never even seen a hiker or walker in the forest. And I live in it. The rules should not be made by city slickers who want to hike near cities. They should be made in the local area by the people who want to use them. Why should we be prevented when we have no hikers here?

Well said. Additionally, designating an area as "wilderness" should not mean - as it does currently - that envimentally ign recreational activities like trail races and orienteering events are banned. Therefore, the wilderness rules should be modified to allow (permitted) on- and off-trail running events, subject of course to review based on local conditions by the land manager.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well spoken , and I stand corrected someone is advocating OHV in wilderness. I don't think a properly designated wilderness area is the right place for OHV. However that being said I think there is an opportunity to explore new ideas when new technologies come out. Like an access trail for disabled visitors to points of educational interest. So that everyone has the ability to see, learn about and conserve mother earths creations.

We're trying. But the truth is that if there is nowhere legal to ride, then those who don't care about the law will ride where they want to. Gates will only keep out the responsible riders. It's really had to promote responsible OHV use if there is nowhere for responsible OHV use.

What a great idea. More of my hard earned dollars going to another government program. How about if more users get out and volunteer to help maintain what we have.

What is wild? I have friends who think I live in "the wilderness" despite the state highway less than a mile away. The "roadless areas" in my county have miles of existing road in them. Shutting off access to traditional wood gathering and fishing areas is hard on local communities. Remember, Native Americans actively managed the land before Europeans ever arrived. Why not just give it back if we don't want to use it? I think some people here need to quit frothing at the mouth and learn to be polite, or they will turn off any potential supporters they might have.

What's your point ? Hikers need trails.

When increasing funding for the Park system, don't forget the seriously underfunded USVI National Park. Coral reefs are disappearing at an alarming rate all over the world, so we should take special precautions to preserve what's left in the US Virgin Islands. This is a unique and beautiful park in our system, but appears to be very underfunded.

When will you all get it? Wilderness and ORVs don't mix. If I want to share space with motorized vehicles, I can take a hike along the freeway.

While I agree that OHV vacations bring families together, OHV recreation does NOT belong in our national parks and is abhorrent to conservation goals. A footprint is invasive yet far less so (by orders of magnitude) to even the constant tread of a bicycle tire, let alone a 3-, 4- or 6-wheel ATV--and the NOISE of motor vehicles echoes throughout the wilderness so even if you do not see the fossil-fuel burning toy you can hear it all around. (frown) Sorry. OHV/ATV recreation DOES NOT BELONG in anyone's outdoor experience in our National Parks.

Who could be against a few runners trying to stay extremely fit? Answer - Many of America's Great (LOL) enviro groups. Sad but true.

Why would ORV users who go off trail not continue to use a trail that exists but is signed as "closed"? This sound like an unenforceable strategy to me.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness is important for the survival of certain species, biodeversity, etc. Wilderness is also deeply valued for cultural, spiritual, and moral reasons and is vital for the human spirit. There are plenty of places to ride OHVs, drill, or mine. These activities can be done anywhere (private property, farmland, non wilderness, etc). More should be set aside as wilderness, it not only efits humans with recreation and clean air and water, it efits plants and animals that don't have a voice. I may never be able to afford to see some of the wilderness that is available. Most of it is on the other side of the country. The knowledge that it exists gives me piece of mind. There should be more land set aside for wilderness and for non wilderness as well. I don't think we need to drill in every last valley.

Wildernuts, ecofreaks, enviuts. People like you are very creative. You're a real leg slapper. What a hoot. You should be a comedian on TV. Did you know that the traditional use of land is wilderness. The established way of the world is nature's way. You live inside of nature's way, at the mercy of it. If people screw up the planet, nature's way will not give one hoot for any of us. Better not screw up, eh?

Will everyone who supports this still support it after realizing the windmills or solar arrays will wipe out the viewshed near a visitor center with 5 or 10 acres of these things visible nearby. Even if you would other enviros would probably sue to stop the project as they are already doing elsewhere.

With millions of acres of desert in Nevada, CA. AZ and southern UT why is it so difficult to promote an offroad race? The BLM charges a fortune for the privilage of playing on public lands and the events are held on existing roads/trails and are 100% previously disturbed lands. The rules change without public hearings and land use plans, the maps and rules are confusing, we need a comprhensive land use plan and approach that includes horses, bikes, OHV, off road racing and wilderness.

Nonsense. There are enough roads in National Forest alone to go to the moon and back (several times). No one is stopping you from using those roads that are open - which are in the thousands and thousand of miles. Plus motorized wheelchairs are ald in many wilderness areas and elsewhere. I am sorry for you physical problems, We don't need to destroy the rest of the country to appease you. So what about the blind, should public lands be fitted with brail inscriptions or audio stations every hundred yards or so? How about those who don't have the physical capacity to scale halfdome in Yosemite, should we put in an escalator? And those who can't climb Mt Rainier, should we helicopter them to the summit? You guys just don't get it. We are running out of Mother Earth. Quit seeing what you want to see and open your eyes (somewhere other than a dirt bike trail).

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

- If you really paid attention to the gulf oil spill you'd know it wasn't the lack of regulation that was the problem. It was the combination of being required to use known bad government supplied current information and regulators ignoring that regulation sign-off reviews are not paper in an office. Both BP and THE GOVERNMENT were/are equally at fault. Oh, and sign-off was by an Obama appointee not a Bush one. All lands that are open to the public should be owned/operated by the states and local communities, or subcontract operation to private parties, NOT the over-bearing-it's-good-for-you federal government. Look at the misery the federal land management is causing in many of the western states. If the federal government had it's hooks into proportionately as much land in the east and far west, this new expansion would be quashed summarily.

slinging insults rather than dealing with the arguments- how are you going to deal with overgrazing and damage by herds that procreate quickly? BTW most herds were kept in check in the past by native americans who captured them for use and also ate them. Also they were rounded up regularly for use as working animals- but we don't need them anymore. so how do we deal with overgrazing?

U are sooo full of non-sense ! We do not want more- more- more- like you say. This is what happens: We have been OHV riding in certain areas for years. Some do- gooder in Congress wants to leave a legacy, so they get behind a Wilderness Bill. This often times wants to apply "Wilderness Designation" to land that already has roads, trails and mines on it. (Shouldn't be "Wilderness") Thus the OHV groups must fight the designation, because it is not true "Wilderness" and shuts down land already in use by OHV'ers. We don't want More-More-More, we just want to keep what we got.

I think your view of many of these so called "non-profits" is a little off. Many of these organizations have gone the way of corporate giants such as Exxon, General Motors, and BP. They have lost all touch with reality and are only out for personal gains, posing as wildlife sympathizers. For instance, according to their 1998 tax form the Sierra Club spent about 50% of donations on actual preservation. The rest went to wining and dining the fat cats at the top of their corporate ladder. { <a href="http://www.sovereignty.net/p/ngo/sac-1.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Another example is the Nature Conservancy, who made nearly \$400 MILLION dollars after expenses in 2000 alone. Remember, because they are classified as a "non-profit", no income taxes were paid on any of this money. As of 2009 they had \$5,637,205,000 (that's over \$5.5 billion) in assets, a number I'm sure has only gone up since then. That is some serious cash, enough so that I have a tough time calling them anything but a corporate giant. { <a href="http://www.undueinfluence.com/nature\_conservancy.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://www.nature.org/aboutus/annualreport/files/fs\_fy2009.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I don't know about all of you, but I am tired of big business calling the shots. Don't let these companies pretend to care about the enviment so they can line their pockets. If you want somebody on a federal committee, how about asking a neutral source such as an independent biologist. That way actual facts and figures would be heard by those in charge, not just extremest ramblings by envimental corporations looking to make a buck (or 400 million).

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Not "no" but "Absolutely NO!" to KS Wild enabling the Department of Interior's locking up our Siskiyou Ridge. It's our land, not DC's and certainly not KS Wild's! Anyone confused about what's lead us to this covetous governmental action, just click a region on this { <a href="http://takingliberty.us/TLByRegion.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Not ALL forms of recreation. Motorized ORV noise/pollution destroys habitat, harasses wildlife, and damages the peace/quiet/"wild" experience for other users.

Not sure what this idea is. Why wouldn't the fee just go to the park instead of to an outside entity? The website link did not clear up my confusion, so I'm demoting, because it would be easier just to pay the fee to the park being visited and have them use it.

Nothing will stop the green industry that is coming from degrading many vistas with solar and wind arrays. SOME wished for it and now THEY will get it whether they like it or not at scale - large scale. Don't worry totally though because China will probably produce the hardware off shore so a lot more factory spece won't be needed except for the research we may do.

Now that we have made steady progress in strengthening laws aimed at protecting wilderness areas and untouched lands that are protected by the government, we have to make quite sure that those laws remain shaply intact and untouchable for ages. We have to protect old growth forests in their entirety, and not just the old trees themselves, but give the same kind of protection to other trees that were planted for years and new trees that are located in wilderness areas our any untouched pieces of land protected by the government. Recent forest management proposals ignore this, suposedely in an attempted move beyone management controversial issues of the past, and we believe that forest management should finally be toughen up. Instead of focusing on saving old those trees, we need to designate entire forests of old growth, that way both envimental priorities and moneterly desires can become solved. Proposed logging of young trees in Old Growth Forests would impact the ancient balance that nature has so well maintained. Nesting habitats for Spotted Owls and other threatened and endangered species would clearly be disturbed, any youn trees that are removed would remove vital nutrients from the forest life cycle, and activity of machinery would subject fragile forest topsoils to erosion. Now let's protect what we have left of these Old Growth Forest Ecosystems, so we can protect the entire Old Growth Forests, not just old trees within them, but new or recent trees as well.

Off road vehicles are the toys of a spoiled rotten few mo types. Let them go ride their stupid toys on private dirt tracks.

Off-road vehicles have nothing but negative impacts on the enviment. They create air pollution, noise pollution, cause soil erosion, and frighten the wildlife. I ought to know; I used to ride dirt bikes and four wheelers before I came to my senses.

Oh, so you want your land-disturbing activities--horses, bikes, OHV, off road racing, etc.--none of which I am opposed to per se, to take place on "undisturbed lands"? Take a moment hink about the logical merits of that statement. This is a lousy idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHVs do not belong in the wilderness. If a person needs noisy destructive polluting vehicles for recreation, then s/he should be in already developed areas rather than destroying the little bit of quiet that we have left.

OHVs don't belong in a wilderness. Period. They would be more acceptable in national forests and other wild areas IF they were quieter, lighter, AND the persons riding them were responsible. They are so intrusive for those of us who hike and camp, though, that my knee-jerk response is to say ban them all; the OHV riders I've seen tend to have loud music, go off trail even when it's not allowed, drink alcoholic beverages and yell to one another almost constantly. Maybe that's just in my area?

Okay, I am reading all you are saying about this. honestly, I am. I hear about God, his trees and his bushes and his crystal clear water. okay, there is that little thing about how the .gov can't get into the God debate, so you can just make the whole side of the argument go away. I hear how you love going, walking, sitting where it is quiet and tranquil for you. How you love seeing nature, and how you hike and how you this, and how you that.... and then you can me and other OHV user selfish. yah, the issue runs deep in this one. I hear you say "Ride on private land", okay, you hike on private land. Oh yah, this is about you isn't it, everyone else must change so you are happy. By the way, just who's private land are we to ride on? I will throw down my annual tax bill with just about anyone, let's see who all pays what for our Public Land. It isn't just for me, or you, or the squirrels. It is for all of us. You want to split the land down the middle? You take half and we take half? Great deal for the OHV crowd, because we have way less than half now. How about you hike where we AREN'T?? We have very little land to ride on, so it shouldn't be too hard for people of even limited intelligence to find out where we are not allowed, and then just go walk your little butts off.

On a case by case/trail by trail basis allow mountain bikes access to Wilderness. Especially the more remote areas where conflicts are not likely. It's proven that mountain bikes have about the same impact as a hiker and far less than horse. The mountain bike is almost the only human powered recreation not allowed in Wilderness. In more crowded areas, since new trail construction is allowed in Wilderness, create separate trails for Mountain Bikers.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

On May 18, 2010 there was a Board of Supervisors meeting held in Yreka to discuss the effects the National Monument would have on our county. In attendance were the Board, representatives from USDA Forest Service, BLM, neighboring county officials, representatives from our Congressman and about 300 very concerned citizens. KS Wild the proponents of the monument excused themselves from attendance via email so we were deprived of their responses to the many questions this issue raises. In a nutshell we learned that no one really knows what the effects will be of making our area into a National Monument. The decision on who will manage it will not be made until after the declaration. It is between the USDA, BLM or the Parks Department. Each administrative entity have different guidelines on how things will be managed. Howard Hunt, the assistant manager with BLM for the Cascade-Siskiyou national monument outlined the guidelines which the Cascade-Siskiyou Monument have to work with. A few of the restrictions include: NO mineral or geothermal extraction. NO use changes of private property within the monument. NO commercial harvest of timber or other vegetative material except when part of an authorized science based ecological restoration project. NO off road vehicle use. Road density reduced. Fighting fires is far more complex. NO road development or improvement. Road maintenance restrictive due to budget constraints (the timber industry was paying for the maintenance through timber sales) The forest management plans which were supposed to take 2 to 3 years to complete and either are still not complete 10 years later or took 6 to 8 years. The monument has been restrictive to any vegetation management plans due to appeals and protests and still does not exist. (guess who is tying things up?) I recorded the meeting and have the video if anyone cares to dispute this. The issues we don't know about and are very concerned about are: NO firewood cutting. NO undergrowth removal from the forest. Runaway Fires as a result. Uncertainty about our water rights. Loss of any and every industry we presently have in our area with the exception of tourism. It does not follow that tourism will increase because we have so little of it presently and our area is already one of the most pristine in the country. What color we can paint our houses. NO new building permits. NO improvements to our homes and businesses. Stories from other National Monument victims of having to sell out to the government for ten cents on the dollar. I challenge anyone to look at these restrictions on their own homes and businesses and welcome them. On the surface having another National Monument to enjoy sounds like a really good idea. Guess what, the American people already own the land, it is already managed very effectively by the Forestry Department lead by Ken Harris in our area. We do not need any additional restrictions to keep things beautiful. Come here and see for yourself. This is one of the most beautiful places I have ever seen and I have been all over the world. This boils down to who is in charge of managing our resources, man or nature. Our constitution says we are. The environmentalists believe nature is. President Obama gets to decide.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

On National Park Service land RV's get an absolute gift of far below cost campsites to the point that nearby privately operated campgrounds cannot compete. That is a guaranteed fact in Big Cypress National Preserve. In So Fla market RV campsites are a heck of a lot more than the 14 - 18 dollars a night that NPS charges. And privately operated dump stations are not allowed to be on the honor system. I sympathize with retirees on a fixed income but you have to come see these \$250-500,000 dollar RV's down here getting NPS RV sites for 14 or so dollars a night when local campgrounds are barely surviving on account of it.

Once again an ECO NAZI misses the point intentionally. If you were trying to be at all honest you would have described how setting aside all this land has an effect on you. You didn't, so that tells me it won't have any impact on your life. Chances are you don't own anything and therefore have nothing to lose. We who live here and own property and business do. If this land grab goes through, Do you really believe that you won't lose also. What happens when the Federal Gov. comes to you and landlocks your land. What will you say then. You won't say anything because you probably will never own anything of value. The fact is that with one swipe of his pen, our "president", can make it so that the only way anybody who owns property, in a national monument area, can access their land is by helicopter. Your proposition would remove roads there by limiting access to only the most physically fit, if even they were granted access. So are you that hateful to seniors or the physically challenged. Or is it that you feel guilty for destroying the environment in which you reside and want others to suffer for your guilt. The fact that you claim to be protecting the health and diversity of other living creatures is a farce. You value these creatures over my life and livelihood. You sir are a fool. If you think you can destroy this amount of personal wealth without any blowback on yourself you are even more of a fool than I currently take you to be. I hope that you are prepared for the fight that is going to land on your doorstep. I will be noticeable when I bring this fight to your doorstep in the same fashion you brought this fight to my doorstep. This is not an argument about your rights to try screw over your neighbors. It's an argument about IF it's for RIGHT for you to SCREW YOUR neighbor over. If in your mind that's OK then you won't have any problem when Siskiyou County shows up on your doorstep, IN OREGON, and requires you to answer for your actions. You are very generous with everybody else's money why don't you use your accumulated life's wealth to just buy all the land at or above fair market value. Instead you seem like the sort who will wait until the Government has driven the property value down. Then you can come in and develop the area for a dime on the dollar. Just like the Sierra club saying that you care about life so we need to save this area is a joke and so are you and those who think like you. Take care of your own back yard, then your block, then your city, then your state and maybe then you will have SOME credibility. DON'T try Destroy My Business, MY Property and MY HOME so you can feel less guilty about how YOU have RAPED the environment in your area. If you really believed this crap you would have the guts to come down here and talk to us, but you lack integrity and therefore won't.

Once again, motorized vehicles destroy trails, cause erosion, and cause noise pollution as well. They do not belong in wilderness protected areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Once again, NO to motorized vehicles on trails. They cause erosion, noise pollution and destroy trails. Also, alcohol is currently prohibited and should continue to be prohibited. Enjoy the sunset while drinking, juice, tea or coffee, or water, not a cocktail.

one more time, gee obesity versus walking, obesity versus walking maybe not that many people want to get off- or out of - their misery making vehicles

Our challenge is to preserve and protect our natural habitat (and the natural habitat of the entire world) to minimize degradation and consumption whether by timber harvesting, grazing, recreation, mining, pollution, etc. Unchecked, human beings will consume and eventually destroy every natural area in our country and other countries if that activity can generate a profit. Simply recall what has happened to our great virgin forests and our great plains because there appeared to be an abundance of them in the 18th and 19th centuries. Consider what happened to the passenger pigeon and multiple other less well known species of plants and animals. Additional areas must be included in protected areas now before it is too late. Multiple use like any other set of guidelines/programs must be limited by tight and clear regulations with out loop holes for clever lawyers and business to exploit. These regulations must be accompanied by vigorous enforcement. Business interests with a stg profit motive ueber alles are the greatest enemies of nature, much more so than those of us who merely want to get out and enjoy it. Our "destruction" is lack of respect for what we have and not destruction by intentionally consuming to generate profit. I am not anti capitalism. I am a registered Republican. But competition which can both successfully support and control business ventures won't work in protecting our natural resources and areas. With entrepreneurs only one side exists, the profit side, and there are no altruistic principles that control the profit goal.

Our national and state parks are the preeminent signs that we have intelligent life in America. Any culture that does not put preservation of its natural resources ahead of anything else is a culture doomed to fail. It is the natural environment that gives us fresh air, clean water, and silence to restore our spirits. Man made cities may have have thrills like restaurants, movies, and concerts but they also produce landfills full of disposable waste and decibels of noise. Long ago troubled individuals could live in the woods away from citizens who found their homelessness or crazy rants disturbing. We "progressed" to mental hospitals then "progressed" further to allow them to live in the streets. We have a diminishing population without immigration. If we allow immigration but continue to limit our population, we can reclaim this great nation instead of further progression toward a concrete jungle.

Over 80% of lands West of Mississippi are open space. Wildlife has plenty of places to live. There is no need to create Wildlife Corridors or designate additional Wilderness Areas. The creation of Wildlife corridors will have a disproportional and severe negative impact on rural communities. It appears that organizations such as The Nature Conservancy stand to make huge illicit profits by swapping lands to the government for Wildlife Corridors



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Paperwork showing the current trails are required. Yes, I agree it would be better done every other year with one year's cost of doing the trail paperwork spent actually on the paperwork. However, unless the paperwork is done in a timely manner - which is determined by Government - no body may walk on this trail as I see things.

Parks are a place to enjoy and learn how to care for nature. We need to show where our values are.

Parks are not a business. That is one problem the Dept of Outdoor Recreation is having right now. They are trying to run the dept like it is a money making business. If you want to make money on a national park you have to sell something. I dont think anyone on this forum wants to see the Dept of Rec get into the the business of selling natural resources.

Paying ones taxes doesn't merit tearing through desert ecosystems. We pay taxes so this countries land is protected and preserved for low/no impact usage of its citizens. We don't pay taxes for the right to rip it up. I'm a mountain biker, a dirtbiker, four wheeler, backpacker, paddler and a hunter, but I'm also an ecologist. There are plenty of appropriate places for the more impact pe/invasive activites. The desert is not one of them. U.S. desert ecosysems are extemely diverse (believe it or not), fragile and are already highly stressed. Lets look at the science FIRST, and not base our land use policies on what give us instant gratification. Screw this up once and it's gone forever.

Perhaps if 50% or more of our income wasn't eaten up by taxes and government fees, more time could be spent in the outdoors, without additional mandates on business.

Please - Do not let people who do not live in the Siskiyou Crest area determine the future for the area. A national monument there is a bad idea. The current residents are doing a good job of preserving the natural habitat - after all, it is their home. A National Monument will hinder fire fighting, tree management, recreation, and much more.

Please ! NO 4 wheel vehicles in Parks ... except in very specific areas !They destroy everything where they are ... Faunas as well as Flora !

Please increase funding. This is vitally important.

Please protect and fund our national parks. These parks need to be preserved from ATVs and snow mobiles and all types of drilling, logging, mining, etc. In the future they may be the only untouched land we have left for native plants and wildlife.

Please protect the BWCA and the watershed of northern MN as I value it and want it for my grandson as well as others. PLEASE and Thanks!

please.increase the funding for the national parks because they need it thank you bryan trent

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Problem is, ORV use actually destroys resources. If we allow these lazy folks to ruin everybody's land, there won't be any resources left. Not to mention becoming dependent on terrorist regimes for our imported oil, so the ORVs can run rampant on our beautiful country!

You are absolutely right about starvation forcing people to cause environmental havoc. I think agriculture is required to produce way too much food today because people eat and waste way too much in this country. Also, hamburger takes a lot more land to produce than rice and potatoes. As always, living on Earth is a balancing act. In my opinion, this is the best of three alternatives I put forward, not ecotopia, but we may not go extinct in the next few years on this course.

, I have to agree with you on one thing. I would love to see it all before I die... But the power plants are belching smog over it, the cities are paving it, power lines are criss-crossing it, fences are keeping me from it, and freeways are dividing it. The enviro-freaks (your definition), myself included, want there to be something left to see. What do you propose to see when it's all gone, not roped off or locked up, but GONE. How nice it would be to go back to the creek I grew up next to and cast a fishing line in the water and catch a real fish, not just a sucker. You know how many kids these days can't go do the basic kid stuff like fishing because the water's too polluted. You are lucky if you can drive a car far enough and see something that's not crapped on. The enviro-freaks don't want to lock it all up. They just want there to be something left to see when they get a chance to look for it.

Ranchers work closely with the BLM. The great American Cowboy is a persona that many foreign visitors imagine as well as those in urban areas. They are the fabric of the West who deserve to have their history preserved as well. In creating these National Monuments, many ranchers who have maintained their family ancestral properties will be forced to leave. I cannot in good conscience vote yes to this as I realize the impact this would have on those families and the communities in which they live.

Recently the National Forest Service has allowed logging in the national forest directly behind my home..Pike Natl Forest in Colorado.. It had closed the 2 sections of the park where logging was established and recently reopened the sites.. but one in particular i went to see recently and it is a mess with logs, and pieces of wood from the choppers, all over the ground..should there ever be a forest fire in this area, there certainly would be enough fuel for it all over the 5 acres where they logged.. why didnt they accommodate cleaning up? They had given reasoning for it, due to forest fire prevention or beetle kill..which there is little of in this area. Better to use manpower to cut down the infected trees (which are few and far between) as the wood can be used for flooring, walls, furniture etc. as the beetle kill has a very beautiful blue tinge in areas of the wood. I think it is just plain desecration of our standing forests and i have been in this area 14 years and never seen a forest fire here..In addition, living trees roots provide storage for water in rainfall and run off.. Must everything be destroyed for profit which it seems was the reason truckloads of the logs went over the roads twice a day(2 lane country roads already potholed) and the heavy trucks making the roads worse than nature does. Decisions like this we could live without.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Responding to V's comment is at the heart of this issue. "This is one of the issues at the root of some of the OHV community's problems in getting organized. Most of us are by nature, not the type of individuals pe to joining groups." Neither were mountain bikers, of which I am one. You OHV users need to put aside your pride and elitism as we bikers have had to do, and realize that the only way that other user groups are going to be willing to discuss terms with you is if they can put a name to a face, so to speak. Get organized and get involved and you MAY in time earn the respect and understanding of other user groups, as we have done. As long as people see you as an un-organized band of noisy, fume-emitting full-helmet-wearing faceless rogues, who roam the public trail systems ripping, widening and rutting multi-use trails, you will be shunned and excluded. I promise you that. Start showing up at trail meetings and trail days to work on building and repairing trails, and people might see you differently. The ball is in your court. We do not have to let you have access to the trails we work on and maintain. If you want to come into the house, you ring the doorbell, you don't break the door down off the hinges and expect the residents to invite you to sit down to dinner.

Responsible use of public land is the only thing that makes sense. Land that is managed and utilized for grazing and timber harvest is much better for the land and the enviment. MORE GOVERNMENTAL REGULATION AT THE PROMPTING OF ENVIRONMENTAL RADICALS IS THE LAST THING WE NEED! SUWA – GO HOME!

Right now the parks have a lot of funding for the centennial initiative, a push to repair and maintain the parks in prep for the 100 year birthday party in 2016. However after that I'm afraid that many of the jobs that I've had and my friends hold won't have funding behind them to continue. Despite the Centennial Initiative, parks are still understaffed. And what's worse is that the other public lands of America like USFS and BLM are in even worse situations with funding and staffing. Soild, long-term funding from a tax would be immensely helpful to parks in planning for the future. Increasing user fees is would be exclusive and is not the solution. Many groups like the CCC and the SCA provide a ton of support to the parks and a great opportunity for young adults to get a taste of life outdoors. For some like me, a summer volunteering can even start a career in the parks or forests. We could use more programs like this. Funding for Conservation Corps would create jobs and get people interacting with the natural world again. Rangers spend lots of time educating visitors in the parks, mostly to protect the natural resources that exist there. When proactive education isn't effective in protecting the park, we have to stoop to law enforcement to enforce the laws that have been broken (i.e. feeding bears or cutting trees in campgrounds). Needless to say, a little preventative education is far cheaper and more effective than reactionary enforcement later on, in protecting park resources. Rangers should be staffed year round rather than temporarily. They could spend the busy season in the visitor center and on the trails, and then in the off season they could be visiting local schools and teaching programs about envimental conservation. The most profound effects in protecting our national treasures will come when people truly care about the land. Since so much of the population today are urbanites, it's hard for them to know how to interact with the land unless somebody takes the time to teach them about it and get them to care. Rangers are part of the missing link, and they love what they do. So pay for them to stick around all year rather than keeping short term seasonal jobs without any efits. Lindsay Wilderness Ranger Yosemite National Park

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Right on . I love how all these OHV supporters and so called nature lovers also always include that they "like to hike" also as if that gives their ideas more credence or somehow will make us that know better think OHV or ORV use in not damaging to the land and the species that call that land home or just an outright nuisance to those of us that actually do like to hike and enjoy the peace and quiet of nature and the great outdoors.

Right! NOT! Just let every TD&H have access to the public lands to do what they want. Screw the future....let's just get ours. You have got to be kidding!

I find the fact that bicycles are lumped in with OHV users a bit misguided. I think that bicycles should be added into 100% of the places a horse is allowed. Bicycles have a considerably r impact on the environment and the trail systems than horses or OHVs. To directly compare them to a horse bicycles weigh in at about 10 to 75lbs depending on the bike compared to a horse weighing in at around 1,000lbs. Bicycles use rubber tires to contact the ground, horses usually have ridged steel shoes to put considerably more weight down. When was the last time you had to step over or around bicycle poop? I think that in many cases bicycles should be added into the same areas as hikers. Not all hiking trails can facilitate bicycles but there should be an easy way for bicyclists to request access to a particular trail, possibly by submitting a video of them hiking the length of the trail, or a forest service employee should hike the trail. These should be processed in a timely fashion, ruled upon, and the signs should be updated. I would think that a trail designation could easily be changed in a 1-2 month period. To overview I think that bicycles should be removed from the mechanized travel restriction list and added anywhere that horses are allowed as well as being allowed on the hiking trails they make sense to be allowed on.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHVs belong on well-regulated private tracks, not on public land. Off-road vehicles (OHVs, ORVs), aka All-terrain vehicles (ATVs) are not compatible with hiking, nature study, and other healthy, environmentally-friendly use of our public lands. But there is still pressure to allow more ORVs on public lands. Manufacturers and dealers are working to open up public lands to ORVs. ORVs have important environmental significance as well as health and safety implications. Some ATVs are even advertised as suitable for users six years of age or older. The Forest Service maintains an ATV trail system in North Carolina. It is reported that usage of the area is causing multiple plumes of visible sedimentation in the Tellico River and its tributaries. The ATVs have cut deep passages in the soil as they repeatedly traverse this steep area of loose soil and big rocks. Trout Unlimited and other environmental organizations served on the Forest Service a Notice of Intent to sue. The purpose was to force the Forest Service to stop the destructive sedimentation of trout waters. The exhaust of all terrain vehicles (ATVs) contains unburned hydrocarbons. You will sometimes see a blue haze. Because of the known dangers of unburned hydrocarbons, our automobiles are designed to reduce these emissions. Automobiles utilize a four-stroke-cycle engine. There is an intake stroke, compression stroke, power stroke and exhaust stroke. And many modern auto engines are designed with two exhaust valves and two intake valves for each cylinder. Many ATVs utilize a two-stroke-cycle engine. Two-stroke engines combine functions and use ports for intake and exhaust. This arrangement simplifies the design and produces a higher power-to-weight ratio. The tradeoff is much higher noise levels, poorer efficiency, and abominable pollution levels for ATVs. Based on some calculations, the pollution due to one ATV equals the pollution due to fifty automobiles. ATVs cause other problems as well. Many ATVs are inherently unsafe due to the lack of a differential. They are destructive of trails and make our open space areas unsafe for hikers, nature lovers, and other users. The vehicles can wreak environmental havoc by eroding hills or streambeds. And riders who illegally speed through back yards usually favor the least effective mufflers possible, endearing themselves to no one. There are private tracks available, but it is unlikely that more will be built due to safety, noise, and air pollution concerns of potential neighbors. ATV owners and dealers are asking for more access to parks and other public land. The owners and dealers are well-organized and polite as they advocate multi-use trails. But, hikers and other trail users are unsafe on trails frequented by ATVs. One watershed/forest preserve told the owners of ATVs and motorcycle dirt-bikes to have an opportunity for off-road recreation on designated off-road-trails. They reasoned that the logical management plan was a "permit process" that would encourage and limit "off-roading" to a special use area within the forest, while discouraging and preventing it in the off-limits areas. As the numbers of off-roaders increased, the permit process failed. ATVs overran the watershed and had the run of the place. Unfortunately, the designated off-road-trails led directly to all the hiking trails, bridle paths, colonial roads, and utility rights-of-way throughout the forest. But, the off-road environmental degradation didn't stop at the borders of the forest. The mechanized destruction within the ecosystem spread unchecked onto State Park Lands and private land holdings. When the rains fell, illegal off-roading churned and turned forest hiking trails into muddy streams and historic colonial roads into scarring rivulets. Brooks, upland ponds and wetlands - along with the very life they supported - were choked to death by the wash of silt and debris torn-up by off-roading. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and other agencies have noted that we are facing an epidemic of health problems, partly due to lack of

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

physical activity. ATV's interfere with healthy and environmentally-friendly recreation. ATV's just don't belong on our public lands.

"All forms of recreation" is a call for "lets put our own short-term fun above the survival of the ecosystems...ecosystems that we, however, want to be there for us so we can have fun the way we want to, never mind the long-term damage we cause." Guess what? The natural beauty you want to be there for you to indiscriminately use any way you want wouldn't be there if it weren't for conservationists who learned about and understood that natural beauty and protected it up until now. Conservationists bother to know the science of what sustains an ecosystem and respect those conditions. Millions of people also inherently, naturally "get" that, without having necessarily studied it. People who don't understand the vital importance of the conditions vital for the survival of natural beauty, or who refuse to abide by those conditions, run roughshod over science just like they do over the delicate ecosystems they damage.

"And in return for this fantastic volunteer help, off-road recreationists are first at the table when decisions about where to ride are made. When I hear the off-road vehicle groups have given a million dollars to the Susan G. Komen Foundation (breast cancer), then I'll have my first example that they act in anybody's interests but their own." So now we are going to judge people by how much money they have donated for your cause, you must be a US Congressman or maybe Rod Blagojevich one thing is for sure your part of some sort of self serving good ole boy network, you should be ashamed trying to stg arm people to serve your cause let me guess you keep 65% of the money you collect for breast cancer as a fee or bonus like all other charity's are run. Nice try.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"China closed 2,087 factories because they did not meet environmental standards" Oh wow, those factories would have never been allowed to open in the US. "Did you know China has committed to plant 1 BILLION trees" No I did not know that. How many trees will be planted in the US? The Arbor day foundation says their members planted 8 million trees last year. I would say that was pretty good for a private group. Who knows how many trees the USFS and BLM planted? "The point is the choice is yours to make and if you want to see this country return to the beauty it once possessed" Yes it is my choice to make thank you. I have lived in the Northwest for my entire life except for a couple years in Europe and have never noticed a degradation in the beauty you speak of. What I have noticed is an extreme limitation on the ways that people are allowed to access the outdoors. I drive vehicles that allow me to get the best MPG's in order to suit my needs, I do keep my thermostat below 68 degrees and I heat with a renewable resource (AKA wood). I do all this in the name of being self sufficient and saving money not to worship at the altar of environmentalism. "Responsible harvesting of trees can help forest yes but how often do you see that? Instead you see timber companies go in clear cut old growth, new growth and anything in between until it is completely gone and what is left is eroding top soil that cannot support regrowth in many cases and destroyed wildlife habitat." You are spreading typical environmental lies and disinformation. Where have there been clear cuts on public lands in the last say 20 years? The Forest Service has not allowed clear cuts for years except in very limited circumstances, such as fires or bug infestation. The only clearcuts you see now take place on PRIVATE land. As long as the land owners follow the rules as they are specified there is nothing anyone can do to stop what they are doing on private land. Your environmental emergencies feel fabricated to me.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Don't mindlessly transmit your chosen faction's talking points, but use your actual experience to mold your opinion." I do use personal experience to mold my opinion and I would venture to guess so do most others here. I have seen first hand trails rendered impassable to hikers because of OHV use, seen animals I was watching run away as a motorbike buzzed by, seen streams and meadows torn apart by 4wd vehicles and motorbikes alike, seen trails off limits to motorized vehicles with motorbike tracks on them and have many times picked up and carted out trash left behind by OHV users. Seeing all these things personally it is not hard to imagine others stories or pictures that show the damage OHVs do. That is why I oppose giving more access to the OHV crowd not some sound bite or "political buzz word". As far as not going to places where ohvs have access that may be easy on the west coast but here on the east coast between the lack of wild places remaining, the amount of access given to ohvs and the fact so many bikes go where they are not supposed to go it is hard to find places to hike where you do not have to share the area with an ohv. This forum has also been very enlightening in terms of exposing the ohv crowd. To give credit where credit is due a few have tried to come up with common sense ideas to help out and minimize the damage they do plus have expressed and shown a desire to protect and preserve nature but the overwhelming majority have proven that they not only do not respect or love nature but that they are just as or even more happy to see it drilled into, mined on or driven over as seen it preserved and would just as soon see all wildlife extinct as saved. How do you support someones ideas when they are so ignorant and totally opposite your own views? To be fair though I will say I have picked up trash obviously left behind by hikers and have once seen a meadow that was been damaged by a camp site and even though I have never seen a trail degraded anywhere near the extent of OHV trails I suppose it could happen if there were enough people using the trail over many, many years. That is why I have stated time and time again, as someone who loves and respects nature and sees it's importance far beyond my own self centered enjoyment, that there should be areas that are off limits to all human recreation and encroachment and I do not need a "political buzz word" to tell me that is one true way to go.

"During the NPS General Management Plan (GMP) planning process, NPS identifies those backcountry or primitive areas in national parks that they believe appropriately qualify for wilderness protection, and those areas receive interim administrative protection as "proposed wilderness."" As an OHV user, I've witnessed first hand how lopsided this plan is. Notice the word "they", instead of, everyone believes. We, the OHV community, have watched as our green sticker funds have been raided so that proper trail maintenance and enforcement could not take place, and then have suffered the loss of untold access of forest & BLM land because it is unmanaged! This in spite of the the thousands if not millions of volunteer hours, people who really care for our lands have done on trail and erosion control. I care greatly for the outdoors & the enviroment, but remember this is all our land and equal access should be available for all! Thank you President Obama, for giving us all a voice in these important decisions that effect us all! I hope it works for everyone.

"I agree, but some recreation should be only ald in designated areas." Hello! Recreation is only ald in designated areas already I am not sure what point your trying to make perhaps you can elaborate some.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Leaders of non profit environmental groups are radical people. They are radicals and extremists and oppose all development. They are people who have dedicated their lives to wearing tin foil hats. They know nothing about what areas are okay to develop on and what areas should be off limits at all costs. They use the power of scare tactics to win cases over the big money of the oil, gas, coal, logging and ohv industry" I fixed your first paragraph for you . No need for a thank you I am glad to help.

"Nature's way" ...in some parts, maybe. Most trails open to multi-use recreation are just fine without Wilderness designation. And maybe, just maybe, if the so called "conservationists" would be a little more open minded, and cooperative, and not sneaky liars then people wouldn't come up with names like wildernuts, ecofreaks, and enviuts. Seriously though, all user groups essentially want the same thing. To preserve land for future use. Understandably not every trail is appropriate for multi-use, but the ones that are....leave them open. Closing trails just concentrates all that use in smaller areas and fewer trails. Multi use can be done responsibly and sustainably

"Noise pollution drives away animal life, stunts plant growth, can prevent germination -- when you add the pollution of oil and gas and exhaust, you have a recipe for the destruction of wild places. I see no legitimacy in destruction." Apparently the wildlife in my area loves the noise. On a daily basis, within the city limits, I would see about 6 deer a day. On my commute to work, the deer are so terrified of the noise that they stare at me while I honk my horn so they'll get out of my way. Two point bucks stop to lick themselves next to the road that is being repaved in ft of the high school. I could have slapped a doe on the rump as I passed her on my motorcycle commuting to work. My job takes me into the national forest. Every year, the forest is reclaiming the road that is travelled daily by dozens of cars from the day that the snow melts, until the day that the snow returns. Methinks the only recipe is in some peoples minds. It's not happening like you say it is.

"The forceful arm of the EPA" That needs to change also, too many times the radical enviros use the EPA in ways it was not intended to be used, to advance their position of no logging, no ATV's/OHV's, no grazing, no fishing, no hunting, no boating, no swimming, no horseback riding, no campfires, no charcoal grills, no hiking except on trails, no mountain bikes, no rock climbing, no hang gliding, no activities at all other than taking pictures, and sniffing the air. The intent of the EPA was to stop industrial pollution, not to stop all human activities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"The overwhelming majority of OHV'ers are conservationists, who seek to preserve the same outdoor experiences they enjoy for children and grandchildren." As a volunteer land monitor on private conservation land for the past five years, I have had many contacts with OHV riders. Most of the adults are respectful, stop, and talk civilly and do not return when informed they are on private land. However, most of the riders are unsupervised children, who at times threaten to run me down rather than to stop. They put bullet holes in the "no motorized" sign, break it off and hide it in the brush. They roll the barrier rocks out of the way. They cut trees and ride over seedlings and shrubs to make new paths. Conservationists? Vandals. The roar of three or four atv's going round and round for hours is a great enhancement to an outdoor experience. Someone bought a new jeep and when they found they could not get past the barrier rocks and ditch they drove back and forth on a muddy bank next to the parking lot to put mud on their vehicle.

"The public enjoys motorized access and OHV recreational opportunities on our public lands. It is a very healthy form of recreation and provides a great connection to the out-of-doors.  
"Absolutely!!!

(this is in response to OHV enthusiasts wanting to keep all forest roads open)I don't care if it costs a billion bucks. I need trails to hike on. Taxpayers should pay for installation and maintenance of a new trail system for hikers only. Just like the forest service road system OHV'ers want to use, my hiking trails should be built along 500 foot contours. I gotta see it all. And there are a hundred million people just like me who want to see it all. And we wanna hike, so no motorized vehicles. And, because there are so many of us, we're all paying taxes and that's how we want our money spent. Actually, why don't we make some trails up and down the ridges too, so we can hike at 1500 feet for a while and then hike up a ridge and get on the 2500 foot contour. This'll be great for wildlife too. Bears love trails. They'll be able to get to their favorite blackberry patches a lot easier.

... and transportation and power grid! There are a lot of brilliant, able, willing and even eager for a job that can pay a living wage! Less money to the Military Industrial Complex, more money to social programs that would have to include a Renew American Confidence Know!

My feet get MUCH better gas mileage than your motorcycle. Motorcycles and Prusus are not elements that occur naturally in nature, feet are...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Quoting a list is not an answer to the question I posed. Is there a stated reason these things are on the endangered list set by \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in the blank). Are you saying, in quoting that list, that OHV's, road use by modern methods, are what caused this list? How big was that list say 50 years ago, 100 years ago, 200 years ago? Were the same organisms on it then. Honestly, I am not a biologist nor do I pretend to be, however, common sense tells me making wilderness areas that keep wheels out, (bicycles included), or any motorized equipment out is not an answer to saving the whales or planet. This time I say whales due to the endangered sturgeon on that list, especially the gulf sturgeon. Colorado is not home to sturgeon, wilderness areas are not going to save them. Inappropriate wilderness designations do not mean that suddenly any endangered species will then flock to the new wilderness en masse, as if in a great rush to save themselves through the evolutions of the worthy all knowing self proclaimed saviors of the endangered.

"Prior to the Wilderness area locking up the trails in my area, volunteer MOTORCYCLE groups did 95% of all trail maintenance on this patch of 300 miles of trail." If there were 300 miles of trail in an area that was then declared as Wilderness, then it was one more case of an area that did not meet Congress' idea of "untrammelled" country, and it should never have been declared as Wilderness. But now it is, and the law prohibits mechanized as well as motorized use. Carving out some sort of exception for one group while excluding others makes a mockery of the law. Either the Wilderness Act means what it says, or it doesn't--at the cost of one more chink in the foundation of law our government is supposedly based upon. Demoted.

"Given the effect rampant ORV use would have on cattle ranching, I wonder how ranchers are reacting to the apparent push for greater access for those destructive machines." First off, it's OHV, not ORV, which would be eliminated by increased Wilderness Area designation; and most ranchers understand that sanctions against OHV also impact their ability to do their work.

even if they're not "big city legislators," they're often eastern state legislators like Rep. Hinchey (D-NY22), who keeps sponsoring western state Wilderness legislation. I said it elsewhere; one for one--for every acre someone like Hinchey proposes, he should have to find an acre of proposed Wilderness in his home district.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

your use of the terms "wilderness area," as in "you are still operation a heavy, noisy, polluting, gas burning machine into wilderness areas" ignores the fact that the term has been defined in federal law (earning itself capital letters in the process) as an area where motorized travel is prohibited. People who ride into WAs are already violating federal law and should be prosecuted. As for the rest of public lands, some are legal for OHV use and some are not. Expanding use may be appropriate in some areas, curtailing use in some likewise, but the opportunity should exist because Americans can rightfully expect that some of their public lands be made available for motorized recreation. As for your idea, I presume that your goals for having licensing are to educate and regulate users to some degree, a process that already happening in many states with requirements for OHV registration and safety training. Until such time as you could provide more detail to your idea, such as whether your licensing regime will allow kids who can now legally join their adult family members in riding on public land, I would have to defer either promoting or demoting your idea. We have recently seen states make youth riding at various ages on certain machine types illegal, despite the facts that most youth injuries occur from unsupervised, untd use of adult-sized mac. I can show you child after child who can safely use a child-sized machine with training and supervision. Would you allow them to be licensed?

"Looking at your voting record I can plainly see you are no fan of nature, wildlife or the preservation of either so I am not surprised by you comments but the least you could do is provide a valid argument." No, , he just doesn't perceive those things the same way you do. The idea that one set of values is the only "correct" set is exactly the kind of fundamentalism that our nation's constitution was constructed to avoid.

If the country is broke, we need to make a choice on what our spending priorities are. What are your priorities? 1. Accomplishing worthwhile conservation goals while providing training and employment opportunities for young adults 2. Providing more subsidies to private companies (forcing citizens to give their wages to private business), in the hope that this time they will do what we want instead of just increasing their profits Tax money is not "your" money - our democratically-elected representatives have voted to levy taxes on workers and allocate the money as they see fit. That's how our government works. I'm sorry if it's not in your best (financial) interests - welcome to the working class's world for the past 30 years. If you don't approve, you're free to leave!

Motorized vehicles allow access. I'm 73 with my leg in a cast and see people out with all types of access. They all seem to get along. Seems like people on this site want to stop access and are not the same friendly people I see on the trail.

As parks expand, the private property within the newly designated 'coveted boundary' becomes an "inholding". As park expand their boundaries to encompass tracks of private land, NEPA should be MANDATED to document the effects ON these private tracks of land and their owners.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

ATVs, 4x4s, dirt-bikes, Mtn-bikes horses and hikers, snowmobilers, x-country skiing and snow shoes etc.etc all need a trail network. Most of these activities would prefer trails be designed for their purpose and visitor conflict between activity types are common place. Land managers just need to become more transparent with their decisions regarding access, restrictions and limits. Ratios showing comparing recreational opportunities available within each planning area to participation rate demographics for each activity would provide a helpful tool for planners and highlight the available trails for visitors. Rivers should be treated the same as trails. Motorized watercraft, paddlers, anglers and swimmers all desire to recreate and travel in these waterways causing obvious potential conflict.

– Right on the money! It was started once back in 1972. I always thought it was a great idea but not sure where it went. I don't see the maps being displayed on the website any more, but here is the opening statement and web links. State Motorized Trail System: This is our Motorized version of the Pacific Crest Trail going from Mexico to Canada. During the formation of the OHV Program in 1972, legislation specifically stated that we would have the State Motorized Trail System. Website link { <a href="http://www.smts.info/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I think California Trail Users Coalition (CTUC) was on it at one time { <a href="http://www.trailusers.org/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

I am also in agreement that OHVs are too loud for many trails...but the idea of making them more quiet, and more stealthy, will also make them more dangerous for bikes, Horse, and hikers. I would rather know if an OHV is about to round a blind corner when I am hiking with my kids or biking with friends. OHV riders deserve opportunities to enjoy the outdoors, just not everywhere and separated from hikers.

I don't own an OHV. I hike a lot and have never encountered an OHV. Maybe I live in a state that has already shut down State Park and National Forest trails to OHVs - I don't know. As someone who isn't already emotionally invested in a "for" or "against" stance, there is one trend in the comments that I find striking and telling. Most (not all) comments for restricted OHV use focus on environmental impacts. Most (not all) comments for more OHV opportunities focus on personal pleasure. I don't doubt that there is a lot of family bonding, enjoyment of the outdoors, exploring rare areas, and fitness efits. None of these positive things have to do with "protecting the PLACES you love" This forum is for the Great Outdoors - protecting an actual place. Not protecting family traditions or favorite activities. The PLACE - the land. Not the mac or an individual.

In principle, this is a good idea. I would argue more along the lines of mitigation, though. In other words, if an area traditionally used for OHV recreation is closed to that purpose, then an area of similar recreational value must be opened to that purpose in compensation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Local area politicians usually speak for local citizens, and local citizens should be given more weight as to how federal lands in their area are managed. Too often national lobbies organize a public comment campaign designed to alter park policy. These organizations usually distort or misrepresent facts in order to get members to write the majority of the public comments favor their position. What is needed is balance! Local authorities should never have the only voice,, but they should be weighted more heavily since they better understand local needs and concerns.

, Thanks so much for the input, this is what I was hoping people would do - comment about balloons after having had an experience in one. I too do not want commercialization of the parks, but if we could come up with some ideas like these - a quiet way to see the animals and terrain, - I'd love to have this as an option.

Please look at the commodity prices for Timber over the past few decades. Prices for timber have not kept pace with inflation even during the building boom. The Timber industry is still viable, but harvesting more trees on public land will not help timber prices during a building slump or be necessary as we move toward a paperless society. Some sections of our forests should be dedicated to non-use values while others should be open to varied types, and amounts, of recreation while other areas should provide for sustainable forestry.

Protecting the 'surroundings of preserved assets' is simply asking the agencies to dictate use on the private land surrounding the parks. NEPA should include how agency planning will impact (directly and indirectly) the landowners as well as how local land development might impact the resource. The expansion of NEPA beyond the boundaries of the park should look both ways; NEPA should include the impact the park has on local landowners as well as what local landowners might have on the park.

Turning wildlife conservation areas into free-for-all zoos, is not the answer. I am comfortable with being limited from wildlife conservation areas, so long as the reason provided for this conservation is transparent to the public. If wildlife-dependent recreation demand is pent-up in this area, registered tours conducted by the fish and wildlife service at the appropriate times and in the appropriate places, should minimize wildlife disturbances while offering those eager to visit this area the desired opportunity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do you want us to be able to meet the current and future challenges to producing sufficient food for yourself, your children, and others? Do you appreciate clean water and clean air? Do you take advantage of modern medicine, and do you support continued medical progress? Every one of these things is dependent upon BIODIVERSITY. This is a fact, supported by overwhelming scientific evidence. But please don't take it from me -- I invite you to search the scientific literature yourself. Not sure where to start? Here is but one book which provides a detailed summary of this overarching concept: *Sustaining Life: How Human Health Depends on Biodiversity*. Editors Chivian and Bernstein{ <a href="http://www.amazon.com/Sustaining-Life-Health-Depends-

Biodiversity/dp/0195175093/ref=sr\_1\_1?ie=UTF8& s=books& qid=1275233704& sr=1-1" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Edited by two physicians at the Harvard School of Public Health, it provides detailed explanations and numerous examples backed up by long lists of references which prove beyond a doubt how we depend on healthy ecosystems - yes, on other species - for food production, clean water, clean air, medical innovation, and other ecosystem services. How does this relate to connecting with the Great Outdoors? Understanding how we depend on other species forces us to appreciate the existence of the many plants and animals which occupy that Great Outdoors. It helps us see why we should not destroy them. Why am I asking you to learn and teach about biodiversity? Because most people do not yet understand it and education is urgently needed. Even on this very website, check out the comments and voting on some of the "Ideas", and see how many of them deny the need for, or even ridicule the concepts of, environmental education, nature appreciation, and habitat/wildlife conservation. Sadly, these people are advocating for ignorance, pollution, extinctions, hunger, thirst, and disease. Maybe they do not understand the need for such conservation efforts, or perhaps they fear it will be a threat to a chosen way of life. But YOU can do something about it. Learn what biodiversity is, and why it is important. Arm yourself with any of the many examples of what it does for us, as well as examples of disasters consequent to habitat degradation and species loss. REALLY learn it. Learn it until you are able to discuss it with others. Then teach at least one other person in your life. It WILL make a difference.

Our national parks have paved the way showing that providing wildlife with habitat protection and reintroducing species that those species can survive and in many cases thrive when left alone. The same cannot be said for our public lands and national forests where over development, over hunting and human activity have decimated wildlife populations in some case to extinction in that region. Habitat restoration and protections will provide more areas for animals to live, an abundance of food and cleaner water which will cause larger animal populations and reintroduction of species will provide a greater number of species for people to see which in turn will spur a greater interest in our parks, forests and public lands. Even the OHV crowd should support this, greater habitat and animal populations means some areas now off limits can be opened up to you.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Problem: Federal agency officials continue to resist the idea that easements and other alternatives are effective cost-saving alternatives to fee acquisition of lands. They talk about using alternatives but rarely try to implement them. The Solution: Incentives need to be established for officials to use easements and other cost-saving alternatives. Penalties need to be created for buying more than the interest necessary to achieve project objectives. Federal officials have often, and inaccurately, misrepresented the cost of easements. A popular notion is that easements cost 80% or more of fee title. The key is to buy easements early when development is far away. Easements increase in cost as development gets closer. However, officials have made little or no attempt to use easements or other alternatives, and instead go to great lengths to avoid them. Inholders have actually been scared out of using easements because of very restrictive terms and negative statements from federal officials. For example, the State of Minnesota successfully used easements on a cost effective basis on the Kettle River. The Park Service was unable or unwilling to use easements on the nearby St. Croix to the degree suggested by Congress. The result was costs much higher than necessary on the St. Croix and poor landowner relations. The Fish and Wildlife Service has also successfully used easements to protect wildlife habitat at costs approximately 40% or less of what the fee title would have cost. The inability of the federal agencies to use alternatives to fee title has actually led to the protection of some areas and wasted funds. The result is that there is now a huge backlog of unprotected lands. Some landowners want to sell but can't because of the shortage of money. In addition, relocation and human costs associated with fee acquisition are not considered by agency officials. Nor do they consider the project effects when inholder communities are left intact. There may, in fact, be a long term management and maintenance cost, especially when landowners remain in areas where significant cultural and historical values exist. An example is the Buffalo River. Local landowners were so mad at the Park Service that they would not even show the agency how to run a historic grist mill. How much better it would have been to have kept the grist mill in the hands of the original owners so visitors could have seen living history. There needs to be better training of land managers and acquisition officers and more information for landowners, so that all parties can understand the benefits of using reasonable alternatives and avoiding unnecessary conflict. The bottom line from the federal agency viewpoint must be to acquire only the interest in land necessary to meet the intent of Congress. This issue was developed in cooperation with the American Land Rights Association [www.landrights.org](http://www.landrights.org)

Please ! NO 4 wheel vehicles in Parks ... except in very specific areas !They destroy everything where they are ... Faunas as well as Flora !Please show us all this destruction.Please define "destruction"

A bicycle hurling down a narrow trail at you can only be considered as a threat to your health and well being. I know that perhaps most mountain bikers are considerate of other users, but there are enough that aren't so that any hiker on a trail with mountain bikes has to be prepared to scamper out of the way when one comes rocketing past. Another problem with letting mountain bikes in Wilderness areas is that it makes it very difficult to restrict OHV's if you let mountain bikes in. They are both mac and they both run on rubber tires.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A bike isn't gonna do anymore to cause erosion than a 1000 pound horse. A long time ago mountain bikes were ald in Wilderness. The signs used to say "human-powerd" only. Pretty much takes care of the slippery slope argument about allowing electric vehicles in. I never could get how fellow mountain bikers are alright with being needlessly shut out of great riding areas.

A fabulous vista is as important to our spiritual well-being as anything else. There should be a way to protect a viewshed just the way land can be protected using a conservation easement. Developers should not be able to spoil a vista that millions of people might enjoy every day by building something on a mountainside next to a highway or city that defaces the view of a natural landscape.

A huge problem with motorized vehicles is their noise!Have you ever been enjoying the quiet of a winter landscape and have a bunch of snowmobiles show up? They turn the place into Grand Central Station.

A lot of species are threatened by habitat loss. Where do you get the idea that habitat loss is not a problem

ABSOLUTELY NO Gas nor Oil digging in Alaska !

Absolutely no to OHV's and off road racing! Even wild hogs who do extensive ecological damage in The Great Smoky Mountains National Park, don't do as much damage as ORV's and racing. In polite society people don't ride their bikes up and down the isles of the symphony orchestra theater. It probably isn't against the law. It's against a common code of ethics. The great American parks are our symphony orchestra theaters. The parks are there for all to see, hear and feel. They quiet the mind and heal the soul. They are not there for the "pleasure" of trashing.Listen to the call of the Owl, the bugling of the Elk, howls of the wolf, drumming of the Acorn Woodpecker, wind in the Pine needles. Smell the scent of pine and wonder at the pattern of a butterfly wing. That is only a glimpse of the players in the theaters that our national parks protect and preserve. We can not recreate them. We can only destroy them, or protect and preserve them.

Absolutely, anyone who shows a lack of respect and a lack of love for nature has no business being there. Nice try but this still does not mean ohv users should be given access to national parks and wilderness areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Access by definition conflicts with preservation. If we open up more public land to vehicles, etc., without regard to preservation, there will be nothing left to preserve in a generation or two. Sometimes you have to set good things in reserve so there will be a good thing left when we've used up or destroyed the rest. As far as I can see, *\*all\** use creates damage. Hikers aren't leaving the land untouched, either. The more remote the place, the fewer hikers there are....but even one hiker does tread on something that causes damage. Opening up those remote places so non-hikers can get to them just uses them up faster. For those who think singletrack vehicles and mountain bikes do no damage, there are plenty of state and local parks and other locales where the evidence of damage is plainly visible.

Agreed, . ATV/snowmobilers have a powerful lobby (they have turned the tourist seasons around in northern Wisconsin). That's fine for established tourist areas, but don't cave in to the motor-mouths in the wilderness.

Ahhh, the wilderness. Cats chirping, frogs croaking, birds singing, bees buzzing and the sound of dirt bikes and gun shots. Oh boy, can't wait to go camping.....

If you don't see any recreation in those things, I suggest you don't do them.

Thanks for the comment. I do travel from my home with National Forest just out my back door to other Forest's, Death Valley National Park, Mojave National Preserve and many others. There are so many Wilderness Areas in Central and Southern California alone, in looking at a map it appears to be one third of that section of the state. But I understand the point you are trying to make. But! Where did this "... 99 percent of this country doesn't meet wilderness criteria" come from? Can we back out some of the Wilderness Areas that may not belong now if we have more than one percent total land in wilderness now? Just kidding! A tidbit of information for you: Wilderness areas in the United States - Content Source: Congressional Research Service In total, more than 17% of all federal land, and nearly 5% of all land in the United States, has been designated as wilderness. Alaska, because of its size and relatively pristine condition, dominates wilderness statistics — more than 53% of designated wilderness is in Alaska. In total, nearly 16% of all land (federal, state, private, and other) in Alaska has been designated as wilderness. In contrast, 3% of all land in the United States outside Alaska has been designated as wilderness. And with so much more Wilderness designations on the way! I do hope any new Designated Wilderness Areas truly deserve that title!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thankyou for your comments. I too believe that we should be free to disagree. I think that is one of the best attributes of our form of government. We are able to openly discuss our opinions free from government oppression. In fact I think this website, provided by the govenment, is one of the best thing I have ever seen. Already I have been inlighted by the differnt rage of ideas and concepts proposed here. I am however preplexed by your comment "I think I am most offended by the way this list has been taken over by an OHV group and every other so called idea is about driving ATVs through the wilderness." Please do not be offended that OHV users want to express thier opinion. And I have yet to see anyone post that they want to drive ATVs through the wilderness. They are just tired of places they currently ride always under threat of closure due to potential wilderness designation.

What OHV group has taken over this list that so greatly offends you? I thought it was an open forum for individuals and not groups. And even more importantly who is posting "...every other so called idea is about driving ATVs through the wilderness." If I have voted in support of any one suggesting ATV's should be within a "wilderness" area I would like the opportunity to correct my mistake! A true wilderness is roadless area, untrammled by man that deserves protection where NO motorized vehicles belong. But I don't recall anyone suggesting an idea which would allow ATV's to be driven in wilderness.

You really feel "Military and other jets are so dominant in the sky over places like Death Valley". I just haven't seen it at all like that within the Park. Now back in the early eighties a couple times in Saline and Panamint Valley's (which at that time were outside of the boundary of the Monument) I remember the jets just screaming up some narrow canyons over us. Got to tell you it was kind of cool to see the pilot tip his wing to us and the feel of the heat coming from the engine of the plane. It was close! Remember the signs out there warning you of the low flying aircraft? I thought that with the large expansion of additional acres and going from National Monument to a National Park there were real tight limitations place on the Military flyovers of any type. Not real sure on that though. I have seen in the Los Angeles, Antelope Valley, and Mojave areas the "checkerboards of contrails" on many occasions. Most I have heard on this was the speculation the government was doing weather control experiments. Who knows what they are doing.

you could not even ride a bike if you were 400lbs. I have ridden a dirt bike most of my life and I can tell you it is a work out. I DO NOT tear up the land doing so. I stay on the trail, and respect others. I have however seen hikers going off the trail running down the mountain kicking rocks downhill and scaring any wildlife they would ever hope to see. Irv, my dad taught me how to ride responsibly. I have taught my kids and they will teach theirs, so that our childrens's children can enjoy riding the trails!!! -right on! If I am depressed, once I get on my bike it all melts away. It is encredible. I too am healthy and happy when I am riding my dirt bike.

said "Off-road motorcycle and motoc riders are some of the most agile, fit, high endurance people. You don't see 300lbs massive bodies suffering from diabetes and choking from 50 feet walk ac parking lot here. "That's how they looked to me, but maybe 400 pounds. If you are getting any exercise from your dirt bike, you are seriously tearing up the land you are riding ac.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All aspects of running a National State Park need to be funded. This includes the personnel who staff and maintain the educational, maintenance, administrative, cultural, ecological and environmental aspects. These personnel are usually very enthusiastic in their work and are eager to share their knowledge and love of their respective park settings... let's pay 'em.

All off road vehicles should be forever banned from National Forest and National Park lands.

An idea whose time has come. Hunters and vehicle recreationists always claim that their dollars support conservation while wilderness recreation is free. National park and wilderness visitors complain about user fees. Maybe the Outdoor Retailers Association won't like it, but a small federal tax on outdoor recreation gear could help fund wilderness and parks.

And in return for this fantastic volunteer help, off-road recreationists are first at the table when decisions about where to ride are made. When I hear the off-road vehicle groups have given a million dollars to the Susan G. Komen Foundation (breast cancer), then I'll have my first example that they act in anybody's interests but their own.

Another vote for a new WPA! The US has been grievously neglected since the 1980s, whether we're talking about protecting nature or our infrastructure. Millions need jobs, and there are millions of jobs that must be done. Connect the two. Put a moratorium on ALL corporate tax relief; it has left us with fewer, not more, jobs. Wind down our wars. Invest in ordinary American people, from basic needs to education to job training. So many already have their sleeves rolled up, and are eager to start rebuilding this country.

Any new areas recognized as Wilderness should allow existing uses to continue. If the Wilderness must have new Wilderness, instead of one of the many other land protection designations, to make themselves feel good, then at least allow traditional uses to continue.

As a member of the Siskiyou County Sheriff's Possee, Search and Rescue, I have traversed the Siskiyou Mountains - on horseback- for 40 years. While it is true that overgrazing is detrimental, open range cattle kept the meadows open. Former meadows are now so choked with brush that it is impossible to walk or ride through. Instead of fodder for wildlife, these "pristine areas" have become fuel for devastating fires. The present governmental "caretakers" of our region are understaffed, undertrained and underfunded to preserve and protect their existing areas of responsibility. The Federal Government can't take of itself now - let's not add to the problem.

As a private landholder adjacent to BLM, I can tell you there is no way in hell I will give those bureaucrats any more than a temporary easement, nor do I want to give access to the "public," which most often want to treat private land as their own.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a Tour Director-Interpreter of the southwest of the US, I would like to point out the tremendous amount of Tourism dollars the National Parks generate for the Economy. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Parks should be properly managed and funded. I wrote several times to the National Parks to prohibit cigarette smoking in any of the Parks (the butts end very often in the stomachs of wildlife!), to also police and properly all rubbish generated by campers and visitors and implement the rules. It would be recommended to involve school children in their education of the National Parks and the importance of the safekeeping of these National Treasures which belong to all of us. Bring awareness of our impact on Nature and to continue the fight to keep Big Business, logging and mining out of "Our Parks" There should also be a summer programme for teens as volunteers summer camps to study and maintain the Parks and all of its fauna and flora. We have to prepare the next generation. Last but not least, we should "Green" energy consumption particularly in the parks.

As a Utahan who has seen the damage, I completely oppose this idea. There is already enough torn up land that is useless now for anything other than events like tohos races.

As I reread a lot of the posts here I find myself wondering what part of the country some of you live in. I ask because here in Indiana the OHV areas are few and very far between but in Alabama offroad parks on private ground are plenty full. In the mid west and the eastern part of the country we ride on private ground while the western states mainly ride on public ground. The other references all of the OHVs ruining his outdoor experience but after a quick google search I find not one public OHV park.

As in times before, let the USFS take care of the upkeep of the campgrounds in the National Forests. Or, at the very least, make sure that the grounds are kept up by a campground host. I know that Vallecito Campground in CO has operated both ways in the past. I was told that last year, by the campground host, that they were to be laid off as a new "private administrator" was taking over and that things were to be more or less run on a less than desirable basis. No supervision or campground host(s) were to be on site and they were just to collect the money. The pit toilets were to be cleaned only once per week. If this is the case, the American camping public is being shortchanged. All in the name of PROFIT. I propose that the USFS take over the administration on the campgrounds as it was in the past. Things really worked out for the best. How are we to experience a clean outdoor experience if we don't? I am a firm believer in a multi-use format, but not at the camping public's expense!!!

As long as an individual pays taxes that support our government's ownership of land, that individual should have the ability to exercise use of said land to a reasonable extent. The facts of the issue are that a significant number of American families choose to participate in OHV use. These same families make up a significant proportion of the national tax payer base. Thus, these family's land uses deserve to be represented along with everyone else's. No one is proposing running a race through the Grand Canyon...

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ATVs and OHVs damage (and in some cases, destroy) the land where they are used. The National Park system should not be required to restore the damage these machines cause. They should be banned from public lands and used only in facilities that are equipped to repair the damage they create.

ATV's, OHV's, etc. cause almost as much environmental damage on the National Forests in Georgia as the US Forest Service does. There is no legitimate use for these vehicles on the National Forests which were established primarily and essentially (although their use has been corrupted by putting them in the Dept of Agriculture) to restore and protect watersheds.

Before government campsite charges by States or Feds are cut for anyone they should be required to study local private businesses rates offering similar services. No government pricing should be allowed to be below the fair market rate for the specific locale the government is competing with private folks in.

Before strictly enforcing this Act it has to be reigned in to its original intent that was to protect species really endangered with actual extinction and to maintain populations of them but not at land carrying capacities.

Like your idea, yes wheelchair access and access for all of the handicapped is needed, but not sure how you would accomplish this. I would think a great deal of construction would be needed even if it was for a wheelchair, there are a lot of safety concerns that would have to be satisfied. If you are making this a proposal for within Wilderness Areas I doubt that after safety aspects were addressed that it would be a true Wilderness Area. I know that you are for preservation and wilderness so I am hesitant to bring this up and open a can of worms. But there are many groups that get the handicapped their access to the backcountry, no way near enough of them do this or are available, but it does happen. Four wheel drive clubs and other OHV groups transport them often. I have taken quadriplegic's on ATV's that they can operate on their own. While it is not in the National Parks it is in to the backcountry and only up to wilderness boundaries. Feedback often is it was something they never thought they would experience again.

Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, designated federal Wilderness hiking trails, backcountry primitive camping - these all signify what is truly special about the great outdoors and what has stood the test of time. Long after ATVs/OHVs have lost their appeal, the same immutable qualities that have characterized America's wild lands since before humans first arrived will still be here, truly defining the experience. That is what we need to protect and covet, instead of caving to the influential motorized-use lobby.

I own horses several of them as a matter of fact. You should know as well as I do that it takes a lot less than the sound of an engine to spook a horse. Here in Southern Indiana we have a state owned offroad park that is multi use and it works well. The horses don't seem to mind the jeeps and ATVs at all. That being said they will spook over something that they "think" they saw or heard. You won't like this but I feel like if your horse spooks that easily it is due to the lack of time spent with your horse or your substandard training.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Agree 100% The endless lawsuits by radical enviro-nazis, who have contributed nowhere near what hunters and hunting groups have to wildlife conservation, still insists that the wolves are not hurting elk populations. B.S. I have seen it with my own eyes, in NW Montana, wolves have killed elk, and not eaten even a bite out of them, same with mule deer, they have ripped a calf out of a cow elk giving birth, and eaten neither one, just killed the calf, and left the cow to die. Someone on this thread said wolves increase elk populations, more lies, let them come to Montana, or Idaho and see for themselves. More radical enviro-nazi news.... The Center for Biologic Diversity has filed a petition with the EPA to ban ALL lead ammunition. Lead shot is banned for waterfowl hunting now, lead fishing sinkers are a thing of the past, and the amount of lead from eating wild game has been proven to be below harmful levels, despite what the CBD says.

But if they are bought up by federal and some state funds, they can be "managed" and logged by BLM, etc. That is my concern.

By definition alone a Wilderness Area is roadless and it needs to stay that way. Everything else I applaud you on, but it needs to be in a NON-Wilderness Area.

By promoting parks and other units that reflect the rich cultural diversity of our nation, we have the chance to reach out to minority communities that are under-represented in visits to national parks. This expansion will not only reflect our rich and varied history, but it will also hopefully recruit more people who are committed to the preservation of our national parks system.

Certainly there are places vehicles should not travel. Why would we want to harm our public parks. What we are asking for are designated spots to enjoy our sport. We don't want all of the land like you guys do we just want a small parcel to enjoy ourselves.

we live in Utah and right now we're trying to rally everyone to work together to keep decisions about Utah land use in Utah. We all have to work together: OHV riders, mountain bikers and horseback riders alike. We also have groups of OHV users who get together and volunteer their time not only showing up but organizing trail meetings and trail days and we're happy to let you have access to the trails that WE work on and maintain. Let's get together on this stuff! Know that we in the dirt biking community do our part as well. In fact, as I went on the local mountain biking forum I came across a post describing how to sneak into a local area and avoid paying the fees that are used to maintain one of my favorite riding areas! I was shocked. That's not responsible! We all have to do our part. Anyone can point fingers. Let's work together instead and accept the fact that there are good and bad in every group.

Thanks for pointing out that restrictions are already in effect. (Sidenote: I wonder if these rules are consistent across all "wild" places? Is this national policy? How about various state policies?) I also wonder if there are exceptions for certain types of vehicles? Anytime I've encountered the smaller OHVs (motorbikes and snowmobiles, in particular), they've been awfully loud.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of my favorite trails goes into an area that has a couple of single –use only hiking trails (one being the PCT) a couple single track (motorcycle) trails most the way in, but most of the backcountry users accessing this area by one multi-use trail. The hikers and equestrian have several different trails to access this area , but I always get to stop and talk with hikers that make a choice (as you could make a choice) to use the multi-use trail rather than the single-use hiking trails. Horseback riders on their way into The Golden Trout Wilderness area, mountain bikers and fishermen in 4X4's going to the South Fork of the Kern River to fly fish, cowboys moving grazing range cattle from one meadow to another. Yea, the motorcycle trail riders do buzz by at a faster rate than most sometimes, but I guess the people (riders) are more courteous out this way. A couple of years ago I noticed the signs marking this same trail for snowmobile use in the winter. Eight different user groups ald into the area, I don't think eight different separated trails to the same destination point would make sense. But I guess it is too much to expect the majority of one group (Hikers) to be capable of learning to "Share the Trails" or travel into the same area on a single-use only hiking trail! Multi –use Trails work!

Well maybe I live in LaLa Land if multi-use trails are a fairytale! One of my favorite trails goes into an area that has a couple of single –use only hiking trails (one being the PCT) a couple single track (motorcycle) trails most the way in, but most of the backcountry users accessing this area by one multi-use trail. The hikers and equestrian have several different trails to access this area , but I always get to stop and talk with hikers that make a choice (as you could make a choice) to use the multi-use trail rather than the single-use hiking trails. Horseback riders on their way into The Golden Trout Wilderness area, mountain bikers and fishermen in 4X4's going to the South Fork of the Kern River to fly fish, cowboys moving grazing range cattle from one meadow to another. Yea, the motorcycle trail riders do buzz by at a faster rate than most sometimes, but I guess the people (riders) are more courteous out this way. A couple of years ago I noticed the signs marking this same trail for snowmobile use in the winter. Eight different user groups ald into the area, I don't think eight different separated trails to the same destination point would make sense. But then again I only live in LaLa Land and it's all a fairytale about Multi-use trails. Or could it be that the real fairytale is to expect the majority of one group (Hikers) to be capable of learning to "Share the Trails" or travel into the same area on a single-use only hiking trail!

With statements such as this, you and other "hikers-only" users show your narrow-minded and selfish attitude towards other user groups. We all need to work together to build a community of responsible trail user groups who respect one another's PRIVILEGE to use public lands for their preferred method of recreation. Excluding and alienating other groups because you don't understand them, or choose not to, based on one or even several bad experiences is not right. People like you should be ashamed of yourself. Once the people who see themselves as entitled to first dibs on trail usage start seeing this issue in a new way, like the rest of us do who are relative new-comers to trail use in this country, we might start making progress towards a common goal of conservation supported by all user groups. By supporting out-dated exclusionary concepts such as yours, you only reinforce the walls that have seperated user groups for decades. This is not the way to promote "grass-roots" conservation efforts. I personally do not believe that ANYONE should be ald in Wilderness areas, hikers included.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Concessionaires are supposed to maintain the facilities in return for the fees. we need to hold them to the contract!

Currently, when an area is designated "wilderness", it effectively becomes off-limits to competitive events like trail runs, adventure races, orienteering, and rogaines. This is unwarranted. Federal land managers should modify the language associated with wilderness designation to allow environmentally-ign recreational activities like on- and off-trail runs to take place, subject to permits administered by the local land manager.

Defining "sustainability" is so important in these dialogs. In the case of this report, the goal seems to be a balance of environmental, social, and economic goods. Emphasizing one - any one - way over the others does not get us - the west, the US, the world - where we need to be.

Designated wilderness has always been intended to be free from motorized travel. There is no reason to change this now. Instead, we should be focused on what areas ought to be designated as wilderness and avoid designating those that do not fully fit the definition in the wilderness act.

Designated wilderness should be accessible by quiet vehicles, including quiet motorized vehicles. Very few people actually backpack and get the needed permits to hike in the wilderness, yet the amount of designated wilderness is huge. This often excludes the handicapped, young children, and others that cannot or will not carry heavy backpacks to fully enjoy these vast lands. With technology like the spot gps satellite messenger any risk to those going off designated routes through the wilderness can be mitigated. Please support access to designated wilderness by slow, quiet, responsible vehicles. This will benefit everyone; not just those that are fit enough to backpack.

Designating an area as wilderness currently automatically means that the area becomes off limits for runners participating in a race, such as a trail race or a map-based running competition like orienteering, rogaining, or adventure racing. It makes more sense to allow these sort of activities, with a permit and the superintendent's permission, since there's little to no evidence that they lead to any environmental damage or significant disturbance of any kind. Therefore, I suggest modifying what wilderness designation means such that these type of recreational activities are allowed.

Can we solve our problems without compulsory work? Getting people to agree with you takes more than indoctrination in school. When I was in class, I argued with the teachers "just cuz". Last time I checked this was still a democracy, so only presenting one set of beliefs might be a problem. Exporting demand to other countries has not been good for the environment. Physical education used to be part of school- not sure why it isn't now.

Disagree. While it sounds fair, recreation on public land should be controlled enough to limit uses that degrade or damage the environment, including noise & air pollution.

Diversity, diversity, diversity. If the National Parks belong to us, the people, then they should reflect our diverse population!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

who are the "outsiders" you refer to. We all own this federal land and all deserve a say in what happens to it.

Equestrian access to public trails is one of the most threatened and diminishing resources, particularly in the eastern US; only OHV users have less access to public land. Though Federal lands like National Forests seem to stay committed to all forms of outdoor recreation, this open-minded ethic has not been transferred to State and local governments in their planning for parks and recreation. Repeatedly I encounter State and local planners and land managers that are absolutely oblivious to the equine industry around them, and (one of) the erroneous assumptions they operate from is that as urbanization increases, horse ownership decreases. I support organizations that raise awareness and educate, and do the best that we can, case-by-case. However, an increased push from the Federal level to equally consider ALL forms of outdoor recreation in the planning process would be helpful, particularly if any part of the land purchase or facility development receives federal funding (CWMTF, RTP, Land and Water Conservation Fund, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act/Pittman-son funds, etc.). ALL uses should be OBJECTIVELY evaluated before being ruled out based on sound scientific/technical reasons, not based on elitist preservationist or just plain uninformed opinions.

- Horseback riding and carriage driving are legitimate and culturally-significant forms of outdoor recreation.
- Riding and driving, along with the care and maintenance of equines and equine-property, is physical activity which gets people out of doors, encourages exercise, and causes appreciation for the natural ecosystem.
- As urbanization increases, so does the equine population and the demand for recreation opportunities. This is, in part, because well paying jobs and disposable income are clustered around urban areas, and many fast growing areas still have ex-urban areas where traditional agricultural lands are being redeveloped as hobby farms or commercial equine operations.
- Use of Federal funds to purchase land that will allow any form of recreation (including hunting) should mandate the inclusion of ALL forms of recreation. The exclusion or prohibition of equestrian, mountain bike, and/or OHV use should occur only through a methodical, transparent and reproducible evaluation process that includes input from all stakeholders.
- State and local tax codes need to be revised to recognize equine operations as agricultural, not commercial, enterprises to be eligible for tax relief, farmland preservation, and/or voluntary agricultural districts.
- As traditional agriculture is replaced by hobby farms, federal state and local conservation incentives need to be developed and/or strengthened to recognize the open space preservation value of equine farms.
- Similarly, incentives and stg indemnity laws should be developed for private land owners to allow trail easements on their properties. Public/private partnerships between local and state governments and large residential developers should be strengthened to allow public recreation opportunity.
- Greater opportunities for "ft-country" equestrian experiences in local and State Parks must be developed, so that people (and their horses) can gain the skills and appreciation to progress into the often more-challenging National Parks and Forests.
- Equestrians need to become better educated about conservation ethics, impacts of trail use on the environment, the importance of volunteerism, and training to prepare themselves and their mounts for the multi-use trail future. This can be done through funding to agricultural extension, soil and water conservation districts, and state horse councils and equine industry commodity groups.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Erosion causes more damage than bikes and hikers on steep trails, and they need to be redesigned. Not sure how bikers aren't honest about the effect we have on trails. I see lots of signs at trailheads explaining responsible riding. What I don't see is the same thing for hikers. "no cutting switchbacks" for instance. As far as conflict, I'm lucky to live in an area where it's a rare. Most everyone is reasonable whether you're on foot, horseback, mountain bike, or OHV. If you ask me user conflict really boils down to attitude more than anything. Some trails in Wilderness should remain foot only (keep the horses off too), and it wouldn't hurt to have a few trails for mountain bikes only as well. If the hardcore "preservationists" would learn to share, and be a little more open minded, maybe they could use some of the money they waste on lawsuits to do something worth while like combating the pine beetle.

Erosion is a natural process, what do you think made the Grand canyon? There are enough restrictions on OHV/ATV users as there is, those who enjoy these activities should not be banned from using the lands. Some of the lawsuits are absurd, like prohibiting ranchers from using 4 wheel ATV's to herd sheep/cattle on BLM lands, get a grip here, the land have been used for grazing for over a hundred years, now all should change because some enviro- whacko group says so? Excessive runoff from logging roads, or even in the few cases where it is from overuse by ATV's can be stopped, so work to fix that, not to ban certain groups from using the land to enjoy their preferred type of recreation.

Even when used in the most sensitive way OHVs are irrefutably damaging to the environment as they promote erosion and disturb wildlife. They also disturb me in my pursuit of outdoor recreation. For many of us, the single most revitalizing aspect of outdoor recreation is the serenity of being in a natural setting without the oppressive din of engines all around us. This is what always what I seek, whether I am camping, backpacking, hiking, fishing, or recording nature sounds. Please don't bring the city noise to the parks - these are the last places that the rest of us go to escape! By the way, I don't doubt that many OHV users love the outdoors just as much as the rest of us. But unfortunately it seems that many OHV users' love of their recreation blinds them to the impact of their pursuit on the land and the people they attempt to share it with. The use of OHVs on public lands should not be banned - obviously this form of recreation is a great source of enjoyment for many people. But I still advocate limiting OHV use to designated high-impact areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Every 3 years, I license all 6 of my motorcycles(2 dual sport, 4 dirt bikes) and every weekend that I go camping and riding, I pay a fee to camp in a forest campground. How much do hikers, Mt. Bikers, and equestrians pay? When I was younger, I did a lot of backpacking and mountain biking. I got kind of upset when a motorized vehicle intruded on my solitude. Now that I'm older and don't have the time and energy to devote to human powered endeavours, I enjoy dirt riding with my family, friends, and especially grandchildren. Motorized travel also allows the sr and weaker to keep up with me so we can all enjoy the outdoors together. I can easily hike a 30 mile day, but the rest of my family sure can't. There are hundreds of places to hike in my state, dozens to ride an atv, only a handful that allow off highway motorcycles. I can go for a walk out my back door. I have to load and transport dirt bikes no less than an hour in any direction before I can ride on mostly limited trail. My closest riding area has a measly 11 miles of trail, and most of it is usually closed. Instead of hikers and horse back riders complaining about me riding in one of the few areas ald, and trying to take away my right to enjoy the outdoors in the manner I choose, why don't they just go one of the places I can't go? It's not about tolerance and equal rights for all, it's about control and expressing the views of your own special interest. Don't ask why people are riding where you hike, ask yourself why you are hiking in one of the few places people can ride if it bothers you. You have the choice and the opportunity to go somewhere else. I don't. I have private farm land behind my home, and I get upset with snowmobilers who ride there (without the farmers permission, of course) but that doesn't make me want to ban snowmobiling everywhere. Don't punish everyone for the crimes and ignorance of the few. I'm an avid dirt rider. I'd never ride on the walking trails near home, and I'd read the riot act to anyone I caught doing so.

Excellant, well thought out. Agree that the most destructive types of use must be severely restricted, especially motorized devices such as snowmobiles and ATV's. I have seen first-hand the kind of damage these vehicles do to natural parks. They are a plague here in the East, where I live, we must not allow them to ruin the great conservation areas of the West.

Expansion of the Parks should be fully funded. There are areas which require management or they will be lost due to the lack of concern and care.

Families don't always have time to spend outdoors, especially when both parents need to work to make ends meet. It is shameful that we are the only developed country without mandatory paid maternity leave. New parents that can't afford to stay home have to leave their young ones with someone else, often a daycare, and get far less outdoor time than they could if they were at home with mom or dad. Busy schedules also lead to more dining out, fast food, or easy and often fatty meal prep at home and thus higher rates of obesity, and even less desire to go out and play.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fees charged on Public and National Forest and Park lands should be similar to fair market value for all permits/fees. RVers should pay more than tent campers but just doubling current fees without market research is w/g. If the going rate for RV spaces is \$25 a night then the government should not be charging only \$12 a night a mile down the road on public land. I do not know any specifics about recreational use fees but I do know that grazing, mining, drilling and logging fees are significantly below fair market value. The Bureau of Land Management loses hundreds of millions of dollars annually on cattle grazing permits alone. Huge corporations and millionaires own most of the grazing rights, not family ranchers and the fees paid haven't been raised in decades. A few are efiting to the detriment of many.

Thanks for the explanation. I agree that the DOI, as with many Federal entities, is not capable of implementing another large program; however, I must have poorly communicated my idea if that is how you interpreted it. The Task Force would use existing DOI data to identify Conservation Priority Areas. Ideally, the Task Force would be composed of representatives from DOI, other Government entities, NGO's, and private industry, which would require minimal resources or administrative burden for DOI. Essentially, this program would use existing data and knowledge to address serious conservation issues on private lands. I'm sure an avid outdoorsman such as yourself, based on your numerous comments to other ideas, could support such an objective. If this is not the appropriate mechanism for achieving such an objective, you should submit your own idea and allow others to vote and comment on it as well. Thanks again for your explanation

-Can we leave the last 1% or so to the animals or must we cut down every tree, dam up every river, pollute every lake and send every animal species to extinction because of "human needs"?

Fully protecting these wonderful lands is something that has to be TODAY because without them there is nothing to protect the beautiful animals nation wide and that is a fact.

we already pay our fees through off road registration programs and fees to enter certain areas. What fees have you paid? OHV use is great for family togetherness. Some do have radios and communicate, most stop from time to time and communicate about what they have just seen or done.

Give priority to recreation

Given the rapacity of corporate enterprize (and their allies/servants in all levels of government) and the cumulative damage done to our natural areas over the decades, the US does not have nearly enuf wilderness protection. When I hear comments about 'we're locking up too much public land', I automatically assume that the apologists for the miners, the timber comppanies, the oil and gas producers, the cattle grazers, the ORV groups and the other exploiters are pushing that sentiment. Our public lands belong to ALL of us, not just the monied interests!

Good idea. Of course it all takes money. It would be helpful if there was money earmarked for such events. Some schools offer these programs, but funding is always a problem.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Gosh what a lot of emotion. Some folks obviously have had a different experience than me. I am not an ATV rider. I have pack animals. 99.9% of all ATV and motorized bike riders stop and wait for me to go past. they are friendly and courteous. The ones that aren't are generally young idiots. ON the other hand, 80% of mountain bikes riders don't slow, I assume because they think that not making noise, they can't possibly be frightening to animals. Of course, they are wg. These uncourteous riders often have gray hair- in other words, old enough to know better. I still don't think that mountain bikes should be banned, I just want them to follow a few rules for trail etiquette. Can we try to be polite on the trail?

, Nobody will loose their private property because of this proposal. No one has ever lost their private property due to a national monument designation. There are private property parcels even in our oldest national parks. You can retire in peace and serenity knowing that the land next door will never become a clear cut.

Grazing is a (poor) substitute for natural fires that clear out the underbrush and destroy sick trees and bark beetles. Grazing does not eliminate the beetles. I have hiked in some areas where the sole source of water had cattle standing in it as they defecated, thereby polluting the water for miles downstream. After selective removal of sick trees and thick brush, forests should be "managed" with controlled burns in areas near habitations, and wildfires should be ald to burn naturally at higher elevations. When Lewis & Clark came West they noted that a man could run full-out through the healthy forest, as there was sufficient distance between the trees. People need to update their ideas with newer science-based data regarding healthy forests before they accept or reject forest management schemes of any sort.

: Please stop putting words in my mouth. Just exactly where do I say: "William Hoffman wants the only human activities ald in this area to be walking & hiking ---!" What I said is: "There is an off-road vehicle plan, primarily for Cedro Peak, following an extensive two-year hearing process with local residents." Check it out: { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r3/cibola/travel-management/tm\_sandia/index.shtml." rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } It accommodates many competing uses and interests, especially among local residents who were badly conflicted and fragmented. Several years ago, I had the awesome experience of Bco four-wheeling in Colorado with my son-in-law and daughter on Medano Pass, northern Sangre de Cristo (Rocky) Mountains, west to the Great Sand Dunes National Park, with an incredible view few will ever experience. Our public lands are just that -- for everyone -- not just someone's private property, with preservation, access and safety paramount for all. William Hoffman Aug. 17, 2010

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is not the genes themselves that anybody is worried about. It is the introduction into the environment of traits that have unknown effects. An ecosystem exists in a delicate balance and altering that balance can have disastrous effects. These systems have developed slowly over millennia. To change them within a generation is inviting consequences that we don't understand. What's more, just the foolishness of using a single species to the exclusion of others is a bad idea. Biodiversity is being threatened. This is the goal of GMO producers and it is a very shortsighted and selfish goal. I don't care if there's been no research supporting the finding that GMO's are bad for humans. It is simply irresponsible to create an organism that has not been tested in the laboratory of evolution. By the way, it is impossible to prove that they are NOT harmful and until that can be done, there is no way I would ever support their creation.

Have parks multiuse and be sure to make room and safe pathways for hikers.

and There is a very simple solution for both of you. Get out of the areas where OHV's are allowed and get into a Wilderness Area where they are not allowed! It's really not that hard!

Here it is. For an example, the federal government has paid millions of dollars to build a road so the local lumber company can extract about \$100,000.00 worth of timber. The one I'm referring to took place in the Tongass National Forest. Seems like a giant waste. This is one of the best ideas I've heard.

Hikers don't want to be on the kind of trail you're proposing, so "multi-use" really means "motorized." But it might serve all interests to have a designated route that would both serve the ORVs and contain them on roads designed for this kind of traffic and away from sensitive woodland trails. It sounds like most of the route already exists in forest roads and just needs to be designated and put on maps. If segments have to be added, options should be studied and their costs detailed (both money and ecological).

Hiking is an optional activity go buy yourself a farm to hike on. I wonder if you even have a clue where your tax dollars are going? Would you even notice if you were funding a country trail system? I know I have no idea where my money goes but I am sure some of it goes toward some tree hugging agenda that I am firmly against. Do you know of the inner workings of any OHV organization? Obviously you don't because if you did I wouldn't have to correct your posts.

Hmmm.. I wasn't under the impression that we (as OHVers) were fighting for the right to utilize wilderness areas. What MOST of us (and I would probably say all, but there's always that 1%) want is the right to continue to use the already designated areas that we have enjoyed for decades. We continue to lose designated areas yearly, and what does this do? It increases use on other areas. I have been fighting for years to keep the Rubicon Trail open for public use. We just lost another month of use on the Dusy-Ersheim trail. Last year we lost the Clear Creek area. If you enviro-extremists want wilderness area, fine! I like to hike and camp also! But I also enjoy off road vehicle use! All we ask is that you folks leave the already designated areas alone.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Honestly not all ATV's do 30 mph all the time. Maybe I am different but when I compare my ATV dashboard LCD readings of mileage and time of engine running my average speed is between 2 - 8 mph depending on the terrain in flat So. Fla. I do not let the engine idle and waste gas either so the engine time is right on. Where I go and considering what I do (hunting) I intentionally seek to be quiet, move slow and keep the wind in my face. The only time I get up around 10 or 15 is enroute to a hunting site in terrain I am extremely familiar with and even that is risky where I go. Most everyone I know operates ATV's similarly since if you don't you WILL end up seriously injured or dead.

Horses, yes. OHVs, no. There's a big difference.

How can we call them National Parks and not fund and protect them?

How is getting on a smelly ORV family time. Family time is doing something where you actually spend time talking to your kids and having some quality time with them. Sitting on an ORV which could cripple or put your kid in the hospital does not seem to fit that parameter.

How is listening to a motor for hours "getting away from it all"??

How is there family togetherness when you race through protected lands on separate OHV's You can't talk with one another. Since OHV's damage the landscape much more than other methods of recreational enjoyment, charge them appropriate fees. Given the revenue needs of the park and forest system, a seasonal fee of \$1,000. per OHV used in each land unit is a good start.

How many times am I going to have to write this? Motorized vehicles destroy trails. They cause erosion. They are noisy. They do not belong in protected wilderness. When they are let in, it is no longer "wilderness" no er how many families enjoy them.

Hunters are hurting the land you bring shame to the name .

I agree 4 wheelers give all ohv's a bad name.

I agree . There should also be areas that are for OHVs. There should be more wilderness preserved, too. One thing that amazes me though, is when people have access to wild lands, it seems they can't wait to develop the land and don't care about conservation or protection for the land, other than their own use of the land. More land should be protected for the good of the plants and animals that don't have voice. A healthy environment means a healthy human population also.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree that all user groups need to find a way to share a limited resource. I don't think every group needs to share it in the same way or exactly share the same space, but all users need to have a place to play. If everyone could compromise for each other it would be easier to move forward. I hope that Salazar can continue to try to find the middle ground and move forward to making everyone happy and continuing to protect our precious resources.

I agree that we should promote all forms of recreation, but every form has its proper place. I don't think too many people would disagree with that.

I agree there are few children outside. Most of the adults I know are either working, have other time priorities and/or not willing to expose themselves to legal liability. So how, where and when will you find the 6-12 adults for the equal number of children to make this happen? My case - I was present while a child fell down. Later that child's mother had already spoke to police authorities and charged me with assaulting her child. When the police finally ask the youngster what happened - the truth was learned - they fell in an accident which I had nothing to do with. However, I had already been written up and lost my youth position with the Church based on this. I like well behaved children but due to today's litigious set of parents - unless in a group setting with plenty of rules, cameras, regulations and insurance - I would not work with kids again for awhile!!!

I agree with ald on the funding part

I agree with Carpenter: stop roads in the Tongass. I think the Tongass should be declared a national monument immediately.

I agree with this, because the sad fact is, many people using ORV's simply aren't willing to use the parks in a responsible manner. Allowing ORV access for people with a severe handicap that prevents them from using the parks any other way is one thing, but allowing people who just want to feel the dirt rip out from under their tires? No. Rupert, that's a good point, there are people, especially families who are willing to be responsible and follow the rules, and so there should be some areas in the parks for ORV use, but the fact of the matter is, even responsibly used, an ORV/ATV causes damage and air pollution, so these areas need to be severely limited.... grow up and take off your tinfoil hat.

sounds like she has a vested interest in land being available for development. There is already enough land available for development and enough land that has been developed. Time to preserve more.

I agree! There must be adequate staffing in all areas (interpretive, natural resource management, protection, maintenance, and administration) to ensure the visitor is receiving the best possible experience in the enjoyment of the parks. And all visitor age groups need to be addressed. Young people are certainly the future and will carry on the conservation of the parks as they become adults. But "adult education" is important, too, as these are the people with the potential funds to help the parks NOW!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree, but some recreation should be only allowed in designated areas.

I agree, in part. Let us ALSO teach our children that ALL of the outdoors is to be protected and respected, not just the National Parks. Children (and adults) need to respect and care for our cities, our playgrounds, our suburbs. Stop littering....stop damaging and vandalizing areas just because they personally do not belong to you or your family. If you wouldn't throw trash in your own yard, don't throw it in someone's else's yard, or in the street, or by the side of the road, or out your car window because you want to keep it clean inside. Enjoy the outdoors--YES, by all means--but remember that others also have a right to enjoy a pristine view, without litter and damage (and this includes our wildlife, whose home the outdoors really is).

I agree. We need to support multiple use of these lands. Races can be an economic boost to small desert communities. Let us get off the couch and get outdoors!

I agree. { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/AF9E289C790DF2B68625772100497AE4" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Go to this great Idea and promote it! We need to be teaching ecology and the history, etc of our lands and how science is used to form management decisions. Oh, yea, history, science, reading and Writing, all subjects in school. Why not incorporate field trips that remove the student from the blackboard and mortar classroom and put them into the land that provides life? Let's develop some lesson plans, learning objectives, etc and share with each other to move this along. K-12 is where to start.

I am a mountain biker. There are plenty of places like logging roads for me to ride on already degraded lands. I don't need to take my bike into the wilderness where it might add to the trail erosion problem and degrade the wilderness experience. It would be hard, once you have allowed bicycles in wilderness, to exclude other mechanical transportation devices, even though they might degrade the wilderness experience. If you allow bicycles, it might be argued, why not electric bicycles; why not all terrain wheel chairs?

I am all for a race series. Look at Baja in Mexico. We have enough land here in the USA to have a tract of land set aside for an endurance race. I think OHVs have a hard time hurting sand and rocks.

I am an OHV user by choice but also due to injuries incurred while serving this nation but I am also a hiker/backpacker and I see more littering and trashing of areas that are accessed by foot. I have seen many hikers cut across switchbacks and while in a dispersed camping area off the main trail we run across piles of trash that hikers were too lazy to pack out. We use these as learning moments with our Boy Scouts to teach them the Leave No Trace principles. When out with a group of ATV riders, we tend to carry out more trash than we carried in. I agree that OHV enthusiasts need to work harder at patrolling themselves as a couple bad apples seem to be some of our own worst enemies.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am disabled, and incapable of visiting the wilderness as a hiker. But I would never take a vehicle into it -- noise pollution can be as damaging to plant and animal life as any other kind. Animals flee, if they're able. Plants stop growing, and many stop germinating. Then considering the fumes, the constant drip of oil and gas that comes from any internal combustion engine -- this constant drip tears up our stg asphalt roads (talk to anyone who paves roads or runways if you don't believe it), so imagine what it does to the life of a forest or other wilderness.

I am pretty sure that cars use gas too and there are way more of them than OHV's. Do you support your own vehicle? Maybe you should walk everywhere and get rid of your own car.

I am the executive director of Western Wildlife Conservancy in Salt Lake City, Utah. WWC is a non-profit wildlife conservation organization with approximately 300 members, most of whom live in Utah and recreate in the American West. I am also a member of the Western Governors Association Wildlife Council Stakeholder Advisory Group. Our specific charge is to aid the WGA Wildlife Council in implementing the WGA Wildlife Corridor and Crucial Habitat Initiative. Additionally, I am a member of the "Spine of the Continent" Wildway steering committee under the aegis of Wildlands Network (formerly The Wildlands Project). We seek to create a "mega-corridor" of functionally connected wildlife linkages up and down the Rockies, from the Brooks Range in Alaska to the Sierra Madre Mountains in Mexico. I have read the full draft BLM discussion paper on Treasured Landscapes. I find the vision embodied in that document bold and exciting and believe that it is urgently needed. Moreover, as a member of the WGA WC SAG, I know that it is exactly what is needed in order for the WGA Wildlife Corridor and Crucial Habitat Initiative to be successfully implemented in concert with another WGA initiative, the Renewable Energy Zone Initiative. I believe that the most important thing the Obama administration can do for public lands in the United States, is to protect their ecological integrity and resiliency. Therein lies our future. We must protect, and where necessary restore, our beautiful iconic landscapes, our watersheds, and the resiliency of our ecosystems. This will provide us with clean air, clean water, abundant wildlife, and a variety of types of outdoor recreation into the foreseeable future. It will preserve and enhance the possibilities for horsepacking and backpacking adventures. Combined with swift but prudent implementation of the WGA Renewable Energy Zone Initiative it will also enable us to move toward a clean energy future, which in turn will provide new jobs for our citizens and help preserve the quality of our environment. For all these reasons, I urge the Administration to set its sights on protecting connected landscapes and ecosystems. Protection of our ecosystems, watersheds and iconic landscapes will not only require that the protected landscapes be functionally connected to serve the needs of wildlife, it will require that we limit access to much of it. So be it. OHVs, ATVs, snowmobiles, and the like must be restricted to areas where they will do the least harm. In addition, livestock grazing must be curtailed in many areas where it is inflicting severe damage on watersheds and wildlife. Energy development, including renewable energy zones and transmission corridors, as well as other types of development, must be located outside the most ecologically sensitive areas. Finally, but not least in importance, it requires wolf recovery and healthy populations of all native large carnivores.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I appreciate that many folks enjoy using motorized vehicles, but the big picture is being lost in this discussion. Natural areas all ac this nation have been devastated by development and industrial/residential growth - we have a tiny fraction of even somewhat wild lands left compared to what used to exist on this continent. (and this is the pattern all over the world) . We need to preserve whatever is left for the peace and quiet, the biodiversity and the scientific discoveries that can't be found anywhere else. Motorized vehicles are simply not compatible with this. THERE ARE AN INFINITE NUMBER OF PLACES TO RIDE MOTORIZED VEHICLES IN THIS COUNTRY. Go enjoy some back roads somewhere, but not on public wilderness land. There's simply way too little of it left compared to more "civilized" areas. If you really want to go deep into wilderness, get in shape and walk out there! But don't ruin the experience for the rest of us.

I believe in recycling however I do believe in logging, mining, oil rigs, farming, fishing and other uses of the land that may disagree with. Aug 17, 2010

I believe roads and sustainability go hand in hand. We need to be envimental stewards while allowing social and economic activity. We need them all in a fair balance. Aug 17, 2010

I believe that existing OHV trail systems should be analyzed, improved, and ald. Then enforcement of trespassing, trial-blazing, etc. should be ruthless to include the loss of the perpetrator's vehicle - permanently. There is enough room to allow many different uses.

I cannot believe some of the closed minded ideas and accusations being thrown around here! I am an OHV user and there are many things we do to help...yes I said HELP the enviment! I live in the beautiful state of Oregon. Twice a year, SOLV (Stop Oregon Litter and Vandalism) has a beach clean up. Guess who drives up and down the beach, picking up the garbage bags! That's right, OHV clubs! How about helping BLM remove garbage, junk and abandoned cars that they can't get to. Done it! I have not met a single Sierra Club member on ANY of these events! Like someone said earlier, OHV land is a very small percentage of the forest. There are plenty of places to hike where there aren't OHVs, so why is it so important to hike where there ARE OHVs? My experience is that OHV users are generally the ONLY ones that promote use for everyone. There are many that want them completely eradicated from "their" forest. It is not "their" forest, it's everyone's! I believe the selfish ones are the ones who don't want anyone to do anything they don't like. Private property is actually a good idea, but there can be problems with it. Cost, insurance, regulations etc. Farmland? I don't know about you, but I prefer that remain a productive farm. Here on the West coast, private forest land is all but impossible to come by. Yes, it IS a legitimate family activity. I can spend the entire day, in my Jeep, driving around the woods with my family. We talk about some amazing things, when there are no other distractions and it is truly some of our best family time. Oh, and Ms. Foster, while you are entitled to your opinion, what qualifies as family time for my family is not up to you to decide. I have suggestion to those of you that oppose OHV use. Step outside your comfort zone and contact a local club. Spend some time with them, maybe even... \*gasp\*...go on a day trip with them. Experience it. You don't have to like it (although I suspect you will), but it may give you a different perspective and you will see that we are people, just like you. A responsible club would welcome you're visit and be glad to show you what they do. Would you do the same for us?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I don't go to the local mall on black Friday then complain about noise and over crowding, I suggest you rethink where your going camping, all the places I go to its so quiet I have to keep the radio or TV on so I can sleep, I visit about 6-8 different states annually, most the time I am alone on the trails.

I don't have time to read all the comments, but I don't fully understand this proposal. Is the author suggesting that for every acre of wilderness set aside, land managers should open an acre of wilderness to OHV use? If so, this is simply unsustainable and irresponsible. Wilderness cannot be created, or even restored; it can only be preserved. Even when used in the most sensitive way OHVs are irrefutably damaging to the environment as they promote erosion and disturb wildlife. Any "wilderness" that is opened to OHV use will quickly cease to be true wilderness, and that can never be reversed. I am an avid birder, camper, and hiker, and I mostly keep my recreation in medium- to high-use areas. I love wild places, but I've only set foot in a true "wilderness area" as designated by the government on a few occasions. Even so, I'm comforted by the existence of such areas. I expect all unselfish outdoor enthusiasts would feel the same way. Whether we are hunters, hikers, boaters, OHVers, birders, climbers, fishermen, or any other form of recreationist, we don't need to be drooling and scheming to get into every untouched natural area just because it exists. Even if I never set foot in a wilderness area again, I hope for the sake of all of us and our future generations that no wilderness area is ever opened to OHV use. OHVers, I respect your love of the outdoors. I believe there is a place for OHV recreation. But it's not compatible with wilderness. Once OHV use is allowed in a wilderness area we can never get it back.

I don't know what kind of ATVs people use in your area, but I have yet to find an area that was passable by ATV and not on foot. I have, however seen the converse of this many times. Be that as it may, I agree with most of what you're suggesting. Many times damage occurs because of a combination of irresponsible use and lax enforcement. It's also possible that the place you live does not have a statutory provision for the destruction of roads. My state does. A person can be arrested for criminal damage for causing damage to a muddy road surface, for instance. Try getting in touch with your local OHV groups and see if there can be some agreement and then approach the land management agency with your mutual concerns. Most OHV operators realize that the type of damage you refer to is what causes problems for us and will be willing to work with making repairs and working on ways to prevent future damage.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I don't know where these "billions" of acres of empty land are. One thing for sure, our population is growing (from 200 million to over 300 million in a short time). I say more land needs to be preserved as both wilderness and multi use land before we are all smashed into a few small areas to "recreate". I also promote all forms of recreation. Hello! You would have to read some of the ideas posted above mine to get the point of "some recreation should only be ald in designated areas". Here is an example, though. In my state, they were trying to preserve the wild nature of a certain state forest. They closed the area to OHVs and also closed roads to everything except foot traffic. It worked and the area still has a wild nature. At the time, we hunted in the area and also road motorcycles and three wheelers. We still hunt there today, but OHV elsewhere. I don't see any problem with most OHV use, but they are not and should not be ald everywhere. Most people would agree that this applies to all forms of recreation. That was the point. Some people are not only concerned about recreation, but also the health of the eco system so there is clean water, air, and habitat, for both people and the other creatures that depend on the enviment. It is important to me and people like me to have areas set aside from the threat of development. Maybe it's because we haven't seen these billions of acres of vacant land you have access to. I think most people are concerned about the enviment and I would say these different groups (OHVer, hunters, fishermen, hikers, etc.) have more in common than they we think.

I don't think any development is "smart".

I don't think any reasonable person would be against access for traditional wood gathering or fishing. I also believe OHVs should be ald in designated areas. For example, some places in Alaska allow native communities to use snowmobiles, etc., to continue traditional (hunting, fishing, etc.) practices, even though the area is designated wilderness.

I don't understand why mountain bikes aren't considered to be "eco-friendly" by some. No pollution, quiet, and very little impact to the soil. Maybe the reason a small minority hate mountain bikes, is because they are selfish radicals who expect everyone to hike hundreds of miles with 40 lb backpacks on? And they know that will never happen... so what they want, is in effect, to lock the people out of the forests and deserts. Sad really. Common sense tells you that a bicycle on a trail harms nothing at all.

I don't want to see, hear or smell OHVs when I am in the wilderness. These places were set aside to preserve them for all. It goes against the very idea of wilderness to allow these vehicles into wilderness. Also, it sends a message that it's acceptable to pollute the air and continue to support oil use. When I am trying to commune with nature and get away from noise, I don't want to have my serenity disturbed by loud and smelly OHVs. My world is loud enough, thank you. Get off your behinds and walk.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I feel BLM needs to be reviewed for the present and the future. Too much say is represented by the big ranches and they tell us to get rid of the wild horses. I feel we need to save as much wilderness that we can. Lets not have the attitude that we should use every natural resource in the present. Lets preserve for future generations. If people have to use a orv then I feel they don't understand the value of wilderness. We have raped just about every piece of land with exploration like gas/oil/coal/minerals. Lets stop and smell the roses for a time.

I fully agree with you. I grew up on a cattle ranch in California. I have watched my family have to sell off portions and rent out portions just so they could pay the taxes to keep their homes. Now with the new water taxes coming out that is just another hit. Private land is just that, Private. Public land is where families should be picnicing and camping and such. Public lands are the property of all the people and should not be restricted. Private lands are the land owners to say who can and can not enter.

As the administration considers how best to protect America's great outdoors in the 21st century, it is imperative to remember that we face far different threats to conservation than we did in the 20th century. Already facing increased habitat fragmentation and development, pollution, invasive species and overuse, America's great outdoors are increasingly experiencing the effects of climate change. Indeed, climate change is directly threatening many of the conservation investments made over the last century. As the administration draws up its blueprint for conservation in the 21st century, it must include strategies to reduce carbon pollution and safeguard natural resources from the impacts of climate change that are already occurring.

Conservative estimates of the economic value of the vast range of ecosystem service provided by the natural environment range into trillions of dollars annually. Examples abound of how healthy natural systems help people and the economy. Among other things, they provide clean drinking water and clean air, protect communities from extreme weather events, and help pollinate crops, and agricultural resources ranging from timber to pollinators. These services are in direct jeopardy due to sea level rise and increased storm surges threatening coastal wetlands, declining snowpack threatening the availability of drinking water and aquatic habitat in the West, pine bark beetles devastating western forests, and a host of other climate change impacts.

Wildlife and natural resources are also critical to the recreation value of America's great outdoors. Outdoor recreation accounts for 8% of all consumer spending, contributes \$730 billion annually to the economy, and supports 6.5 million jobs (1 of every 20 jobs in the U.S.). Much of this economic activity is now threatened by global warming. Southern trout streams could soon become too hot to fish, declining snowfall and increasing winter temperatures are hurting skiing and other winter sports, and shifts in migratory timing and patterns may soon be impacting waterfowl hunting opportunities.

Above all, we have a moral imperative to protect America's treasured wildlife and special places from the impacts of climate change. Twenty to thirty percent of species are at even greater risk of extinction due to global warming under even moderate global warming scenarios.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Defenders of Wildlife is a national, nonprofit membership organization, with more than 1 million members and supporters, dedicated to the protection of all native wild animals and plants in their natural communities. Our programs focus on what scientists consider two of the most serious environmental threats to the planet: the accelerating rate of extinction of species and associated loss of biological diversity, and habitat alteration and destruction. Addressing the overarching threat of climate change, and assisting wildlife to adapt to impacts of climate change already underway, are key to our work to protect wildlife and its habitat.

The America's Great Outdoors initiative has been described as a conservation agenda for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Global climate change is the defining environmental threat for the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond. Changes in ecosystem structure and function resulting from climate change require fundamental rethinking of how and where conservation occurs. Accordingly, the America's Great Outdoors initiative must work to promote conservation of wildlife and its habitats and, in particular, to assist wildlife and natural resource adaptation to climate change. To accomplish this, the America's Great Outdoors initiative should focus on, and further, the protection of large, interconnected natural landscapes.

Climate change is the single greatest threat to wildlife and habitat. Changes in temperature, precipitation, and sea level are literally shuffling the deck of natural ecosystems, significantly increasing the threat of extinction for numerous species. As wildlife seeks to move to more hospitable habitat in response to climate change, such movement becomes increasingly difficult in landscapes already fragmented by roads and other human development. Resilience to the impacts of climate change for wildlife will be enhanced through the conservation of large, interconnected landscapes, providing protected habitat and corridors for wildlife migration. Accordingly, the America's Great Outdoors initiative should give the highest priority to conservation of large, interconnected landscapes that will assist wildlife and natural resources adaptation to climate change.

Unfortunately, the Senate companion measure, S.3663, the Clean Energy Jobs and Oil Company Accountability Act, does not include full funding for the HPF, but includes full funding for the LWCF.

We and other SHPO programs across the nation need Senate champions for including the HPF in S.3663, either within the language of the bill or as an HPF funding amendment when the bill comes to the Senate floor this fall.

Provide more funding and opportunities to support our state 20-year plan on Recruitment, Development and Retention for hunters and anglers (see attached summary).

Land and Water Conservation Fund needs dedicated, equitable funding between the stateside and federal program to ensure acquisition and development of "close to home" recreation opportunities.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Provide funding to purchase and conserve unique landscapes in Nebraska. We and our partners have the staff to implement programs on private land and the ability to manage public lands purchased. This is closely tied with our State Wildlife Action Plan.

Increase federal funding for the National Fish Habitat Action Plan, especially the Reservoir Fisheries Partnership.

Hunting and fishing are important parts of Nebraska's rich heritage. These time-honored outdoor pursuits are important to overall lifestyle, well-being and natural resources of the citizens of Nebraska. Along with hunters and anglers paying for conservation via permits and excise taxes, they contribute \$74 billion to the economy nationwide in 2006 (USFWS 2007). In Nebraska, Fishing and Hunting impacted the economy with nearly \$367 million in 2006 (USFWS 2007). Unfortunately, this tidal wave of funding and economic impact will not continue unless we maintain one of our most important stakeholders, our hunters and anglers.

Total number of hunters and anglers per state have been recorded by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for many years, in part, to help in the distribution of Federal excise taxes between states. These numbers have fluctuated throughout the years, with record highs in the 1960's, and lows in the mid 1980s. In the past ten years (1997-2007) there has been a loss of 18,579 hunters and 36,272 anglers (USFWS Online Federal License Certification). Although the west-north central region has not seen as great a decline in hunters as other regions, it is still alarming the rate at which our hunters and anglers are leaving the sport.

State funding in Illinois for land acquisition has also decreased significantly with the strain on the state budget just when land prices have dipped. The infusion of federal dollars into land acquisition programs will give local governments the opportunity to move forward on significant land protection efforts now.

There has been a dramatic decline in USDA-Forest Service Cooperative State and Private Funding from \$4million in 2007 to \$2.7million in 2010. This is just one example of the challenges that we all face. If these financial incentives are not there for the private forest owners to assist in good management improvements, then sustainability will be adversely affected. This is vital for future generations.

We need legislation to include incentives for private family forests to be able to participate in carbon markets. Managed forests can increase the carbon storage from its current 12% to as much as 20%. Biomass will become a renewable part of our energy as we move to cleaner forms of renewable energy in the future. Since private forests make up 75% of all forested land in Alabama and 62% of forested land in the US (423 million acres) those legislative policies need to define biomass where private forests are included in this definition.

2. 6 million acres of family forests change hands each year; and 1.4 million acres are actually lost to urbanization or development as a result of families having to sell property or cut timber to pay federal estate taxes. This could be alleviated with legislation such as the Thompson Family Farm Preservation and Conservation Estate Tax Act.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are proactive when it comes to education. We realize that if the next generations are not exposed to managed forests and not exposed to America's Great Outdoors with its inherent benefits then this legacy will wither and be only history. We are each called to be good stewards of what we have. Being good stewards of our family forests is part of that sustainable legacy. We need funding and incentives for environmental education to ensure that our children learn to appreciate and invest themselves in our environment's future.

As you are aware private family forests provide many benefits to our society. Jobs (avg. 8 jobs/1000 acres), clean air and clean water (xxx acres supply enough oxygen for xxx people), wood products and their derivatives, a source for renewable energy with less carbon and environmental impact than concrete and steel, recreation and aesthetics. Private forest owners need incentive to allow them to continue to manage and preserve their forests.

These listening sessions are a great move forward in bringing the discussion and awareness of how fragile America's Great Outdoors is. We need to be proactive in our conservation efforts. This can effectively be done in partnership with private family forests, industry and the federal government. Let's get to work to strengthen this partnership.

If this idea succeeded, we'd be going back to the days when Forest Service and BLM field managers were captured by the local county commissioners and state legislators. That's why the forests in my native Oregon got clearcut so badly in the decades after WWII, and it's why cattle were allowed to wreck the riparian fish and wildlife habitat all over the western range. When I worked for BLM, I saw that citizens' groups' ability to sue gave my agency the strength to follow the law and resist political pressure.

After what has happened at Cape Hatteras where the signs state no people allowed the NP needs to be controlled. Killing wildlife and closing the area to humans.

We don't need to limit anymore use of ORV on federal land anymore than they are. If anything there is wilderness that needs to be taken away.

I promise everyone who is against ORV does more damage to the environment than they do. You pee and you poop in water, laugh at this all you want but every time you take a dump or piss in water you just made it toxic for me and my family to enjoy. So let's say we ride once a week and you pee 4 times a day and poop 4 times a week, so you have ruined a water way 32 times on average a week compared to us once a week on a good month. I believe everyone should have to poop outside and bury it 5 feet deep and hold their pee in, cause no matter where you pee you just ruined the environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is enough wilderness as it is. National Forests are really a better way for everyone. Logging is a good idea, we all enjoy living in homes don't we?? I don't know about your home but mine is made of wood and a lot of it and it requires logging to build homes, crazy huh. Here in the Cache National Forest you can ride in a truck or a jeep, take a ATV a dirt bike or hike. It caters to everyone's needs and desires. And the hiking trails also go where no machine can go in the summer and you can get away from it all and not listen to any motorized vehicles of any sort. Then we can ride sleds there in the winter :) :) NF are the way to go and there should be wilderness took out and NF put in there place so everyone enjoys them. And all the fuzzy little animals you love enjoy the NF to. I know you don't believe me but they really do and they are more scared of you walking then on anything else. I know this cause I hunt all sorts of animals and if you are on a wheeler or vehicle they stand still and wait for you to go by but if your walking and they see you or wind you guess what???? they run farther and faster to get away from humans, it don't matter if you are hunting them or not every person environmentalist ORV user, hunter, hiker, hippie it don't matter they see us as a predator not a safe house.

that is way to extreme and not even realistic. No guns?? forget our 2nd amendment in the Constitution? We have a right to bear arms No ATV's?? If they are used on designated trails ATV use is perfectly fine the way it is. Hike on designated trails only?? by far the most unrealistic comment yet. You must like to be told what to do, me not so much. I will enjoy the outdoors how I see fit, when I am hiking I will NOT stay on the trails and I will go anywhere my heart desires. For all the environmentalists on here who think we are robots get a grip, it's public land and the thought of you even saying we should only walk on designated trails is outrageous.

Only 2/10 of 1 percent (0.2%) of the land surface of Eldorado National Forest is legal for an OHV to set a tire upon. However, a staggering 1/3 of the forest is already locked away from the majority of the public within the Desolation Wilderness and Mokolumne Wilderness. Yet in spite of this, the anti-access groups are still fighting tooth-and-nail to close the Rubicon Trail and the other last remnants of a spectacular sightseeing OHV trail network. Not everyone is a hiker. Some like biking, some like OHVs, some like kayaks and canoes. But these public lands belong to ALL of the public. Wilderness designation is EXCLUSIVE, while a Backcountry designation is INCLUSIVE while providing the exact same natural resource protection. Keep public lands open to ALL of the public!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your Comment Below4) OHV's, snowmobiles, and jetski's should all be banned from most public lands and waters - they are the usage that is least compatible with other uses, and they have the longest-lasting negative impacts. Just like America in general was sold by Madison Avenue into thinking we all needed giant SUV's for our single passenger daily commute, OHV-users have been sold into thinking that they can't enjoy the woods without a gasoline engine roaring between their legs. If OHV users want to band together to buy themselves a private wooded racetrack with a noise control barrier and onsite mountain dew dispensers, fine, but even then they should still have to clean up their act so they don't send water pollution downstream. where do you get YOUR information from? Some one has fed you some true bull. What makes you believe so hard that OHV's have the most lasting effect in the forest? Where or Whom gave you this bull story? Logging is the most long lasting effect besides development. It takes from 5 years to 20 years for trees to become a "Forest" and marketable again! First of all.....OHV's Do Not leave a long lasting effect in the forest by any means. Any Forest Ranger will even tell you they do not. Trails that are designated for OHV's are used by ATV, OHV, 4X4, hikers, horse back riders, and many others. By this action it reduces the need for multiple trails for different uses. Most OHV People even care for the trail when USFS does not have the manpower or budget to even start to care for a trail. USDA will more than happy to send YOU.....Ron Sutherland..... the information of just how many OHV people take care of trails in ways that even USFS will not. Bridges over streams and creeks, clean up, maintenance, re-planting of trees, and so on.Ron Sutherland.....if want to complain so much for a true reason than at least have FACTS to back it up. Just typing what ever you wish to be negative only makes you out to be a person that no one else wants around. Get a Life dude!OHV's are here to stay because Family Time is more important than ever before.WE.....The People..... have the rights to enjoy our great lands in our Nation, by all means for the category we choose responsibly. OHV's will NOT just Go Away because YOU don't like SUV's. People whom wish to take their families into the forest of this great Nation will become more involved because it Brings Our Family Together..... Unity.By the way..... have you even considered how many Disabled Persons use OHV's because it is their only way to enjoy our great lands with nature?I am one of those..... your comments can become very costly Ron. Think a bit and have facts from all areas first before your fingers type what is on your mind.I love our land..... our forest..... this nation..... I am involved in many areas that concern our forest..... I am an All Terrain Vehicle Rider also..... in our forest..... and a member of Blue Ribbon Coalition ..... sharetrails.orgWe ALL can work at this together..... after all..... it is our land.....One Nation ... Under God.

There would be enough land for all if we would stop closing it off. I am so tired of people who think that their way is the only way and are out to save the world. The planet is cooling, man is to blame, the planet is heating up and man is to blame! In California whole areas are wiped out and people are put out of work to save a little fish! I wish we could work together and compromise but reading some of these posts I do not think it will happen. It's time to go get in my SUV and head home, burn a steak and drink a beer. Maybe shoot some cans in the back yard while I still can.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Unmanaged land allows chaos and politics to rule. Logging is only one small activity in the total activities that occur on public lands however the elimination of logging is used as a basic tool to eliminate all forms of use on public lands..... If you want folks and activities locked out you are an idiot. If you promote wise multiple use then you have something going for you. There are far more acres degrading from neglect than from any other cause. Management can be controlled, chaos simply happens....

My wife and I have travelled over 7500 miles on our ATV's in the last 4 or 5 years...we have travelled on the Wallowa Whitman, the Umatilla, and the Malheur National Forests. Some on roads, some on trails, some just plain cross country. It is with amusement I read the comments about damage, impact, degradation, pollution and destruction of habitat and harassment of wildlife. It would seem that if you tell lies enough they become truth? The photo's used by government agencies are often decades old and are used to "prove" current damage. Arguments are started over topics like ATV entry into wilderness areas..in most cases though illegal it would really cause no impact. There are laws up the butt that cover all forms of abuse, use, trash, travel, trails, roads, cross country, animal harassment, noise, pollution and so on and so on. Where is the enforcement? Non existant because for the most part users do not destroy the world, they may change it but they do not destroy it. USFS says no money to maintain roads....this is only a smokescreen or excuse. USFS has plenty of money for payroll, vehicles (huge fleets by the way) retirement and benefits. Locking the public out of the forests will accomplish a few things though. First of if the public is locked out they will be unable to see how poorly things are managed, Second it will enable the USFS to expend more funds on enforcement officers with more payroll, benefits and retirements to act as zoo keepers on the public. The third item is probably the pacification of the enviro's and politicians that currently run things. The end result is the public will suffer, the resources will degrade and deteriorate at a much faster pace, opportunities for management will be eliminated and the something for nothing folks that espouse this closure and lockout can sleep well at night thinking they have done something holy and good.....while individuals like myself will break the laws, defy the rulings and give the enforcement folks a justification for their existance. Sounds much like the feudal system existing in Europe and Britain a few hundred years ago doesn't it?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Its interesting reading comments from folks with no true vested interest expressing their view into how my world should be locked up and restricted. Wildlife corridors from Canada to Mexico? Its unusual for most animals to have a range extending more than a handful of miles from where they were born. There are exceptions but they travel anyway. Nature Conservancy? Just big money hiding behind what they call a noble goal. Nature Conservancy entered Wallowa County in Eastern Oregon under the banner of good neighbor and friend.....the reality is that they purchased land in a way to make profits, sell what they do not really want for more profits, and lock folks out of what is left. Nothing wrong with profit, nothing wrong with locking folks out of your private ground but do not do it under the guise of a holy endeavor. Others make value judgements based on their view of their world and their holy grail of innocence and perfection that organizations like Nature Conservancy and the numerous "Friends Of" groups put out. Its only based on bias and dreams and imagination. Get off the freeway, get an ATV or a pair of hiking boots or a pickup and see the real world you are trying to influence. Visualize yourself with no electricity, no wood, no grain, no meat products, NO TAX BASE to support the life of something for nothing. Get to the real world folks..there is a price to pay for everything...Its in our best interest to make sure we get a value received for a value given.

It is ridiculous to think of restricting motorcycles from public lands. Most trails were created by some sort of motorized vehicle, majority of new trails by motorcycles. Exploration is a part of the American heritage and character. Focus your attention on mass transit and older vehicles to decrease greenhouse gases, not these tiny motorcycle engines. One option would be to restrict the size of engines on these trails, as I believe there's no need for big V8's with 38" tires on many trails.

This is not just an issue for OHV users, but for all user's of public lands. Hunters in particular are increasingly restricted as access points to public property that runs through private property is closed. Many long-time landowners that used to allow public access (lumber companies, ranchers) are increasingly selling off to developers as government policies drive them out of business. These developers think nothing of blocking public access, if it gives their "customers" exclusive access to the public's property.

What Off Roding is all about, is the Family experience. The old saying, " it takes one bad apple to spoil the whole bushel" applies to Off Roding. We need more education, rules of riding ect. The number one problem that I have encountered with people against riding off road is NOISE. Dust is their second concern. Since we, as a family group, have been riding, I make sure all our equipment has STOCK mufflers and silencers on the bikes, quads, ect. Speed around others is also a problem. When ever we encounter anyone on the trail, we slow down, NOT SHOWOFF. This keeps the dust and noise to a minimum. We need to police yourself, to a point, and try to keep those that think our trails are race tracks, informed that they are for pleasure riding, not racing. With more Baby Boomers in the retirement mode, we should have a large pool of potential volunteers to pick from, to help implement this plan. "Keep it quiet, keep it on the trail, tread lightly". Remember, help keep the "Public" in Public Land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHV recreation is a viable and important use of public lands. No other form of recreation is as important to my family. Closing off existing riding opportunities does not help the environment. It squeezes more impact into smaller areas.

Some people just cannot understand that some of us are a little more fast paced then others and don't get much thrill out of hiking, x-country skiing etc. I hike for exercise and have more then enough areas to go that don't allow motorized use, I have to drive at least an hour to ride my snowmobile. Plus where I ride my snowmobile I am so high in elevation I rarely see wildlife nor non-motorized users but they still want to kick me out??There is lots of things in this world I do not agree with but I do not think they should be banned, this is America and people have the right to do what they want.

I am copying a statement as it hits the nail on the head. A few bad apples ruin it for everyone. I've gotten in a fight with a fellow off roader because of his recklessness, and he thanked me later for it. It opened his eyes to what impact he was creating for his fellow OHV's . He gets it now and is very concientious where he rides off road. ("It's always so frustrating to read through these comments spouting that OHV enthusiasts are reckless, polluting, land-hungry caveman mentalities trying to take over the world's public land. I get it, you've had a bad experience with some a-holes somewhere down the line and put the other 99% in the same category. Please wake up. Your campaign is more likely to hurt your cause in the long run. You are trying to shut out one of the largest groups of folks that has respect and offers care to the lands you are trying to close access to. All we want is access to the same public lands we and our past generations have had access to and the same for our/your future generations to come. We are not the partying, drag-racing, gang-banging inner-city thugs with toys tearing it up having some drunken' booze-fest in the middle of nowhere. We are the "tread-lightly-so-we-can keep-enjoying-the-peace-and-beauty-of-what-we-have-been-treading-on-for-generations" folks. Now. Go lobby against illegal dumpers and factories destroying our ozone for a change! Fight a REAL threat for once!")

"I have to laugh! I have a 36' long 5th Wheel trailer. I can pull into a campground with full hook-ups and stay there for 2 weeks without plugging in, dumping or "hooking up" anything. In fact, given that I arrive with full water tanks, live off of solar while I'm there, and I dump at home, I'm pretty sure that would use "many, many times as much resources" with his tent than I would in the site next to him!! And I should pay double what a tenter pays??? No thanks!!!"

Nobody is proposing "expanding" off-road racing. Off road racers use exsiting roads on on ever decreasing "public" lands, and private lands. They do not banzai willy nilly accross open desert, and are penalized for venturing off the trail. As to the unfortunate tragedy that happened at the off road event recently, off-roading has one of the best safety records in regards to fan safety in motorsports, and new and exsisting safety measures will be enforced. Should we place a moratorium on all teen aged drivers being able to drive because of an accident while texting that killed a family of 4. It was an accident. " Can't we ALL just get along?"



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What about the folks in places like Chester, CA? Should our policies turn their lives upside down. This was a case of closing an area to uses that had been in place for many years. This was a "restoration" not preservation. The "preservation at any cost" approach totally disregards the impact on humans. Increase appreciation by closing areas to access. What a crazy concept! Things out here in the West are quite different than back east. There's lots of forests and lots of land. But on the forest management issue, ask anyone who's been affected by wildfires if the overgrowth is an issue. It certainly has been in the Arizona fires of recent years.

Just wanted to say that I demoted because the fees have already been paid for registration etc. on all those "bad" things you listed. Entering any National park, state land or whatever there is a fee and they are generally per vehicle, persons, etc.

We keep finding more and more wildlife venturing into residential areas b/c they have nowhere else to go. The last thing we need to do is mine a beautiful area. We have no right to continue to destroy mother nature and all its beauty

Motorized bikes used to be the popular vehicle of choice in my area. Now it's the bulldozers that took over natural wildlife and really killed it all. Small time recreation is not acceptable but wildlife destruction is more than welcomed? How's that so?

Sharing- As a life long OHV user the only encounters I ever have with hikers and those touting the idea OHVs don't share due to noise and "scaring" others have been ON A ROAD OR TRAIL. Like 99.9% of OHV users I never go cross country yet I've had hostile hikers and cross country skiers accuse me of ruining "their good time" while on a 12' wide, snow covered, ASPHALT ROAD and on a mining trail cut by a Caterpillar tractor. If you want more peace and quiet leave the road you can't. Erosion- the latest buzz word for the anti access groups, it's gravity and water run off people. Dirt going down hill isn't a bad thing, it's nature. Health/ self righteousness- Sure walking is more healthy than riding... WRONG! Motorcyclists use more muscle groups than any other sport. If you want to be self righteous than you'd better be walking to work and not driving your car creating smog... and your not are you? It's not just health that keeps folks from hiking. My family has had 3 generations recreating TOGETHER ranging in age from 5 weeks old to 70+ years old for 40 years you can't do that with a backpack. Where are your kids and elders? If you don't realize how big our public lands are and how much room there is for everyone to do everything I suspect you have been in the city too long and you can't even tolerate your next door neighbor.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The government mindset towards environmentalism is that they can do no wrong because they are trying to protect the environment, this is a fallacy. While I agree that there are parties and companies who abuse the land and should be held accountable for it, I do not agree with writing a blank check to do it. The abuse of this loop hole by the environmental lobby is a greater crime against the American taxpayer by environmentalists than the environmental crimes they are supposedly trying to prevent. As \_\_\_\_\_ stated, follow the money. This law is not only being abused by extreme environmentalists but by the law firms that have sprouted up solely to pursue these types of lawsuits for a paycheck. It also makes for an imbalanced system of justice when a minority group has unlimited legal resources to push their environmental agenda against a popular public activity such as OHV groups that have to raise their own money to "TRY" and retain the lands they have used for years and are now losing because of this law. It is an unbalanced and unfair misuse of taxpayer dollars.

Since April I have been listening to OHV users pound this site for access to federal land. I really think your point was made a long time ago. I challenge each of the OHV crowd to come up with ideas that do not relate to OHVs. The ideas I have submitted to this site are all totally different. Not everything in this world relates to your transportation desires. So let's hear some originality.

As cities expand, recreation use is jammed into a smaller and smaller space. Then it does more damage to the land that is left. Fight to keep the cities corralled. Fight for open space. Don't blame things like this on environmentalists. It's about urban sprawl, which is driven by population growth.

Hey, I'm sure it's nice to live there in the Cache NF. When city folks get a rare vacation, they go to the national forests and find mines, clearcuts and a million miles of dusty roads where they thought there was going to be solitude. Buba, it ain't just your forest. You're probably one of those folks who expect the government to provide you with a job, then you complain about the welfare society. There's not enough wilderness.

here you are again, posting the same drivel. You say "There is more forest land now than there was 100 years ago." Where is it? On Mars? Well, let's see. From satellite photos, it looks like a clearcut. Is that what you are calling forest land?

A better question is "are the Eco-groups using their own lawyers to bill the government at a higher rate than they are paying their lawyers?" And yes, you can google the EAJA and read it for yourself. It is unbelievable, but TRUE.

I was recently chastized by a day hiker who drove his Land Rover to the top of Stoney Pass, Colorado, to go hiking because I was riding an ATV. He ignored the fact that he had pulled his Land Rover to Silverton, Colorado with a diesel Motorhome then drove to the top of Stoney to go hiking but accuse me of destroying the environment. It is time for some logic to get injected into the discussion. I rode all day on 3 gallons of gas, How far does 3 gallons move a motorhome? A family picnic at 12,000' is the best way to teach kids and grandkids about all that is wonderful in the outdoors and it matters not how you got there, Walk or Bike or ATV or Jeep.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Ban them! Get rid of them now! They're a recipe for destruction and abuse of our wild and rural lands!" Your life is a recipe for destruction and abuse of our, not your, wild and rural lands. Shall we ban you?

Most wildlife sanctuaries and preserves are woefully understaffed. Those who do work and wish to work for them have little or no idea the type of habitat eACH species requires. I would suggest a course of study and training for those individuals with qualified personnel as their guide to what and how they should conduct their various jobs. One main issue would be to watch out for poachers and hunters and trappers who beleive that every wolf cougar and beaver etc is theirs to do with what they want. If and when they catch someone in the act of violating the law they should immediatly report them to the proper authorities in order that they may be reprimanded with a stiff fine and stiffer jail sentence. If this procedure is followed each time the wilderness areas and preserves will begin to be what they were set out to be - a safe haven for animals to live in and with nature without fear of human detrimental interference. This also applies to Alaska, and idaho. Hillary Bartholomew T

OFF road vehicles are a small factor in the environmental impacts compared to what's really going on! What about all the cities full of millions of cars, buses, all the green house gases... what about airports and oil spills? Don't you think that wild animals are being affected by the millions of homes built every year?I live in the forest (literally) and we are working with the USFS reps to keep trails open where I live and to make sure that we provide the correct information and educate our OHV visitors when they want to come up and recreate.

I would also like to add that irresponsibility comes in all walks of life. How many forest fires have been started by irresponsible hikers/campers that did more damage in one fell swoop then 10 years of off roading? Why are the keep our wilderness clean crowd not coming to the desert and having clean up efforts to clean up after the illegal border crossers? There is much more damage being done there. Much More. I always pack more out than I pack in and I have always taught my children responsibility on and off the trail. Why should my family not have access to public lands? This is the land of the free is it not?

People who drive off road vehicles have no respect for nature or the rights of others. Please ban or restrict their access to public places. WRONG!!!! Talk about generalizations. Vehicular profiling??? I am a long time off road rider as well as my family. My children have always been taught to respect nature, stay on trails and pack out more than we pack in. If anything we are conservationists because we don't want our areas of natural beauty that we enjoy on dirt bikes to become another subdivision, golf course or strip mall. Let's ban all of those in the name of preservation. We have seen irresponsible behavior from many different users of the wilderness from equestrians, hikers, etc. We have had forest fires started by those hikers who cannot seem to figure out how to put it out or it's no ok to just leave it. Let's get some of the wilderness protection crowd out to clean up after the illegals and the illegal highway heading north. Talk about destruction of desert wilderness areas, I have seen cleaner landfills. Prioritize, folks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I feel the stonewalling and lack of collaboration is not on the part of OHV groups, rather Sierra Club, etc who are unwilling to compromise on ANY issue. They have a our way or the highway attitude. The majority of my friends and most certainly my family who all ride, do so responsibly, safely and pack out way more than we pack in. I see a lot more destruction of our lands by construction, shooters leaving their brass, and illegals heading north. If the Sierra Club, et al, were really concerned about cleaning up the existing wilderness areas they would be cleaning up the illegal highway. I have seen cleaner landfills than those areas. Don't point fingers at OHV's for all of the environmental woes. Let's end urban sprawl, strip malls, new highway construction instead of limiting the ability for many to enjoy our PUBLIC lands. This is the land of the FREE is it not?

The amount of public land open to OHV use has already been reduced by over 30% in the last 25 years. I pay my taxes just like everyone else. I should be able to engage in responsible recreation in designated areas. I don't like it when people try to take away the tiny areas we have left for ohv recreation.

The adjacent dunes that are in the wilderness area are not as large as the ones in the OHV accessible area. On two separate occasions a group of hikers / ecologists attempted to hike in the designated Wilderness Area. Neither attempt brought them even a mile into the 29,000 acre area before turning back under strenuous walking conditions. The last known attempt was cut short. On 04/22/06, Ecologists & students attempted a hike on Earth Day. Photos were later published showing the group walking in dry stream bottoms and desert hardpack areas along the dunes edge... not even in the Sand. They finished their 'walk' on State Hwy78!! We're talking about dune Slip-Face Walls that travel for mile after mile after mile that are over 100 feet tall. Witches-eyes that are the size of a 2 story house, and lee-ward sand that is so soft that OHV tires feel flat. Even if transporting yourself in the dunes WAS possible, you would need to carry no less than 1 gallon of water per 2 miles of travel on a avg 80 degree day. There is no water in the dunes. This means that carrying a whopping 23 pounds of water would bring you no more than 6 miles. For this reason, OHV riding alone can mean your death! I'm glad you think I'm funny, but I'll say it again Jack, you simply cannot get to these places without an OHV. "Since April I have been listening to OHV users pound this site for access to federal land." First off, I don't care what you've been listening to, or what you think of it! (mirroring your comments from another thread) . You might be an old man, but I am not. I already have OHV access to Federal Land, AND I USE IT!! But you can bet your paycheck that I'll be beating my drum about it in a thread on this forum attempting to take that away. "I really think your point was made a long time ago." Apparently it hasn't as we sit here in an idea titled "Ban OHV use on federal lands" "I challenge each of the OHV crowd to come up with ideas that do not relate to OHVs. Not everything in this world relates to your transportation desires." Don't hold your breath waiting for me! I do not care about anything on this forum nor in the AGO Initiative other than OHV related ideas. Now, can we all get off our high horses and make a deal to work together? { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/6916F48ADD8B4B76862577980082041D?opendocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Would the author of this idea please respond to my question in post #18: "Gaylord Yost, Off Road Use is already limited and restricted on Public Lands. Exactly what is the proposition here???"

wrote: "BLM only closes lands where there is resource damage. " This is not true. BLM closures will occur per an approved Recreation Area Management Plan. While closures may occur in a place that has no resource damage, OHV access can be granted to Critical Habitat areas for a 'threatened species'. 24) Jack Duggan wrote: "If the OHV crowd were truly interested in havng appropriate places to ride, they'd get behind this kind of planning and quit whining about "losing" trails that were created without restriction." Several of 'us' are members of OHV Organizations who are "behind this kind of planning" already. But you can bet your paycheck that when some inconsiderate, MY WAY OR THE HIGHWAY user starts up an idea on this forum titled "Limit Off Road Vehicle Use on Federal Lands" and makes vague and unsubstantiated claims like "The recreational use of motor vehicles on federal lands is destructive to the land, destructive to wildlife habitat, noisy, polluting and has reached a stage where it needs to be curtailed and reduced." that those same people will be whining about "losing" trails, regardless of when they were created! Especially if the author of such junk isn't going to answer questions to the 'voting public'. Working Together. No one wants to make a deal, fair enough. But let me tell you what folks. If I can preach to the far reaches of those on my side of the table here, you guys can do the same on your side!! Adding substantiation to such an absurd idea just brings us farther apart.

wrote: "As far as I can determine the biggest threat proposed by ORV is the carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption from getting to a place to ride." I hear you on that Justus! Heck, I used to be able to ride in my own County. Not anymore. Now, to get my family and OHV's to our recreation area, we drive past 3 closed OHV areas that would suffice just fine, and burn 30 gallons of gasoline to get there (one way!).

OHV is Fun, yes. And I can tell you as a matter of FACT that for my family, it does foster an appreciation for the LAND (I can't say Wilderness, because I go the Desert). Now, the rest of your OPINION about riders being "inconsiderate of neighbors, wildlife, and any damage they might do", well, that's your opinion. It's nothing short of unfortunate that the OHV users around you are acting like this, but with all due respect please don't cast this vague and unsubstantiated image over an entire community of people, myself inclusive!

This has been a big discussion in 'my area'. Hundreds of visitors have seen Rangers allow a big law to be broken while chasing a little law. "Tripping over a dollar to save a dime". EXAMPLE: Rangers have been known to let a group of vehicles by who are violating the Prima Facie Speed Limit (15mph with 50' of people, camps, etc) to write a littering ticket to a guy for having a soda can on the ground in his camp. I for one say, before any new laws are implemented, we need to properly ENFORCE existing laws!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As an avid OHV user and 'tread lightly' advocate, I strongly agree that OHV groups and riders need to do more to cultivate a responsible environmental ethic among all OHV users. I would think that this is what every OHV user would want. Now, this said, your OP attempts to walk the fence between two parties, but it really comes close to (or maybe does) offend an OHV community causing them to demote the idea on this forum, I only hope that they haven't done so in their heads!!! In general OHV groups do preach the 'Tread Lightly' concepts. One of the largest in your area is the American Sand Association. Check it out. Beyond that, where the rubber hits the dirt, 'my camp' passes along this ethic at every opportunity. In your OP, you wrote: "I've watched as these illegal OHV routes greatly facilitated the colonization and spread of several invasive and noxious weed species, especially cheatgrass and Sahara mustard." Can you provide any science to support this statement? Because I question how you think an OHV in the dry desert is facilitating this process? After riding my quad literally thousands of miles in the California Desert, I can state as a matter of fact that I've never brought it home with invasive and noxious weed species seeds on it. It's not like OHV's in the Calif Desert carry seed born mud and drop it off in other areas. 99% of the year, there is no mud, as it's a desert. If so, I would have invasive and noxious weed species growing in my lawn, where I wash my quad off after every trip. It's nothing less than unfortunate that the Mojave desert tortoise population is declining (and I thank you for not blaming that on OHV as there is science to the contrary), but I will not let you place blame of a fire killing more tortoise on OHV if your link is to an OHV transporting a seed. The whole concept is kind of a stretch to begin with. Other 'elements' transport seed much more efficiently than a machine that is not designed to do so. Wind. Birds Animals Flowing water I am receptive to your idea that OHV groups and riders need to do more to cultivate a responsible environmental ethic among all OHV users. But you lost my vote in your OP. If you would like to revise it to something that is not blaming OHV for "greatly facilitating the colonization and spread of several invasive and noxious weed species", I will change my vote.

"Get out and Walk"?? In the desert, how much water can anyone carry? This will restrict your travel more than anything! If I'm doing my math right, 5 gallons is 38 pounds! You need what, 2 gallons per day when hiking? So, you can walk 1.25 days into any Area. So, if all you can carry is 38 pounds of water, an area 5 days wide is 50% inaccessible by human travel.

"Promote this people!" How? When I don't know anything about it. The OP provide no sources for the stated information and I can't help but question this statement: "It would destroy the worlds largest and most productive salmon fishing grounds in the world and forever polute all the surrounding fresh lakes. " Is this an undisputed fact? It's certainly stated as such.

I like this concept, as I hate those guys that screw things up for the rest of us. However, enforcing this rule would be just about impossible. As it is, a lot of these jerks arn't even getting a ticket when Law Enforcement see's them break a rule/law! Seems they'd rather go for the guy sitting in his camp with a soda can sitting on the ground. Littering tickets are easier to give out!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"on A lot of the hiking trails in my area (and I've heard similar anecdotes from other regions) are practically destroyed every spring by masses of ATVers (including trails where ATV use is supposed to be restricted)." \_\_\_\_\_, This is a law education / enforcement issue. If you are stating that OPEN ATV trails are being used and receive damage from ATV's, then these OPEN ATV trails should have already been studied with a Biological Opinion and a Management decision for the ATV use effects. This input from you should have been provided by you prior to the Management Plan being written and implemented. If you are stating that ATV's are being used on trails that are CLOSED to ATV, then you either have irresponsible ATV users or lack of signage / education for the ATV Community. This would call for more education and enforcement. While your closing sentence states, "Law enforcement needs to get serious about showing that public trails are NOT the place to do so. ", I vehemently disagree with you. Where ATV's are permitted on select Public Trails, this is in fact, "the place to do so". Sitting on the seat of my OHV, I will agree that Education and Enforcement are important and should in fact be increased. But your approach with this idea is attempting to strip me of my legal rights to ride in an OHV accessible area. DEMOTE.

I strongly disagree that OHV use as practiced fosters any appreciation for wilderness. It seems to me that this is largely a thrill-based experience, and riders are inconsiderate of neighbors, wildlife, and any damage they might do. I live in a semi-rural area where riders tear up the hillsides, where they leave behind soil ground to a fine dust, dead plants, and trash. I have seen the destruction; I have yet to see any appreciation for the land they use up.

The states and the people of those states are the ones responsible for their lands, not the Federal government and the other 49 states. National lands are supposed to be limited to the "erections of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and necessary buildings." All other uses of land within the United States are to be subject to the State government and the people of said jurisdictions. These institutions are just another statist effort to control our lives. I do not need someone else to tell me how to live my life or raise my children nor tell us what activities are acceptable or not. As long as I am not in direct conflict with rights of someone else, I should be free to do as my conscience leads me. I find such efforts by others to be anti-freedom, the same way I find seat belt, helmet, etc laws to be repugnant. You are probably one of those who think the 16 year old girl shouldn't have been allowed to attempt to sail around the world. Who are you to tell whether someone is qualified to operate an ohv. Nothing about one's age gives any indication of ability. As Benjamin Franklin stated: "Those who would give up essential liberty, to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." Also Isocrates: "Virtue is not advanced by written laws but by the habits of everyday life; for the majority of men tend to assimilate the manners & morals amid which they have been reared. Furthermore, they held that where there is a multitude of specific laws, it is a sign that the state is badly governed; for it is in the attempt to build up dikes against the spread of crime that men in such a state feel constrained to multiply the laws. Those who are rightly governed, on the other hand, do not need to fill their porticos with written statutes, but only to cherish justice in their souls; for it is not legislation, but by morals, that states are well directed, since men who are badly reared will venture to transgress even laws which are drawn up with minute exactness, whereas those who are well brought up will be willing to respect even a simple code."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Federally protected wild lands is unconstitutional. The Constitution at this time only allows the federal government to "own" lands for the "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and needful buildings." Nowhere does it say the federal government is supposed to confiscate lands from the states or the people to "protect" it from them. It is the stewardship of the states and the people of those jurisdictions to accomplish this. If anyone wants the federal government to do this, the Constitution needs to be amended to accommodate this. Stop trampling the Constitution under your progressive/socialist feet to force your ideals upon everyone else. We are supposed to be a country of laws. The Constitution is the Supreme Law of the land and no law passed by any body, executive, legislative or judicial, state or federal, can bypass this. The only way to do this is to run through the amendment process.

The Constitution does not grant the power to the Federal government to purchase lands for preservation or conservation purposes. This is a right left to the state governments. The Federal government only has the right to "own" property for the "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings." (Article 1 Section 8). The Constitution is continuously trampled under progressive/socialist/statist feet. Some of you need to get your facts straight as well. There is more forest land now than there was 100 years ago. Responsible people and organizations, including for profit corporations, know they have to replenish the resource. According to the US Forestry service, since 1900, there has been an average of 745 million acres of forest land in the United States, with the lowest point being in 1920 at 735 million acres. In the year 2000, it was up to 749 million acres. I think there are too many people out there who have been too willing to accept the indoctrination out there, like the Story of Stuff.

The National Park system is another example of an unconstitutional usurpation of power the Federal government has taken from the States and the People. The Constitution specifies that the Federal government may only "own" lands for specific purposes as listed in Article 1 Section 8: "erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock yards, and other needful buildings." Where is it that National Parks are found here in the enumerated list of acceptable situations for the Federal government to own property. Also, by the Constitution, the federal government is only allowed to "own" these properties as specified by the consent of the state legislatures, not by presidential executive order. It is just another opportunity the progressive/liberal politicians and other statist/socialist/communist followers have foisted upon the people to fulfill the steps to move this country from a representative republic to a totalitarian socialist state. In fact, the confiscation of all lands, thus the abolition of private property, is the first "plank" of the communist manifesto as directed by Karl Marx and supported by Vladimir Lenin.

It is my belief that if all users were properly educated then we wouldn't have the hot dogger issues. It seems to me that those that don't seem to give a rat's behind are the ones that are uneducated about trail erosion and such. I have seen people that just want to wheel & tear it up come round full circle once they have been educated. Plus many clubs & coalitions are more than willing to volunteer to maintain what they are allowed to use & even places that their rigs can't go.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public land should be accessible to the public. It's our property, not politicians in Washington. I believe some careful restrictions should be in place to protect wildlife and endangered areas. But the government should stay out of overly-restricting access for horseback riders, hikers, and OHV riders. Give us back the millions of acres the government has been systematically grabbing over the last two decades...

Seriously, do you think off-road vehicles driving around in the forests have more of an impact on the environment than the millions of cars, buses, trucks, trains, airports, refineries, manufacturing companies, etc. throughout the country!!?? Animals are being pushed into urban areas because URBAN AREAS ARE MOVING INTO THEIR LAND!! It has nothing to do with me driving my motorcycle or truck in the wild. Off-road vehicles are noisy? Maybe but try sitting on the curb next to the freeway next time you have a few minutes and compare that to a few trucks or motorcycles driving past you in the forest...seriously...which one is louder or noisier?

I have been an avid off-road enthusiast for most of my life. I ride motorcycles and four wheel drive trucks all over our national forest system and follow the "tread lightly" way. I leave the area as I found it if not better, and always pack out my own trash and the trash I see around my campsite. We stay on marked trails and help by clearing trees and debris from the trails all the time. For the most part, my experience is that people take good care of the land. Where I go off-roading only serious people manage to get out there and they usually share the same passion and respect for the land as I do. I see more garbage in the mall parking lots than I do off-road, maybe somebody should ban them instead??

Generalizations are so believable. I think that all issues should be so clear as this one. As far as I can determine the biggest threat proposed by ORV is the carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption from getting to a place to ride.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Come on folks, don't be ridiculous and don't think just wheelchair or electric scooter when it comes to disability! How about a guy who is over 60 who has worked since age 14 who cannot take a canoe onto the canoe route in Kenai National Wildlife Refuge? I did for years but now it has been changed to Wilderness designation. I can't carry the canoe, but I can push it on a little device with two bicycle wheels. This is NOT ALLOWED in wilderness areas though. I would love to take my grandchildren canoeing, looking at swans, fishing for trout and char and camping in this area I had used for more than 30 years. The facts are my bicycle tire tracks cutting a line in the muddy trails full of boot prints would upset the wilderness purists and break the law. This is the kind of access that can be addressed. We don't have to use Mt Denali is to tough for a wheelchair as a reason to support keeping those unable to carry loads or walk long distances out of wilderness areas. There are lots of wilderness areas that can accommodate all citizens. Or, maybe we should have wilderness areas set aside for the handicapped. Areas where there may be a 4 wheeler trail for those unable to walk, a guide/chauffer who can take someone who may be paraplegic or unable to handle an OHV. How about a trail for those who can walk with the aid of a cane or crutches but no access for OHV? If we set down and discuss this issue I'm sure we can come up with access for or areas for the handicapped. What do those of you who so flippantly dismiss the desire for wilderness travel by the handicapped think of special wilderness for the handicapped only?

We believe that the primary challenge for conservation in the 21st Century -- and therefore the focus of America's Great Outdoors -- is how to sustain working landscapes, working communities, and working people. And while no single approach is appropriate in all situations to achieve this mix of objectives, we believe that one of the most important building blocks in any region is strong, inclusive, and locally-driven partnerships -- such as the Blackfoot Challenge, Rocky Mountain Front Advisory Committee, Coalition to Protect the Rocky Mountain Front, Swan Lands Coordinating Committee, and the Southwest Crown of the Continent Project.

Create the right set of incentives and opportunities for federal agencies to be effective partners in community-based and large landscape conservation. While there are many good examples where federal agencies are excellent partners, the nature of the administrative system often makes this a challenge. This is not a suggestion for agencies to abdicate their statutory authority, but a realization that agencies bring valuable resources -- information, expertise, funding, and authority -- to the table. What we need -- in the Crown and throughout the country -- is a way for the agencies to both empower others to share the responsibility for solving problems related to public lands and resources, and to be empowered to engage in more flexible, adaptive means to achieve their mission and mandate.

More broadly, we strongly encourage expanded use of LWCF funds for conservation easements over private, working lands that are integral to important public lands. While we have had great success in the Crown using LWCF funds for this purpose, landowners from other landscapes tell us it is very difficult to access LWCF funds for conservation easements.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I guess I don't understand. Most people chose to live in an area that is surrounded by federal land. There must be efits. Could it be a tranquil setting? No crowds of people? With a gowing population and more pressure for development, some land use rules have to change. If not, eventually won't increased use and development change land use anyway? More land should be preserved. Both as wilderness and as multi use land. Soon the country will be one big suburb.

I had to give this a Demote because of Line 4, sandwiched between numerous other ideas supporting responsible horsemanship on public lands. Line 4 states that: "Use of Federal funds to purchase land that will allow any form of recreation (including hunting) should mandate the inclusion of ALL forms of recreation. The exclusion or prohibition of equestrian, mountain bike, and/or OHV use should occur only through a methodical, transparent and reproducible evaluation process that includes input from all stakeholders." I see a huge difference between a trail ride and OHV use. I can support conscientious use of wild areas by horses, but not by noisy and polluting vehicles which tear up the landscape and habitats.

I have been trying to safe a parcel of land on a manmade lake we live on. It was just 1 Million Dollars but nobody helped. Now a builder bought the land and made it into a horrific subdivision. With lake access for every lot which means lots of bulkheads and no room for "water animals" to survive.

I have just read through many of these comments, and hear the message from those who use motorized means on our nation's trails that it is their "right" as Americans to do so. I suggest that these folks are putting their personal interests first, and are not truly concerned about what remains of our wild lands nor about others who prefer not to encounter ATVs, dirtbikes or snowmobiles when out for a hike. If I head out to hike a trail, it is for a sense of peace and quiet that does not exist in our cities and towns, to escape pollution, and to appreciate first-hand the wonders of nature. Motorized traffic in such a place makes all of the above impossible. Those who would push for an increase in motorized accessibility to trails are being selfish by feeling that they have the right to despoil these areas, to affect the average hiker, and to affect the animals and birds that call these places home. Humans have caused great damage to our enviment in many ways, and it is time that we started putting our planet first.

I have mobility issues, but I still don't want any more OHV/ORV access in our park lands and wild lands than is already there and would actually prefer that most of the existing access be revoked. The erosion, noise, pollution and disruption of wildlife are not worth it!

I have noticed that most UTVs have roll cages, and their ads show drivers skidding around corners on trails. Seems to me they're built and marketed to be driven so recklessly that they can sustain a rollover accident. If I were an ATVer, dirt biker, etc., I sure wouldn't want to be out on trails where UTVs are being driven so intensely that they're rolling over. Keep these monsters on the racing tracks where they are apparently designed to be driven.

I have to agree with this. What's the old saying - One bad apple spoils the whole bunch. That goes for any group including non-OHV groups. I don't know why the OHV group was singled out, shouldn't everyone be included?.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I haven't heard anyone say that OHV's should be allowed on every acre of land. All we are asking for is to keep the trail system that is already in place, and not to close more trails. In some areas where there is overcrowding there does need to be a few more trails to lessen the overcrowding. It seems to me that the selfish ones are the environmentalists. They want the land to be used only by hiking, and sometimes for equestrian use. I look at a mountain range every day that is over 120 miles long. There are 3 OHV trails, and many many more hiking trails. That is fine with me, but there is a big push to close one of the trails that was originally made to access a cabin, and lake at the top. This cabin was built by my great grandmother, and the cabin has been there for over 100 years. Hikers have taken over this road, and declared it as theirs. You tell me who is the selfish ones?

I live in the middle of the Mojave Desert and trust me, (or don't- come visit the desert on foot) most of it can not be visited by hiking, there are millions of acres of BLM, B of R lands, much of them have limitations, no OHV even though there are hundreds of miles of dirt roads for power lines, gas pipe lines old mines etc... Allow OHV use and off road racing on the areas previously disturbed. The fees to put on a race are outrageous! BLM really socks it to ya!

I see a lot of people demoting and a few promoting, but not many taking the time to discuss the balance between spending on recreation versus hospitals, police, etc. My question is designed to elicit some actual input from everyone on where the line is. For instance, because of many of the restrictions that are placed on open lands in my county, our budget is negative. We no longer have a hospital. Response time from sheriffs is in hours not minutes. All firefighters are volunteers, and most are over 40 years old. I am well off enough to move or drive to the next state where the nearest hospital is. However I do see the impact this has on people with lower incomes. Some people claim recreation brings jobs, all I can say is, not here. We have some organizations willing to build more trail in my county, but this does nothing to alleviate the real suffering that exists. I don't see anyone wanting to step up and help us with medical or law enforcement costs. Although I too like to recreate, and see value in providing recreation opportunities, I can't agree that recreation is "basic." To me, and most people, "basic" means provide for emergency health, sanitation, and law enforcement.

I strongly disagree with the "fair market value" comment. Spending time in nature is critical for mental/emotional/spiritual health - it is not a "commodity". Private businesses can offer more services if they want to attract people at higher \$\$ rates. KEEP THE GREED MOTIVE OUT OF OUR PUBLIC LANDS. I find it despicable that some parks charge higher fees for "view" or "waterfall" sites. Talk about catering to the wealthy!! This is disgusting and should end immediately on all public lands.

I think I agree with you, . I personally believe that we have - as a industrialized society - lost our connection to the natural environment. By studying past cultures and the ways they lived as part of the landscape (rather than OFF of the landscape) we can solve many problems, ranging from environmental degradation to population growth. There are mutually beneficial ways that human beings can live on this planet and (tell me if I am wrong, ) it would be more sensible for our policy-makers and our government to be researching such methods.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think the intention behind the idea is good, but using only a website to track public sentiment is not practical. The digital divide may be shrinking, but it still exists and there are those who may not know or have the time to visit such sites. I am demoting the idea because of that, but urge the AGO team to to expand outreach/collect information in such a manner.

I wonder how many people realize that state agencies use private sector trappers to control animals in public parks. Do you know what would happen if we let the beaver population go unchecked? How about coyotes and wolves? Mabey you like hiking with rouge bears? It is too bad trapping is so close to becoming a lost skill. More people need to take interest.

Just because you don't like big gov telling you how to live your life doesn't mean you are racist. The polite term is tea partier. the other term has sexual connotations and is just plain crude. Some folks assume others are lazy just because their disabilities are not visible. Someday they will be sick and in pain, and look back with regret at their rude insensitive comments (fat and lazy indeed). Some serious illnesses require treatment with steroids, causing severe weight gain. Anytime I see an overweight person, I do not judge, because they may be in that trap. Let's all treat each other as humans. I demote because your idea encourages too much of the intolerant "healthist" attitudes seen here.

I would love to see you come on a ride with our group and tell us how "lazy" we are. You have no idea what you are talking about. you want to make me change my name to something alittle more respectable.

If some of my friends in our Civil War reenactors regiment saw my vote they might "reenact" a firing squad! But let me take a states rights position. I don't levies and excise taxes on top of what is there now, but could current tasex be adjusted , channeled, to accomplish the same purpose?

If you are going to cut the funding for the US Forest Service, than you MUST increase the budget for the National Parks and include former Forest Service locations into the National Park program.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If you like this idea then you believe that the government should have the right to confiscate all land in the United States for any reason. You enter a discussion like this with great intentions because whatever happens will have no effect on your life. So you can be magnanimous. You can show off to each other what great hearts and forward thinking intellect you consider yourselves to have. You place the value of dirt above the value of human beings. You justify your position saying you're trying to save the planet or the environment or whatever cause celeb floats your boat. What you don't seem to understand is that you have no credibility. Your cities that you live in are cess pools, only less habitable, environmentally speaking. Especially if you compare it to this area. So when you come to me and say save the planet starting with your back yard. I say YOU FIRST, why don't you save your own area first then maybe I would be more receptive to your Pollyanna perspective. What do you think will happen if the Federal government goes for this large of a land grab. What happens to all of the families and business. Who replaces the accumulated wealth lost to this bad idea. Put the map of the proposed area over a comparable map of the area in which you live. Remove all commerce and see if you can still live in your neighborhood. You either hate people or feel that your own lives have greater value than my life does. Your wife and you wouldn't treat your dog this poorly.

I'm concerned about the type of help private landowners would get, but since they already own the land anyway, discussing ways to keep the land wild is a good idea. So I reluctantly promote this idea.

I'm not sure what this topic is advocating. I believe we need to preserve more wilderness and multi-use land. I'm not an environmental extremist. I just can't stand the thought of our last wild areas being sold off for the quick buck. A growing population and pressure for development mean we either lose what we have or we choose to preserve it.

In the brief seconds it takes a hotrodding 4-wheeler to scream over a piece of virgin land, several hundred years of nature and beauty are destroyed. This is exclusive of the fossil fuels burned, the hundreds of thousands of pounds of waste product pumped in the air as exhaust, and the unbearable noise pollution. This kind of destruction should be limited to private land ONLY.

In this area the max size for an ATV trail limits them to ATVs only yet UTVs do less damage to the land and are slightly wider. Even the forest rangers use UTVs but UTVs get ticked if they use the trails. The rules were written before UTVs to keep 4WD jeeps off the trails but the trails are wide enough for UTVs. We have been unable to get anyone to change these outdated rules. Please change the rules to allow UTVs (side by side) on the existing ATV trails.

Inside of our national parks? Privately owned property development has decreased the wildlife habitat but I am unsure where it is being lost in national parks.

Instead of putting people's jobs on the line to fund the parks why don't we have a day use fee to fund the park? OHV parks in the mid west and east coast are mostly privately funded so it can be done. We pay upwards of \$50 per day to enjoy the parks we go to. That only gets you in the gate. The park can also make money on concessions and even merchandise. Not every want needs to be a burden on the already overtaxed taxpayer.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It all sounds to be just the right thing but I for one do not trust the BLM after their horrendous management of America's Wild Horse and the BLM's management of our public lands. I do not trust this agency. There are too many cattle grazing leases being given out. Who is the watchdog for the BLM? As we learned not to trust the MMS, I think the BLM needs to be investigated and probably reorganized.

It annoys me when everyone thinks that the land is for them to with as they see fit. Everyone is talking about I want it to be this way or this way so that I can do what I enjoy as if it belongs to just people. What about the inhabitants who actually have to live there? Shouldn't their needs come into play too? For them it is not about I should be able to have fun any way I want but what do I need to survive. Let's try expanding our wants and needs beyond people. We share this planet with a lot more than just other people.

IT is always great to read the responses of Anit-Acess crowd. Since they never have logic on their side it always resorts to the same tired old tactics of name calling and trying degrade the person speaking. states his feelings in a logical manner and then Mr wants to degrade him with name calling comments that show just how smart Mr really is. At least Mr Harris is making a point in a manner which adults speak. Grow up Mr, the public has grown wise to tactics of people like you and see through them for what they are... shallow attempts to quite the public.

It is important to stay on the trails and recreate on property that has been designated for OHV use. The problem is unless we can find a place for people to ride they are going to trespass. It is up to us to educate the public on where they can go.

It looks like some group of people that are particularly interested in those vehicles tried to use the forum as a way to push their agenda. Ick. Personally, I think those ideas are much more about their enjoyment of their own vehicles than conservation.

It seems that there is a huge divide between those who like OHV use and those who don't. We need to find a way to work together so we can all enjoy our wild spaces. Education, training, and respect are the keys. ; ;Towards that end, let's create a new class of driver's license for Off-Road Driving. ; ;It could include training in safety, technique and skills, rules of the (off)road, courtesy and respect, and conservation. ;This was a good idea, to bad it was withdrawn.

It's not just about trails, OHVs use gas, and add to the pollution problem and add to global climate change. If they create an electric OHV -- and there are a few small bikes that are electric already then more power to you. Until then I cannot support gas guzzling off road vehicles using public lands while they destroy the enviment

It's one thing to pay for using a developed boatramp or a campground with water, picnic tables, toilets, and trash collection. It's entirely different to pay to park your car at an undeveloped trailhead or scenic pullout. The latter should not be permitted.

It's proven that 4x4 use actually destroys public land. As a patriotic American, we need to discourage this selfish, wasteful behavoir and keep public lands so that our children's children's children can enjoy them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I've hiked large areas of the forest, and wherever OHV's had passed, the trail was more eroded, and difficult. What is fun for OHV's is that thrilling ride through mud, but for hikers this makes the trail dangerous. I'm sure it is also nice to get out further than you could walk, but I would prefer OHV's use private lands, rather than National Parks. There is something incredibly beautiful about time spent quietly in the wilderness. OHV's change that experience for us, making it full of man made noise and pollution, and taking the clean, quiet majesty away.

I've watched OHV's and dirt bikes churning through the trails of the Sonoran Desert, turning them into deep useless ruts at the fastest speed possible; while their drivers may be enjoying the thrill, they definitely are not experiencing or caring about the features of their natural environment. Their place is on private lands, not on public lands or in the forest, wilderness and National Parks we have set aside to conserve for generations to come. By definition, put a road through it or a vehicle in it, its no longer a wilderness.

You don't need to be against wilderness, though, to save money. You need to be against WAR!

and , thanks for the comments. yes, it was a confusing comment, lumping the 2 together. The only thing ORVs and feral animals (domestics gone wild) is that they both have a propensity for water sources, washes and sensitive habitats and can be destructive. As of now, certain locales have experienced damage from wild horses and burros, pigs, and to some extent wild turkeys and hatchery-raised trout (a few examples). Humans have placed these animals in places that are not suitable for them and they can suffer or compete with native wildlife. The idea of preserves for the wild horses and burros where they can live a healthy life is a good solution. As for ORVs, they need their own space too. I would love to donate for wildlife preserves. ORV sites should be paid for by the users, since the vehicles are destructive, sometimes driven unsafely and create a nuisance to other public land users. Touring at low speeds is the only public land use that should occur.

-If you had the choice to keep riding for the rest of your life but at the cost of making a single species extinct, would you?

-Nobody is trying to force their views on you. They are just stating plain and simple fact. We are losing more and more open space every day, to the tune of 5000 acres a day, and more and more species are becoming threatened or endangered every day. That is just plain and simple FACT not someones opinion. You can bury your head in the sand and pretend nature is doing fine or maybe you do not care one way or the other if nature survives past your lifetime (that would be my guess) but if we do not start preserving what little nature is left all you and your family will be riding your precious ohvs by and through is clear cuts, oil rigs and strip mines. Is that what you want ?

Congress cannot be trusted to fund the parks on a long range planning basis. States should help and volunteer orgs can add funding for special projects. Who gets cut first? Parks and recreation! Western states think they can regain the park land by being obstructionate.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

this will not be cost effective since the type of worker will not have any of the skills of the farm worker of the 30's They will require more supervision and discipline. City youth will be hard to recruit. Select with care.

, I was in death Valley for a week this year in prime fr time and the contrails were everywhere, and a stealth bomber was practicing aerial refueling. I don't see any limits on what the air force does in the skies above Death Valley. They were right above the campground at Furnace Creek all day every day. That's not to say watching a stealth bomber is not interesting. It's just not what I expected to see in a national park and it's definitely not a wilderness experience. As for the contrails, they do seem to be about weather modification. But not the government. Water companies and hydroelectric companies are spending big bucks on cloud seeding, without anyone's permission. Hughes aircraft has a patent on stratospheric seeding from 1991.

, There are 109 million acres of wilderness areas. Over half of that is in Alaska. There are 1.9 billion acres in the r 48. I stand corrected. A lot of states don't have any wilderness areas. The reason California has a relatively large amount of wilderness area is because Death Valley and the Mojave Desert are lacking water for development and the high Sierra is solid barren granite. Next, congress will designate the moon as a wilderness area to show how much they care about the wilderness concept. The last round of designations included the worlds most inhospitable landscapes. Military and other jets are so dominant in the sky over places like Death Valley, there are checkerboards of contrails almost all the time, so, though the land is untrammled by man, the wilderness looks and sounds man made. A lot of southern California wilderness has seriously impaired air quality. I don't understand how roads get included in wilderness areas, but that seems to be the wave of the future. Finite land, booming population. Politics as usual. And nothing really accomplished.

, there's a simple solution to the problem of having too much wilderness around and not having your access restricted by wilderness areas. There are plenty of areas of the country that don't have any wilderness assets. In fact, over 99 percent of this country doesn't meet wilderness criteria. I don't blame you for wanting to stay where you are, avoiding the ugly, soulless development that is rampant all over the place. When you do travel, I bet you can't wait to get home. The beauty must be astonishing. It's not there everywhere anymore. I bet you see smog moving into your area and wonder what the heck is going on out there in the world. Times are changing. If you appreciate the things you moved to your area for, you will have to fight to protect them, not just the access, but the whole quality of life.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

-Okay, now I understand. It is okay for you to criticize me and question my motives on my ideas but I cannot question your motives or criticize your ideas. Ahh, the typical double standard. Not a surprise. Here I will use the same words as you did on one of my ideas "this idea is a wolf in sheep's clothing"! Like that better? Yes here in CT where I live I have seen 2 trails I enjoyed ruined after being opened up to ohv use and a couple more not opened up to ohv use but used by atvs and motorcycles just the same and although not ruined beyond repair certainly damaged by that use. On the ruined trails wildlife all but disappeared, giant ruts and huge puddles that formed after rains and lasted days if not weeks depending on the season making many areas impassable on foot without straying far off the trail. I saw meadows ruined, streams torn up, saplings and berry bushes run down, trash strewn everywhere, broken glass. In fact one area of a trail I used to frequent before it was turned into a multi use trail had so much broken glass I had to pick up my dog and carry him because there was literally no where for him to walk without stepping on the glass. Over the months I saw less and less hikers and eventually I stopped going to all of those trails so rejoice, your community drove away the hikers and the wildlife so now it is all yours. Congratulations. In fact with so much area now opened to ohv use and so much other areas developed on I have less than a half dozen trails to enjoy but who cares about hikers and wildlife as long as the ohv community gets all the access they want right? It is like some surreal, alternate world you ohv enthusiasts live in where your motorbikes, atvs and 4wd do not harm the environment or wildlife but actually help it. Is it possible that ohvs in your world are lighter than here so they cause less damage? Are they less noisy in your universe? Are the drivers more callous and less responsible in CT than anywhere else in the world? Or is it that your community is oblivious to the damage you cause and uncaring when you do find out? I never really gave the ohv community much thought to be truthful and I always thought it was like hikers and backpackers where most were generally good but there are always the few bad apples. That was until I saw with my own eyes the destruction they cause and the disrespect they show others. This forum has also been quite an eye opener in exposing just what you people are all about. I now know without any effort of the doubt that it is indeed the very small minority that is in fact responsible and respectful of nature and others while the overwhelming majority care nothing about preserving nature and wildlife and care only about their own self centered pleasures. I still believe that ohv enthusiasts deserve areas to enjoy but I am quickly becoming more and more convinced that it should be banned altogether considering some of the comments and ideas I have read. -Actually I have had motorbike riders drive me off a trail or to be more exact my dog. He was so frightened in fact that he was shaking and it took me quite awhile to calm him down and that was after I had moved out of the jerks way. Of course I should just wave and try to make small talk though because it was me and my dog that were in the way for being on the trail in the first place right? How inconsiderate of me to be hiking in the woods with my dog on a multi use trail and causing some speeding jerk to actually change his course by an inch or so. Trust me if god had shined on me that day and I had been able to catch up with that butthole I would have been doing something other than waving to him. He showed me and my dog ZERO respect and I would have shown him the same. As far as you being courteous to those people why would you not be nice? What had they done to you? They were just trying to enjoy the outdoors like you so unless you are like that jerk that nearly ran me and my dog down and think that hikers have no place in the forest they gave you no reason not to be nice.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

-Were you opposed to the hiring of Arnold Schwarzenegger by the president to promote exercise back in the 80's? Was that "big brother is watching" as well? Where were your objections to GW allowing wire taps and screening of our emails? Was that not "big brother is watching"? The reason I took offense to remarks is because President Obama, or "O" as liked to call him, has not tried to pass any legislation on what people watch on tv like she tried to say. Republicans, and especially teabaggers, love to make Obama the 2nd coming of Hitler and I think it is ridiculous. The guy is not even a far left liberal to tell you the truth. Obviously she hates our President for reasons she has made up in her own mind and the fear seems racially motivated. Everyone has the right to access to public lands and they should continue to have it as long as it does not destroy habitat or cause harm to wildlife but lies should be pointed out.

R said it for me. The intention is good, yet the results I'm afraid won't be. For example; the Peirson's Milk-Vetch plant has been listed as a Threatened Species, this was done back in 1998. To this day, there is NO recovery plan in place. This plant was used as a "tool" to close an OHV area in CA. If the Fish & Wildlife Service didn't have radicals within, we would have a workable plan to use by now...

RI have read in a few articles that climate change and over hunting has caused as much damage if not more to elk in Yellowstone as wolves. Predators bring a natural balance, climate change and increased hunting throws that balance off.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

-I failed to mention it because it does not exist. While it does mention wolves killing each other nowhere in the article does it state that the MAIN reason is wolves killing each other. Read again and tell me WHERE in that article you read that the main reason is wolves killing themselves? Here is the quote from the article that proves it is YOU that only reads what he wants to read.. "While parvovirus and mange continue to reduce the population, part of this year's decline can be traced to the fact that wolves lost protection in the Northern Rockies under the Endangered Species Act in 2008. Wolves, like all wildlife, are protected inside the park, but when they roam beyond the borders, they fall into the state's wildlife management practices. Idaho and Montana, which border Yellowstone, permitted hunting of wolves this fall. Idaho recently extended its hunt until March. The Yellowstone pack hardest hit by the hunt is nicknamed Cottonwood. Hunters killed four members of the pack, including the breeding female, her mate and her daughter in a Montana wilderness area bordering the park."The article also clearly states the plans to increase hunting to wipe out 1,200 wolves..."The group faults the states' management plans to reduce wolves from 1,650 to 450. State officials state the need to balance the wolves with the habitat and other wildlife." How come you do not mention that? Let me guess, because it proves you wg?Also the article plainly states that hunting and extreme weather (brought on by climate change no doubt) is a large contributor to the decline in elk. Here is the quote to prove you wg ONCE AGAIN..."The winter elk numbers in the park have dropped from 17,000 to 6,800 since the wolves were reintroduced. Hunting and weather factors have also taken a toll, Smith says."No mention of the Buffalo slaughter from you Josh? Gee, I wonder why? Thank you for proving my point Josh on just how much we DO need environmental non profit voices in the government because extremists like yourself either cannot understand or choose not to understand what is going on out there and would rather just use nature for your own self centered enjoyment regardless of the damage it does.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

-I was not talking about you, I was talking about the author of this who obviously did something which is why every idea promoting conservation has been heavily demoted while every idea promoting ohv use or development has been heavily promoted. Since you stated how you feel about protection of wilderness areas how do you feel about the supreme court ruling that says government can seize private property if it can prove it is for economic development? This causes people to "pick up the pieces and in many cases move" as well. I highly doubt that is what our founding fathers wanted either would you not agree? As far as Americas private land rights being the cornerstone to what made the country great tell that to the Indians who we killed and stole the land from. -Sorry to hear about your wife. Most people who oppose ohv use, myself included, are not saying we should ban use altogether but restrict it to areas where there impact will not cause harm to threatened wildlife and plant species. You have a right to enjoy your hobby as much as anyone but you do not have the right to go everywhere and you shouldn't. If you are looking for someone to blame do not blame me for being closed minded. Blame it on the rampant over development that is pushing animal species into smaller and smaller areas and causing many to become threatened or endangered. Do you not want to have your children and grandchildren to have the opportunity to see a bear, wolf, buffalo or eagle in the wild someday? Hopefully with land restrictions not just to ohv users but hikers and backpackers as well they will. I am more than happy to give up some of my access for the greater good, aren't you? I agree our founders are turning in their grave but it is more because of how ignorant, self centered and destructive our society has become than any other reason.

-In 2008 1,600 buffalo were slaughtered outside of Yellowstone NP and plans exist to reduce the wolf population by 1,200. In fact the hunting of wolves is so rampant that Yellowstone has seen their wolf population reduced from 174 to 114, the smallest in over 10 years, because of killings outside the park of females and pups. Of course we all know of Sarah Palins disgusting aerial hunts and who knows how many of those poor animals were brutally gunned down. If you want to read about it you can go to the USA Today web site and find it.

-It takes a lot more than some mo linking this site onto his facebook page or ohv site and getting all his "friends" to come here and promote ideas to destroy forest and wilderness areas to get the president to all of sudden open designated areas to ohv use, oil drilling, mining and logging. Tell me though since you are so hot and bothered to see wilderness designations go away where will you ride your precious ohv when all the forests are destroyed or developed on?

- all I know is Pope built a second home in my county that is worth far more than the home of any logger or farmer that I know. The interior has old growth douglas fir beams, and is completely paneled in wood. He built it during the winter, so mud went in the creek. Then he and his then wife demanded that the county plow the road to their house every snow storm, which caused further degradation of the watershed and damaged the road. He makes way more money than anyone I know in my county...he has privileged access to lawmakers and high level bureaucrats. I think that defines wealthy conservation....

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Keep in mind that the biggest spenders on influence buying with government officials are the managers of Big Oil. These men are among the 1/100th percent of Americans who take more than five percent of the national income. That is to say, among the 300,000,000 Americans there are about 30,000 people whose income averages \$25,000,000 per year. One of the Big Oil managers recently retired and took \$400,000,000 from the company. To put that in perspective, the entrepreneur Ted Turner says it is hard to spend more than \$75,000,000 on yourself -- how many 747's do you need? Now, these men are not inventors or founders. They are the survivors of office politics, with the sharp elbows and whatever else it takes to get to the top of the pile and the ethical competence to sell doubt about smoking and cancer or global warming. Our dysfunctional corporate governance allows them to skim the profits from our economy. With the SCOTUS decision that corporate managers can use their positions to sponsor politicians, the managers are increasing their spending on advertising and politics to fight for their increasing share of our wealth. Concern for the other 299,970,000 Americans is not high on their agenda. Think Cheney, Bush, Yoo, Scalia, Thomas, s. Big Oil rules!

you tipped your hand when you referred to "so-called environmentalist, politicians and others" When people use the term "so-called" they are conceding that they don't have any good arguments except to smear those who don't agree with them. You also say that you have worked in noxious weed control for years. Of course, you know that one of the best ways to spread noxious weeds is to construct roads.

Kudos to you! There are extremists in every group, but the key thing that all users have in common is preserving open space. How the land is managed should be done on a local level, not 3,000 miles away. Public Lands are just that, PUBLIC!

Let's define some terms. You cannot "make" an entity donate anything. The proper term for that is robbery, unless of course you are a government, in which case it is called taxation. At least have the courtesy to call it what it is. In January, the largest tax increase in the history of our nation is set to take place. This along with the impending mess created by an unconstitutional health care scheme will likely cause severe economic hardship for everyone. Adding to the potential disaster is beyond unwise.

Lets see communities where you can actually walk somewhere, not having to get in an automobile every time you leave your house ?Set aside a billion dollars or whatever, from highways to be put aside for bike paths, and or sidewalks? Could you imagine a place where you could actually walk to the store, or walk down a tree lined street, without the fear of getting hit? Everytime you walk out your ft door you have to get in an automobile.

I seriously doubt that the same 4x4ers cleaning up a road are destroying the same. We maintain the roads and trails so that people stay on the road. Are there some bad apples? Sure, but I am sure there are bad apples in your circles as well. I have packed out many freeze-dried bags that I am sure came from hikers. I have heard hikers yelling and screaming on the trail which I am sure scare off any animals. My dirt bike is quiet, when hikers approach, I turn my bike off until they pass. I respect the environment, stay on the trail and report those who tear it up by going off-road. However, I wish you would respect me as well and let us keep what roads and trails we have.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Living near the Blue Ridge Parkway in North Carolina, I have experienced what happens when one kind of vehicle (motorcycles) becomes a major nuisance to any other vehicles like cars, family vans, and bicycles on the Parkway. The unregulated noise pollution, exceeding the posted speed limits, and riding bumpers of vehicles obeying speed limits are only a few of the behaviors of motorcyclists which have caused many other vehicle drivers to forego attempting to enjoy the beauty of the parkway. This is a cautionary example of what can happen if off road vehicles would be encouraged on national and state parklands. If motorcyclists' joy of speed and deafening motor noise has had such awful consequences on the Blue Ridge Parkway, I shudder to think what will result if off road vehicles whose owners enjoy speed and loud noises as they tear up the land, terrify animals, and drive off any other type of park use people. The parks will become the private playgrounds of the off road vehicle owners, just as the Blue Ridge Parkway has become the play road of motorcyclists.

Many ranchers, farmers and forest owners have trouble making a profit, yet each OHV user consumes public land resources in amounts incredibly greater than any equestrian or mountain-biker, let alone any hiker. Barring motorized vehicles from off-road use in public lands would encourage OHV users to pay private land owners for access, creating additional income for economically-challenged land owners, and allowing market forces to determine the real costs of managing land for OHVs. The basic models would resemble private game ranches, where users pay for temporary access, or hunt clubs, where OHV clubs would buy distressed property for the use of members only.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness Areas are Roadless! Ok - they are not! But then they would be able to justify a Wilderness designation if they have roads! First this for clarification: Wilderness areas in the United States - Content Source: Congressional Research Service Prohibited and Permitted Uses In general, the Wilderness Act prohibits commercial activities, motorized access, and roads, structures, and facilities in wilderness areas. Ok! Got it? NO Motorized access! NO ROADS! NO Structures! NO Facilities! Now you know and I know and everyone else should know and I can prove, there are roads, there are structures and there is motorized access in some parts of designated Wilderness Areas! And that is my problem with the areas that should not have the travel restriction or the designation that they do. So what you may be up against for the Coconino National Forest, as I think you already know, the environmental group(s) is going to wave their magic wand and POOF! Whatever roads, structures, and motorized access they don't want there is gone. OH they are still there but they can't be there and the legislature that will pass this wilderness bill will be told they are not there because they can't be there! The other option I see all the time is Cherry Stemming. A road that runs right through a Wilderness Area where (I think) 15 feet on either side of the road is Wilderness. This is the best solution as they usually force the wilderness designation through but you retain a little bit of access. I find it so hard to believe it is a viable solution, if the area is a true Wilderness Area should there be a forty-five foot wide, miles long road right down the middle of it! Maybe it is not a true Wilderness Area after all. I have seen old motorized access (a road being used) through a wilderness that gets property owners to their cabin that is in the wilderness. Yea, yea I know no structures in a Wilderness! But you and I cannot travel on that same road the property owner does as its Wilderness. I am really for TRUE wilderness Areas. But you can see I have problems when that magic wand comes out and part of an area that shouldn't be all of a sudden is! On rare occasions we still get back to the many old miners' cabins I love hidden away out in Death Valley and surrounding areas. We sit around the pot belly stoves, explore the mines, headframes, structures and all the equipment left behind that is part of the history of this magnificent place. But then again it must not really be there as its wilderness now I wonder where I really go then! Best to you and fight for what TRULY DOES NOT BELONG IN A WILDERNESS. But allow it if it does belong. Either that or go a kiss your access good bye!

Maybe I have so much wilderness around me I am oblivious to this. Most everywhere I want to travel I am restricted by Wilderness Areas and they are not going anywhere! Some of these Wilderness Areas take away my freedom not give it to me. I am for TRUE Wilderness Areas, but I see so many parts of some Wilderness Areas that do not meet the criteria for Wilderness status, they should not have been included and don't belong. We face an on slot of Wilderness Bills every year.

Maybe, maybe not. Given the growth in OHV use, I doubt this will be the case. This is why we must manage our public lands with both interests in mind.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have NO desire to go to YOUR park. There are plenty of places I can go to see strip mining, logging and oil drilling or have my enjoyment ruined by the noise of an ohv. I do not need a lesson from you on what public lands are for either but the overwhelming desire for this country to develop on those lands has created a tremendous loss and destruction to those lands causing a severe imbalance between nature, preservation and development. While this may be fine to someone who does not respect or love nature like yourself that is not fine with me. I have said time and time again on this site that if hikers and backpackers are not better at preserving the environment then they should be banned from areas just like ohv users so get your facts straight before opening your mouth and proving your ignorance. How is my wanting to protect lands and wildlife self centered anyway? I get no money from that and I am willing to accept restrictions and regulations that affect me unlike yourself. If anyone is self centered here it is obviously you. Finally this is not my 1,340th post so I have no idea where you get that number from. I may have a few dozen comments, maybe 300 or so votes and a half dozen ideas or so but nothing near 1,340. That is what happens when you love nature, you actively try to save it, something you obviously know nothing about.

More OHV use has nothing to do with conservation of anything. Thumbs down.

Motor your intrusive, abusive, destructive, polluting caboose on your own property, not on public lands where responsible adults want to enjoy serene and pristine nature, and where wildlife exist. Intrusive, irresponsible, noisy, polluting and destructive activities have no place on public lands, where responsible others enjoy the serenity of God's pristine, soul-reviving wilderness, and wildlife live and have homes. Let the irresponsible boys play with their destructive, noisy and stinking toys on their own properties. Then they won't mind when trees and other plants are torn out by their roots or crushed, and crystal-clear streams and other freshwater sources are fouled and rutted into filthy mud holes. And they won't mind when topsoil erodes and washes away, depriving wildlife of plant forage that once grew there. The real problem is irresponsible selfishness, and self-absorbed promoters of such a depraved ideology can't comprehend that the natural state of pristine wilderness always takes precedence over intrusive, abusive and destructive activities/behaviors. Following their attempts at reasoning, they would be fine with drag racing down residential streets, or open, illegal drug use in public parks, libraries and schools. It's called wilderness for a reason; leave it wild. Keep your abusive, noisy, fouling, adolescent, destructive, irresponsible, self-absorbed intrusions to yourself, and leave beautiful, serene, untrampled wilderness to God's creatures and responsible adults, who know the value of unspoiled wilderness and will fight to protect and preserve it from the likes of selfish off-road abusers and other exploiters, who will despoil all wilderness into an eroded, sterile rut if they have their way. I would agree to distinctly separate areas that the toxic-gas-fume heads could intrude upon or abuse to their hearts' content. Just make sure those places are far removed from wildlife and ecologically sensitive or aesthetic areas. In other words, far away from the ever-threatened, remaining fragmented bits of serene and pristine public wilderness. No one has the right to abuse, noisily intrude upon or destroy publically owned lands and their biodiversity.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Mr. I do not ride OHV's on any government lands, nor did I use facebook to contact friends to vote on this site. I own no land and in fact live in a large city. It bothers me that you use the word mo to describe me, as I have never personally attacked you, or anyone else for that er, on this website, no er their opinion. My big problem with wildlife designations are the way they are formed. The president can at any time and for any reason designate a national monument area. He does not have to ask for opinion or input if he chooses not to. The individuals on any land designated as a monument are forced to pick up the pieces, and often times this amounts to moving away and finding a new home. I believe this is very unfair and completely undermines the type of government our founding fathers wished for all Americans to have. American's private land rights are a cornerstone of what made us a great nation to begin with. What really makes me "hot and bothered" is that any individual would knowingly do this to another person all in the name of "nature" or anything else for that er. It also bothers me that people like you are so unwilling to listen to other opinions and bury your head in the sand any time somebody with a different idea comes along.

National Parks should be totally funded. I am also against loaded guns and off-road vehicles in the parks.

No , that is NOT the case. Congress specified in the Wilderness Act (see { <a href="http://www.wilderness.net)" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } that if anyone sold their land willingly to the feds, it would automatically be incorporated into the wilderness wherein the inholding occurs, No Congressional action is needed. The Agency in which the wilderness unit occurs CANNOT log, mine, or otherwise degrade that unit. The non-profit above Wilderness Land Trust (www.wildernesslandtrust.org) has purchased over 30,000 acres of inholdings from willing sellers and transferred or sold them to the government and every square inch of that is now protected as part of our National Wilderness System. Everyone needs to help out this process by supporting that non-profit and making sure that Congress always appropriates 100% of the funds called for under the Land and Water Conservation Act (Max is \$900,000,000 only reached twice in the history of that act, not a pretty record).

No one should be able to use public lands and degrade it to the point that it is unfit for the animals and plants native to that land. OHV users aren't the only ones who want to get out into nature. The rest of us pay taxes as well, and deserve to be able to enjoy public lands in their natural state, without noise pollution. Maybe we should set aside specific lands just for OHV use . . . The problem with "giving" the land in AZ, NV, CA and Utah up for OHV use is that those soils are very fragile. One step onto a Utah soil can take a hundred years to go back to it's natural state because of the soil composition and the lack of rain.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No, you are the problem. But really what problem are you talking about? Blaming the US for the world's pollution and ignoring other countries like China and India who pollute more and have virtually no environmental safeguards in place. Or the problem of an over-politicized and bloated EPA that will not allow truly fuel-efficient cars to be built or imported. Plus a governmental structure that takes so much money from oil companies that it is not in the oil companies or the government's interest to make fuel-efficient cars. Or the problem of letting our own timber rot in the forests or burn in wildfires every summer. This while we are importing so much timber from Canada that most of the mills in the West have closed up and left entire regions of the rural West as destitute as an inner city.

Noise and stink doesn't stay within the designated ORV trails.

First of all, immediately and permanently stop mountain top removal coal mining. It's a moral abomination to the land, the people and the wildlife. Grand vistas or not, such behavior by humans is simply wrong, arrogant, and against any sense of decency, morality, or understanding of the will of the Divine. Disfiguring and poisoning the earth is not OK. We can adapt to living without air conditioning, but we had better not adapt to feeling OK about rape and murder of our Mother Earth. If we do our species deserves to die - and indeed will. We already see the results of our spiritual dying, but soon, we as physical beings will cease to exist.

Second of all, immediately stop all industrial logging in Southeast Alaska. Selective logging for local value-added products is sustainable and to be encouraged. It is far more effective in providing employment and cultural sustenance for residents. The old-growth forests of Southeast Alaska are a treasure of far more value than the incredible scenery, recreation and resources they offer. They are cathedrals of the most magnificent construction and transcendent worth, purely worthy of our awe just for their very Being.

In both cases, the corruption of money in our electoral and governing processes is destroying our democracy, our soul as a nation, and the world itself. We are no longer a nation of, by, and for the people.

Our "Great Outdoors" is NOTHING to the monied powers that actually control every aspect of our government and culture.

People living on Earth for 65 million years changed it little until only a few hundred years ago. We hope to continue many millions of years more. But now technology allows Urban Sprawl to accelerate at an alarming rate. Open wild spaces when built upon and are disappearing. For example see the link explaining that the South Fork of Oak Creek Canyon near Zion N.P. is now inaccessible due to private land development surrounding it:  
<http://canyoneeringusa.com/cusapress/zion/oak.htm>

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Other pristine canyons in the area are yet unprotected. To imagine how built over a nation can appear in only 500 years, compare how natural the east coast appeared when Christopher Columbus arrived to how it is today (areas of nearly continuous city from Washington to New York). We can literally not have enough recreational space for a growing population. Crowds already fill some National Parks requiring quota systems to limit overuse.

We will run out of the kind of wilderness solitude the spirit needs to adventure in, to ponder its wild expanse and be thrilled to pass through; space away from crowds and the spreading development of buildings and pavement that continues covering all remaining unprotected lands. Because it is not yet too late in America's developing life, some open spaces are still available to save. Protecting the Red Rock Wilderness will not be possible once development gets its foot in the door. Not enough is saved for our future dense population.

Unrelated subject but here is my chance: We need a national subsidized program as big as the space program to push development of advanced Hydrogen and Solar energy technology and LED Light technology to depend less on oil and gas. The oil will be gone and is not our future solution.

I am from Montana where great strides have been made in conserving public lands. What I would like to comment about is getting people connected to the outdoors. We have an obesity epidemic in our country, video games, computer time all work to keep our folks indoors and inactive.

Here in my state, I see another problem. Land managers avoid providing appropriate opportunities for outdoor recreation. I am a hiker and a mountain biker, but I see much resistance to promoting these activities. Of course, increased use or new trails and maintenance take time and money, but the managers need to realize that the funding will come if people are allowed and encouraged to "hit the trail".

Our local forest service and city and county folks are very reluctant to promote front country trails for physical activities like hiking, running and biking. Getting people outside, enjoying physical activity and the natural environment will provide huge benefits to participants and society in general. The land managers see use as a headache which increases their work load for maintenance of trails and trailheads.

I have been in other areas where the public trail system is promoted and used. Look at Bend, Oregon or Sedona, Arizona, the health benefits are undisputable, so let's get more trail access and use, get more of the public interested and participating. The more users, the more support we will have.

Please try and keep the back roads and trails of Utah open for all of us who ride ATV's. Most of us are too old to hike very far and ATV's are the only way we can enjoy the back country of this great state.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If walking and bicycling and other non-motorized modes of transportation are not options for young and old in the cities where they live now, urban residents will be much less likely to spend scarce time and money traveling across the state or nation to engage in those activities at a National Park or Monument. I liken this to habitat restoration for human race and that sort of restoration work is what I want to be engaged in,

The National Park people are doing a lot of great work. I was very impressed with the new hybrid bus system I saw the Grand Canyon this spring (they also had them at Yosemite), but I think that they should ban overnight parking in the close lots so that day-trippers can access the most popular view sites. Parking at the most popular view sites should be held down to ? hour so that the largest number of people can use the lots.

An acute example of mismanaged lands would be Lakes Mead and Mohave. I live in the corner between them have enjoyed visiting the beaches for years. Actually, you can't really visit the beach at Lake Meade anymore, without a boat, but that is another matter. Lake Mohave still has a very high waterline, and several beaches, which the BLM (or somebody else?) has recently improved so it is actually safe to drive down there from US Hwy 93 in Arizona. Except that there is no water available for at least a 30-mile radius in one of the hottest parts of the desert, and no cell phone reception. When people's cars break down, if no one drives past you (or offers help!) you could die out there. Seriously, there is NOTHING out there. Nothing, except people's garbage and human feces. Since there are no toilets, either, people just go wherever they want. Some people bring boats with toilets, and more often than not they dump their waste right into the lake. If a few porta-potties were available at a few key sites, I think most people would use them.

Both Lake Meade and Lake Mohave are befouled by human waste. These lakes are reservoirs for human consumption, but they have become the toilets of the people who recreate in them. I'm not sure if you can (politically or physically) fix this problem, but I refuse to visit certain parts of those lakes that are heavily trafficked by boats, because it is too disgusting to swim in them. Think Boston Harbor in the 1980s. Yuck!!!! You want a tour? Check out Katherine's Landing or any of the main boat launches of lake Meade.

I think it is wonderful that Native Americans are being given fair access to tribal lands within our park system, but I worry that some tribes use sovereignty issues to destroy the environment. For example, filling in of the wetlands has increased in Ledyard Connecticut, since the Pequot Tribe regained control of their Tribal lands; they have been developing like crazy. I think it is great that they have found a way to benefit from our economic system, but they need to respect the environmental laws that protect the wetlands in that area. I guess what I am saying is that no one should be immune to our environmental laws, Native Americans, private property holders or corporations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fire is a major issue, not only does it cause death and destruction on-site, the smoke chokes the air downwind of the fire for days, giving me the same allergy attacks that I got when I lived in New England cities (which I came to rural Arizona to avoid). It looked as though the Forest Service had been doing controlled burns, which I think is necessary for the health of our forests, not only in the west but also in the east. Any plan to manage our wild lands needs to take the role of fire into consideration. Controlled burns are the only way to prevent devastating forest fires.

Mineral extraction has to be practiced with the least damage to the local site possible. I am disgusted by the BLM's willingness to allow entire mountains to be removed, devastating the landscape forever, not to mention their casual attitude toward the most dangerous kinds of pollution. The BLM in Alaska decided that dumping poisonous chemicals in a lake, and killing all the fish, etc. that lived in it, was OK as long as the company cleaned it up and restocked it with fish later.

THIS IS NOT OK! And even if it was, guess what, the company never cleans up when it is done. Instead, taxpayers get stuck with the bill, every time. Please start forcing the mines to pay BEFORE they play, at the very least!

- Not enough people, including government officials, understand the essential nature of access to Nature for humans we need it for our mental, spiritual, physical and psychological well being.

- Too many people still think global warming is a hoax, and don't see the direct contribution that natural areas and trees make to cooling.

- We've all become much too sedentary and technology connected; this works against people unplugging and getting outside.

Too much sprawl is still happening. Resource wasteful development needs to be prohibited.

Too many Americans live in housing that is larger than necessary. It would be better for our entire nation to make housing/buildings smaller/more efficient and put more land instead into outdoor areas.

There is way too much turfgrass in public landscapes, wasting water. It should be prohibited unless a resource value can be proven.

Mainstream America has completely lost touch with the ancient wisdom of indigenous peoples to live more harmoniously with Nature.

- There's way too much asphalt and concrete in our world we need softer and greener alternatives, and more public transit, rather than continuing to build new roads/highways.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have been working with Defenders of Wildlife and, thanks to U.S. District Judge Malloy of Montana, the gray wolf in the Northern Rockies is once again protected. 350 out of nearly 1500 wolves in Montana and Idaho were killed last year. The theory here is the only good wolf is a dead one.

I would love to send you a copy of Steve Nadeau's note to me. He is from the Idaho Fish and Game Department. He and Butch Otter, Idaho's governor, had a contest as to who can shoot a wolf first. They should realize the old west days are long gone. Hunting was acceptable when it was needed for food and supplies but those days are also gone. A controlled hunt to prevent hunger and overcrowding is understandable, but not the killing of animals just for bragging rights. Odd enough, a poll of Idahoans shows 81% of the population would like to see wildlife management changed

As Judge Malloy so brilliantly stated, the only reasoning behind killing off wolves and buffalo is human greed and politics. What it amounts to is the killing of nearly endangered animals because they are an inconvenience, killing what man himself wants to kill and the eating of pasture land which cattle ranchers want for their herds.

If you are doing investigations, can an agency look into the unlawful killings of the only 40 Mexican wolves left in the southwest and the hazing every May of the few remaining original buffalo left in Yellowstone. Buffalo Field Campaign is a wonderful organization and can give you information. Regarding wolves, someone might want to read Judge Malloy's ruling. It puts the whole issue in a nutshell. Also Michigan's Wolf Management Program is informative,

Sorry to be so long winded. This is an issue that has bothered me since I moved to Idaho back in 2006 and saw what was happening here to the wildlife. Thank you so much for caring. Hopefully the Baby Boomer generation's reputation can be salvaged.

The BLM's practices of using helicopters to roundup "excess" horses and take them away from their native lands, is killing horses, and is destroying the vegetation and small animals in the horses terror to escape the low flying machines.

There is talk about taking over the lands and designating some as National parks. Many are worried that then the government will lease out some of these lands for oil drilling or allow other destructive uses for the land. Everyone has a different story. No one knows what it might mean.

Once these animals and this ecology is gone, it's gone forever.

To qualify for (100%) of our gun tax fund (\$300+ million annually) state wildlife agencies must sell the most hunting licenses. At any cost they will recruit hunters to their state, and do so by artificially increasing large populations of game animals by manipulating hunt seasons. The over population of deer is NO accident, and people die as a result.

The antiquated P-R Act implemented by Roosevelt needs repealed, NOT endorsed! 60% of gun owners now do NOT hunt. So WHY do state wildlife agencies get 100% of this tax (and keep lying to you that they fund themselves!

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Because of special interest monopolization of wildlife management, Sportsmen are "selling" our wildlife and allowing exploitation of it like never before. Abusive "sports" are growing, sanctioned by themselves and over-stepping state anti-cruelty statutes. ex: Dog fighting is illegal, but THEY can permit live bait dog training, torturing our wildlife just for the fun of it.

New "snuff" hunting videos portray killers with guns wounding animals and laughing over their suffering. 54% of bow-hunters lose animals they hit with arrows. The stats are staggering on what now goes on in the name of "hunting".

The solution isn't about anti-hunting - but there is a scary lack of ethics that now engulf the "heritage" they cry must be upheld. And THEY are fully in charge of this reckless management.

Please tell Obama to REPEAL THE P-R GUN TAX, give some of the \$ to crime victims, and STOP STATE WILDLIFE MGMT FROM QUALIFYING FOR IT BY "GROWING HUNTERS"!

Demand states qualify instead via how many wildlife appreciation programs they implemented, how many sanctuaries they permit, how many wildlife rehabilitators they recruited, how many humane population controls they implemented (vs ignored), how much truly public input they utilized... (instead of flat ignoring 60%+ public votes NOT to have a cull or bear hunt in their communities)

Hunting has caused a 300% trait change in species. It is NOT being done properly because they are in charge, their salaries depend on it - and they need YOUR kids to get a gun and "get out there".

Let's require our children help care for orphaned wild animals at a rehabilitation center. Then if they want to hunt? At least they will have some respect for their prey, as true hunters should. I challenge Sportsmen to walk their own "code of ethics" today, and stop hiding behind "great outdoors conservation" smoke screens.

"Fair Chase"? "One shot-quick kill"? Prove it with regulations that display this code, or we call shenanigans! It is selfish, and our society is fueling a scary self-serving lack of compassion.

Thank you for recognizing America's Great Outdoors. Without air to breathe, water to drink and food to eat, jobs and healthcare are useless. Without far vistas on which to rest our eyes, we turn into myopic ditherers. Without natural beauty, we are poverty-stricken souls. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

GREEN CORRIDORS SO THAT ANIMAL POPULATIONS ARE NOT FORCED INTO AN UNNATURALLY SMALL AREA ARE NECESSARY TO PRESERVE THE HEALTH OF ALL SPECIES. WITHOUT WETLANDS NOT ONLY WILDLIFE BUT MANKIND IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This can turn into one of the best "jobs" programs since the 30s. We desperately need trained "rangers" in the field to protect what is left of our semi-wild country. These rangers need to be trained/educated not only about the natural environment and the life that lives in it, but also in human nature and how to deal with those who do not obey the law.

This just hasn't happened in decades. Agencies keep cutting real jobs instead of keeping pace with needs.

That also opens up lots of job training opportunities for those who have been there, done that. In the old days, you could find rangers to help you out on our public lands, to answer questions, to give public programs that people actually went to and learned from. But they also protected the public lands from harm by being out there and issuing citations when warranted.

We need to get back to having people "on the ground", enjoying their jobs and serving the public.

You need to look at the overall way resources are dealt with. Some areas need to be untouched, some can be mined, some might serve to contain the destructive ATVs. The country is so variable and I'm not sure the overall picture of how to preserve what we have and provide recreation for the different interests and use the mineral resources wisely with the income going back to the people has ever been considered by those with power.

Presently, the greatest threat to species loss is the appropriation of habitat by humans. The most effective way to counter this is through habitat preservation, and more specifically through the setting aside of large tracts of wildlands, places where the forces of nature are dominant and humans have but a minor influence. I subscribe to a definition put forth some time ago:

"[wilderness] is the ultimate source of health-terrestrial and human." That encompasses all the values encapsulated by the Wilderness Act in a short simple phrase. It recognizes that for wilderness to remain "untrammelled", it must also serve as a Noah's Ark in an age when least 20% of mammals, 30% of amphibians, and 12% of birds, 30% of flowering plants, 20% of reptiles, 40% of freshwater fishes, and 70% of freshwater mussels, and 20% of ferns, and many more, are threatened with extinction. Fortunately we have a mechanism for accomplishing this aim: the National Wilderness Preservation System. However just over 2.5% on the lands in the lower 48 states is protected as wilderness. Much more is of wilderness quality. Your administration needs to work diligently with Congress to place many more lands under Wilderness status. Such designation is also of benefit to humans in terms of non-motorized recreation, watershed protection, wildlife, fisheries, carbon sequestration, and rural economies. I suggest that your Presidential Legacy should involve the designation of at least 50,000,000 new acres of wilderness. And baring the ability of Congress to act quickly enough, you should reach into your administrative tool-kit to protect these lands by regulations and Executive Orders (e.g., National Monuments).



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Mr. President, conservation biologists will tell you that, in order to ensure species long-term survival, these wilderness cores must be connected by means of wildlife corridors. You should order that Federal Agencies adopt policies to establish such corridors immediately, and then your administration should work to have these embodied as the law of the land. Furthermore, since many of our key core wilderness areas are beset with potential destructive private inholdings, you should seek funding to buy out as many of these as possible. This does not have to add to the administrative burden of your Presidency. There already exists a very effective non-profit, The Wilderness Land Trust ([www.wildernesslandtrust.org](http://www.wildernesslandtrust.org)) that pursues this goal. They just need some additional funding to make it happen. In the interest of full disclosure, I proudly serve on the Board of Directors of that organization.

Extensive habitat fragmentation is common with more than 30,000 miles of roads in the ecoregion. Moreover, intensive logging has replaced biodiversity-rich old-growth forests with sterile-tree plantations at a rate of about 50,000-acres per year since the 1970s.

Today's Millennium Kids are different outdoor users than previous generations. As a result, kids lack a sense of place about nature in their communities and parks. One needs to ask why (Good marketing message of the organizations supporting this endeavor) kids know more about the challenges of the Rain Forest than animals, birds and trees that are native to their backyards. They do not have a natural connection to the outdoors and need to be actively connected through positive role models, and supported by groups that provide programs with up-to-date facilities and services.

It's time to get some smart and influential people, including politicians and policymakers, out in the public to promote WORKING FORESTS - realizing at the same time that certain areas should be left to nature. As stated by a tree farmer at the session - foresters and tree farmers love trees and we want to do right by the land.

Off-highway vehicle recreation does not belong on public land. It is destructive of vegetation. It is harmful to wildlife. It is incompatible with many forms of recreation, such as hiking and wildlife watching, which are more suitable and appropriate for wild and semi-wild lands. OHVs no more belong in National Forests, National Parks, National Monuments, Bureau of Land Management Lands than do roller coasters or golf courses. OHVs, with their noise, dust, soil erosion and lawlessness make public land squalid. OHV recreation, if it is to be accommodated, and it should not be, should be restricted to enclosed, soundproof arenas in industrial areas adjacent to freeways.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is a terrible idea and here is why.... Thousands of families who make their living in deep rural areas will have their homes 'seized' by the government under the guise of this proposed national park expansion. Don't think that can happen? It did in the 70's. Don't think there is enough park areas that are like Zion and Yosemite? Well, there's not. But that isn't the fault of anyone, it's just the way the earth was formed and we can't 'make' more of those special places regardless of the amount of park growth. There are millions of acres of national forest, BLM and other lands that are accessible to Americans. You are just going to have to drive that little eco friendly car of yours out to see them. Don't have a place to plug it in when you get there? Then don't go and stay close to urban sprawl..or not, I don't care. But when you want to 'save' the lands that belong to families and you haven't even been more than a mile away from your Subaru in the real 'outback' just doesn't make sense at all. We can all 'share' the lands here without imposing ridiculous restrictions and government takeovers of forested lands. Feeling guilty about humans wrecking the earth? Well don't have children and keep the population down...do your part. The fact is, you will never live long enough to see all of the public accessible lands here in America, but you can try.

"Strenuous, perhaps, but very dangerous for children under age 16. Nothing so dangerous (killing or injuring over 40,000 children every year) deserves the "family friendly" label." - S P In 1992, 722 bicyclists were killed in the United States in collisions with motor vehicles<sup>1</sup>, and an estimated 650,000 people were treated in emergency rooms for bicycle-related We now need to ban bicycles... And cars...

There is space for all on our public lands. Education and enforcement of rules to stay on established roads and trails is the answer not banning. Cows and clearcutting do more damage to water resources than any ORV could think of! If you have a problem with irresponsible users of any resource, educate and if they won't respect the land fine and ban them and not all those that do.

Thanks for the laugh! "land that you simply cannot access without an OHV!" If your machine can get there, my boots can too.

I agree with you that all users should be able to share trails. It seems like such a simple thing, and I know of no ATV users that really oppose such an option. However, as you see, some members of the non-motorized community don't want to share. I guess they weren't taught to play well with others when they were kids. I would propose trail sharing to a point. Once there is conflict, the limited number of designated OHV trails, which are currently shared with the non-motorized community, should be closed to non-motorized use. Non-motorized already has vast trail systems and far more cross country areas they are allowed to use that the OHV community is prohibited from. Many users that complain about motorized use on motorized trails do so only to create conflict.

Developed ski areas, particularly downhill, are very destructive and consumptive of our public lands, for the benefit of a few. It is not clear if the OP is referring to developed areas, or backcountry skiing. I'm demoting for now but would change with clarification of the OP.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent.

Living just east of the San Francisco Bay for over 50 years I am aware of the decline of fish populations, mercury contamination in the smaller fish caught today resulting from past mining activity, and pollution of the bay from agricultural runoffs. Efforts are being made to remediate. The Consumnes River stands out as an example of what can be done - through the work of the Nature Conservancy and many volunteers, this river has remained free-flowing and relatively clean while providing access to many, many birds as residents or migratory visitors and to their human students and admirers. The rest of the Sacramento River watershed needs such intervention on a more massive scale.

There are plenty of designed "Wilderness" areas for you to enjoy peacefully. I am glad you enjoy it. But don't try to take away my right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I along with millions of others enjoy riding ATV and enjoying the great outdoors. I also can ride all day and not see another human except my group. BUT, I do see deer, elk, and bear. I have seen more wildlife from the back of my ATV for the last 10 years, than I have in 40 years prior as an outdoorswoman, walking in the forest. If you don't like ATV go to Yellowstone or any other national park, or any designated wilderness area, there are millions of acres. Good luck getting into the center of that wilderness area. That alone tells me we have too many acres designated already.

Again, if you do not like OHV/ATV then partake in the millions of designated wilderness acres. You won't find us there. Who has made the biggest footprint on our beautiful national forests? What about all that fossil fueled asphalt or concrete to build all those roads, you travel on. Wind and time will take thousands of years to cover (not restore) that. But look at the wagon trail ruts left on the Oregon trail, you can hardly find them. The only ones I have seen where on protected farm ground, that the farmer has diligently protected and preserved and that was only a couple hundred years ago. I am all for government policing of OHV recreation. Please donate your tax dollars to any anti-access organization. Or just write a check to the US Treasury and in the memo, write to help police our national OHV areas and to help keep those dirt roads open.

While I promote maintaining and preserving our existing National Parks, good luck getting the unemployed to help. The majority of them are not working because they don't want to. I have offered to help keep ATV trails open but the USFS would not allow it, I am not chainsaw certified, but I have ran a chainsaw for over 30 years. Go figure. There are a lot of volunteers out there, but government and anti access persons keep us out.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I cannot believe the first two commentators. I am lucky to drive my atv 200 miles in one year, at about 50 miles to the gallon. How much more do you expend in commuting, taking the kids to soccer practice, jumping in your car to drive to the super center to buy one plastic bottle of water. ( I drink my from a natural well, from my natural faucet) , or all the other unnecessary miles you travel in a year. Now try to tell me who is causing global warming. Let's get together to help solve these national problems first, then work on the global arena. Remember to be considerate of others.

What I find quite interesting is in the 56 comments above, out of all the OHV haters and bashers (there's a lot of you up there) only 3 or 4 have posted any IDEAS of your own on this website. You just surf around blasting other people's topics and ideas. That's what I call 'TYPICAL', or better yet, 'STEREOTYPICAL'! You can keep your comments, they are meaningless, angry garbage. For those of you who are participating by posting your own ideas, I'll come visit your IDEAS and see if you have anything productive to say.

National, state and many local parks support life-long activities like biking, hiking and paddling. These activities are so important for a healthy, fit America. Parks also preserve our natural and cultural heritage and remind us what makes our nation great. Unfortunately, some state governments have looked to their parks as a way to cut "non-essential" programs from budgets in meager times. Parks have been closed, staff cut, land even sold! Yikes! In the 1940's, recovery brought us hundreds of thousands of acres of accessible parks and left a legacy that helps make our country great. Let's work so that recovery in the 2010's does not leave out our state parks. Having a strong system of local and state parks in every state is essential for maintaining our great America!

I have spent 2/3rds of my life protecting natural resources, as well as you as humans, by fighting fires in the wildlands and forests. My body has paid a little for that endeavor as I have gone through 4 knee surgeries and will have to have at least 1 knee replaced as I approach my retirement. I live in a forest. I love it. I hike as much as I can. I raft and kayak and I ride my quad more as a recreational thing now than as a racer as I was. In the future, it will allow me to go to places I went when I was healthier without having to deal with extra pain and suffering. I believe there are 100s of thousands of folks in my shoes who would love the chance to see things their bodies just can't accommodate on foot any longer. I suppose there are plenty here who simply would say "Too bad for them, they should not have abused their bodies so much..." Well, if I wasn't hiking into fires with 50-60 pounds of gear on my back to fight fires in the wilderness caused by "green" hikers setting their toilet paper on fire so they would 'leave no trace', then maybe I would be in a different place. I guess you could call it environmental bigotry. I saw it growing up in Santa Cruz when they started banning mountain bikes from the trails as incompatible and I see it now with them wanting to ban anything with wheels.

Don't let people define "the only true camping experience." Different people have different needs, yet still should have access to public lands. Making them tent-friendly only is NOT in the best interests of our nation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

That's great if there will also be a charge & licensing for horses, which also damage trails. If you've ever followed a horse on a trail after a rain you know this is true.

When I saw this headline I thought, 'How great that someone is looking at OHV solutions that don't involve closing trails,' but on reading it, this is not an incentive, but another excuse to close more OHV accessible territory. Why can't you find ways to get along instead of always trying to shut down OHV's? What if I got the government to tell you that you're not allowed to do what you love?

Interesting how some people want to dictate how others live & enjoy the lands that belong to all of us. If you don't like the noise of my dirt bike, then go to a place that's designated for the use you want to participate in. I'm not telling you how to live your life so stop demanding that I live by your rules! There's room enough for everyone & a free society doesn't mean freedom for the chosen ones, but for everyone. You find God in your way & let me find Him in mine.

My OHV group just did a "clean up day" on BLM land. We filled 5 giant dumpsters full of trash. Including garbage from a Sierra Club camp-out. Whens the last time you saw a Sierra Club "clean up day". I've looked in my area and found none. I'd love to participate!

Neither I nor any of the people I ride with have ever expressed a desire to ride in designated wilderness areas. Our concern is that other agencies want to exclude us from ALL public lands. This is wrong. I have also read posts in which people have said that OHV users should go find their own ares to ride in and build and maintain their own roads and trails. We do. Huckleberry Flats OHV area in Oregon is just one example.

Great idea! Public Access to Public Land... who would have thought that a concept so simple would be so difficult to keep. I advocate Training for local recreation program managers as well. SP: The concerned families for ATV safety has a platform that is partly based upon figures from { <a href="http://www.atvsafetynet.org/pdf/atv2010.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } a report titled ATV Injuries and Deaths Among Children Decrease. This report states the following in part: "According to data released by the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, child deaths and serious injuries caused by all-terrain vehicles appear to have decreased in 2008. Tragically, however, at least 74 children lost their lives and more than 37,000 were injured seriously enough to require treatment in a hospital emergency department." The deaths as one poster already tallied in this forum reflects less than .04% of OHV users in the same group in 2008. I take issue with the 37,000 kids under the age of 16 who were injured seriously enough to require hospital treatment. In 2008, while on a Off Roding / Camping trip, I took my son to a near-by Emergency Room for stitches. At the end of the visit, the nurse confirmed that his visit would be counted as an OHV related treatment, as we were coming from Glamis, Ca. I took issue with this, as he was in the ER for splitting his chin open while playing in camp after dark with his cousins. It had nothing to do with an Off Road Vehicle!!! Knowing that my son is one of those 37,000, I seriously question the validity of the other 36,999 visits for Hospital Treatment in 2008.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Climate change is already here, and it is going to get worse. We are already seeing new peak temperatures set in the world every summer (ask the folks in Pakistan), as well as the increasingly frequent and violent storms that have been predicted by climate scientists for some time (remember Katrina), as well as increased flooding and drought in different parts of the world. I recently saw an aerial photo of a sizable lake I visited in Kenya in 1992, which is now entirely gone. Simply evaporated in the increasing heat. It has tremendous implications for the future of wildlife in our country, as well. Here in New England, biologists are already beginning to see evidence of changes in timing of species migration, flowering of trees and shrubs, etc. It will likely affect the composition of the tree canopy, resiliency of forests to pests, and viability of farming. Anyone who is fond of spending time in the outdoors should start caring about reducing global carbon pollution right now. If you want to learn more about what you can do to build political support for meaningful change that will protect our wildlife and outdoors, as well as the health of our planet overall, visit [www.350.org](http://www.350.org).

mixed use. Motorized access is more restricted than any other group. Yet if you look at the factual data, we give the most back. If the liberal agenda wants to take away from one, then take away from all and shut the whole area down to ALL recreation

I think hiking off trail should be addressed too..... That clearly has an impact on sensitive ecosystems. Additionally, breathing while in natural areas increases greenhouse gases, not to mention all the energy consumed to build holier than thou hiking products. The sooner people realize the world is not going to crumble to a end if they enjoy it, the better off we will all be. The planet has made it this far folks, come on!

Keep your filthy stinking ATVs out of our National Forest lands.

No more off road vehicles on our National Forest lands! You can't hike? Tough luck. No one said life was fair. There are plenty of open roads even in our National Forests and National Parks for you to get your fill of scenery.

I share these concerns. Trappers often set traps near trails on public lands, and then people out hiking with their dogs may get their dog accidentally trapped. This has happened several times in the rural community where I live. Some trappers also do not check their traps regularly. They may set their traps on a weekend and not return until the following weekend. This is incredibly inhumane regardless of whether a trapped animal was a target or non-target species. As such, I think that there should be a required trap setback distance from all public trails, and a requirement for trappers to frequently check their traps. A trap identification system must be required to make this work, as otherwise any traps found in violation could not be connected to the responsible trapper.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I strongly support and applaud this idea. National Forests cannot afford to maintain more than a small fraction of their existing road networks. The absence of maintenance on most of these forest roads causes them to deteriorate and this creates safety concerns and adverse environmental impacts. We should reinstate the Roadless Area Conservation Rule for economic, public safety, and environmental reasons. The Forest Service has no business authorizing or building new roads when it cannot take care of most of its current road systems.

I strongly support and applaud this idea. The problem of illegal OHV route proliferation is increasingly serious, and current enforcement and education efforts have clearly not been enough. Hunters who poach may lose their rifle. Drug dealers who use a car or boat to transport illegal contraband may lose their car or boat. It is time to take away the OHVs that are used to create illegal new OHV routes. A small fine may not be a sufficient deterrent for some committed scofflaws, but losing an expensive OHV could be. Confiscated OHVs could then either be sold at public auction to raise funds for additional federal rangers and law enforcement, or provided to government agencies for their official uses.

I support this idea, but recommend that it be broadened to consider a coordinated and connected system of federal, state, and private lands. Even with a major expansion of national parks, they alone are not going to be enough in terms of meeting current and future wildlife corridor needs. National wildlife refuges, national forests, BLM lands, state parks, state natural areas, private lands under conservation easements, and other assorted lands must all be considered in planning to maintain habitat connectivity and to provide for wildlife movement corridors. The new Climate Science Centers and Landscape Conservation Cooperatives will hopefully play an important role in this coordinated planning and management effort. It is clear that greater leadership and direction are needed to effectively "connect these dots."

The Justice Department and USDA have clearly dropped the ball in terms of stopping big agribusiness and slaughterhouses from creating de facto monopolies to unfairly squeeze out small family ranchers. I don't always agree with ranchers on issues, but I think that fair competition and anti-trust requirements are absolutely essential. If we don't reverse the current downward trajectory, much of rural America will become ghost towns.

I strongly support and applaud this idea. I've worked with young people on conservation projects who were provided from the Student Conservation Association and Chicago Botanic Garden intern program. They are always bright, enthusiastic, and diligent workers. The only downside is if they are not engaged in productive work, or given trivial or bureaucratic work. This can discourage them from future conservation involvement. So bring on the youth for many beneficial reasons, but make sure that their supervisors give them productive work and a rewarding experience so that they will maintain a life-long conservation interest.

It's time to undo years of damage to the Everglades especially as new housing developments are inching ever closer. The Great Lakes are our largest body of fresh water and have been misused for years. Now they're being threatened by invasives. There are initiatives being made by organizations and surrounding states to repair damage. The federal government needs to get behind this crucial work.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

:An "agriculture professional" is not the same as a "farmer" and "how food is really produced and how natural resources are managed" in industrial 'agriculture' today is not the same thing as "sustainable agriculture" yesterday, today, or tomorrow -- that is the problem with Comment #1.

Government entities should not support organizations that discriminate, such as the Boy Scouts -- Demote.

This appears to sidestep the scientific evaluation of what "minimal impact" is environmentally sustainable in any given habitat -- your description of the Forest Service allowing your volunteers to make their own (unscientific) decisions about how trail work is done in 'your' area is quite worrisome -- if there were a workable means of federal oversight of such volunteer activities based on such science, then this Idea would be worth serious consideration.

For 25 years I have been riding in our National Forests through out California (where I live), Idaho, Oregon, Washington, Nevada, Arizona, Montana, Utah, New Mexico and Texas. I enjoy riding with my children in places off the beaten path...single track in our forests...designated and open trails. I rarely and I mean rarely, see another biker, hiker, equestrian or other dirt biker. There are no homes to bother and no pollution to speak of relative to all other forms of pollution. There is more dust and noise around my home from freeways, garbage trucks, leaf blowers, weed whackers, lawn mowers and boom boxes. There are billions of homes in the world displacing sewer, garbage causing carbon dioxide affecting the planet in such a far greater way than OHV use that it is almost laughable anyone would think OHV use contributes anything at all...comparatively. I had to be crude but humans and animals who breath, fart and excrete bodily "stuff" create more carbon dioxide and pollution in such extreme amounts that point a finger at OHV use defies rationale thinking. Look...billions of homes on the earth have dug foundations...displacing insects, rodents and other animals, not to mention the erosion issues! OHV users use such a minute portion of public land in usually remote places, it is hard to understand the opposition other than the environment is a religion in and of itself!

The disconnection between some of these folks and reality is truly alarming. The preservation of and responsible access to our nations natural lands can and does coexist. From my experience, the vast majority of people who frequent our national forests and other such lands are kind-hearted OHVers and, or sportsmen who truly appreciate the outdoors and our wild places, not individuals who are destroying it. Sure, there are a few "bad apples" who abuse our lands, but punish those individuals and not the vast majority of outdoor enthusiasts. Expand our National Forests and Open Spaces, but allow responsible access including managed OHV use. We mtn bikers, rock climbers, dirt bikers, 4-wheelers, fishermen, equestrians, and other outdoor enthusiasts must unite against these anti-access extremists. Through responsible access, appreciation for wild places is gained and protection is guaranteed.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Land preservation=goodResponsible/balanced access=goodLand closure (wilderness designation)=badIt seems to me that many of you are very well intentioned, but are disconnected a bit. I wonder how many of you have been to any of our National Forests in the west? National forests, Open Spaces, BLM land, etc. do offer environmental and wildlife preservation yet do not effectively close the land to human access. However, a wilderness designation essentially does that. Of course, responsible management of our national forests and other public lands is essential, but they do offer preservation. We need to stop the sprawl and preserve wild places but I believe, in most cases, wilderness designations are not the answer. Expand our National Forests and open spaces but don't lock out all but a very few. Through responsible access, appreciation for wild places is gained and protection is guaranteed.

If the feda don't make money on a timber sale, it is because the tree huggers have imposed many useless regulations on the agency selling the timber (or other resource)

We must ALL come together on the climate change,goverment,non-profits,and the people at large. Can`t anyone realise that as we kill the climate we are forcing our great-great grand children to find an off earth home ? Will the technology be there to find one or do we doom them to a horrible death here ? As a world, we are one but to argue and push each other away for fear and loathing we ALL loose !

The second post is ridiculous. Less than 1% of BLM and national forest land is open to OHV use. Quit trying to take away peoples fun you "people hater" . You are contributing to the erosion of freedoms in our country.

Most of the time out here in the west, BLM, USFS & NPS managed lands share a common legal boundary on the map. They don't, however, share common & best management of the land. The mission of the NPS is strictly one of preservation, and it is in the Dept. of Interior (DOI). While the BLM is also in the DOI, its mission is not strictly for preservation. The USFS is in the Dept. of Agriculture, and its mission is management of the forests for "sustained yield" and "multiple use" purposes "for the greatest good". Coordination between these agencies is little to none. It is time for all federal agencies concerned with the management of public lands to be combined into one department, eliminating many highly paid Washington bureaucrats. Put the money saved to use out where the jobs and resource management are desparately needed!

Where do you all get the idea that any and all clearcutting is bad? Here in Colorado we need MORE timber harvesting of Lodgepole Pine, and properly designed (size & shape) and executed clearcuts are the preferred sylvacultural method. It is the lack of timber harvesting over the last 30-40 years, combined with total fire suppression, which has directly led to the devastating Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic here. The fire hazard created by all these dead trees is staggering. There are many places where people can't recreate anymore because there are so many trees blowing down. Wildlife won't use these areas either. We need timber harvesting and the forest products industry here for jobs, and to maintain a healthy forest!

Off Road Use is already limited and restricted on Public Lands. Exactly what is the proposition here???

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While it seems that there are good intentions behind your idea, you wrote, "(Wilderness Protection) is important for the enjoyment of future generations". Congress designated Wilderness Areas remain just that until an act of congress re-designates the Area. In the meantime, access is substantially restricted. Hiking is permitted, but like another poster stated, a 50 mile hike half way into a wilderness area is not feasible for most of our society. Something else to consider, is will the ground permit your foot travel for such a distance? A good example here is the North Algodones Wilderness Area in the Southeast corner of California. This 26,000 acre Area was designated by congress as part of the California Desert Protection Act of 1994. As holds true with any designated wilderness area, you are permitted access either by foot or horseback (if you haul in your own feed). Neither current nor future generations of the human species will see any enjoyment from the 26,000 acre North Algodones Wilderness Area! You see, 99% of the area is covered by towering Sand Dunes which are impassable by horse. Hiking brings to mind the expression "taking one step forward, brings you two steps back". As a result, no one has hiked more than a mile into this Area's perimeter since it was designated as wilderness area. It was "protected", and human access has been completely restricted since the Wilderness Area designation hit the ground in April of 1999. (The above statement in no way implies that the author is seeking, petitioning nor advocating unauthorized recreation in a designated wilderness area, nor does it condemn any current standing Wilderness Areas or restrictions thereof. The, author seeks to illustrate the ramifications of such designations and illustrate that it's impossible for "Wilderness Protection" to bring anything to future generations of the human species. )

I would hate to know that someday my kids would not know the experiences that I get from "responsible OHV use". The only reason you find my name in these pages is to support the Preservation of OHV use for future generations!!

ORV's are permitted on many "Public Lands"... so what broken law would justify confiscation? This 'idea' needs to be clarified. If it is, even I (a law abiding off-roader) can agree to it, that is until all Public Lands are closed. At which point, Off Roader's "machines" become worthless and you will see a "I'll ride it where ever I want, as long as I can" mentality. Economic impacts aside, if you take everything away from the ORV community, they will have nothing left to lose.

The DOI recently told BLM to be setting aside areas for other sources of energy like geothermal and solar. This is much to my dimay, as its in the middle of 'my area' on a new map, potentially adding more clousres in my area. That said, the BLM is doing a pretty good job with 'my area'. They do what they are allowed to do by the USFWS, and even then a lawsuit from the Private sector can change what the BLM is doing. Evidence my 49,000 acres of sand dunes closed over an Administrative lawsuit. Now, I belong to an ORG that watches BLM and makes sure they are doing everything that they need to. Filing reports on time, studies, etc to avoid that they get sued by our opposition on a stupid admin lawsuit to close more land. My ORG works very close to the BLM and things are good. If what you say about your area BLM is happening, I would agree with you. But, my area BLM is ok with me.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I recently saw an electric motor scooter on the street, and it was very quiet indeed. Quiet electric OHVs would be an advantage in front-country areas where OHV noise now conflicts with picnicking, camping and fishing. It's especially a problem in confined valleys and around lakes, where the noise of conventional OHVs bounces off rock or water surfaces, spreading widely. The erosion impacts would have to be analyzed case by case, as they are now.

Your comment about the fact that OHV and environmentalism cannot coexist is a joke. Hitler thought Jews could not coexist with Germans. You have the same kind of perspective, control everything and your point of view is the only one that matters. I know my example is extreme and the comparison of killing Jews and riding a dirtbike in the woods seems stupid but I have heard environmentalists talk about how all OHV user should be shot. I have seen that exact statement on bumper stickers. I have never heard an OHV user mention how a hiker should be shot for hiking. Fossil fuel is a fact of life it is the cheapest form of energy at this point and we need to use it responsibly but to say don't use it at all is ridiculous. And this isn't even mentioning the pseudo science used to show that fossil fuel even has an impact on global warming. Try reading up on Solar effects on global warming. On the quieter OHV I agree I even talk to people who are riding that have overly loud vehicles and try and use peer pressure to get them to be more responsible.

I'm curious, where are the calls for electric OHV's, ya know, nice and silent???? No exhaust or gas fumes? Grease in bearings instead of oil which might leak out? I hear you about the noise, I don't like the vehicles that have had their STOCK exhaust system modified.

If we the people had an input as to what is taught then maybe this would work. However environmentalist with flawed information should never be allowed to teach anything.

Roads:1. Increase traffic -- if you build it, they will come2. Break down and wash into streams, with the result that the gravel bottom becomes clogged with silt, reducing habitat for wildlife, for example, frogs and salamanders3. Are a disturbance that facilitates invasion by weeds4. Cost scarce taxpayer money to maintain and to patrol

Our National Parks in their pristine condition are the greatest treasures that this nation has. They need to be protected from degradation in quality and the wildlife in them needs to be protected and enhanced. In particular they need to be protected from overuse overdevelopment noise air pollution and other threats posed by our overpopulated and industrialized society. decrease immigration and encourage smaller families so that overpopulation does not destroy all the progress that has been made in the past century and which may ultimately destroy our parks. THIS IS AN EXTREMELY IMPORTANT ITEM. HOWEVER IF THERE ARE TOO MANY CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN OUR PARKS WILL BE OVERRUN AND DESTROYED AS THEY HAVE BEEN IN OTHER NATIONS. Remember that our overpopulation MUST be addressed if we are to protect what we have and pass it on.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

America is losing at least one million acres a year to development roughly equivalent to the size of Delaware. Coastal lands will be lost at an accelerating rate due to climate change. Unless we protect these areas now our treasured lands could be lost forever. Our national parks are routes to healthier lifestyles and gathering places for local communities.

A centerpiece of the "America's Great Outdoors" Initiative should be affordable access to and thoughtful preservation of our nation's great playgrounds and classrooms our national parks. Fees for national parks are already prohibitive to many people. In fact my 20-year-old daughter just returned from a long-planned for and hard-earned road trip to Alaska volunteering on organic farms studying flora and fauna and camping her way to the Arctic Circle. It was disheartening to hear that she spent no time at a long-dreamed of destination Denali National Park. With great anticipation she arrived there only to find that in addition to the \$20 vehicle/admission fee she had to pay over \$40 for a shuttle bus into the park her cheapest option since visitors' vehicles are barred from entry. While she agreed wholeheartedly with the objective of keeping traffic out of the Park it was akin to extortion to charge Americans \$60 to see the majesty of their own publicly owned lands. On principle she refused to enter. Surely we can provide free or cheaper transportation into this magnificent place and others like it so all may know its grandeur. Park fees continue to rise and those who could most benefit from a free or affordable recreational experience are those least able to afford it. While wealthier families have a host of recreational opportunities available to them poorer citizens and their families should be able to rely on national parks as an affordable destination for day trips and vacations. National parks belong to all of us and no one should be barred from visiting them regardless of income. One suggestion might be to provide a free or subsidized annual national parks pass to families receiving federal or state assistance such as food stamps. While it may seem contrary to the goal of making parks more affordable and thus accessible to poorer Americans accessibility and its oft-accompanied development must be curtailed. Anyone desirous of a truly momentous outdoors experience should be afforded the opportunity; however creating that opportunity should not compromise the very essence of the offered experience. Our national parks are ever approaching an amusement park ambiance with concessions congestion and too much concrete. With greater funding for parks perhaps we could eliminate profitmaking ventures that interfere with a true appreciation of nature and its sublime absence of commerce. We need to adhere to our national parks' mission of preserving our wild spaces. To this end we must limit the footprint we leave on those areas. The most natural way to limit congestion and paving of park lands would be to do as Denali National Park does and make entry into the park communal albeit more affordable than that park's buses. While Americans with Disabilities should be enabled to enjoy our parks paving should be extremely limited so as not to ruin the overarching aesthetic for all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Enjoying the outdoors increasingly has become a dirty business for Americans. We know because we're out there camping hiking observing wild places wildlife and people. Way too many American kids grow up thinking that "outdoors" means ATV's tearing up sand dunes snowmobiles chasing terrified animals (and each other) motorized "recreational" equipment roaring over lakes that should be paddled or rowed or swum or left alone to just be home to the quieter cleaner millions of creatures that inhabit them. WE KNOW THAT THESE ACTIVITIES ARE NOT EVEN LEGAL IN SOME AREAS IN WHICH THEY ARE PRACTICED. But budgetary cuts have made enforcement impossible; and the educational outreach function that used to be invaluable in rangers is something for which no Federal employee now has the time. Shame on us! So our family hopes that some inappropriate activities will be taken off the table in our parks; that emphasis will be placed on the appreciation of natural values and peaceful activity that's appropriate to these national treasures. And that there will once again be funding sufficient to provide welltrained dedicated rangers to guide teach and inspire.

My family and I enjoy the Great Outdoors. We love visiting our national parks and want to see them protected and maintained in a manner that will allow our future generations to enjoy them. Additional Funds are needed to do this.

Too many Americans especially young Americans have no idea of the beauty and wealth of their natural heritage and are deprived and challenged at best in the out of doors.

Dear Mr. President Thank you for all that your administration has been working for on behalf of the environment including your Executive Decision of July 19 for stewardship of our waters. . . . Too many of our nation's children are deprived of life enriching experiences outside of their urban neighborhoods. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent our changing country and >protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. If we are to stay healthy in body and mind our lives cannot be limited to office parks shopping malls video games and making and spending money.

America's national parks are in deep trouble. For the last 30 years the system has been grossly underfunded the only thing that prevents its collapse is volunteers (like my wife and myself). Delayed maintenance and understaffing combined with overuse are causing the parks to decline they won't survive another century of overuse and abuse.

Dear Mr. President: please follow in the footsteps of your predecessors and beef up the National Park efforts. Also look at how you can help the state parks which are being shortchanged all over the country especially in California. This doesn't have to be financial help but rather putting emphasis on what the people can do themselves. This could be one of your elements asking citizens to help preserve their environment. .

National parks are good investments in our future. Please stop the TC2 Coal fired power plant in Trimble County KY. Many trees are being destroyed because of the transmission lines for the property being taken by EON.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If National Parks are not tended the weeds of highways strip malls mines and wells will take over what little remains of our pristine heritage. Please protect our National Parks.

Don't cut funding for these much needed resources that are ever increasingly under stress from natural and man made affects. Also keep out industry that would harm these wild places that have taken lifetimes to form...

I don't think we need all the timber harvested and thousands of snowmobiles tearing around the national parks like your republican predecessor was going to let happen. We also don't need a bunch of oil wells drilled in them.

The Bush administration did huge damage to the parks that must be overcome. This will clearly take money...maybe a lot of money. What is clear is that the parks are worth it. Their educational role alone justifies major expenditures.

Since there are so many budget cuts why can't we get people that are incarcerated into helping do projects in our Parks? Seems I just read an article that they (inmates) are in need of new ways to make some money. Put THEM to work too.

But we would like to be there without the threat of animals being killed or displaced and without off road vehicles running rampant.

PROTECT WILD AREAS FROM BIG OIL . . .

I am very concerned about the American wilderness.

I want to include our "wild Mustangs" in this. They are wandering our public lands and being forced out by the BLM and the cattle ranchers. They need to be in a national park where they will be protected from helicopter roundups. Citizens need an opportunity to see their mustangs running free and protected like the other wild animals that reside in our national parks. Madeleine Pickens has some good ideas with lots of backing from us. Please listen to her.

. . . I've been to a number of places: Acadia Arches Mesa Verde Mt St Helens/Mt Rainier Yellowstone Grand Teton Redwood Forest Blue Ridge Mountains & Great Smoky Mountains Natural Bridges Mammoth Cave Cape Cod and Myrtle Beach. I've been in the same places as soldiers were so long ago at places like Valley Forge Cutter Gap and Gettysburg. (And those are just the ones off the top of my head!) I've learned that being in those places puts our own lives in perspective and that is why I urge you to help preserve and protect these special places for future generations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

. Our family has been to many of the national parks and have enjoyed our each stay. This year my husband and I went to Denali National Park for our 25th anniversary. Glacier National Park is on the "go to" list in the near future. Please know that the American public cherishes these natural wonders in our country and expect them to be well managed without oil timber and mining company pressure and development. These wonderful places must be preserved for our children and grandchildren to enjoy...for them to say "I remember....now you know why we love our National Park System".

Yet they are not funded responsibly and are supported by many nonprofits as they try to make up the gap between funding made available and funding needed. .

I can't begin to tell you how important our National State and City parks are to me. I can't imagine a world without them it would be a place of desolation. I've seen beautiful places in my own state gobbled up by greedy developers who abandon the site as soon as they've squeezed every dime they can out of it or by vandals who destroy with ATVs and graffiti. The wild places give me comfort and inspiration.

It's disappearing being gouged leveled gobbled up in peoplecreep... . .

We desperately need to get kids out of in front of a computer and into a natural environment for their health and well being as studies have shown.

. . I have written to President Obama concerning the public lands where our wild horses roam. I've also written to my representatives. In addition I have sent faxes emails and made numerous phone calls. I find it hard to believe that President Obama wants to make the White House accessible to us because I haven't gotten ONE response from him. I spent so much time and it is as if my pleas have fallen on deaf ears. The president certainly doesn't care about the wild horses as the BLM is permitted to herd them using helicopters in 3 digit temperature weather. As a result many have died. I voted for President Obama but now am disappointed because he seems to be carrying on business as usual. I don't think he cares at all.

. . Our family began camping when our five children were very young. We bought a ten dollar pass which entitled us to all national parks monuments forests etc. and that included free camping! Since we were on a very limited budget this allowed us to enjoy many wonderful vacations touring the country and camping a long the way. As senior citizens my husband and I continue to take relatively inexpensive vacations camping with our grown children and our grandchildren in many of the same places we visited years ago. One problem does exist!!! Many of the places we visit now are quite run down and are understaffed. (there is only so much the S.C.A. can be expected to do!!!). I hope you will realize the importance of protecting all of our national parks monuments forests for all of us now and for future generations.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

. Closest to my mind right now is a little thought of and often maligned expanse of irreplaceable wetlands in Northern New Jersey directly adjacent to New York City called the Meadowlands. This is an important area that provides a natural method for cleaning the polluted waters of the area's many rivers it is also the breeding ground of hundreds of species of rare wildlife particularly birds and is even the home of several newly adapted species specific to the region. Since the advent of the G. W. Bush Administration this area has been under slow yet steady commercial / industrial development. I see it shrinking weekly before my eyes. Something needs to be done or our waters and wildlife will pay a terrible price in an area that is already woefully overdeveloped and is barely ecologically stable in its present condition. This area if properly managed could mean a lot to a vast local population in terms of environmental and biological education and recreation.

. I recently visited one of our National Parks to climb four peaks over 14000 feet in a single day. Much to my chagrin finding a camping spot in our National Forest was challenging as most of the camp grounds were now private property due to mineral rights acquired by who knows what means. To make matters worse when we got to the MT Bross trail there was a sign saying the trail was closed. Upon my inquiry with the National Forest staff the few left they alleged MT Bross along with MT Democrat MT Lincoln and Cameron were all private property above 12000 feet! In other words MT Bross was closed because the owners didn't want me on their 14er. This is a quintessential example of fascism and it must be stopped and reversed! The other camping I did this year showed most National Parks camp grounds closed due to beetle kill or lack of staff and upkeep. Why is it the tax payers are forced to pay trillions for an over bloated DOD that we don't need wars and war crimes we don't need or want while our National Forests the ultimate commons go to hell?

Mr. President I hate to rain on your parade but there is something horribly lacking in our national parks and you have to know what it is! The lack of humanity and caring for our wildlife is enough to make me sick. You are letting the wolves be slaughtered and do not seem to care about the lose of the buffalo either. I made a special trip to Yellowstone to see the wolf pack that was cared for and released with such love and devotion. I'm glad I got to see them at least once BECAUSE THEY ARE ALL DEAD NOW AREN'T THEY??????? I don't know how you and Mr. Salazar can live with that. Just to appease the cattlemen! You are both treating our legacies with contempt and it really irks me. I have not been back to any national park since the wolf killing started and I will not return until it is stopped. ALSO IN ALASKA!!!!!!!!!! What a horrible death you are allowing for these magnificent creatures. I guess you and your family don't have any feelings for wildlife or you could NOT LET THIS KILLING GO ON!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

First I want to thank the President and the Executive office for doing a great job in these trying times. It is clear to me that Education is failing the American people as there are a lot of stupid comments about the war Gulf oil spill Health reform and other subjects. . . \* (A bit off the subject but close to the hearts of many Americans who want to see our wild horses.) Rein in the BLM who has been rounding up and killing wild horses in several midwestern states. They are in violation of the law and are spending millions of taxpayer's dollars to round up and keep these horses in pens. Stories put out by the BLM have been proven to be blatantly false. Pictures from observers shown this to be conclusive. The stories are heartbreaking. It has become clear that the cattlemen are behind this and want the rangeland cleared up so there is more room for their cattle. And the range: belonging to the American people has been rented to them for cents on the dollar. I would also add the methane that the cows produce worldwide if no cows existed would solve the global warming problem. Although this is not possible it's something to think about when expanding the cattlemen's ranges. . .

P.S. I would like to add that there seems to be a trend toward "privatizing" the upkeep of national (and regional parks) which usually results in the imposition of larger fees for users. This is unconscionable.

Sponsor the states to employ the receivers of extended benefits to work for extra money in the parks.

We are using so much land for unnecessary buildings commercial and apartments even homes. Our land is a gift from God. Let us honor and preserve it.

Recently you visited Acadia National Park in Maine a small but precious gem in our National Park System. With this visit fresh in your mind you are reminded how important the Great Outdoors is to the American Spirit. . . .

. . . My children still talk about the camping trips we took in our National Parks... in fact when my son was interviewed for his job (pilot for Delta) he was asked what was his best memory was from his childhood. He replied "The camping trips we took!" . . .

. . . Out parks are one place the the old and young citizens of this country can connect. A place where people wildlife and nature can all come together and connect with life nature all together. Please keep out parks in good condition so we all can enjoy and connect.

I recently spent a week volunteering at Yosemite NP. Typical of so many of our parks Yosemite is showing the effects of crowding and lack of maintenance. The bathrooms are not regularly cleaned and ranger contact programs have been curtailed. . . .

We moved from California to Arizona 5 years ago; great Governor balanced budget then we inherited Brewer who is a disaster!!!! All of the important programs have been cut or eliminated including education and special services along with the parks. . . .

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Yesterday a college-age young woman knocked on my door canvassing for funds to protect the Clean Water Act. I offered my sympathy for the work she has to do in light of recent disasters (the BP oil spill) and Congress' decision to renege on decades of environmental protection. THIS young girl cared; why don't so many legislators? .

. I would just like to see more employees taking care to uphold the rules and regulations of guarding our existing parks. One ranger to cover 20 to 40 miles of area is anything but right when people in Yellowstone National Park continually violate precious and delicate thermal features. I know I have been a tour guide in YNP for 15 years. If we cannot manage people from all over the world who do not read signs because they don't want to or they speak another language then we need to set up a monorail system within the parks to keep people from destroying daily the thermal features and the wildlife. .

Take Action for the Prairies Today! Take action today for the PPR!  
<<http://www.ducks.org/eblasts/2010/TreasuredLandscape/images/treasuredRHS.gif>> Fellow Conservationists, Today, many families are losing touch with America's great outdoors. Fields, forests and streams are becoming fragmented by lack of support for conserving these crucial areas. As Ducks Unlimited members, we understand the importance of habitat conservation and have led this charge for decades—and we will continue to do so. Recognizing the influence the outdoors has on our youth and the need for conserving America's natural landscapes, the president and his administration have proposed the America's Great Outdoors Initiative (AGOI). This initiative is designed to promote the outdoors to youth, advance private-land conservation strategies, and use science-based management practices to restore and protect our lands. I am asking that you take a moment to e-mail the Department of the Interior, which is currently accepting ideas from the public on how and where the AGOI can provide the greatest benefits for Americans and the natural landscapes that support their outdoor lifestyles and livelihoods. Through sound scientific research, DU knows that the future of waterfowl and waterfowl hunting depend on more aggressive conservation of the Prairie Pothole Region, also known as the "Duck Factory." Encouraging the AGOI to designate the Prairie Pothole Region as a "Treasured Landscape" will help secure the future of waterfowl populations throughout North America.

Once grassland and wetland habitats are modified their value to the well being of Prairie Pothole Region is compromised and in many cases lost forever. Just ask the folks who live in and around Devils Lake ND..

When declaring September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." However, policies remain in place which threaten the natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. The "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When declaring September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place that threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet, and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. The Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. Right speech is always welcome, but specific action (which accomplishes something) would be even more admirable (and more valued by future generations).

After 35 years in Massachusetts, I think I can finally call myself a New Englander, and I love my home here. But I also have a great fascination with the wild lands of the Colorado Plateau, especially the canyon country of southern Utah. I've made nearly annual trips to that country for almost 30 of those years. When declaring September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." I know you must be tired of dealing with the wreckage bequeathed you by preceding administration. However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country.

That needs to be reversed. Southern Utah is an amazing place. Driving through it you can see mesas and buttes of different heights and colors, that stretch over miles. It is easy to imagine what was here and has disappeared due to erosion over the centuries. It is a place where the geologic history is easy to see and marvel at. This area does not need 20,000 miles of ORV roads. They do not need access to every square inch and that is what they want. Too many operators of those types of vehicles have no regard to where they are driving through or over. They care only about their fun. People who will intentionally ride through an area that is off limits just to prove they can't be stopped, have little sense of right and wrong. And they have done that with ORV's in Paria Canyon earlier this year.

It has been incredibly disappointing that policies enacted by the least environmentally-friendly President in history are still in place more than 18 months after a supposedly pro-environment President was elected.

Recreational off-road vehicles do one thing and one thing only---destroy. They destroy the land, the water, the air, and the peace. Tranquility is impossible if they are within two miles.

Why is the Bush No More Wilderness Policy still in place? If Ken Salazar doesn't rescind it, you should ask him to leave. It is hypocritical for you to sign the proclamation you just did regarding wilderness protection and the values to be preserved for future generations knowing that the Secretary of the Interior has done and likely will do nothing about this Bush legacy.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You declared September as National Wilderness Month stating that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." Somehow your administration has allowed policies from the Bush administration to remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. The Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of damaging ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. Climate change, which is the overriding influence on the health of BLM lands, received only three paragraphs of identical boilerplate language in each of the 1,000-page Environmental Impact Statements instead of any real analysis. I urge you to address these disastrous Bush administration legacies, and support actions that will preserve intact for perpetuity the wildlands of the Southwest, in particular the many magical places in San Juan County, Utah.

I have been able to spend several weeks in the past two years hiking canoeing this area. It is sad that some of the area I able to visit had been over run by motorized vehicles. Many individuals do not pay attention to the markers signifying the start of the roadless areas and simply create new roads.

I wish you could take a kayak ride down the Dirty Devil in Utah, as I have. Then you would, without hesitation, INCLUDE this redrock masterpiece in September's National Wilderness Month. You would put your HEART in your own statement: "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." You would NOT ALLOW policies from the Bush administration to remain in place. To do so, to allow them to stand, is to threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country -- where the Dirty Devil runs.

When it comes to wilderness preservation, we have no second chances, particularly in area already damaged by human intrusion. Please take action to preserve the delicate and fragile environments that remain at least partially pristine before it is too late.

Although you declared September as National Wilderness Month, "No More Wilderness" policies from the Bush administration still threaten wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. It's time to dump this policy and start moving forward in protecting our children's heritage.

Thanks for the proclamation for Wilderness Month. Now please let us have some action! The Bush Era policy of "no More Wilderness" as brokered by Gale Norton and our own Governor Mike Leavitt are still in place! Please have Sec Salazar rescind that terrible policy and allow the BLM to consider - and have Congress implement - more wilderness. The resource plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah were rushed through under pressure from development, extractive and motorized lobbyists. As my dad said, please (respectfully) put your money where your mouth is (respectfully).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When declaring September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." Zion National Park recognized its own 90% Congressionally (newly) designated Wilderness Zone, by conducting public input on a Soundscape Management Plan and draft EA-- proposing new audibility-based, and loudness, Standards for the Wilderness Zone. These draft Standards don't go far enough, but they are a sufficient start to get some improvements in place from tour aircraft (hopefully a ban), and some beginning effort from the FAA on other aircraft noise sources. Thank you for your Administration's support on that. However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. Two of these WSA's are right next to Zion National Park.

These lands are irreplaceable, and thus need protection from abuse by those who do not appreciate them. Please protect them.

Only after the last tree has been cut down Only after the last river has been poisoned Only after the last fish has been caught Only then will you find you cannot eat money -- Cree prophecy

Although my home address is in California, I own property in Utah and spend several months in Utah each year. I think it is important to keep much of Utah wilderness so others may enjoy the beauty and the quiet as much as I do. Thank you.

As a longtime backpacker, and a wilderness-lover and advocate, I am thrilled that you've named September National Wilderness Month. When you did this, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country, where I often hike. The Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. In addition, I have personally observed the destruction of ancient ruins in some of these back country canyons in repeated trips. Turkey Pen ruin in Utah's Grand Gulch, for one example, on my first trip there in 1983, had an intact ceiling (one of the few left on any ruin) and a large number of turkey feather blanket remnants and pottery shards lying about. The second time I visited, in 1995, the roof was showing signs of destabilization and there were only a few artifacts left. The last time I was there, 2007, the roof had been caved in and there were virtually no artifacts left. The degradation was obviously the result of increasingly easy access to the site made possible by ORV enthusiasts. I've found that the easier a place is to get to, the more damage results because these intruders do not seem to have the respect for the wilderness and its attributes that those who reach it only with difficult hiking have.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I visit this area regularly and have seen the results of this mismanagement directly. We need to protect the last remaining wilderness areas.

Compromising with the Republicans obviously doesn't work. Why not do the right thing for future generations?

Here in Utah the red dust from the red rock country is in our blood. Not only do we cherish the pristine wilderness, but this natural asset bring tourists from all over the world. It can't remain healthy with roads and trails invading the fragile desert and riparian areas. Please help us protect this irreplaceable treasure so you can bring your children and grandchildren to enjoy it as we do.

Dear Mr. President, I am a renewable energy developer working in the Pacific Northwest and Interior West. I am actively developing renewable wind and solar sites in Utah, a state professionally and personally important to me. The protection of sensitive areas in the West from development, yes, energy development is critical. While oil and gas development poses a greater threat than does wind, solar and other renewable energy development, an important balance needs to be achieved between appropriate development and wild land protection. It is critically important to wind energy developers that our industry not be held to different, more rigid standards than the oil and gas industries.

Please commemorate the National Wilderness Month of September by preserving and taking good care of the quality wilderness land in Utah. As in Norway, there are big problems with all the ORVs crisscrossing terrain and serious difficulties in keeping those vehicles on the recommended trails. The big tracks they leave take so many years to dissolve. The ORVs are also disturbing shy animals on the verge of extinction when they drive outside. As a young girl I happened to read some National Geographic Magazines at a neighbour. They opened a new world to me. And I was so impressed by photos from the Grand Canyon and other magnificent spots in the U.S. Please tell the BLM to take proper care of wildlands in Utah, so all of our descendants also will have the chance to see this magical landscape.

I hope you will work to ensure that these beautiful lands are preserved for long into the future.

We need less talk, more positive action!

There are footpaths and cowpaths all over the west that have been falsely labelled as roads for the purpose of ATV and dirt bike use. These should be protected from erosion by including them in wilderness study and quality restrictions for hiking, biking, horse back riding, and river transit. Access for lumbering and mining and drilling can be regulated to reduce impact on open range areas. It is not necessary, here or in the wetlands of the Gulf, to cut straight access across undeveloped land. Please focus on the long range and reverse the destructive policies of the Bush administration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

During the past 25 years, my wife and I have spent several weeks each year hiking, photographing and in general marvelling at the majesty that is America's Red Rock Wilderness in Southern Utah. The quiet, the strange beauty, the total solitude of this area is a thing to be cherished. However, during the past 10 years we have noticed marked changes in the landscape, the overall quietness and the destruction showing up in the general landscape and the ancient dwellings, pictographs and petroglyphs. Most of this damage can be traced to the Bush era's misguided, anything goes, "No More Wilderness" policy that gave a green light to off road vehicles of all kinds and law enforcement and BLM non-enforcement that made those abuser feel like THEY were the protected ones rather than the land that belongs not only to us, but to future generations. We can't pass on to them a land scarred with OHV tracks, looted or simply ridden-over ancient dwellings, and an attitude that one can go anywhere one wants on a monster, noisy machine. We, indeed, you must take a stand and do what is necessary to protect this land. And, it won't contribute to the deficit, it won't raise (or lower taxes) and if President Clinton's proclamation of Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument is any indication, preserving beautiful lands, protecting them from OHV abuse and excessive energy exploitation, preserving the solitude is a boon for tourism in the area while actually creates jobs. Do the right thing. Stand up for Utah's Red Rock Wilderness.

So many of our public lands, forests, and open spaces have already been ruined by development, drilling, OTV/ATV use, and roads! Enough is enough! Our wilderness, forests, and public lands are under threat from so many angles. They desperately need to be protected. Our parks and forests are supposed to be a place of peace and quiet, for us and for the animals who live there. PLEASE let our public lands stay as beautiful and peaceful as Mother Nature intended!! Their future is in your hands! PLEASE help save the wilderness for ALL future generations!!

I recently spent a week in the Mammoth Lake/Devils Postpile area of the California Sierra - half the trees are dead. I then spent 2 weeks in Yosemite National Park - half the trees are dead. On the way back to Oregon I passed through about 70 miles of the Fremont Nation Forest in south central Oregon - half the trees are dead. Spreading bark beetle infestation due to a warmer climate. It may already be too late,

the land and water is the only thing that we have.. people need to relize that the land wate tress dirt air and so on r the only thing that we have and we are killing it ~!!!! we need to do somehting about it... the best thing to do is to round up all the people that dont care and make theme stay in the city cuzz its sicknig

Where do you get off telling me I cant ride my bike in the woods?

I drove cross country this past week to help a friend move from Boston to LA; we went through some stunning parts of the country I had never seen before and never knew were in danger of extinction or destruction. Knowing now how fragile our ecosystem is puts into perspective how important taking care not to damage it is.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am 14 years old and when ii was 6 i moved to agoura hills when i moved hear nature was every where but in the past 2 years they have taken down whole mountains to replace with office building please stop

NOW is the time!! we cant wait!!! we must start making drastic changes to insure that our children can enjoy our outdoor spaces for years to come!!

All too often there is a black and white discussion on environmental protections, pitting business and extraction groups against conservationists. In reality, protection of many of these lands, if done properly, aid both groups. An example of this is the positive benefit to anadromous fish species (salmon) from watershed protections. By increasing spawning habitat protection, we can increase the populations of harvestable salmon, and we increase the long term sustainability of that resource. These protections extend to other resources, such as ranchers in the southwest, where protections would have kept the grasslands of Arizona in place, providing a much more healthy grazing space than the current, anthropologically induced deserts of this area.

While the most obvious incidents between resource users and resource protectors comes from restrictions due to T & E species (incidents that do not need to occur, if protections take the time to listen to the users concerns and properly compensate them), the potential for cooperation could easily outweigh these conflicts. We just need the political debate to give way to honest attempts to compromise and find that middle ground.

. It wont stop unless we fight to stop the UNconscientious development and the greed the will surely rid of all wild places if it could. What we have now (Ntnl Parks and Preserves etc) is not enough for the survival of the creatures we reside together with on this planet.

We keep getting new mtn. bike trails shut down in our valley and we are in an outdoor heaven. Let areas like Victor, ID get new trails! We need them, the people want them and the forest service shuts them down.

One specific example is of the continuous and poorly planned parcelling off of the Black Hills, which now contains so much private property that the area is riddled with powerlines, roads, wealthy landowners, and cattle.

Our natural resources are limited and once they're gone, they're gone forever.

USA has beautiful places and gorgeus nature, 20% of the pollution of the word is generated by USA, helping to keep this great outdoors will help to balance this pollutions. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too.

Despite growing recreational needs, the Forest Service's abilityto support forest visitors is actually declining. The Angeles Forest spends only about one dollar per visitor on lawenforcement, educational materials, interpretive services, and visitor center management. The Station Fire, the largest in thehistory of the Angeles National Forest, has exacerbated this shortage of recreational opportunities.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I grew up near the San Gabriel mountains; I know what destruction of habitat means in this area. Thank you for considering my comments.

I have lived within sight of them for most of my life, and enjoyed recreating in them many times. These mountains benefit our quality of life and the health of our families by providing us with clean air and water and incredible natural beauty. Our region's youth obesity and diabetes crisis has brought new urgency to connecting our people and communities back to our mountains and rivers.\* Additional resources to help with Station Fire recovery and a public education component NOT associated with the NRA, but rather with a non-gun-proponent, pro-animal group opposed to hunting, to track recovery and educate the public about wildfire.

I lived the first 46 years of my life in Rosemead, with their majesty in view, taking for granted all the wonder, education, and recreation they afforded our community. These mountains benefit our quality of life and the health of our families by providing us with clean air and water and incredible natural beauty. Our region's youth obesity and diabetes crisis has brought new urgency to connecting our people and communities back to our mountains and rivers.

One of the most important things we need to do this decade is to connect people to the environment. The city landscapes tend to disconnect people from the natural environment they depend on for their lives which is why we need national recreation areas that rekindle that connection to place on earth.

The current big concern in this country is the rush to DRILL FOR NATURAL GAS, which is being touted as the REPLACEMENT for our dependence on oil. Enlightened taxpaying citizens are well aware that greed, ego, and corporate interests are looking to make as much \$\$ as possible raping the planet of fossil fuels (i.e., the catastrophe in the GULF). It is already too late to "return" to the respect for Mother Nature our ancestors had. But we can preserve SOMETHING for future generations.

The San Gabriel Mountains soar above my home in Pasadena providing much of our public open space. These mountains benefit our quality of life and the health of our families by providing us with clean air and water and incredible natural beauty. Our region's youth obesity and diabetes crisis has brought new urgency to connecting our people and communities back to our mountains and rivers.

We definitely need conservation efforts to be started for the wolves in Alaska and other states. They are being shot for no reason. The only justification is the stupidity of the people who shoot them, who claim that they are controlling the population of wolves. Why are the wolves endangered? It is definitely because of this stupidity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Friends of Our Mother Earth: I would just like to add the following. Our children have lost what we were given because most of the creatures of Earth are gone or in such small numbers they are barely detectable. The stars are obscured by electric lights and pollution and so our children must live in a bland world of virtual reality void of youthful exuberance, and a marriage between the physical and the spiritual. We should be ashamed but are not. No guilt or sense of responsibility for what we have destroyed is in our art or our media, only the quest for more and more material acquisition for ourselves as the actualization of the self when it translates into the destruction of all of the elements that comprise the self. It could turn out to be a very tragic and brutish end of what should have been a paradise for mankind in harmony not at war with Nature.

So much of the political wrangling today can be linked to ignorance of American history. By strengthening the general public's understanding of our past we can broaden our public discourse in a more functional way. Our president understand this concept as does the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Our physical record of history in the form of buildings landscapes and artifacts further assists in gaining knowledge and perspective of our American way.

Sparsely-populated regions of our nation such as my State of South Dakota face enormous competition for resources to raise consciousness about the treasures uniquely ours and the role rural sites and structures played in this nation's history. Federal state and private lands that provide Americans with the opportunity to connect with the outdoors and promote conservation and recreation are also intertwined with our most treasured historic and cultural sites and landscapes. Natural and cultural sites and landscapes areas whose constituent resources are closely related to one another are inextricably linked because environment shapes human societies and people in turn affect their environments. These historic and natural sites reflect a wealth of locations resources histories and voices whose interpretations help all Americans celebrate our shared earth and heritage.

Please bring funding for cultural resources back into balance with our natural resources. Americans continue to connect to the land and its historic and cultural resources but the work is not finished.

As the executive director of a public library and a regional museum I can freely attest to the enormous importance of federal support for our efforts. The struggle to find private funds for preservation and interpretation of our collections and historic buildings is frustrating; the results are often far from sufficient. Programs like Save America's Treasures are critical to the future of museums and historic preservation in general. Cutting or eliminating these programs is short-sighted and highly disappointing. Help us complete our work by supporting these key programs.

What has already happened to far too many state historic sites (21 in Pennsylvania alone) is frankly bad enough. Budget "crises" are triggering governors in multiple states to shutter important state and national historic sites with no real clue how to conserve the fragile pieces of our heritage until budgets improve.. Please President Obama while we continue to send tens of billions of dollars overseas as aid military support etc. our own American cultural heritage is sliding away.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My wife and I are continually amazed at the fine buildings and historic structures (mills barns etc.) that are allowed to fall into ruin due to lack of attention and funding. Americans continue to connect to the land and its historic and cultural resources but the work is not finished. There remain important places and lands that need your help to guarantee permanent protection including Fort Monroe in Hampton VA which will soon be released by the US Army.

Programs such as Save America's Treasures and Preserve America are economic drivers for many communities large and small provided a broad range of jobs from construction through hospitality. We regard these funding programs as an integral part of economic development in such underserved areas as Northwest Mississippi as well as in our larger towns and cities. In the recent past these federally-funded programs have made significant contributions to the state local and federal tax bases. My own home town of Natchez relies heavily on tourism for jobs and without the availability of these Federal programs to restore and maintain our resources both in the built and the natural environment we cannot maintain our current levels of employment.

As a student with the Cooperstown Graduate Program in History Museum Studies funding for public institutions is vital to preserve and protecting our nation's history. There are countless opportunities for the public to learn about the past. Unfortunately there is never enough funding for these initiatives.

I observe in Americans a lack of interest in and appreciation for anything that was around before they were born. But when they get older they regret the loss of buildings towns ways of life they had ignored. I also lived in Beijing before the current "reconstruction" of the city and removal of the last vestiges of an ancient capital. Now those old fascinating parts of Beijing that made it unique are mostly gone. I saw there what I had seen to a lesser degree in US cities in the 1960s - removal of the past at any cost for a "better" future. As many agree today that wholesale disrespect for the past has been a major mistake.

Over the last 100 years Congresses and Presidents of both parties have reserved for the people natural resources in our national parks. Now is the time to reserve our historical heritage for future American generations. Age urban sprawl and economic "progress" threaten to pave over great architectural and historical reminders of our complex past. It is imperative that a "new deal" for historical preservation similar to the National Parks System be funded by private and government resources. Meanwhile I urge you to continue funding for historical preservation through already established programs.

The buildings and their settings together with the natural landscape and the decisions we have made about preservation conservation and development have shaped the cultural landscape of this country. As a retired State Historic Preservation Officer I have seen the results of the lack of parity for over a decade between funding for our historic and cultural resources in our National Parks and other public lands. Please bring funding for cultural resources back into balance with our natural resources. .

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear President Obama I come from Kentucky Ohio West Virginia and now live in NY. I came from pioneer stock who lived off the land and preserved it. I am dedicated to preservation of our heritage in all areas whether cities country creeks lakes rivers or mountains. I have hiked in the beauty of countries around the world and in the USA. I am a practicing doctor at a major medical center in NYC. PLEASE increase support of preservation and conservation thereby providing our children and grandchildren the opportunity to connect with the outdoors and promote conservation and recreation. Our cultural and natural sites and our built sites in nature and landscapes are not replacable once destroyed. Witness the mountain top removals in WV by coal mine companies. Without rich natural environment and landscapes we lose our humanism for one another and for our humanism. These historic and natural sites reflect a wealth of locations resources histories and voices whose interpretations help all Americans celebrate our shared earth and heritage. Our historic and cultural resources in our National Parks and other public lands are desperately in need of additional support funding and conservation. Americans connect to the land and its historic and cultural resources and these remain important places and lands that need your help to guarantee permanent protection. We need more National Parks National Monuments National Trails and other permanent protection for the sites and lands that are important in our national heritage. I bicycle every possible chance on the Harlem Valley Rail Trail converted from the former NY Central RR. This opportunity must be extended to many many more. I thank you for your continuing efforts to improve our great country. I am grateful for all the efforts you are putting into getting us back on track in the USA THANK YOU.  
Linda D Lewis M.D. 320 Central Park WEst NYC NY 10025

Expensive destructive non-sustainable highway projects such as the proposed SR 710 in Southern California that destroy our cultural heritage and urban fabric should be rejected by the Obama administration for proven non highway solutions.

Once a historic site has crumbled it is difficult or impossible to reclaim. But if it is preserved and fostered it becomes a tangible link to the people places and stories that make up our nation. I would argue that as so much of our everyday lives happens in "virtual" spaces these real authentic sites become ever more important touchstones.

From the Southern shores of Louisiana and Florida our natural sites reflect a wealth of locations resources histories and voices whose interpretations help all Americans celebrate our shared earth and heritage. Hopefully we've successfully cleaned the marshes- and cleaned the fouled birds take care of American history- Europe has done it and now our young country needs to find the bits worth saving and move on from there. Architecture is important.

My own hometown of Tucumcari NM is the cite of a historical CCC project from the New Deal era and that cite the Munciple park is in danger of being destroyed by neglect because of lack of funds and polical will to restore the cite and secure it.

Funding gaps for historic and cultural resources within our National Parks and public lands is leading to incremental loss of these resources which can never be replaced. Please bring funding for cultural resources back into balance with our natural resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Once our parks and historic sites are damaged from misuse and neglect they will not be available for future generations. Please consider what we lose every time a noteworthy building is razed; each time land is stripped of trees and vegetation. It takes generations to reforest and the history that is lost can not be refabricated. Western Europeans preserve their history by valuing their aged structures beautiful gardens and their extended cultural heritages. New is not better. It is just new.

The world I've grown up with is increasingly homogenized filled with strip mall and concrete everywhere. One of my favorite things about America is that you can travel and experience new things even new cultures without needing a passport. More and more people seem to be staying closer to home rather than going away on vacation as well so there may (though I'm not sure) be a rise in heritage tourism--to which these programs are vital.

While in the past there has been a responsibility to respond positive to this funding however and I write most importantly OUR country is BROKE. Flat broke! We have a president whose policies have broken this country to become the highest debt we have ever had with an economy that can not support paying this money back. I implore you to take responsibility to curb your spending and CUT. Bare bones minimum.

Dear Mr. President I own and operate and State Historical Mansion in a small village in Columbiaville Michigan. I need a roof on the building now or the building is at risk of ruins. I have owned the property for 12 years. I am single all the money I make off the building goes back into the building for repairs. Our little town needs this building. It is the history of the Village. I have a great team of volunteers that have donated many hours over the last 12 years. I have looked for grant money with no success. My credit is shot because of my divorce 5 years ago. Credit card debt is part of the problem. If you could give any advice of what doors to knock on for help I can do the knocking. I am not a non-profit that shuts many doors. I take school children in our area through yearly to educate them the History on the building and how the lumbering industry was vital to this area. Then we tell them the things we are changing to go Green. Please if you can help anyway? The property name is The William Peter Mansion Michigan state Historical. Web site is [www.williampetersmansion.com](http://www.williampetersmansion.com) thank-you

Cities without old buildings are like a man without a memory. States without functioning parks send the message to our young people that these open natural spaces don't matter. Every state's economy is impacted when historic sites are not made accessible to the public. These natural and historic treasures can not be neglected or they will perish. We can't allow that to happen.

Our Cultural History is important in a country that is so young we need to save what ever we can please help this mission by giving the money support that it needs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

\*\*\*\*\* I'm sure you realize that this letter is part of a mass mailing. But I will insert here that I believe that preservation both of natural and historic resources is critical even in these rough times. Indeed perhaps more so as natural areas can sometime be brought back with sufficient work. Not so with historic structures. Once they're gone (or deteriorated beyond repair) they're gone. \*\*\*\*\*

My husband and I are always shocked to learn that residents of what later became national parks were forced out. No human could live in a 'park' any longer. We were shocked because we are a living ecosystem and we are neither 'nature' or 'culture' but a combination of the two. Our greatest assets are our natural resources and our people and what they create. Preserving what has been created and renewing and restoring both these elements should be the keystone of our preservation and historical goals. This becomes a great way to interpret what our ancestors discovered and what they made of their discoveries--for good or ill. It is a part of our history and it's always an exciting story.

There has been a lack of parity for over a decade between funding for our historic and cultural resources in our National Parks and other public lands. As a resident in a city whose culture has been imperiled for the last five years I know how fragile it is and how quickly it can disappear. Please bring funding for cultural resources back into balance with our natural resources.

Once we lose a building natural space or neighborhood we can never go back and "retrieve" it. It is lost forever and our country is the less for its loss.

As an Immigrant from Ireland I am amazed by the beauty of the natural lands here in the US. Unless we preserve part of what we were and where we came from we cannot really know who we are. A nation without knowledge of its heritage is soulless and directionless.

I recently took a trip to Wyoming and toured Yellowstone National Park and rode horses in the Shoshone National Forest in the Absaroka Mountains. The forest is being devastated by the pine beetle. The dude ranch we stayed at is charged a shockingly high price for access to wild lands that is straining their business. But without outfits like theirs many people would never see some of the beautiful wilderness this country has out west! In times when more and more land is gobbled up by malls Walmarts and sports complexes we are quickly losing part of the awesome living heritage this country has. We owe it to our ancestors and future generations to preserve as much wilderness and open space as possible. Please help us save the precious lands and parks for all to enjoy not just for our use but to preserve what's left of America's biodiversity.

Since the foregoing observations were an experts opinions.....that I agree with, I can register my opinion more personally. If parks are 'forgotten', our lack of interest will probably go to the next generation, and we'll have condos in Yellowstone.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would also like to add that I can see no reason why us taxpayers (yes I am in the 52 % who did pay taxes) pay \$360,000.00 per week for fuel for the Speaker of the House to commute to DC from California. I also cannot see why you would let her upgrade her jet so she would not have to stop for refueling. After all she wants us to downgrade to cars that get better mileage. Why does she not practice what she preaches?

National Parks were only a part of my outdoor experiences as a child 60 years or so ago. They loom much larger in importance today with the great increase in population density and the "homogenization" of society to the degree that one city or town pretty much looks like any other.

When Pres. Teddy R. realized we needed to protect our environment and so many parks were protected, we won. Today we have the greed of OIL attacking our national parks, we don't want drilling in our parks!!! We also need to protect our water. Today in Michigan we have 2 companies extracting water from our water table, and someone in Congress who want to drill for OIL in LAKE MICHIGAN. These things cannot be tolerated. We must put an end to the insanity of destroying the environment of the world. Please help us protect our greatest resources and our lives.

Moreover they should "Buy American" I have found that most of the publications are printed in some Asian country! Not the way to go.

Next, you might consider preserving the animals of the land; the animals who had a right to this land long before human beings decided to usurp her. Animals, like the WOLVES, & the PUMA's & the FLORIDA PANTHERS as well as smaller, less obvious animals that all take a part in our Heritage & Our Natural Beauties of this Land we now call home. STOP THE WAR ON THE WOLVES & OTHER ANIMALS BEFORE THIS COUNTRY DECIDES TO WE'VE MADE A HUGE MISTAKE IN ELECTING YOU.

I think kids must learn the benefits to them of the natural world, even direct consciousness elevating ones. This went by the wayside when emphasis was on making \$ and being a business major. Without values of "greatest generation" the result was our present financial debacle! Arts, philosophy, aesthetics were discouraged in schools. We need a Roosevelt scenario for employing young and old and restoring our parks and wildlands. (D.C.)

We are a nation in SERIOUS need of outdoor recreation, sport and communing with nature. These spaces are essential to preservation of the American way of life! Thank you for considering my comments and in advance for your positive action.

Being fortunate enough to have grown up near Yellowstone and Glacier Parks, I took for granted our careful stewardship of nature's beauty. We mustn't take this for granted!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

First of all, let me say that you and your administration must learn to protect the environment you claimed you cared about before you were elected. Despite that pledge and our corresponding votes, you appointed a Sec. of the Interior in Ken Salazar who has spearheaded the butcher of our nation;'s wolf population, animals who belong here, had been restored at great expense by those of us who care, and who were improving the natural aspects of the environments they inhabited. Right now America's environment is in much worse shape than it was under the reign of the self proclaimed "world's greatest polluter", George Bush. For the first time in over 30 years I am thinking I cannot vote Democratic again if this is the result. I find it incredible that you have sanctioned this type of despicable behavior from your Cabinet officers.

The Asian Carp need to be stopped and they threaten National parks and Shoreline here in Michigan. Please stop them in your home state before the ruin ours!

I also think of how much of our wonderful open space is being eaten up by development and overpopulation. We need to preserve and protect the national parks we have and create more! Lots more.

Let's hope big business doesn't our National Parks Initiative.

Those of us in Utah need your all the help we can muster, including yours, to preserve our precious wild lands that give us clean air, drinking water, open space, beautiful recreation areas and wildlife habitat against the onslaught of off road vehicles and a myriad of other threats.

{As one who grew up in Eastern Ky. in the Appalachian foothills and know the joy of the woods and the animals and then lived 17 years near the San Gabriel Mtns. and played at Lake Arrowhead and Big Bear and now live near Lake Berryessa and within a few hours drive to Lake Tahoe, I cannot tell you how much it means to preserve our forests and wildlife...I have seen and enjoyed a broad spectrum of our Nation's beauty and it hurts me as bad as the Blue Eyed Indian in the commercial years ago as he stood by the highway and watched the kids throw trash out their automobile window as they drove by and a tear rolled down his cheek...It hurts me the same way to watch Corporations and greedy people destroy our wildlife and forests...} Geo. Oliver

From our oldgrowth forests in the north, to the rugged Sierra Nevada, to the vast desert in the south, some of our most precious outdoors destinations are at risk. Development, increased visitation, and budget cuts are impacting some of our most iconic and important places.

The "wetlands restoration" project in the Balona Creek Marsh outside Marina Del Rey (in Los Angeles) turned out to be a project that drained the marsh, leveled it and built housing!!! This was one of the only marsh habitats that I know of in the region and needed better protection!

The following may be a form letter, but it expresses exactly my feelings about wilderness protection. Because of budget cuts, our most valuable treasures are becoming degraded from lack of care. Please give the following serious and thoughtful consideration.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

**MOST IMPORTANT:** California, like the rest of the U.S., lacks a population policy that will take pressure off the natural systems that we need to sustain life, including human life. Degradation of natural ecosystems, such as the ones The Wilderness Society is concerned about, through artificial growth and development actually reduces the carrying capacity of California the number of people California can support into the future at a decent standard of living. Please begin work on a national population policy that will reverse the rapid, ongoing environmental decline in California and the rest of the U.S.

California, a place blessed with staggering beauty and diversity needs your help to preserve its remaining wild lands that give us clean air, drinking water, open space, beautiful recreation areas, and wildlife habitat. Don't let development pave paradise and put up a parking lot. California's enormous population growth puts some of our most precious outdoors destinations at risk. Development, increased visitation, and budget cuts are impacting some of our most iconic and important places.

I would also like to include one of our most overlooked natural resources, the Native Americans. They are as much an endangered species as the spotted owl, and we have much to learn from them about land conservation.

We need to save our wild open places for our emotional and physical health and that of our children. Stewardship for the future.

But in all truth, our ocean, is one ocean. As far as I'm concerned the most pressing issue for the environment, globally is the BP spill. Nothing takes precedent like what's happening right now in the gulf. Animals, ecosystems and one of our largest food sources is in the process of being destroyed and NOTHING is being done about it. We'll look back on this in 5 to 10 years and think 'God, how could we have let this happen...'

When I was growing up in Southern California, the San Gabriel Mountains provided wonderful recreation opportunities for my family and I. We weren't rich but we could take Sunday drives, picnics and walks in these mountains. Now so many people have used these sites (which are near Los Angeles) that restoration is really needed. Please help.

Hi! I've just returned from a trip from Southern CA to Coastal Oregon. Wow! What a scenic trip! I took the PCH (Hwy 1) and Hwy 101 all the way up. I must say Oregon has many, many more rest stops and scenic turnouts than CA, although Northern CA is just as incredibly beautiful. Take the Redwood Forest in Humboldt County for example. It is just spectacular! Because of budget cuts in CA, our parks and scenic roadways are suffering. Anything you can do to help is much appreciated. M Calvert

Developers have destroyed so much of the state where I was born and have lived in for most of my life...where does it stop???

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I moved to Colorado to experience the open spaces of the West yet all I've seen is prime land gobbled up for development (either building or extraction industries). Over the decades what I've experienced is less access to areas where I was free to hike and explore. Private entities purchase land surrounding the BLM, Forest Service or wilderness and deny access to the public lands behind their properties. Our public lands are not their private playground or buffer zone. Please choose wisely when deciding which areas to protect and make sure access to these wonderful areas is provided. Make sure there are provisions disallowing surrounding landowners to cut off or deny access to these areas.

This final point is extremely important as we have seen the ruinous effects left behind by shoddy mining practices and the terrible destruction of ecosystems surrounding oil shale projects. Every man, woman and child need to be a steward of this world and a good place to set an example is in this still-great nation of ours by protecting that which is most precious to our lives. Thank you for your time.

This is more than a landscape issue. This is about protecting a heritage that we share with a diverse and deep ecocommunity. This is about protecting a heritage for our children's children. Much of this landscape is sacred to the indigenous people who have been here from time out of mind. From another point of view, it is now clear that a sustainable economic model is in deep and profound harmony with environmental concerns. It is good business to preserve and respect the environment in which we live, raise children, hunt, worship, and do business. Please hear these requests.

As a Colorado native, born and raised on the Western Slope, where several of these areas are located, I ask you to protect key landscapes on a large scale for the land, for the people.

I live in this beautiful state we are speaking of and my husband performs fire mitigation in our canyon that has been burned sadly enough to see it still and after 13 yrs of living here. We live right next to an open space area and on the edge of Roosevelt National Park, so this is close to our hearts and our lives.

5) I can't overemphasize how important the above 4 points are in our state of Colorado to holding the line on development needs and helping establish a balance of human needs to preserve and reconnect with our natural surroundings. Everywhere we look, the environment is on the defensive and is losing ground - we need to be proactive now for our children's children. Thank you.

Stop Christo OTR project, he is ruining our canyon. He plans to construct a plastic curtain 5 miles long in Big Horn Sheep canyon, in Chaffee County and Fremont county. This is a nesting area for the American Eagles, our National symbol.

I am concerned for the safety of our wild places as the agencies responsible for their care and protection are under smaller budgets and pressure from corporations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The birthplace of wilderness, New Mexico, is home to some of this country's wildest remaining public lands. From the southern desert grassland Otero Mesa to the wild and scenic Rio Grande, our vast public lands support native wildlife and plant species, significant water resources, and imperiled desert ecosystems. These amazing places are beloved by New Mexicans and many more Americans for their hiking, hunting and fishing, and river running opportunities. Constantly under threat from oil and gas development, many pristine lands and important habitats have been destroyed.

AS WE DESTROY OUR ENVIRONMENT, WE DESTROY OURSELVES

If we are to have a healthy world, we need to protect our wilderness areas. They are a crucial part of our total ecology.

These amazing places are beloved by New Mexicans and many more Americans for their hiking opportunities. But they are constantly under threat from oil and gas development, and many pristine lands and important habitats have been destroyed. I am a 7th generation New Mexican, so my family roots in all of our wilderness areas make this important to my family

Since we are the ones living on the planet now, it is our duty to protect the Earth and all its wilderness areas for all future generations to enjoy and appreciate. Without protected wild areas human beings will lose what makes them human, appreciation for all life and the comfort we all take in natural wild places!

If we left these Corporations rape and pillage the earth, we will have nothing left for future generations to enjoy.

We have known for years what a mistake it is to do bay fill. But, even now Cargill is trying to do more. We have to stop them.

Every economist around said that the stimulus package wasn't big enough and that has been proven with the recovery stalling out recently. We need to punch it up with green jobs, green incentives and a Citizens/Civilian Conservation Corps (similar to Peace Corps or AmeriCorps) to keep our lands maintained and preserved while employing folks who need the jobs.

Due to too much internet children are experiencing Nature Deficit Disorder. There are many of us here in the Bay Area that are eager to implement programs that help reconnect children to nature by using the amazing natural resources we have in our local State and Federal Parks.

The presidents that are remembered most are the ones who begin or end a war, who steadily guide in times of crisis, and who do what has never been done before. Compared to that, your work on the environment will hardly be noticed, but you yourself will know, silently with a smile on your lips, how you saved the world.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

*(cont.)*

I am all for conservation and sustaining a healthy ecosystem, but more so I am concerned about the various trail user groups being shut out from thousands of acres of trail accessed land all over the country. Many mountain bike advocates have been working with other environmental groups to designate and share trails while preserving the land around those trails. I hope ALL trail users are considered before any legislation is passed designating wilderness. If equestrians can have land access then so should mechanized bicycles. Hikers must also learn to share trails.....this land is your land and this land is my land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When a site marries environmental, historic, and cultural resources you'll find the most successful formula for bringing people outdoors to enjoy the places that tell America's stories. Take Saugatuck, Michigan for example. It's a sparsely-developed landscape of spectacular beach, rare freshwater dunes, water, woods and wetlands; habitat to several endangered species; and home to a large number of significant historic and archeological sites. Saugatuck has been a very successful draw for Chicago residents and others for more than 120 years because all of these resources work together for one of the best visitor experiences.

**What works: What are the most effective strategies for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors?** One of the most effective strategies for reconnecting people to the outdoors is providing federal dollars for local projects. Modeled after its sister program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) provides dedicated funding to support the programs and activities for historic and cultural sites. Programs like Save America's Treasures and Preserve America along with National Heritage Areas play important roles in promoting heritage tourism which brings people with their dollars out to experience those sites. The programs also attract private dollars to restoration projects and work in partnership with the federal government to promote economic development and create jobs.

**o According to one analysis, between 1999 and 2009 the Save America's Treasures program allocated around \$220 million dollars for the restoration of nearly 900 historic structures. This investment by the SAT program generated in excess of \$330 million from other sources and created 16,000 jobs (a job being one full time equivalent job for one year) at a cost of \$13,780 per job created. (D Rypkema)**

**o We are fortunate to have in our midst the I&M Heritage Corridor, which was the first explicit bringing together of preservation, conservation, recreation, and economic development in the country. There are now almost 50 national heritage areas in the U.S. that owe their existence to the pioneer I&M Canal National Heritage Corridor.**

**Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieve your goals? (for conservation, recreation or reconnecting people to the outdoors)** The obstacles to achieving our goals of reconnecting people to historic sites outdoors are The lack of full, permanent and dedicated funding for the Historic Preservation Fund limit the matching grants for State Historic Preservation Offices; Tribal Historic Preservation Offices; and limit funded preservation activities like planning, survey, and public education for historic preservation. Eliminating funding for SAT that leaves no preservation \$\$ for "bricks and mortar" projects and ends the most successful preservation effort in the country's history.

**o If the I & M Corridor, with its many natural, historic, and cultural resources were given more funding, it could continue to rehab historic resources, and develop more programming to draw even more people to the to this beautiful 96 mile-long historic site.**

**Federal Government Role: How can the federal government be a more effective partner? (in helping achieve conservation, recreation or reconnecting people to the outdoors)** The Federal Government can be a more effective partner by:

- Reinstating FY 2012 federal funding for historic preservation for Save America's Treasures, and Preserve America at FY 2010 levels.
- Increase to at least FY2010 levels National Heritage Areas' funding.
- Provide full, permanent and dedicated funding for the Historic Preservation Fund at \$150 million and the Land and Water Conservation Fund at \$900 million.

**Tools: What additional tools and resources would help your efforts be even more successful?** We believe that increasing the capacity of federal, state and local agencies

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

to care for and interpret historic and cultural places would go a long way to helping our efforts be more successful.

the natural wildernesses of the world are far more important than any other issue today. Without our wild habitats we would not exist, ignorant people don't understand that removing just one species can cause an ecosystem to collapse. such as the wolves of Yellowstone national park.

. Please support full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, including state-side funding. Thanks!

What Works: Involvement/participation- WE need to get people involved. WE have too many public employees who try to take over and be gate-keepers which make many stay away from public places. I was able to get 100 acres on a Scenic River for a Public Park and kept it for 10 years with a single Ranger. One day Ranger Jane showed up with 2 other ladies and told me that I had NO RIGHT to tell people they could come to the place even though I had signed waivers and had an agreement. They also made up some story about my being a "gay basher." They got rid of the hard-working Ranger and replaced him with 4 others... I do not lead hikes there anymore, I do not do "kids in creeks" there anymore and I seldom visit and pick up the site. I saw the same public employees who try to limit public participation at the AGO meeting along others who think parks belong to Park employees and not the citizens. In trying to deal with our Natchez Trace Park people, there is no concern for the public nor genuine safety issues. As a full time volunteer for public parks, spaces and Green-ways, I tend to feel less than welcome..... My suggestion is to replace most of the paid bureaucrats with motivated volunteer groups and neighborhood coalitions. Challenges? Absolute indifference of Government to dumping and filling and ruining of watersheds by a few connected developers.... When you complain or report incidents - you become the enemy. There is something wrong! It is not that we have too much government, it is that we employ too many who do not care, work as little as possible and work against and not for PUBLIC interests. I say motivate or terminate. Most Public employees work fewer hours for more money and benefits that most other workers..... We have a volunteer network in Nashville Parks and Greenways which should be a model for others. Federal Role? Funding, incentives and motivation... Get friendlier, more committed and dedicated workers who care..... Think about those who have worked to conserve great parks, forests and places- not many were Government Employees. Continue to get more public input outside of the paid to work group.... Tools? SCHOOLS! Conservation incentives- Identify the treasures and publicize more about what WE should and can do... Work with existing conservation organizations and help locals to help themselves... A 20,000 acre tract near me that was bought with Federal money is now like a War zone with insensitive shooters and 4 wheelers. There is something wrong in our society with militant groups intent on violence which tool should be training and behavior modification. We need more public education about Good and Bad practices and more public information about what is sane and rational and to do more about those who abuse the environment and to make it news.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

*(cont.)*

HERITAGE AND TRADITIONS ARE ABOUT THE ONLY THING GOVERNMENT HAS FAILED TO TAKE FROM WE THE PEOPLE.BUT ITS ONLY A MATTER OF TIME IF THEY CAN FIND A WAY TO MAKE MONEY AT IT.THERE ARE MANY THINGS THAT HAVE VANISHED FROM THE EARTH I WOULD HATE TO THINK OF OUR PARKS AND LANDS ,REFUGES AND RIVERS BEING TAKEN.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

20 August 2010      The Honorable Kenneth Salazar      United States Secretary of the Interior  
c/o America's Great Outdoors      U.S. Department of the Interior      Fish and Wildlife and Parks  
1849 C Street NW      Washington, DC 20240      Dear Sir,      Thank you for your vision and  
your leadership in helping to make President Obama's America's Great Outdoors initiative a  
personal and national priority. As millions of Americans spend their summer days enjoying the  
great outdoors, including our 392 national park sites across the country, we are reminded of the  
important role they play in preserving our public lands and national heritage. From the great  
southern wildlands like Great Smoky Mountains National Park to places like the Ocmulgee  
National Monument, which memorializes our continent's Native American history, the national  
parks provide some of the best means of connecting Americans, young and old, to America's  
Great Outdoors, and preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation. As the AGO  
initiative winds down, with the ending of the summer, and you begin to ponder the incredible  
outpouring of the ideas and hopes of the American people in order to assist the President in  
crafting a 21st century conservation agenda, I would like to offer several thoughts. The ideas  
below emerge from the work of the National Parks Conservation Association's southeastern  
regional program. They are framed within the context of the AGO's four questions.      I)  
Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieve your goals for conservation, recreation, or  
reconnecting people to the outdoors?      Major obstacles to advancing a 21st century approach  
to conservation include the following.      A)      The Need for Full Operational Funding for the  
National Park Service.      Compared to the overall federal budget, the Park Service is very  
small—only one tenth of 1 percent. Providing Parks the funds needed to serve visitors and  
protect resources is a tiny investment in our national heritage, and provides economic benefits  
and jobs in struggling communities nationwide. A recent NPCA-commissioned report, *The U.S.  
National Park System: An Economic Asset at Risk*  
<[http://www.npca.org/park\\_assets/NPCA\\_Economic\\_Significance\\_Report.pdf](http://www.npca.org/park_assets/NPCA_Economic_Significance_Report.pdf)> , found that the  
National Parks generate over four dollars in value to the public for every tax dollar invested by  
the Federal Government.      The President's 2011 budget request for the National Park Service  
is approximately \$2.7 billion—a decrease of \$21.6 million over the current fiscal year 2010  
budget. Within the total budget, nearly \$100 million in park programs are reduced or  
eliminated—including Save America's Treasures and Preserve America grants—and parks are left  
without funding to pay for cost of living adjustments for staff. The operations budget proposal  
does not come close to meeting the \$100 million request by the National Parks Second Century  
Commission, and is insufficient to maintain current park operations and visitor services. As  
recommended by the National Parks Second Century Commission in their final report to Congress  
and the Administration, NPCA is advocating for a multi-year commitment that reduces the  
operations shortfall by at least \$100 million per year, as well as an additional \$500 million to  
meet the construction and maintenance needs of our National Parks. First and foremost, the  
President and Congress must support operations funding for the National Park Service, sufficient  
to meet its' needs.      B)      Lack of a Secure and Fully Funded, Mandatory Land and Water  
Conservation Fund.      The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) was established in 1965  
by Congress as a bipartisan commitment to invest in our natural areas, working lands and historic  
and cultural heritage, and to increase access to recreational opportunities for all Americans. The  
LWCF has protected land for our national parks, national wildlife refuges, national forests,



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

national historic and scenic trails, and wild and scenic river corridors. In addition, the LWCF state assistance program has helped develop new state parks, trails, and recreation lands in every state in the nation. The LWCF has also helped farmers and ranchers protect working lands with conservation easements and saved some of America's richest wildlife areas for hunting and fishing. In spite of these successes, the LWCF program has been dramatically underfunded. Every year, \$900 million from federal Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) drilling lease proceeds are supposed to be dedicated to the LWCF. But the full funding of \$900 million promised by Congress has been reached only once since 1965. Congress has diverted as much as \$17 billion -- 85 percent -- of the Fund's dedicated revenue for projects unrelated to conservation or recreation. Over the last eight years LWCF funding for federal land protection has dropped over 70 percent, hitting a low of \$130 million in Fiscal Year 2008. In order to preserve America's treasured landscapes and places of national significance, it is essential that the President and Congress fully fund a mandatory LWCF program. Current events in the Gulf of Mexico make keeping this promise more important than ever.

II) What works: What are the most effective strategies for conservation, recreation and connecting people to the outdoors that you have used?

A) National Parks Work! The National Parks embody America's natural and cultural heritage. They preserve the exemplary places and tell the defining stories of the American character and experience. National parks provide some of the best means of connecting citizens, young and old, to America's Great Outdoors, and preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation. They are, in essence, the world's greatest outdoor classrooms and provide opportunities for life-long, place-based and service learning. Consequently, National Parks are the heart of America's Great Outdoors and should have a prominent place in the President's initiative.

B) The National Park Service Works! The National Park Service has become legendary for doing amazing things with few resources. To give one example, the Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA), which receives less than one percent of the National Park Service budget, is making outstanding contributions to community-based conservation efforts around the southeast. The program offers NPS staff assistance to community partners for planning, organizational development, project coordination, facilitation, and public involvement in achieving locally-defined goals for natural resource conservation and outdoor recreation. To highlight one project in Georgia, much of the floodplain along a 50 mile stretch of the Ocmulgee River between the cities of Macon and Hawkinsville is already in public ownership, but is managed under a patchwork of federal, state, and local jurisdictions. Because of this fragmented management, recreational access to the river has traditionally been very limited. RTCA is helping to change that by working with the city of Hawkinsville and Bleckley, Houston, Twiggs, and Pulaski Counties to develop and improve public access points along the river, thereby creating a canoe trail, or Ocmulgee Blueway. When the Blueway project is finished, RTCA's partners will be able to promote river events such as festivals, river races, and run/bike/paddle races that can be combined with other eco-tourism promotions in each county. These developments will support local businesses, such as outfitters, restaurants, hotels, and shops, as well as create new constituencies for environmental stewardship. Ultimately, this project has the potential to link the city of Macon and the Ocmulgee National Monument downstream to the Altamaha River Canoe Trail and the city of Darien on the Georgia coast, over 200 miles away. From Darien it will connect to

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

*(cont.)*

the SE Coast Saltwater Paddling Trail, running al

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our community remains supportive of the National Park Service and the Forest Service with the realization that both are very large landowners in Washington's Western Clallam and Jefferson Counties. Both of these agencies have played, and could play into the future, a significant role with regard to "getting people into America's Great Outdoors." While the goals of this initiative are laudable, the idea that America's Great Outdoors should be an independent tourist/recreation draw is contingent upon people feeling welcome and invited to visit, explore, recreate and enjoy those lands. At the present, our "Great Outdoor" recreation centers are seriously lacking the financial commitment necessary to meet the new level of hype being used to promote them. For years, our community and others have argued for fully staffed facilities where there are no more "rare ranger sightings" associated with educational and recreational offerings by overwhelmed, multi-tasking and multi-hat-wearing front country recreation, interpretative, enforcement, and educational staff. In addition, while the recent investment by Congress into both the NPS and USFS through ARRA addressed some of the maintenance backlog for both agencies, it only took on the projects that were "shovel ready." There continues to be a significant maintenance backlog that is limiting access to and enjoyment of "America's Great Outdoors." It would be worth a note of caution to the Executive Branch that it may be problematic to highlight the need for America to rediscover itself, and its historic connection to its lands, only to have the visiting public find dilapidated buildings, unmanaged trails, outdated visitor centers (such as the one at NPS Hoh Rain Forest). Further, the expecting public may encounter facilities and parks that are understaffed or so heavily relying on volunteers that staffing seems to be a second thought. Also, there are great needs for both the USFS and NPS to engage in recreational planning if we are to see a true realization of the vision associated with this initiative. Over the past decade or longer in our region, we have continually been promised "plan revisions" or "new planning opportunities" to address the concerns and issues being raised about our public lands. Yet, in nearly all such cases, those required recreation plans, day use plans, capital investment plans, forest plans, etc., all get continued out to some tenuous, unattainable date in the future. America has a remarkable heritage that is integrally tied to the utilization of its natural resources and outdoors. This initiative has the potential of rekindling that flame of discovery in the hearts of many of our fellow citizens. The challenge that lies ahead is ensuring that those outdoor resources are prepared for the expected and/or hoped-for visitors. What Works? First and foremost, local collaborative, constructive efforts are probably the best example of what in fact works. In our community, there are conservation efforts focused on salmonid recovery that involve tribal and local governments working in partnership with citizen, state, and federal land owners on specific project enhancement efforts. However, these efforts, unless it is the application period for a specific project grant round, rarely see the continual participation and engagement of all of the federal land managers, particularly the NPS. If the meeting is to regulate, or to explain how the federal agencies could apply for state salmon recovery funding board funds, then we see tend to see the federal agency at the table. If it is to develop a coordinated planning effort, their attendance is less than certain. The USFS in our area, however, has been an active technical supporter of the local collaborative salmonid efforts and deserves recognition for its involvement in these efforts. Unfortunately, some of the agencies own policies and procedures require the agency to create its own local citizen advisory group. Recently, the USFS ONF found itself having to do just that, in spite of two

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

well established salmonid recovery/watershed planning groups, effort to undertake a focused watershed initiative in the Calawah Basin, when many locally felt it would have made better sense to utilize the existing salmonid recovery organizations that have been working, planning and promoting local driven conservation for the past decade. Unfortunately, the USFS administrative process did not allow for the local ranger district to utilize what was in place. Second, citizen buy-in to the idea that the Great Outdoors applies to them - all of them. People need to feel that they are a welcomed group that can partake in activities without worry about being shut out or closed down. This may require land owners like NPS and the USFS to put as much attention on the front end visitors as there seems to be on the wilderness and backcountry users. If all feel welcome and have a positive experience, that will then result in returning, engaged users. Challenges. First, there needs to be a clear realization that adding more land, wilderness or otherwise, to existing USFS and NPS holdings will not result in more people visiting and using that specific park, forest service site, etc. Second, there needs to be a realization that over the past two decades, or so, the discussion of recreation on federal lands has developed some very restrictive "socio-economic classist" views. If we are going to be asking Americans to enjoy their outdoors, we need to realize that this is going to include a large collection of various user groups, enthusiastic, and types. At the present time, there seems to be an agency bias against outdoor recreation that does not fall in the "day hike/outdoor wilderness walk" style of recreation. However, there are a larger number of outdoor enthusiasts that believe their interests in exploring the great outdoors as off road vehicle drivers, hunters, horse riders, etc., should also be incorporated in such new policy efforts. At the present there continues to be clashes between interested user groups and enthusiasts that usually leave a level animosity hanging about the recreation lands. On the opposite end of the spectrum is the hope that some forms of tourism aimed at understanding the underlying ecosystems, species and climate of the region could be developed to attract other users. However, the true investment in such new tourism markets has not been made a priority. In fact, some of the hype assigned to such objectives have been seized upon as a means of dissuading other users that may not meet the "perceived ideal visitor." A balanced, multi-use and user approach needs to be developed as part of this new initiative. Third, the process of engaging in the permits, or being involved in the planning is not an easy one. In many cases, the interested participant has to spend numerous hours attending briefings, meetings, reading through high technical documents, and then have a narrow window to submit formal comments. Such a process can be a significant negative persuader for the general public wanting to be engaged in the future of our Nation's "Great Outdoors." Fourth, the process itself seems to be a hurdle. Many times the lament from the USFS/NPS is that "the NEPA we have on recreation is outdated," "need to revise the existing plan," or, "no plan exists, so we have to wait until we can undertake that plan to address your access issue." Then when efforts are made to determine when a recreation plan, or plan amendment is to be considered, it is usually many, many years off in the future. Federal Government Role Focus. If the goal is to encourage the use of the outdoors and the properties managed by the federal government for recreation purposes, the agencies need to: 1. Make the lands and facilities usable. Limited use and/or closed doors, trails, and campgrounds due to a lack of maintenance funding, or lack of funding for operations, is a significant barrier that has to be addressed. The field staff are doing remarkable things, but they cannot be exp

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Department of the Interior, I attended one of the public youth listening sessions held in Albuquerque, NM on the America's Great Outdoors initiative. I was representing Talking Talons Youth Leadership, which is an animal rehabilitation center in Tijeras, NM. We use our non-releasable exotic animals to teach youth about science, the environment, and protecting these animals and their habitats. We have a summer camp where we take the kids on hikes in the East Mountains, fieldtrips to other rehab centers and nature centers, and really spend most of our time outside. We are trying to create a community garden using garden club volunteers in the community because this will teach that a person can be sustainable on their own - we don't always have to get what we need from a grocery store. The land that our center sits on is directly connected to Cibola National Forest area, and we are working with the USFS to create a program that involves the community in Talking Talons as well as the national forest. These are just some things on the horizon... What Works - Our most effective strategies include the use of our non-releasable exotic animals. We use these animals to teach kids about science and the individual animals' stories. The kids get to learn how to hold them, and this is how they build a strong connection to the animals. Because they start to care deeply about the animals, they also start to care about preserving their habitats in the wild once they learn about them. Caring about the conservation of the species and the species' habitats is then a small step from there. Challenges - Since we are a non-profit organization, we rely on state and federal grants to help us serve our community with our programs that connect youth to animals and the outdoors. This is our greatest obstacle; money and getting available grants. Federal Government Role - Really the grand obstacle to all of our programs is available grants to apply for. Maybe if the federal government had more money set aside for this effort, organizations like us could thrive because more grants would be available to us. Thank you for your time, and I hope these comments help you on your way to submitting your report to the President.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Greetings, I recently attended your event in Albuquerque last weekend. I was delighted to see that the administration is doing something like this and is meeting with folks face to face. The crowd was enormous and I was elated to be involved in such a process with my fellow citizens and members of wildlife and conservation organizations. I had some additional thoughts after the listening session that I wanted to share.

**Access and Advertising:** Some of the discussion during our session focused on the disconnect between youth and the outdoors. National Parks and forests are not accessible or even known about by everyone. I grew up in central Massachusetts and never even hiked till i was 18. I visited my first national park (Arches) when I moved from Vermont to Albuquerque. I think there's a real opportunity given the current economic state that you can use to draw families to less expensive camping and wilderness exploration. Instead of spending \$4 grand to go to Disney world let them take a road trip and camp for 20 bucks a night. I never say this in regard to anything else, but where is the advertising? You guys have to compete with video games and the internet, why not sell ads to websites aimed at children and families or encourage journalists who work for family publications to write stories about their adventures.

In the summer of 2007 i traveled to South Dakota. i was aware, of course, of Mt. Rushmore, but I spent 5 days visiting national parks and monuments that I never even knew existed. I poured hundreds of dollars in the local economies. With more a more serious public relations approach I believe that more advertising would lead to greater accessibility and use of these places.

We also spoke a lot about conservation and a few folks with the organization New Mexico wilderness Alliance offered that the parts of america that are wild all "work" in their opinion, it is we that must find ways to deal with them. Also, folks are also upset about oil, gas and coal companies polluting and ruining the heritage of our landscape. When I read stories about mountain top coal removal and this disaster in the gulf I usually cry. We did not get our wilderness protected in the first place without a fight. Humans have a bill of rights which we all cling to as a defense of our civil liberties, why not create a Bill of Rights or a constitution for our special, preserved places???? Certainly, they deserve it and they, unlike us, cannot defend themselves.

During our session, some folks got very excited when speaking about gmos and corporations like Monsanto controlling the dept of agriculture. I will say from what I have seen that I cannot believe I live in a country that allows a corporation to control the seeds that farmers grow and bullies them and renders them bankrupt if they refuse to use their products. Also they contaminate their environment. If the Department of Agriculture wanted me to believe that they wanted to make a difference they would heed the cries of the people they have met in these listening sessions and implement restrictions on the corporations that are compromising our health and our planet. What is the point of working on ideas for conservation and use of our open and wild spaces if they are in the same jeopardy that our entire planet is in? I appreciate your time and believe this is a great step toward a better future, -- One is left with the horrible feeling now that war settles nothing that to win a war is as disastrous as to lose one.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for the invitation to attend your America's Great Outdoors Initiative Listening Session held in Albuquerque, NM on July 17, 2010. This event was well organized and attended by a diversity of stakeholders from throughout our state; a testament to both your successful outreach and the great interest of the conservation community in New Mexico. While I was able to participate in some of the sessions, I was unfortunately unable to provide a comment during the breakouts. Thank you for the opportunity to comment in writing.

**Observations at the 7/17 Meeting** During the sessions, I observed a strong conservation ethic across a wide spectrum ranging from agriculture, preservation, youth education and empowerment to multiple use. I was also impressed by the agency leadership exhibited by Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture and your interest in developing more effective federal support for local projects and programs worth investing in.

**Comments** I would like to provide comments focused on programs and opportunities that will cultivate and grow the conservation ethic in our communities for current and future generations of Americans . . . in their own backyard! While implementation of sustainable management strategies in our large blocks of public land is important, I believe that federal agencies have an opportunity for a stronger supporting role in cultivating community appreciation of the natural and built environment within the urban and rural areas where our citizens live. Without an understanding of conservation amongst our citizenry and youth, we will lose the opportunity to get them out of the house and to appreciate, experience and support conservation of our wonderful natural areas outside of their community.

**What works** The USDA Forest Service Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Program provides funding to support a State Urban and Community Forestry Program (offered through State Forestry Organizations and the National Association of State Foresters) in each of the 50 States and 6 Pacific Islands. State UCF Programs cultivate local community forestry efforts in our cities, towns and villages through technical assistance and funding support for: development of management plans, tree inventories, arborist education, etc. In addition to providing resources and expertise, State UCF Programs are in-tune with the needs of municipalities and are successful at developing extensive partnerships and programs that support local communities. Here are just a few of the partnerships that states throughout the country have successfully developed:

- Environmental: EPA, State, regional, and local organizations (SmartGrowth, Green Infrastructure, Air and Water Quality);
- Community health (partnerships with hospitals, healthcare providers, urban greening and connection to human health and activity);
- Non-profit citizen organizations (at the local, regional, and national level);
- Community planners and housing organizations;
- Utility and energy providers;
- Outdoor education organizations

The impetus of success for State UCF Programs relies on creative program implementation and partnerships that leverage a limited level of base program funding support provided by the Federal Government.

**Challenges** While the USDA Forest Service and individual State UCF Programs have built an Urban Forestry Program that provides: research, services to communities, and effective partnerships; there are great challenges to building sustainable municipal programs that result in a true impact on the conservation ethic of our citizenry. States face two critical challenges in implementing our programs:

- The current Federal allocation formula for State UCF Programs is based on a state's population. This results in many states throughout the country receiving on average \$200,000 to implement a statewide program. As a result, the ability to effectively serve mid to



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

small size communities is greatly hampered (ironically, these are the communities that our programs have the most potential to impact when services are provided!). State UCF Programs are effective at developing non-traditional partnerships that elevate the importance of urban forestry and often result in additional funding support for individual communities. The challenge lies in sustaining sufficient funds to deliver a sustainable statewide program that can operate and grow to serve the needs of communities. Federal Government Role The Federal Government has an opportunity to recognize benefits provided by the already established Urban and Community Forestry Program and align its extensive resources and programs to support it. For example, nationally we see many separate efforts at expanding implementation of "green initiatives" through Federal Agencies, such as: HUD, DOT, EPA, Department of Commerce, Department of Energy. Locally, there is extensive synergy at aligning these resources on-the-ground, but the state and local urban forestry stakeholders consistently dedicate significant time and resources to compete for a diversity of federal funding sources that serve a common purpose in the local community building healthy forests that result in healthy people. Rather than promoting competition among federal agencies for a "piece of the green", the Federal Government has an opportunity to align a diversity of agendas and overlapping resources into one synergistic "Community Conservation Initiative". This initiative has the potential to: bolster existing programs, further partnership and leverage of resources, and result in sustained and lasting change in the conservation ethic of our communities. Tools "Aligning our resources to create a lasting impact" Across the country, we often talk about the importance of the 3-legged stool in sustaining local urban forestry programs: the state, the municipality, and the grassroots citizen organization. While many state organizations have these pieces in-place, we struggle to maintain sufficient funding to maximize our impact on the citizens of our states. We challenge Federal agencies to recognize the existing infrastructure and expertise in states throughout the country and seize this opportunity to align your diversity of agencies and resources toward a common goal. If Federal leadership accepts this challenge, the states and our partners are poised to provide input and support so we together can ensure successful implementation of an effective and sustainable "Community Conservation Initiative".



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I attended yesterday's listening session at Occidental College in Los Angeles, which I greatly enjoyed, however, I did not get to voice my concerns and ideas. There were some great thoughts being presented that I considered of importance, so decided to email my comments. I am a long time resident of the Mojave Desert, and I have great concerns on the rush to site renewable energy projects. Our deserts provide extraordinary opportunities for recreation such as camping, hiking, photography, exploring, and much more. While I understand the importance of alternative energy projects, our desert is experiencing a rush to site renewable energy projects somewhat like the gold rush. There are many problems with this rush to put such projects all over our desert. First, I don't believe there have been adequate studies to determine the actual amount of energy we will need in the future. There are other considerations to be made before running forward recklessly. Such sites should be close to the areas of use instead of in far away deserts, eliminating the need for transmission lines and the loss of energy when being transported on these transmission lines. More incentives should be made for rooftop solar, not only on homes but on large buildings and over parking lots in the urban areas of use. This could lead to green jobs in the cities where such jobs are drastically needed. Another place for siting solar and wind projects would be in previously disturbed areas of land and not out in pristine areas of the desert. Conservation of energy used is still an important part of the equation. Another great concern of this rush to site these projects is the technology and integrity of the companies applying for permits to build on public lands. Many of the technologies are not adequately proven and the companies that are rushing to get government money are not necessarily going to be successful, thus destroying our treasured desert resources with no successful outcome. Reading the proposals for these projects you will find much necessary information is not included and all the the negative impacts are not addressed. Also some of these applications do not have accurate figures for the amount of energy they can produce. Rushing to put such projects on our valuable public lands could lead to devastating destruction of these resources. We must slow down and proceed in a very methodical manner. Another concern is funding for our National Parks, monuments, and other public lands. Funding should be adequate for comprehensive management plans and for on the ground implementation. As development eats away at our public lands it becomes more and more urgent that these lands are protected for people, wildlife and the health of our people and the ecosystems. Thank you for this opportunity to express my feelings.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Last Friday I attended the session at the Occidental College in Los Angeles and during our break out group, our facilitator at the Samuelson Pavilion encouraged us to follow up with our challenges and or "what's working" recommendations with an example or story. 1. Challenge Our organization has been providing outdoor education programs over 35 years to youth in the public and private sectors and when trying to reserve "group sites" at some of the National Parks, these sites go very quickly because there are not enough. Group sites are critical when working with large groups of students. An example is Yosemite National Park, we need to solicit assistance from several of our staff on the 15th of each month to arrive in the office by 6:30, set up their computers to recreation.gov (the site that reserves for the National Parks) and at 7:00 a.m. SHARP, everyone needs to select a group site, these sites are taken within five minutes. Please increase the number of group sites available for so we can continue our mission of nurturing and educating these youth groups and providing an environmental stewardship inspiration. 2. Federal Government Role How can we partner with the federal government to make outdoor education programs available to our disadvantaged and at risk youth groups? We have a part-time grant writer and would welcome the opportunity to bridge grants that make these effective programs available to low income schools and organizations. 3. What works We have hundreds of stories and letters acknowledging some of the "life changing" experiences that take place in outdoor education. Here is one of many stories pertinent to environmental stewardship. a. A group of students attended a 5-day backpacking program in Yosemite National Park and at the conclusion of their program they were so inspired by their environmental stewardship calling, they returned to their communities and began a crusade to educate their peers and local residents by providing them with alternative on saving on the cost of electricity, within a short period of time, they reported a total of 200,000 pounds of carbon as a result of a program they have launched called the "pay it forward" project. b. A Salvation Army group of youth based out of Los Angeles and grant funded for a 3-part series of outdoor education combined with leadership, service learning and environmental stewardship taught these "at risk youth" and provided them with the tools necessary from the "Leave No Trace Behind", what they can do to contribute in their communities, reconnect with the outdoors and understand the importance of conservation. This particular group's last program was in the wilderness backpacking in the San Jacinto Mountains. Upon their return, they exchanged all paper and styrofoam eating/drinking utensils and now bring in their own washable eating utensils, maybe a small contribution but monumental to this group of youth. 4. Tools I have attached a list of outdoor education programs we provide and are constantly looking for new areas, Angeles National Forest is another great location. It would be helpful to have detailed trail maps accessible by GPS or downloadable to easily navigate trail groups without getting lost. We welcome any future discussion on how we can help support The America's Great Outdoors Presidential Initiative. Warm regards,

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I attended the listening session in Minneapolis yesterday, and I had a few comments to share: What works: I believe that important aspects of reconnecting people to the outdoors are to a) improve access, b) reduce fear, c) enhance connections to natural resources and connections between people in outdoor settings, and d) "make it cool." Some thoughts on these components... Access. I live in Minneapolis, and I love living here. But, I don't think I would be happy to live in many other large US cities. In Minneapolis, there was forethought to design a park system where each residence would be within 6 blocks of a park. Easy access like this, for everyone, will make reconnecting to the outdoors possible for all. Access to the outdoors must be planned for and incorporated on the front end. Fear. In terms of reducing fear... I believe that there we must clarify the true risks and benefits of unstructured, outdoor activities. When I was a child, my friends roamed freely in the outdoor world. We were encouraged to get outside and play. This unstructured play taught us to be creative and make our own fun. It taught us independence and how to think for ourselves. Today, parents are afraid to allow children to roam around outside unsupervised. Parental fear of stranger abduction of their children is pervasive and greatly unfounded. I think it would be beneficial to clarify the true risks of death or injury from various sources. Although the data varies from year to year... in 1999 there were 49 children killed related to stranger abduction, while this is horrible it is hardly a serious risk for most children considering there were ~50,000,000 children in US in 1999. Just for comparison, over 40,000 people are killed in car accidents in the US each year. Maybe it would be safer to let kids play outside in the neighborhood than put them in the car and take them to a "safe" supervised activity. Connections. People are much more likely to maintain their involvement in an activity if they feel connected to the resources and connected to other people who are involved. These connections build up over time... I don't believe they are likely to occur after a single "outdoors program." This relates to the two points above... I believe the easy access... and encouragement of regular, unstructured outdoor activities will create ongoing outdoor activities, rather than "special" one-of-a-kind outdoor programs. Making it cool. People are bombarded with commercial advertising about what clothes, cars, and electronic equipment are cool. Let's get real... it's way cooler to be active, fit, engaged, and focused in an active outdoor activity. And no, it's not just about acquiring the latest piece of outdoor equipment. Just being out there is cool. How can we get that message out??! Challenges: I think one key challenge is to better understand people perspectives on conservation, recreation, and the outdoors. We need to better understand the barriers to, motivations for, and perceived rewards of outdoor recreation and conservation behavior. We also need better analysis of what IS working. Do people who have better access have greater participation? If we break down the barriers to conservation behavior, do more people engage in the behaviors? Federal Government Role: There is a huge role for the government in facilitating the suggestions above. Strategic planning, leadership, funding, and coordination/encouragement of partnerships with state and local governments, corporations and nonprofit organizations. Tools: More support for coordinated research on human interaction with natural systems. --

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thanks for conducting a listening session in New Hampshire to receive input about how to best protect America's Great Outdoors. (<http://www.doi.gov/americasgreatoutdoors/Join-the-Conversation.cfm>). I will not be able to attend your event so I am submitting my comments via email. Bigger threats than insects, disease, and fire to my family's forests are state and federal Government Regulations. The state of Massachusetts' Department of Conservation and Recreation has all but eliminated forestry on 60% of public land and they now threaten to limit private landowners' opportunities to sustain their family forests. Job losses as a result of the state's preservationist policies are enormous. I urge the Obama administration to support family forest land owners, jobs, and open space conservation by enabling private landowners to make a living on their sustainably managed land. As the president and 9th generation of my family's Tree Farm business, I oversee the sustainable forest management of thousands of acres in Massachusetts. W. D. Cows, Inc., is the largest private landowner in the state. As the past president of the MA Forest Landowners Associate and the MA State Director for the national Forest Landowners Association, I presume my views are shared by many. Last year I closed my family's long held sawmill because manufacturing lumber in Amherst just doesn't make economic sense anymore. Moving forward we are focusing our efforts on sustainable forest management and log sales. We also are seeking other forest-based economic opportunities to sustain our family business into future generations. To ensure the future of private forests, we could use your help improving our forest-based economic opportunities in areas including solar and wind power, carbon credits, spring water production, conservation restrictions, and markets for logs. Biomass power has become virtually a criminal thought in my state. How is this environmentally preferable and renewable fuel source not being given full encouragement of the Patrick and Obama administrations? We need your help to turn MA and this country around. If you want to protect open space, please do not take rights and opportunities away from private forest landowners. Please encourage our sustainable and economic opportunities and encourage the state of MA to do the same. Thank you.

Hello, I attended the session yesterday. Thank you for holding it and I hope some very good things come out of it. I have an additional comment to offer. One of the questions asked was about the obstacles that exist to achieve our conservation goals. One is that many times the USFS, as the managing land agency for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, does not take a stand to support "wilderness character". This character is something it is measured on, studies and cares about, however when it comes down to the wire it often works to stay out of controversy instead of simply stating officially, "Yes, this project will deplete the wilderness character of the area for which we are responsible." They won't state anything that will be possibly used in court, even if it is true and simply a statement of procedures or something that everyone understands already. This hurts our efforts to bring effective cases before not only the courts but the public as well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What Works In my community of Western North Carolina, partnerships between land trusts, the state clean water management trust fund, the natural resources trust funds and the National Forests are effective in acquiring conservation easements. Coops of farmers and some state and federally funded local facilities help small local farmers process their products and get them to local and regional markets. The school system in Madison County uses local food in the school lunch program. Challenges Conservation easement transaction costs are very high and not possible for many people who would otherwise be willing to put land in easements. NC Farmland Trust fund has never been adequately funded and \$2M a year does not go very far. Local participation in providing funds for land preservation projects is not possible for poorer mountain county governments. Federal Gov't impediments The system of using volunteers is hopelessly tangled in bureaucracy originally meant to provide some kind of liability protection to agencies. In my own community, an effort to keep a NFS recreation area open more months of the year by having volunteers clean bathrooms, cut grass, and empty garbage complete fell apart because of onerous and unrealistic requirements placed on those who wanted to volunteer. Innovation and grass roots work is key but when all is said and done, all groups are desperate for funding, especially in these hard economic times. Agricultural policy does not take into account impact on small farmers but rather serves corporate farms. Farm subsidies need to be eliminated or completely restructured to provide benefits to small farms and farmers. Food Health and Safety Act as originally written would have put most small farms out of business. Tools Good data and research needs to be done and disseminated to the public and decision makers quickly -- and not so couched in cautious bureaucratic language as to be useless. Example, fish and wildlife initiative to study impact of large wind turbine installations on bird and bat life is disappointingly "cya" in tone. There needs to be some compensation to local governments when a large percentage of the counties land base is publically owned and therefore, tax exempt. Selling off existing public assets is NOT the answer to this problem

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

On behalf of the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning, I would like to submit the following comments:

- **What Works** · School field trips to the outdoors for elementary, middle and high school students, and participation in projects that restore the environment or recreation areas serve well to reconnect people to the outdoors.
- **Preserving outdoor areas and providing the means for the public to utilize them through trails, trailheads, parking areas, information kiosks and websites, definitely increase the use of the outdoors for recreation purposes.**
- **Challenges** · **Funding for procurement and maintenance of outdoors spaces are two of the most pressing challenges to increasing conservation, recreation and reconnecting people to the outdoors.**
- **Safety is also a major additional challenge in many urban areas.**
- **Staffing to work on procurement efforts is another challenge; many local governments and land preservation agencies are short on personnel and other resources, and are burdened with innumerable priority projects, lessening the time these groups have to work on procurement.**
- **A lack of monetary resources has forced many school districts and other groups to cut field trips, physical education classes, and other non-academic efforts, reducing the time young people spend outdoors.**
- **Federal Government Role** · The federal government can be a more effective partner in helping to achieve conservation, recreation and connecting people to the outdoors by:
  - **Fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund every year**
  - **Remembering that even though Americans may not put environmental issues at the top of their "concerns" list every year, preservation of the environment and outdoor recreation opportunities will always be important to the American public.**
  - **Allowing more control to federal units such as individual national parks and wildlife refuges for determining priorities, allocating resources, and working with local jurisdictions to conserve environmental resources and develop joint recreation resources.**
- **Tools** · Additional tools and resources that would help our efforts be more successful are:
  - **A database of best practices regarding strategies that local and regional jurisdictions have employed to encourage conservation, promote recreation and facilitate reconnecting people with the outdoors.**
  - **A database of grant and other funding opportunities to assist local and regional jurisdictions in the acquisition and maintenance of parklands and recreational facilities, and to hire and train personnel to manage conservation efforts and educate the public about outdoor resources and use opportunities.**

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this discussion.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Dear Sir/Madam: On July 1 I attended the Listening Session on Americas Great Outdoors and have included an expanded version of the ideas and issues I presented that evening. I hope you find them helpful.

**Eastside Audubon** The mission of Eastside Audubon is to protect, preserve and enhance natural ecosystems and our communities for the benefit of birds, other wildlife and people. Thank you for holding the Listening Session in Seattle. I welcome the opportunity to tell you about our program and contribute to the discussion of conservation of our natural areas and the promotion of greater involvement in the outdoors by American families. I represent Eastside Audubon, a chapter of the National Audubon Society with a service area that includes East King County from Lake Washington to the Cascade Crest and from the Snohomish County line to just south of I-90. Established in 1980 as a Chapter of the National Audubon Society, Eastside Audubon has grown to about 450 members and conducts all its activities using volunteers. Eastside Audubon has three primary means of serving the community: Conservation of birds and preservation and restoration of bird habitats, education of children and adults about birds and conservation issues, and recreational bird watching. The chapter sponsors a variety of bird watching trips and native plant walks, provides classes for adults, works with youth in a variety of settings, monitors land use and development that impact our communities, and conducts bird surveys of sensitive areas. I will respond to each of the four questions discussed in the breakout sessions.

1. Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieve your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors? A major obstacle is the lack of a national priority to support the consolidation of natural areas at the local level in multi-use urban and suburban parks and neighborhoods. Other priorities such as continual construction of soccer and baseball fields, hardening the environment by paving trails, and brighter lighting of parks seem to take precedence over preserving the natural environment. The introductory film reinforced the belief that nature is far away and the need for people to have to travel to amazing vistas to appreciate the outdoors. There was only token mention of local parks. In addition to protecting our national parks and forests we need to help people appreciate the outdoors where they are.

2. What works? What are the most effective strategies for conservation, recreation, and reconnecting people to the outdoors that you have used. Eastside Audubon has a number of programs that have been effective. For example, over the past five years the chapter has made a major commitment to conservation and bird watching recreation at Marymoor Park in Redmond, WA. We hold a monthly work party of 15-30 people and have been successful in restoring and preserving habitat for birds and other wildlife, and establishing a network of birding trails with high quality interpretive signage. This was done with the volunteer labor of our members, community people including high school and college students who were contributing their community service time, and employees of companies such as Microsoft and the Puget Sound Bird Observatory. We are committed to establishing a legacy of stewardship to pass on to children. Our chapter works closely with teachers in 14 schools in East King County and provides classroom-based educational programs on birds and the environment which include topics such as bird migration, species identification and typical foods birds eat. Each year we provide nature camp scholarships to six children from low-income families, a \$150 grant to a teacher to support environmental education, and a \$500 college scholarship to a high school senior who plans to study science or the environment. Chapter volunteers lead over 75 bird watching field trips per year for people of all skill levels and are committed to getting people out



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

of their homes and into nature. 3. Federal Government Role: How can the Federal Government be a more effective partner in helping to achieve conservation, recreation, and connecting people to the outdoors? We welcome this new initiative and hope it will get the federal government involved in many kinds of grassroots conservation and recreation activities. Promoting this White House Initiative as a national priority in a manner similar to President Kennedys Presidents Council on Physical Fitness would be a great beginning. We recommend that the federal government provide ongoing and consistent support for citizen science projects such as the Audubon Christmas Bird Count and the Cornell Lab of Ornithologys urban bird count and their joint Project Feederwatch. Also needed is financial support for analysis of the collected data and promulgation of the results. We also recommend that the government establish a massive effort to remove invasive species from natural areas, to plant native species of plants, to clean and repair trails and waterways, and to preserve open land in urban and suburban areas where most of the people live. These programs will also provide jobs to millions of Americans. In addition, we need government leadership to help the country stop burning fossil fuels and to review all legislation for its effect on the carbon load in the atmosphere. 4. Tools: What additional tools and resources would help your efforts be even more successful? Federal, state and county coordination will greatly help local organizations expand the kinds of activities conducted by Eastside Audubon which rfect the overall goals of the White House Initiative. These programs can be expanded to new communities and strengthened in the communities where they are already in place. Support for public-private partnerships is also important. Eastside Audubon has partnered with King County in its work at Marymoor Park, and with local businesses such as REI and Puget Consumers Coop to support education and conservation programs. Other communities have asked us to participate with them, but we are limited by size and budget. America is blessed with natural beauty and it has taken the active participation of citizens in Audubon and many other organizations to advocate for cooperation among the various levels of government to protect what we have. To expand the range of opportunities for families and improve the natural areas we cherish will take not only government but also average citizens who feel a sense of belonging and ownership for their country. Conservation and recreation can co-exist and enhance one another. Local community groups are one important aspect of a program to reconnect people to the outdoors. We hope the federal government will support this kind of community involvement. Thank you,



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

YOU WANT TO CONSERVE OUTDOOR SPACE AND RECONNECT AMERICANS TO THE OUTDOORS? HELP IS NEEDED IMMEDIATELY IN THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE, NY. THE CITY WANTS TO LET THE O'NEILL-DUTTON LLC BUILD AN APARTMENT COMPLEX ON LAND THAT THEY OWN, AND WHICH WAS CONTAMINATED BY THEM IN PRESSURE TREATING LUMBER WHICH HAS NOW BECOME A BROWNFIELD PROJECT RIGHT ON THE BEAUTIFUL HUDSON RIVER. THIS AREA ON THE RIVERFRONT SHOULD BE NOTHING BUT "OPEN SPACE" FOR PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO USE THE RIVER AND SEE THE BEAUTY OF THE CATSKILL MOUNTAINS. THE INFORMATION YOU ARE HEARING ON THE "WALKWAY OVER THE HUDSON", A LOT OF PROPAGANDA. I, AND THE RESIDENTS OF THE 1 ST WARD IN THE CITY OF POUGHKEEPSIE WHO LIVE IN THE AREA OF THE HUDSON RIVER CAN GIVE YOU THE TRUE STORY! WE HAVE NOTHING IN THIS CITY THAT ANY SELF RESPECTING PERSON WOULD WANT TO STOP IN TO SEE. WE HAVEN'T HAD A RESPECTABLE MAIN STREET IN OUR CITY FOR 38 YEARS, AND STILL HAVE NOTHING TO BE PROUD OF. WE HAD A COMMON COUNCIL MEETING ON 7/28/10 ON THE DEIS ON THE DUTTON PROJECT, AND LUCKILY BECAUSE OF SCENIC HUDSON, AND A FEW OTHER PEOPLE WE WERE ABLE TO FIGHT THE WOLVES OFF. THERE IS TO BE ANOTHER HEARING ON 8/30/10, @ 6:00 PM, SO THAT MORE CITIZENS CAN ATTEND, BUT ALL US RESIDENTS KNOW THAT UNLESS WE GET REAL HELP, THIS PROJECT WILL BE SHOVED DOWN OUR THROATS JUST LIKE EVERYTHING ELSE HAS IN THIS CITY. ITS THE BUCK THAT COUNTS AND THATS WHAT THE CITY SEES AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW, NOT THE BEAUTY OR WHETHER IT IS A PRACTICAL IDEA. HELP, IF YOU REALLY WANT TO SAVE THE GREAT OUTDOORS, THIS IS YOUR CHANCE!!! THERE IS SO MUCH US RESIDENTS CAN TELL YOU, IF YOU WOULD ONLY LISTEN. GIVE ME A CALL, I WOULD LOVE TO GIVE YOU A TOUR OF "OUR CITY" SO YOU CAN JUDGE FOR YOURSELF. TELEPHONE:

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In the small town of Cuba, NM we have organized a partnership to operate a program of trails, walkways, and physical activity to address health concerns in our community. You may find out more about our program at <http://www.stepintocuba.org>. Here are some challenges and potential solutions that arise from our experience of the last several years.

**MAJOR HIGHWAYS** Our community is bisected by US Highway 550. Our NM Dept. of Transportation seems far more concerned about moving traffic through Cuba quickly, than encouraging pedestrians to do personal business or enjoy recreation on foot. We need speed controls and other traffic calming approaches such as bump-outs, crosswalks, flashing lights, trees, islands, etc. We need a process that allows for adequate public input on this issue. We think that periodic community input sessions and highway design that reflects community desire for more walkable communities should be a priority for state highway departments utilizing Federal funds.

**US FOREST SERVICE AND US BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT TRAILS** We have a working local partnership for developing local trails that interconnect with scenic Federal lands and the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail that surround our community. Our local plans have been difficult to implement because of scarcity of resources for construction and maintenance of trails. We are dismayed that so much of our Federal budget is directed at maintaining outdoor recreational opportunities remote from where people live, and so little is directed to connect population centers - such as Cuba, NM - to nearby opportunities. Again, a meaningful local public input process, and a re-prioritization of resources seems like the answer. The health and quality-of-life "pay-off" from local trails seems huge in comparison to their cost to construct and maintain.

**SMALL CITY PARKS** Our city park is not a green refuge from the "concrete city jungle," but rather a center of outdoor activity. We are developing a year-round fitness trail that will serve as a hub for a network of walkways that will connect to our schools, businesses, services, surrounding Federal lands, and the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail. We are pursuing resources available for developing the park, but they are few and far between. Development of a "national blueprint" for small town parks, including potential resources for development, would be an important tool. A program of municipal park development might be very constructive "economic stimulus" for current times.

**SOCIAL SUPPORT FOR PHYSICAL ACTIVITY** We have a program of social support led by a walking champion. It includes fielding walking referrals from our local clinic, individualized counseling on physical activity plans, organization of walking groups, and worksite healthy activity promotion. These are evidence-based approaches that address our community and Nation's excess weight and diabetes epidemic. They should be among the highest priority of New Mexico's and other state health departments. Unfortunately, they are not, and resources for social support activities such as these are scarce. Health insurance entities rarely cover them as a health benefit, and municipal recreation budgets - such as Cuba's - are inadequate. Rearranging funding priorities to provide for a "pedestrian coordinator/walking champion/physical activity leader" in small communities and neighborhoods, perhaps employed by health departments, seems a potential answer.

**YOUTH OUTDOOR EDUCATION** The No Child Left Inside movement seems an important key to a healthier future for our country. Programs that encourage environmental and outdoor education, self-reliance in wilderness situations, summer youth corps outdoor jobs, and mentoring seem like an important direction. We are advocating for a safe routes to school program that allows for

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

school bus drop-off and pick-up at our city park, with students walking the remaining 1/3 mile to and from the school campus. With the addition of a pedestrian walkway from the park to the schools, we would have a natural venue for school-based outdoor activities. I hope these ideas are useful and can be incorporated into the Americas Great Outdoor Initiative. Once again, please read more about our ideas at <http://www.stepintocuba.org>.

By tracking statistics for those leaving ideas and comments, you have created a contest for people who often do not take this process at all seriously, or who are opposed to the existence of National Parks. Those who oppose the Parks have an additional forum now for their destructive speech; those in pursuit of "Top Innovator" status, as if it were a contest they are winning, treat the process with disrespect by posting irreverent, sometimes cruel and often nonsensical ideas (have you seen the one by a top innovator who wants to ban fat people from the Parks?). Have you considered that many of the comments your "top Innovators" receive are in opposition to their ideas? I and many others who have discussed this in a public meeting in our community at the entrance of the Angeles National Forest who appreciate your consideration in this matter.

I would ask that you NOT set aside any more land for designation as a National Monument or Wilderness areas. I live and work in Siskiyou County California which is a very rural county that has more than 65% of the county managed by the US Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management. The attempt to establish a Monument here would take more of what little private land we have and eventually take it off the tax rolls and hand it over to the federal government, not for management, but for set-aside land that can not be managed. This should not be allowed to happen. In these economic times, we do not need more land that is unproductive, but we need to start wisely using the resources that we have in this country. We should not be importing all of our needs (fiber, energy, steel, wood products, etc.) when we can and should be providing them for ourselves while at the same time producing thousands of jobs with this production. We have some of the most productive land in the world in the Pacific Northwests Forests; and the worlds best land managers, we can managing these lands wisely for the benefit of both forests and our societal growth if given the chance. Creating Monuments and Wilderness areas only locks up this land making us more dependent on other countries to supply our basic needs. Please do not create more Monuments and Wilderness areas. We can encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors, while educating them on the needs of using our resources responsibly instead of using other countries resources where the management is not done as responsibly.

Although I wholeheartedly support better protection of America's shared outdoor spaces, our entire constitutional democracy is now threatened from within by crazies. Please address that first. Stop letting fear of the crazy people dictate your policies.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I want the next generation to enjoy America's dream for greatness. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to undo the damage you have done by not allowing drilling, exploration and production of the incredible oil and gas reserves. We are allowing the Middle East to unfairly assert its influence on our nation. The only way to stop them is to beat them at the energy game. I am tired of being accused of being an Islamophobe. I am tired of high energy prices. I am tired of depending on other nations who use oil and gas as an iron boot against us. Our energy independence is the only way to insure national security. Exploration and production is done all the time without harming the wilderness. As in the example of the Alaska pipeline, it benefited wildlife with caused an increase in the wildlife population by providing heat in the winter and shade in the summer. To ensure that future generations will always benefit we cannot hold lands captive from energy production! Thank you for your leadership in shaping a bold energy independence strategy for the 21st century.

It is myopic to think of nature solely in terms of human recreation (although that is somewhat preferable to thinking of the earth as a limitless resource that we cannot use up). I'm stunned to see that even the Democratic Party does not have climate change as one of its top agenda items -- yes, we need to protect "America's Great Outdoors" but we need to look beyond this to our constant stream of toxic waste, the pollution that already fills the ocean -- such as the Great Pacific Gyre, a mass likely larger than the state of Texas consisting entirely of human rubbish.... When will the White House face the reality of what is happening to our planet as a whole? How many more catastrophes will it take -- more fires to destroy Russia? More floods to cover 50% of Pakistan instead of only 20%? A further increase in the occurrence of severe storms that wreak havoc on our cities, cause our rivers to overflow and wash away precious soil, destroy the trees in our parks? We are sorely mistaken if we think we can protect one parcel of land (or destroy one parcel of land) without considering the global situation. We've decimated the diversity of species on both land and water -- some 80% of ocean species have disappeared. We're hurting human health, causing cancer, premature puberty, all sorts of chronic diseases through environmental pollution. (No wonder the cost of healthcare is so high. You can't fund both sides of a war and expect to win it.) Toxins in, toxins out. What waste we create remains waste, if not forever, then for a very, very, very long time. Please: show us you understand the connectedness of these issues. Take the need for clean energy seriously; reduce the production of plastics; do whatever it takes.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

America's Great Outdoors Listening Session Comments      Obstacles to getting outdoors and recreating: · Perceptions of Risk · Costs (money & time) · Equipment · Skill

I think that the biggest hurdles to getting people outside are the perception of risk and the lack of free time and transportation/access to public lands. There seems to be a perception that parks are filled with perverts and drugs/crimes. Parents are reluctant to let children play outside unsupervised, due to the perceived risks and the stigma associated with "letting" your kid get hurt. Perhaps an educational campaign (advertising) could help to break down this perception of the outdoors/parks being scary places. Pools have lifeguards to supervise and provide rescue skills if needed to visitors to the pools; Can parks/public open space provide (volunteer, paid, combination) "parkguards"? Would a system of parkguards that patrol parks and supervise and assist visitors help to get more folks out enjoying the outdoors? Other big hurdles are the cost of equipment needed for many outdoor activities. Trails can be enjoyed via human powered (hiking, bird watching, running, cycling) for low to no costs. These activities are similarly impacting on the environment. Motorized and equestrian uses require additional expensive equipment and skills, and are heavily impacting on the landscape. Most of the nation's population can partake in human powered recreation on trails in the outdoor setting, utilizing a wide variety of types of trails (greenways, rail-to-trail conversions, ADA accessible boardwalks and nature trails, as well as challenging natural surface trails). Trails provide access as well as experience while conserving public lands by concentrating foot (and other) traffic on the trail's surface. Trails that don't provide the access and experience that users' desire will be used less frequently and users will establish their own trails to get the access and experiences they desire. Trails need to be properly designed and maintained to minimize their impacts to natural resources; Trails need to be inventoried and treated as facilities with appropriate budgets for maintenance and construction. Other than breaking down the perception of risk and keeping the monetary costs associated with outdoor recreation low, we need to make accessing public lands easier for all Americans. National Parks and Forests are wonderful places, but are inaccessible to the majority of the nation. Regional, state and local public lands are where the work needs to be done: Trails and facilities need to be built and maintained. Access needs to be improved, by providing safe pedestrian/cycling routes and public transportation alternatives that access the parks/open spaces and fit the typical and atypical American's busy daily schedules. We need to encourage citizens to "make time" for the outdoors: put down the remote and take a hike, picnic dinner with your neighbors or family in the park, skip the gym go for a run in the woods. A nationwide advertising campaign that makes outdoor recreation seem cool, coupled with paper and electronic resources to help Americans locate and access their public lands is needed to get folks motivated and active. Construction of new public lands and greenways can further enhance the natural and man-made landscape by providing connectivity b/w parks and people and other parks. Greenways and rail to trail conversions provide transportation corridors. These can be co-located along natural features (rivers, waterways, ecological communities) and planned/constructed in a manner that symbiotically provides benefits to man and nature. Corridors can provide safe and efficient commuting routes for students and working Americans as well as recreation for weekend/evening users. It is important to balance access and recreation with conservation. Science and research can help inform and enlighten the public as well as land managers about many management concerns. Science provides an objective lens

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

to investigate problems and formulate solutions that will help provide an optimum balance of high-quality recreation experiences with conservation/environmental goals. Finally, I would like to point out that there are a range of types of parks from National Park Service Units to the local urban open space or playground. America's Great Outdoors come in a variety of flavors and are managed by a plethora of agencies and departments. This initiative is being put forth by DOI, but needs interagency cooperation and public support to be successful. Thanks for hosting the listening sessions; America has great people and great lands that need to be united. I am a researcher at Virginia Tech (cooperating with \_\_\_\_\_ of the USGS); our primary research efforts have been on recreational impacts to public lands. My passion is for science, trails and outdoor recreation. I am very excited to see the Obama administration and Secretary Salazar put effort into reuniting American's with the outdoors. I believe that this is needed and can/will help address several pressing societal issues (health, energy, economy).

I only hope, you continue to use the sage wisdom you have garnered in the past . . . .keeping nature in its protected state, because with all of our self interests, the interest of nature is at risk. Thanks again,

We must be proactive in protecting and conserving our land oceans and wildlife - we hold it in trust for future generations. We must continue to protect our resources as well as expand the current protections. Recent events have emphasized the disastrous consequences from those who take natural resources with only financial profit as their goal. "Only after the last tree has been cut down Only after the last river has been poisoned Only after the last fish has been caught Only then will you find money cannot be eaten." ~ Cree Prophecy No man owns the earth or the sea or the wildlife. We must be the protectors the caretakers . We must cohabit with them with respect and stand for those things which have no voice. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

All I have to do to see what lack of planning to protect our environment does is to look around the city of Hermantown with its unplanned unchecked development. It used to be a beautiful little rural area with many wild spaces and now it has ruined supposedly protected streams and buildings on wetlands which result in pollution and runoff. Don't let this happen to lands which can be saved before it is too late.

Thank you for launching the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. Our land is precious and except for Kilauea (creating lava land in Hawaii) they're not making any more. Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to your reply.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Secure the borders so Americans can visit their National Parks without fear of violence by illegals who camp there grow and process their illegal drugs there use the Parks as transportation highways for drug and people smuggling. Our fragile National Monuments National Wildlife Refuges National Parks and National Forests along the U.S. southern border are being annihilated - not by natural forces or by unwitting tourists but instead by an overwhelming number of illegal aliens (up to 300000 in Organ Pipe National Monument alone in recent years) who rampage through and destroy these supposedly protected areas. Our beautiful and pristine areas set aside by Congress to preserve for future generations are quickly being turned into National Sacrifice Areas: The Coronado National Forest in Southern Arizona sits along 60 miles of the U.S.-Mexico Border. It has become one of the most popular drug smuggling routes in the Southwest with smugglers moving on foot across the forest typically carrying homemade backpacks filled with 50+ pounds of marijuana. A barbed wire fence demarcates most of the border between Douglas and Nogales Arizona. There are several places however where a gate has been simply been put in the fence to make crossing through it less of a hassle. In one place the fence gives way to nothing more than a cattle guard. The rugged Coronado National Forest has become strewn with literally thousands of trails and footpaths worn into the land by the flow of illegal aliens. Often illegal aliens leave their campfires burning starting forest fires. Over 60000 acres of the Coronado have burned in recent years much of it the result of fires started by illegal aliens according to the Congressional Immigration Reform Caucus. Eight years ago a report by Interior Department Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Environmental Protection Agency said "As a result of the vast amount of smuggling of humans and controlled substances in Southeast Arizona the extremely valuable and sometimes irreplaceable natural and cultural resources ... are in jeopardy." This is not just a few footprints in the sand. Some of the damage is unbelievably extensive and will take up to 200 years to repair. In addition to direct damage to the fragile desert ecosystems tremendous piles of litter and drug-carrying backpacks are discarded along with thousands of abandoned vehicles. Tragic loss of life has occurred. U.S. park rangers have been gunned down (Organ Pipe National Monument); in several areas researchers cannot travel without armed escorts; and as reported in numerous National Parks visitors are warned not to enter unarmed. Drug traffic is a significant component of illegal travel through our border areas and over one hundred incursions have been conducted by the Mexican army onto U.S. soil purportedly to protect foreign drug runners. Our park rangers naturalists and ecologists are not trained to defend our borders against armed incursions nor should they be. A July 2002 Bureau of Land Management report calls for a \$23.5 million first-year expenditure to deal with the incursions. To fully implement the five-year plan the cost was estimated at \$62.9 million. This is a reasonable amount to spend to protect our fragile border National Parks Monuments and National Wildlife Refuge areas against incursions by foreign nationals and to prevent further loss of life. Until the borders are secured absolutely NOTHING can be done to restore the National Parks to the legal inheritors....the American people. Until you Mr. President stop politicizing the sovereignty of this nation and do what is necessary to secure our borders don't waste my time playing with words and suggesting you are even vaguely interested in protecting our National Parks our citizens or these United States. "A nation without borders is not a nation." --President Reagan Thank you for considering my comments.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a member of several organization and boards relative to the American Civil War and in these Sesquicentennial Years 2009 - 2015 I hope that you would preserve as many sites and historic entities as possible even in these lean economic years. The encroachment of development urban sprawl and roadways continues to impact hallowed ground and devastates view sheds and tranquility where men fought and died on our soil. Additional border properties should be secured as well as actual fighting and maneuvering sites in order to project the peace which has come over the land. I am a member of Camp 20 -- Sons of Union Veterans Roanoke VA; Camp 1326 -- Sons of Confederate Veterans Roanoke VA; Friends of Booker T. Washington National Monument Franklin County VA; and a Board Member of the Jubal Early Preservation Trust Franklin County VA as well as the Roanoke Civil War Roundtable Roanoke VA. I also serve as Chairperson of the Franklin County Sesquicentennial Committee for the commemoration of the American Civil War. Hopefully your organization and our elected officials will do all that you can to preserve our heritage --- in a few years there will be nothing to save.

Please not impose any new restrictions in the National Forest Or any public lands. Being a long time Forest visitor I have witnessed the unnecessary closing of way too many campsites roads & trails since the 1960s. Please do not impose any more use restrictions on our land. The new proposed restrictions are a slap in the face to the hard working American families that have paid for & enjoyed these public lands for generations. With the expanding population of people wanting access to their public lands closing or restricting access just increases the overuse of the few areas that remain open. The American public needs more access not less. The majority of us also do not require any new structures signs parking lots roads or improvements we just want the existing sensible access to our public lands. My family & many others have enjoyed access to these lands since the early 1970s . Please keep it open for the tax paying public.

After reading the list of pre-prepared comments I would have to agree on all of them. To close more public lands to popular means of access so that more people can "reconnect" with nature seems completely backwards to me and hints that there is some other reason to lock up public lands. As a life-long Arizona resident an off-road enthusiast and a person who has traveled the country extensively it looks to me like the back-country in general is in pretty good shape. I've been on day-long motorcycle trail rides without seeing another soul seen lots of healthy wildlife (sometimes in my yard!) and seen open country spreading for miles. I've also volunteered for trail maintenance cleaned up campgrounds and generally leave a place nicer than when I found it. With this kind of stewardship taught in schools instead of extreme "environmentalism" I think we could go a long way towards preserving the country for the benefit of the people who live on it than a select few who simply want everyone else out! In closing I think the "Wildlands Project" is a pipe dream and I can't imagine what good would come of it. Does the U.S. government really think they can lock up half the country?



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

The answer is not to create more land ?area designations? but rather to do a better job informing the youth of the opportunity to enjoy the existing outdoor areas we have. Instead of creating new ?monument? and ?wilderness? areas that severely LIMIT many peoples use of public land; it would seem better to work to make more ?national park? areas that can be designated for many more different uses. American Great Outdoors Initiative - what a horrible thing to do to our future generations.

Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. If public lands are not made available to all members of the public for all legal uses they are not public lands and we will end up with many groups of citizens left out from using lands for which they pay to maintain yet are not allowed to use as they see fit. Without multiple use access we do not have "public" lands we have land that belongs to the federal government and sadly the federal government has lost sight of the fact that it exists of by and for the people.

Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. I have been enjoying our national forests as a hiker camper hunter fisherman horseback rider and off road explorer my entire life. I have watched the areas accessibility dwindle as it is. The elderly that climbed these lands as young people can no longer explore because ATV's are their only means of transportation and they are rarely allowed anymore. It's time to give back to the people and quit taking it away!

Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. Taking away the rights of the American Public to use public lands will not accomplish any good goals. We have been restricted and regulated out of recreation areas across the country our rights have been violated and our sense of freedom as Americans has been widely affected by such legislation. We seem to headed toward a Socialist State form of Government that is totally the opposite of the principals this great country was founded on. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH! STOP RAPING THE CONSTITUTION! These lands belong to the American people we have a right to use them!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Gentlemen: As a young boy I was privileged to join and participate in Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts (and was active until I joined the USAF). This put me in touch with the great outdoors in many of our 50 states and I was able to hike camp canoe boat fish hunt and otherwise enjoy this beautiful country God has blessed us with. Following my Air Force tour I married and raised three children. To "pay back" some of what I had "taken" from Mother Earth I returned to Scouting as a Scoutmaster and also served in several management positions. As a family unit we spent many weekends and vacations camping in the western states with our Jeep and tent trailer exploring the remains of many "ghost" towns and learning more about Americana than is usually available in most text books. Later we took up dirt bikes (motorcycles) and snowmobiles exploring the back country Alpine Nordic and backcountry skiing mountain climbing and the like. I think it is safe to say that I have a deep appreciation for the outdoors and would support most projects that would promote the accessibility of our public lands to current and future generations of Americans. This is not one of them. Unfortunately many of the places I have been privileged to visit have been designated Wilderness Areas and Off Road Vehicles (ORV) can no longer use the pre-existing trails. That forces the ever increasing numbers of ORV enthusiasts to use the ever decreasing number of "open" trails thus making them more dangerous more crowded and further away from home. Result.....fewer and fewer people get to enjoy the busier and more dangerous trails and more non participating people in the area complain about noise traffic and other negative aspects typical of large groups of people in smaller areas with a view toward obtaining more land closures. A vicious circle. Let's get some proponents of the use of public lands involved and come up with some ideas which when enacted will move us closer to our multitude of objectives.

I am in a wheelchair and I am a Veteran soldier of the US. Don't shut out my wilderness areas to motorized off road vehicles. I want to get into them to see the land I fought to protect. And don't give me another worthless "Handicap Access Path" to a spot where everyone is littering up and where you think I should be happy sitting there looking at all the signs you put up. Wilderness and US Monument areas restrict or wipe out access to everyone but the government workers who have a key to get in. And you probably have never been to one of these areas to know that. If you want to promote city youth and others to get into the wilderness then stop this falacy of "Smart Growth" zoning and "Inclusive Planning" that keeps the cities overcrowded and keeps people out of open space areas. Federal lands need to be opened up again for the Americans that pay for it so we can enjoy them. The lands are not there just so Ranger Bob can be in it everyday driving around or so that the Secretary of the Interior gets a semi-annual photo op.

I live in Southern California and own property in Landers CA located in the Mojave Desert. I am concerned about the abuse of current laws such as the Endangered Species Act and so-called Wilderness closures where the definition of true wilderness is completely ignored and instead large tracts of public lands are manufactured into what some like Senator Fienstien would lead us to believe is really wilderness (untrammled by man). I also do not believe that Wildlands Project serves the majority of Americans because it goes too far in keeping the public from enjoying public lands by vehicle access. Please do not support this bad idea and leave public lands accessible to the public by 4WD motorcycle and bicycle.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I object to spending 2 billion dollars of tax payer funds to set aside wilderness and monument areas. This will significantly decrease local revenue throughout the Western states and cause a severe economic recession to areas reliant on use of public lands. By declaring these areas off limits and only open to people on foot you are in essence "herding" the masses into specific areas that will make outdoor recreation more crowded and in some instances dangerous. Despite the President declaring the need for local involvement to implement his plan he has not sought any local groups help in this matter. This act will have the opposite effect of attracting Americas youth to the great outdoors most kids don't want to hike into anywhere to see the beauty that America has to offer. This is a very poor land management method close the land to reduce management costs. This will kill forestry in America making the US less self sufficient and more reliant on foreign sources. But perhaps this is part of the Presidents Socialism plan to control the masses. This is bad change. Troy Rauh - Redding CA

Living with a National Monument I have come to witness the lack of decisiveness which has led to poor forest management all resulting in less public use of the land.

Mr President. I object to your America Great Outdoors Initiative. In my experience areas designated National wilderness and monument designations limits the areas in which people can actually access. As an avid outdoorsmen (Hunter fisherman ATV'er Dirtbike'er Snowmobiler mountainbiker and hiker I find it most enjoyable to be able to do my sports with as few limits to where I can go as possible. The tougher it is to access an area because of nature the more fun. The tougher it is to access an area because of Government restrictions the more boring and un-enjoyable it is. Also I start paying taxes in 2 years. some of my paychecks already get cut for tax purposes. I want that money going to keep these areas open and easily accessible to the public not to close them off. Thank you for your time. IF you are an aid reading this it's for the President of the greatest nation on this planet. Not you.

Please leave our public lands public. If you have ever tried to hike in the wilderness you would realize that it is over grown and impossible. You can't enjoy something you can't access. The forest service does not have funds to maintain trails and trails are being maintained by user groups. most of the maintenance is being done by motorized users. You talk about getting youth out. Just try getting a young person out for a day of hard work clearing a trail or repairing a trail tread. This just doesn't happen. Please visit your user groups in Idaho and see the work we put into preservation. Leave our country open to multiple use.

Please STOP taking land from the US citizens. Don't forget it is OUR land. There are so many closures happening every year it's ridiculous. The offroad community is being squeezed into smaller and smaller areas and this is making the remaining areas more crowded. Don't make us go to Mexico for freedom. If you want to save the planet buy some rain forest land and keep it rain forest. De-foresting the rain forest is what's going to kill this planet not us driving around in the desert.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

President Obama As a life long Democrat and member of organized labor and I vote for the person best suited to insure my continued employment. With that said and as you understand better than anyone I'm sure many issues are not just D. or R. so I would like to ask your support to continue to allow me and many others the chance to enjoy the great outdoors in our favorite past time including off-road motorcycling and horse back riding. These activities are my families two favorite past times. We as a family have enjoyed countless hours together as well as spent 10's of thousands of dollars to enjoy our hobbies. The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas we need less! Thank you for your consideration.

While I believe that we do need to preserve the natural beauty of this great nation we should encourage people to enjoy that beauty not restrict them from it unnecessarily. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas we need less. If the goal is to reconnect Americans especially youth with the outdoors I believe that it can best be done by providing more places for them to enjoy their favorite forms of outdoor recreation. Off Road Vehicle use is by far the most popular form of recreation followed by Mountain Biking yet the Initiative seeks to create Wilderness and Monument areas closing another 13 million acres to people who enjoy those most popular forms of recreation. Please consider all forms of recreation that are impacted when Wilderness and Monument areas are designated. It truly pains me to see more and more of our Nation's lands being isolated from new generations of Americans. Please reconsider closing additional public land and make more land available for use by our children and subsequent generations.

The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need more Wilderness areas we need less.

Let's not forget that these are public lands owned and enjoyed by the public and we should not be "locked" out by over bearing restrictions to use. The average person can only hike 10 miles per day. If you designate millions of acres as wilderness it effectively limits it's use by everyone! You are supposed to protect our public lands FOR the public not FROM the public. Don't let the small but vocal minority bully their way into closing down millions of acres. Thank you

The Presidents is not acting in the interest of the people by making these changes with out consulting the people effected by the changes. Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. The majority of the public will be denied use of these lands due to the Physical limitation that come along with human life. All of the public needs access to these lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The push for ever more human-activity-less landscape must stop now. REMOVAL OF APPROPRIATE HUMAN ACTIVITY AND STEWARDSHIP IS NOT SAVING BUT DESTROYING OUR COUNTRYSIDES. THE TRUTH UNDER THE BIG LIE IS THAT WILDERNESS AND SIMILAR A-HISTORICAL RESTRICTIVE DESIGNATIONS ARE CAUSING MASSIVE LOSS OF FOREST HABITAT AND SPECIES VALUES RUINED WATERSHEDS ETC. THROUGH BIOMASS BUILDUP LEADING TO THE INEVITABLE CATASTROPHIC FIRE. People have been part of these lands for thousands of years. since before the forests and the landscape depends on appropriate anthropogenic activity to flourish and survive in abundance. PLEASE WAKE UP TO THE THREAT OF THESE DESIGNATIONS!!!

This bill is ridiculous urban youth aren't going to go visit National Monuments and Wilderness. There's nobody at a National Monument or in the Wilderness that's going to buy drugs or stolen property off them so they have no reason to leave their urban environment.

This will further hurt the economy. Many jobs and business' are directly related to off roaders enjoying Americas lands. Many of these locations are very desolate areas also that have no other uses. Kiss the business' goodbye and put them on the unemployment list. More areas need to be opened to people who enjoy these most poplar ways to enjoy the outdoors.

To whom it may concern: Closures of recreational parks will not only wipeout millions of families who enjoy off road activities but I also belive having places to go on the weekends will keep many many kids from geting involved with unsavory activities. They will be bored and most likely get into trouble. My family has been involved in dirt biking for 30+ years. I cannot tell you how many great times us and millions of other families have had at these venues. Youre being selfish and ignorant because you don't like it or understand it. What if we closed down all your precious golf courses... SAME THING DIFFERENT SPORT. LIVE AND LET LIVE. My children will thank you

Why are we doing this? Over 80% of lands West of Mississippi are open space. This land belongs to the people of the United States of America!! Why would we (the people) want to lock it up? We should let the wildlife run free the animals know where they want to go. We don't need wildlife corridors. Leave the poor wildlife alone including the wild horses. I am appalled and disgusted that is even being discussed.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear President Obama I am very sorry to see that your administration is seemingly managing our public lands in such secrecy and not giving the public a voice in how our land is being potentially shut off from our use. I am all for preserving the environment but not by labeling everything as Wilderness land. That designation essentially puts it off limits to many older generation Americans which I am one of. Sorry but mobility issues as I get older limit how much I can hike into the wild lands so if I cannot even use a vehicle road then essentially I can't get there at all. I wish I was 20 yearsold again but I am 60 and I greatly enjoy cruising camping and getting access to the back county and at this point in my life it is in a truck or SUV type vehicle. I am not talking about riding on hiking trails with ATV's I am talking access via any kind of road large enough for a truck/camper. I am in favor of controlling off road vehicle use in a reasonable manner but not by putting everything "off limits" Wilderness designation eliminates all of that access. ...and you are not even offering public debate on these decisions but doing it quietly on the sly! As a honorably discharged Vietnam veteran I did not fight for that kind of "freedom" nor the removal of my generation from our public lands!

I am writing this letter to oppose the land closures with regard to OHV access. We are already having a problem with people using illegal lands to ride. Closing more public lands to OHV's will only worsen the situation. I believe that everyone should have access to portions of public lands to recreate.

I am writing to voice my objection to the America Great Outdoor Initiative. The goal to reconnect Americans especially youth with the outdoors can best be done by providing more places for them to enjoy their favorite forms of outdoor recreation of all types. Off Road Vehicle use is by far the most popular form of recreation followed by Mountain Biking yet the Initiative seeks to create Wilderness and Monument areas closing another 13 million acres to people who enjoy those most popular forms of recreation. OHV and ATV activities are a fantastic way for families to enjoy both the great outdoors as well as quality time together please don't make it any harder to find safe and scenic locations to recreate.

I enjoy sending time in the national forests. I travel by jeep and motorcycle. Your intended legislation will limit access to the forests. Please don't legislate away the public use of public land.

I want to express my strong opposition to the designation of more wilderness. My wife and I are ardent hikers and backpackers and enjoy frequent use of existing wilderness for that purpose. But I'm also an off-road motorcycle rider and mountain bike rider and appreciate the opportunities I have to enjoy non-wilderness areas for those purposes. Far more citizens take advantage of recreational opportunities on non-wilderness lands than on wilderness lands. Designating more wilderness will have the perverse effect of actually preventing the public from enjoying the outdoors. Not everyone wants or is able to strap on a pack and hit the trail. At a minimum the President needs to include the two largest forms of recreation as a priority in his plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors: Off Highway Vehicle recreation and mountain biking. More areas need to be opened to people who enjoy these most popular ways to enjoy the outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm tired of losing public access to public lands! Who is going to go use it? There is millions of acres of "wilderness" areas already. And Jon Stossel's 20-20 report already stated we have more acres of forests now than we had 100 years ago. Cut it out. You have better things to do than adding more land for your already budget-cut employees to monitor and patrol. It would actually be better to sell some public land to help with the short falls.

It is becoming increasing clear that one group of users (radical environmentalists) is lobbying to exclude other groups from enjoying public lands. The radicals' desire to monopolize public lands is hypocritical. If human impact is so bad for wild lands then all people including the radical tree huggers should be kept out. In reality people and wild life co-exist from one end of the nation to the other. Recently on the Animal Channel there was a documentary on the Canadian lynx. The cameras followed a mother lynx to her den and showed the kittens living there. Then the camera panned across a valley and showed a snowmobile going by in the far distance. The narrator said that the mother lynx was forced to move her den by the noise from the snowmobile. Yah sure...like the cameras being poked into the den by a crew of environmental types had nothing to do with it. Radical left-wing tree huggers should be recognized for the hypocrites they are and given no credibility.

please do not close off public lands to off road vehicle use. my family and friends go camping together to use these areas to use our off road vehicles and enjoy the beauty of the outdoors as well as our friendship together.there are many many others out doing the same as us. by closing access you would be depriving us of our freedom to our recreation.

This initiative is a horrible idea. The National Monuments and Wilderness areas we currently have are under utilized while the areas open to other forms of transport such as motor vehicles and mountain bikes are over utilized. Washington is clearly out of touch with mainstream outdoor recreationalists.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To whom it may concern I am writing you concerning land and forestry use involving ORV (Off road vehicles). Are people misinformed and don't fully understand what is at stake and what may be leading to a lost right for ALL of us? Myself I LOVE the smell of fresh crisp clean outside country air and the sight of more trees and less buildings. After all this is where I grew up. But I feel some groups and individuals are going about this land protection thing all wrong. I call it LAND LOCK. Little by little our rights are being ripped from us. The areas for (adults and children) to enjoy ORV (Off-Road vehicle and snowmobile) are far and few between. Some people and groups like to complain about pollution. Let's look at the facts! There are serious doubts about people having an effect on the planet called global warming now and there is data out now actually showing the contrary to this. These small vehicles emit about the same emissions as a lawn mower due to the ORVs limited time of use and the small size of these engines. I do believe that chain saws weed trimmers and lawn mowers emit more pollution than ORVs in general due to our forty hour plus work week. Should restrictions be put on those as well? I feel the need to write about other states as well as my own. The land closure issue seems to be the same scary path that the entire country is on with all of these silly bans because of the people and groups that DON'T fully understand all issues they bring up. Let me to fill you in on some facts about the woods and animals. My brother is a hunter and I have nothing against that. The funny thing is that we see more animals when we are out in the woods enjoying ourselves on our ORVs relieving some stress and showing our young people these beautiful isolated areas of the outdoors when my brother sees fewer animals. The animals know we are not out there to hurt them when we are on our ORV. Animals are smarter than what they get credit for. They can sense when they are being hunted or when there is a hunter nearby. Some breeds actually cry out to warn others. They have strong senses that they use to survive. They don't speak or rationalize like we do. They use their senses to survive therefore their senses are very strong. I have been in situations where I have gotten very close to wild animals even with a motor running under me you can't tell me that they can't sense I was not going to hurt them. Another example this one I have seen many times. As I ride down the trail I see a bunch of birds on the ground eating some seeds that fell from a tree. As I come through some may move a short distance on the tree or a surrounding tree. I then see them go back to the fallen seeds on the ground in my rearview mirror as I pass. I doubt that I've devastated them. I have also been in similar situations with deer. One occurrence comes to mind. I was coming over the top of a hill and as I went over the top there was a deer standing in the trail eating. He didn't care at all about moving from the middle of the trail. Another time I remember was when I was with two other friends on our bikes. We were in Beartown state forest in Massachusetts. We left the parking lot going up a big hill. We stopped and shut off the bikes to talk about which way to go as the trail split off. As soon as we stopped a quail came walking out of the woods and started to walk around my friend's bike. He then started to peck at the rear tire. We just laughed and were wishing we had a video camera as these things happen to us quite often with wildlife. Don't get me wrong I support and think that land preservation is VERY important but I know the facts first hand! We need land protected for us NOT from us. We need to create more designated areas for ORV use. I spend a lot of time out in this great country's wilderness. ORV riders don't drive animals out of an area. A trail through the woods does no damage unlike removing trees and developing the land Putting in a new road for cars to run over animals or building new houses



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

or malls! The clubs that I belong to help to keep trails free from fallen trees and other blockages for all. Animals use these trails as well. Even in small local areas (such as power lines) people seem to enjoy complaining about ORVs and the sound of a small engine. I have been on the side of the trail and have been surprised several times when an ORV came around a nearby corner and at that point was just able to start to hear it. This applies to ORVs of today's standards with factory exhaust. An ORV is one of the classic sounds of the country or wooded areas just like a chainsaw log splitter lawn mower or a weed trimmer. I say "If you don't like what you hear move to the city and see how many pleasant country sounds you hear." Another effect that people don't think about is the impact on young people. Kids that take up these sports develop respect in learning about wild life and the environment and getting out enjoying our wooded areas with family and friends. They are usually not the type to leave food wrappers and beer bottles behind. When you take land away "or don't have any areas to begin with" guess where kids go. They hang out in the cities and towns more and a good part of them may get in trouble. Of course this is not the major cause of youth trouble but everything adds up these days. Some elected officials actually enjoy these activities themselves. I would be proud to take someone along to show him or her the fun and beauty of these sports. The revenue these sports create is also beneficial as well. States should take a good look at this issue and designate more areas for its people to enjoy these activities that can be separate from hiking or skiing areas. Don't let America continue on a LAND LOCK path. Do your part and help stop this before we all lose out! Thank you for your time!

Closing Land to controlled motorcycle and ATV pleasure riding simply takes away the American way of life that has gone on for 30 years. RV trips with families for the weekend tens of millions of dollars revenue from Motorcycle Dealership business millions of healthy young people enjoying the outdoor life will all be pressured. PLEASE THINK AGAIN

Dear President Obama It appears that your administration is about to embark on a program that will deny citizens of the United States access to a large swath of their public lands.

I support careful stewardship of and preservation of access to public lands for prudent use by hikers mountain bikers equestrians etc. These rules while they achieve the goal of protecting lands may create a generation of Americans that don't know about or appreciate the importance of these areas. Mountain Biking does more where I live to introduce our young people to the beauty and value of our wilderness than any other single activity except perhaps hiking. It teaches the value of volunteering for trail building and maintenance and helps to expand appreciation for our lands and encourages us to "leave no trace". It encourages health and fitness in a nation that is facing crisis levels of obesity and chronically poor fitness.

I've got a great idea....let's close down the entire country to ALL types of outdoor activities (camping offroading fishing hunting mountain biking horse riding etc) and pray to God that the children of the families who love these activities don't become hooked on meth because they now have nothing else constructive to do with their time. Good job Obama. Good job! Why don't we worry about more important problems the country is facing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ANY changes to our Wilderness areas need the FULL attention of EVERY AFFECTED USER GROUP! To commit any less is unconstitutional (public lands and "taxation without representation").

To whom it may concern. As an avid user of Public lands for the last 40 years in activities such as hiking mountain bike riding motorcycle riding. rafting fishing walking camping etc.. I want to go on record as being opposed to any proposal to redesignate Public lands without disclosure and public input in the area's where the Public land is located.

To whom it may concern. The \_\_\_ Family contributes green fees to enjoy off roading/mtn biking every year we spend vacation at least 4 times in the desert/mountains some where we can forget the pains of work schooling urban life.. Please don't reduce are choices tiny little areas like in Santa Clara County CA . This area is full of preserve and the wild life is threatning man kind in neighborhoods already.. Sightnings of dangerous Mtn Lions continue on a regular basis. The fish and game plant trout in the local ponds only to be devoured by the Commarrant (non native species) You need to irratticate the problems before shutting down the areas that we enjoy every year.I just returned from the upper desert this week to view it's true beauty while offroading. Please don't allow this initiative to be innacted. Downsize your staff like America has already.. Then rehire when revenue returns.. Registration has doubled for me but I still pay.. But if becomes like the fish problem. I will non op the bikes and cars.

Whatever happend to The Pursuit of Happiness within reason? Teddy Roosevelt definetly did'nt intend Public lands to be closed to the public when he started the Fed Land Act! STOP THIS MADNESS!!!!!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Not only does this "closure" need to be stopped but I & many of my friends would like to see radical changes made in the area of public land use. I say this because as a snow-mobiler I see every year the boundaries for snow-mobiling moving in closer & closer; restricting us more & more & this without any direction by Washington. Just this week (and very near the end of snow-mobiling season) I went snowmobiling w/ my sons in one of our most frequented areas and that after a fresh & unexpected snowfall. The Forest Service had just erected many new signs that were not there the week before doing this very thing; restricting snow-mobile access. The reason this happens I can only conclude is that the department in the forest service that controls land use is run by people who are members of radical anti-human groups such as Sierra Club & the Nature Conservancy. To myself & many of my friends & associates this kind of restriction makes no sense at all. The Wilderness areas that are so designated now are hugely over-abundant & almost never used. There are thousands & thousands & thousands of acres of land that are never accessed by snow-shoers or snow-skiers in the winter. And the number of people that access it in the summer is extremely low. If the true desire of this "wilderness designation" was to promote access then the opposite course of action would be the one promoted. It would be legislation that would make accessible more areas to people who do not backpack or snow-shoe. In writing this letter I also need to let you know that I am not a lop-sided close-minded OHV only user. I also love to snow-shoe cross-country ski. And in the summer I love backpacking. But these activities are the only ones tolerated under this type of "designation." Believe me if I observed that there was not enough land for non-motorized activities such as backpacking I would not oppose this "designation." I would promote it. But that is far from the case. Please do the right thing & oppose this closure.

As I review the map that illustrates the President's plan I recognize that many national forest and park lands are included as well as federal and state access routes into those areas. What is most interesting is that all of these access routes have connections to our southern borders. It would appear then that the "biodiversity" that is going to be protected is the illegal immigrant and his/her access into the interior of our country. This is not acceptable. Our nation's borders must remain sovereign and protected. I reject outright this plan.

As the years go by and I get older and less able to get around I find there is always someone trying to stop or make it impossible for the senior citizens to enjoy the natural beauty this country can provide. Making half of America wilderness area results in the elderly unable to enjoy less and less. I am 65 years old and have trouble waling so I and my wife ride quads or ;ATV's to get around to clean up trails take pictures and enjoy what we love so dear. I strongly object the closure of public lands so only the young and healthy can enjoy what is my god given right to enjoy by being born in this country. I can date my family back to 1724 and there was very little that held them back from enjoying the country they adopted and help make so great without a wilderness act to restrict them.

I am against closing any public lands for recreational use of any kind. I ride my dirt bike and support the local businesses. If you close the land those businesses will close and jobs will be lost.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I Believe that locking the wilderness away from people is the worst thing that can be done !!! I enjoyed the wilderness as a youth with the boy scouts and all my friends. it teaches you to love you're land and use it with respect. If its locked down then no one will respect what they don't know. To spend any money to close down nature from the benefits of proper enjoyment is absurd!!! Instead you should take a look at WEST VIRGINIA it has opened maintained trails with a permit fee and largely boosted it economy with out handing out (waisting) tax dollars. If you want to know whats good for any area you have to live there for a while. You can't know whats good in ARAZONA if you live in D.C. or for NEW YORK and live in COLORODO. I live 35 minutes south of D.C. and have watched development destroy all the woods I enjoyed as a youth. I have seen allot of people that call themselves tree hugger that have never spent a week or two in the woods camping and in joying nature instead they have to have a blow drier and cell phone. There idea of camping is a motel room!

I have two children who love the outdoors. We are a family of motorcycle riders and have been forced to go further and further to ride and enjoy the land that our grandfathers were all able to enjoy. For you to close these areas to me & my family is a disgrace to all who enjoy the outdoors. Given there are a few that neglect the outdoors but to take away the rights of everyone because of those few is ridiculous!

I object strenuously to wholesale road/trail closures without legally required public hearings etc. and contrary to the interests of the people most affected.

My principle hobby is riding motorcycles on primitive trails on National Forest and BLM lands near my home in Durango Colorado. This is my chosen way to experience the wilderness. Like 99% of the off-road motorcycle riders I know and ride with I go great lengths to ride responsibly. We do not damage trails. We do not ride trails closed to motorcycles. We maintain our machines to run quietly. And we do more to clear downed timber from our trail systems in the spring than any other use group. Sadly our contributions to trail preservation and maintenance seem to go unnoticed. Motorcycles are being excluded from more and more single track trails. I have seen several occasions where a trail in closed to motorcycles it quickly falls into disuse and disrepair and within a few years is unusable. Certainly there are public lands where user conflict is a serious concern but where I live if motorcycles are not allowed on the trails they will disappear. We have abundant land for motorized recreation in Southern Colorado. We maintain the trails. We ride responsibly. For these reasons I write to oppose the administration's recent proposals for increased Wilderness lands National Monuments and other potential land use changes connected to the Great American Outdoor Initiative that would exclude motorized users from public lands. Let's find a way to enjoy and preserve these lands for all user groups.

Stop stealing the publics land use rights in the false name of conservation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an avid outdoor enthusiast and enjoy a variety of outdoor activities from hiking to mountain biking to motorized OHV use. There is a need and a place for all such activities in order for each of us to enjoy our public lands. I strongly reject the notion that these radical special-interest groups are somehow smarter more noble more worthy or more representative of America. Please do not let them steer us toward ever more restrictive policies - keep our public lands publicly accessible!

Most of the land in the west is open space. Wildlife have plenty of places to live. There is no need to create Wildlife Corridors or designate additional Wilderness Areas. I object to spending my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations. This will discourage the public from enjoying the outdoors.

Sir My major concern is that by taking away designated riding areas (such as Stonyford and Elk Mountain in northern California which have been riding areas for years with no negative impact!) that do not impact the environment in a negative way will lead to more destructive environmental impact by riding enthusiasts riding in sensitive areas. I have no problem with more wilderness areas; only do not go to extremes! There need to be riding areas for motorized vehicles and areas where they do not belong. Let's hope this administration addresses both sides. I love dirt bike riding in the mountains but do not want them in special or sensitive areas. There needs to be a balance please!!! I would appreciate a response to this letter just to know someone has read it.

I have been an off road enthusiast for more than 40 years. I have seen the gradual erosion of access to PUBLIC lands through using the "environmental" or "preservation" excuse. Those who advocate this kind of program are self-centered eliteists who think they are the only people who count and to hell with everyone else. The proposed program is just another in a long line of plans to reserve PUBLIC lands for use by only the anointed elite.

I am sick of this administration shoving their agenda down the throats of the American people. PUBLIC lands should be kept open for the PUBLIC.

As a 3rd generation avid off-road family we responsibly enjoy the use of public lands. As a member of a local Jeep club that sponsors cleans and maintains public trails for free I find any attempts to limit back country motorized access to be misguided and a gross violation of my rights to use our land owned by the people. This land is NOT the property of anti-human special interest groups who provide junk science and lobbying dollars as a basis for imposing their will on the other 99% of the populace. Nor is this land the personal property of overbearing politicians in Washington who view themselves as rulers rather than representatives of the people. Do you really believe that the people want to loose access to their own land? The anti-human lobbyists had had a voice but why have the other 99% have not been invited to voice their side? You do know that the Nature Conservancy will make HUGE profits procuring lands to the government for wildlife corridors?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live on the eastern side of the Sierra Nevada mountain range in California. Productive use of this area has been largely shut down by government acquisition management and wilderness designation. Farming mining timber harvesting fishing and hunting were done in this area long before the first European settlers. A few head of cattle some alfalfa hydroelectric power production and diversion of water toward Los Angeles is about the only production left. Networks of roads and trails left by the former utilization have made this a great area for recreation but with continued wilderness designation and no maintenance even these activities are threatened. Please - No more wilderness designations!

A recent article in the AMA (American Motorcyclist Association) magazine has brought my attention to Wilderness and Monument. This is another example of government intrusion into the land and lives of American citizens without representation. As I understand it this sweeping legislation intends to make millions of acres inaccessible to a whole segment of the recreation industry off-road ATV's and motorcycles. Wilderness and Monument represent the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for all Americans without the Government deciding what's best for us without representation. I have ridden approximately 10 000 miles off-road over the past three years from Utah to the Bay of Fundy NB. I did it lawfully without trace without disturbing public or private property. I have seen the Utopia that some politicians falsely and without any thought process think they are protecting. I have earned the right to do this by paying taxes serving my country in the Vietnam theater and working on submarines for 30 years. Do you have any idea how incredibly offensive it is to suggest that politicians have the right to deny access to millions of acres of public land that me and millions of other Americans have fought for? And to suggest that the Government knows what's best that select politicians don't need congressional debate to legislate and just take it away? I will continue to fight for my right to see America without permission from a politician and continue to fight for free unrestricted access to Wilderness and Monument for all Americans. I respectfully request that you ensure that these areas are kept free unrestricted and available to all Americans.

Where in the Constitution does it say the Fed can own anything ? besides the grounds and property of Washington D.C. and military bases..... Don't over step anymore.... The country belongs to the People and the States not the Fed.....

i worked for over 40 years so i could now enjoy the many places i never had time to see. Why in the world are these place going to be closed off for who or what? Ken when you ran for office i thought here is a man for the people and from my state we have a winner here. What happened to you? Was all that you told us a lie? Don't do this it's wrong for everyone please stop this

I don't believe that the public land in the US should be closed to 90% of the public. If I can't use mechanized travel how can I enjoy the land? Let's just leave it the way that it is.

I enjoy hiking any chance I get and I find that people who travel into the wilderness whether it be by off road vehicle mountain bike or hiking/backpacking enjoy these areas and maintain them. They do NOT destroy them! More people should get out and enjoy the beauty that America has to offer.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am 62 years old and remember when I was able to go into the woods and enjoy nature without interaction with governing bodies. Now the area I frequented in my youth is closed off and the roads that use to lead there are closed 7 months out of the year. Our local areas are best understood by local people that use the land. We need to spend the 2 billion dollars on the monuments and existing wilderness not create more. I regularly hike in a wilderness area and the log in and out book has not been picked up by a ranger for two years now. Lets fix up what we have and let the people enjoy their land without over regulation. making new monuments and wilderness while the existing falls in around us is not prudent management in my opinion.

This initiative is a travesty. Closing public land to the public stands counter to everything this great country is about. It's the stuff of dictators and kings. It's not surprising considering the current administration but this has been going on since long before the current president ever took office. Closing public land is akin to just taking it. Without access for all it may as well be on Mars. I get so tired of a well funded and vocal minority infringing on the rights of the public at large. It's time to stop. Fences should border only private property not public. If the Sierra Club and groups like them want to close off land they should have to buy it through public offering. They are as greedy and underhanded as any special interest group you can name Thank you for reading this and I hope it can actually do some good for the public rights.

This letter is about my concern on the closing of so many of our public lands. For the past 40 years I have enjoyed our outdoor recreation areas and the past 10 years have been able to explore with my children. Which is priceless! We boat we hike and we offhighway ride. I fear that if we don't become understanding to others needs then all our riding areas will be closed. This will cause a backlash and will lead to violation protests. Being fair is the utmost importance. Please help keep our recreation and offhighway opportunities open to all Americans. Thank You

I am partially disabled and motorcycles and bicycles are the only way i can acces some of our lands. Wilderness diesgnation excludes too may Americans who have a right to access.

I live in busy crowded Los angeles with my husband and two children. We visit california city desert monthly to dirtbike spend time together and enjoy the wilderness. By taking our freedom away to visit public land our family bonding time and children's memories will be lost. Limiting access to private land can only harm the american family and the youth's interest in wilderness. I do not believe the peoples' best interest is at heart here.

Off road vehicle use destroys our public lands at an accelerating rate. I fully support the Wilderness and Monument designations. It is the right thing to do.

The elected officials these days seem to be on a mission to take away our personal liberties. When will it stop? I thought public land was public land. Off roaders of all types do more to preserve the trails than anyone right? Keep your hands off our trails.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When will we stop trying to keep public lands from the public. By only allowing a "select" group of outdoor enthusiasts to use public land you MR OBAMA are clearly discriminating against all who don't view the word public as you do. Shame on our first black President to only see the use of discrimination when it applies to you and illegal aliens. This kind of act and thinking is exactly why you are a do as I say not as I do President. Wake up and smell the coffee. This wrecks of the "special interest groups" you so often criticize making policy we all have to live with.

As a recreational user of public lands I object to the access restrictions being proposed. Real Americans fought and died for this land that we may all have a right to enjoy our freedom in. Think about that the next time your foot touches this precious American soil. Restricting access to our recreational areas is an insult to the cause of freedom and to be blunt it is just un-American. If you are truly representatives of the people you should be outraged by the political maneuvering being done in the name of conservation to restrict the freedom for this and future generations of Americans. This is a land grab and it's not even politely disguised as anything else. You know it I know it and anyone with a sense of reason knows it. In closing I will remind you that you are in your position by the appointment of the American People and we make these decisions in good faith. If we made an error in judgement by electing you or those whom appointed you be certain that decision will be corrected at the first opportunity. I pray for sound judgement to prevail in this matter. God Bless America

Therefore I urge you to look closely at any/all legislation or other forms of power/land-grabbing very closely so as to avoid further reducing access to so-called public land. If it is indeed public land then the decision as to what to do with it should be left to the public and not a small faction of environmentalists bureaucrats and politicians. I give my support to whomever stands against any further action by this administration and/or the federal government in-general to lock the public out of any additional public land.

I think we should be able to access land with our snowmobiles and ATVs!!! I have been riding in public lands for 25 years and that is what I do for relaxation! If I did not have that in my life I would probably be a very stressed out person. Plus what do you guys think people should do for a past time? Drink and drive and kill people????? We cant afford jets to fly around like you guys! There needs to be more trails in place and that would mean less travel with cars. That would help pollution also. You people need to pull your heads out of your ass!!!!!!!!!!!!

Does the word "public" mean nothing to you? There are billions of acres of lands protected unused and hoarded already. Slowly but surely the small areas for recreation are becoming diminished. It is bad enough we got screwed because you all were getting yours and now WE have to pay. ( and you will still and always get yours) Let the people have some space for recreation. Do you know how much public land is used for recreation? I have been told it is less than 1% including deserts. We should be appalled that you would even think of carving away more. I should be upset that we do not have any more of the other 99% The worst part is this will only probably have an adverse effect on me and my loved ones. You should all be very ashamed of yourselves!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The creation of Wildlife corridors will have a disproportional and severe negative impact on rural communities. Towns such as Disney Oklahoma and Clayton Oklahoma Depend on the money that is spent within their towns by people like myself who travel to these towns to use their Off Road Vehicle. Many towns through out our nation are similar to this and depend on the money spent by people like myself. It appears that organizations such as The Nature Conservancy stand to make huge illicit profits by swapping lands to the government for Wildlife Corridors.

Every year more and more so called "public land" is being closed! It is getting harder and harder to find places for law ""to go and spend time with their family's riding their dirt bikes and quads. With money being as tight as it is it seem that spending "2 BILLION"of my tax dollars (it is "OUR" tax dollars) to close public land is not a wise thing to do. But for some reason you people in goverment think that there is no end to the money you can spend! The more "Public Land" you close the more trampled the land that is open will become. I have noticed this over the years and when the land that is open does get trampled you want to close it because of over use! I have been riding in areas for over 30 years and in the past 15 to 20 years I have watched them slowly get "worse and worse" because of over use! Because of the fact that other areas get closed to orv use and no other places are being open to take the load off of them this is what happens! There are more and more people getting into riding off road every year. But our area's are getting smaller and smaller. It does not take a rocket scientist to see what is coming! Instead of giving kids a place to go and have fun you are just keeping them from doing anything contributing to nothing for them to do causing them to hang in the streets get into trouble and over populate our juvenile detention centers!! Give families back there rights to do FAMILY things!! Make the right choice by keeping our lands that "WE PAY FOR & OWN" open. Some of my best memories are when I was young riding dirt bikes up in the woods and spending time with friends & family.

Our leaders need to include the two largest forms of recreation as a priority in this plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors. That would be Off Highway Vehicle recreation and Mountain Biking. Both of which our family friends and neighbors are involved in. Just by taking the sample of residents in our neighborhood who participate in these activities it would seem that a large number of our population enjoys these 2 sources of family recreation. I object to the spending my tax dollars locking the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations for a select minority many of which do not even frequent the "wilderness".

I think our focus should be on good manors and etiquette for people on public land.I enjoy wilderness area's too but this kind of recreation doesn't require huge acreage and most land is not suitable for this use.As you crowd people into a smaller and smaller area it leads to more damage and less cooperation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Keep public lands open to the public! I object to my tax dollars being used to lock the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations. The president needs to include the two largest forms of outdoor recreation (Off Highway Vehicle and Mountain Biking) in his plans to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors. As a BSA Scoutmaster I am dedicated to introducing our youth to the great outdoors. Living in the State of Texas makes this a challenge due to the chronic lack of public lands - almost all land in the state is privately held. Please don't make the job of educating our youth in outdoor skills by closing more lands to public use. We must be able to get there before we can enjoy it! Can we protect our public lands without locking them away from the public? YES WE CAN! Say NO to land closures!!!!

Please stop limiting the public's access to public lands. 90% of public land is now closed to the majority of the American public other than those few are physically able to hike the rugged terrain.

Please stop the Wildlands Project. Human being have rights too.

This plan is ridiculous! Closing down land does not encourage "outdoor connection." By far the majority of public land use is that of OHV and mountain bikes. There are places on the map you can only get to with some alternative means of transportation. Don't destroy an entire community for the hope of pleasing a small minority other. In no way do I support this bill.

To Whom it may concern. I think that all access to public property to remain open. Access and continued useage of areas will help control future Wildfire situations. If the areas were closed the future wildfire effects could be catostrophic. Not only to the wildlife but to personal properties. Please allow these areas to remain OPEN andACCESSIBLE for future generations. If it were to be closed new generations will never know what public access is all about. Thank You

As an avid OHV enthusiast and environmentalist I have observed first hand the impact of responsible recreation in our public lands for decades. I would ask that you ACTUALLY VISIT some of the areas being proposed for 'lockout' by any form of recreation due to concerns of human caused harm. You will find that as with most things in life claims of impending doom are greatly exaggerated. Additionally I object to spending over \$2 billion of my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations which are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans. I thank you for your consideration on this matter.

I do not think that the government should be creating more wilderness that does not meet the required elements as wilderness. Or to take away any other private property rights. If anything there needs to be more areas or trails opened up for people to use for recreation. Since this administration is pushing for more rights taken away and the congress seems to support such things I will make sure that I vote and get some people to represent the things that I believe in to be in congress.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I strongly disagree with the closer of any public land. I furth disagree with any limiting on recreational use. Thank You

The President proves over and over again that he says one thing and does another. He clearly wishes to stifle American freedoms under the guise of he knows what's best for us. He is schooled in the Saul Alinsky mold of destroying America from within. He is not to be trusted at all! In any case Local Stewardship projects are the key to improving forest health. This has been proven time and time again on both private and agency lands where active stewardship has produced better forest health and increased biodiversity over non managed preserves. The President is interested in local involvement in his plan yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans.

This land grab completely ignores all the users of public lands. Our off road motorcycle club works closely with the White River Nat Forest and we urge you to vote no on this public land takeover without input from all user groups.

To whom it may concern I am avid outdoors person between back country hiking to offroad motorcycle riding and making my living teaching responsible offroad driving of 4 wheel drive vehicles. It has come to my attention that the parking lots of the areas for offroad recreational use is full of youth of all ages. The parking lots at the wilderness areas are normally empty if there are cars in the parking areas they are normally older imports. With drivers of the age of 40+. From my experience whom ever is pushing for more Wilderness to help the youth of this country they do not themselves visit Wilderness or offroad recreation areas. If you truly wish to help the youth of this country pull your head out and ask them what they would prefer. To be allowed to enjoy recreation in this country or be locked out of their public lands? It is their tax dollar that will be spent locking them out.

Closing 13 million acres to people who presently enjoy recreating there is not acceptable; I do not consent. Wilderness and Monument are the most restrictive forms of land designation and reduce access. We need to revert some of these lands back to Multiple Use in order to promote access for urban youth and all Americans.

It is an economical mistake to limit any offroad areas currently available as defined by this proposal. There is a lot of renew made in these rural areas. It should be promoted more not less. Stop it already with the "BIG GOVERNMENT ALREADY"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an OHV enthusiast who recreates in the American Southwest and do it responsibly. I am one member of a larger group of men who have ridden together in Arizona New Mexico and Colorado with our off-road motorcycles. We are responsible obeying all laws & restrictions; we all purchase ORV Tags and are happy to do so if it helps keep trails open. We are always courteous of other users on the trails and give the right-of-way to hikers mountain bikers or equestrians but to be perfectly candid we rarely see anyone else on the trails wherever we ride. ?I strongly object to any further closures of "public" lands. I respectfully submit that a better approach is to allow those of us who love the open lands to participate in upkeep and trail maintenance. Most of the people I know that are involved with off-road vehicles; be they motorcycles ATV's mountain bikes or jeeps are more than willing to help maintain trails & roads; they just need to be enabled to do so. We have long admired the well managed off-road use program in Colorado and have worked to try to influence the establishment of a similar trail system in Arizona and have offered repeatedly to help maintain such a trail system. It is sad to see that small self-serving special interest groups have gained so much power and influence that they have closed off the use of so much land; our land; to all but a very small group of people. Please do not allow this trend to continue; please keep our lands open for all Americans to enjoy.

I'm starting to feel a victim to environmental fundamentalism. We are blessed with a lot of land to enjoy but more and more of it keeps getting taken away. This increases density usage which is bad for all concerned. Please keep the public land open for public use.

my family and friends ride dirt bikes for fun and pleasure. we don't drink or do drugs. if you keep taking land from us we are not going to have any where to ride. our kids will not have any where to ride except on closed course tracks were it is to dangerouse to ride for our ability.

Stop the closure of Public Lands and the Wildlands Project!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have been camping and offroading in the California desert all my life. The desert has been subject to many closures over the years and now areas will be opened up for solar and wind projects. Those areas will no longer be accessible to the public. The Marines are looking at a large expansion into the Johnson Valley OHV area. I understand the need for our military to have training areas but they have options to expand away from the well established OHV area but indications are that they will take most of the OHV area. I have been going to this area with my father since I was a boy and have enjoyed many years their with my son and family. I always thought that public lands should be set aside for the public. These areas will not be developed and my tax dollars will help protect and expand my oppurtunities for public access. The way in which the uses on these public lands has been restricted in some areas makes them off limits to most. If you have an area that has established roads and trails that have been there for 100 years why would it be changed to exclude motorized vehicals. These kind of restriction cost state and local goverments millions in lost revenue. If you take the amount of money spend by the OHV Hunting communities for offroad vehicals camping vehicals and all the things you need for a weekend with the family its large amount of money. I some ares in California are closed or several restricted as prosed some small towns will be wiped out.

Another example of government out of control and overstepping their reason for existence. They are such CONTROL freaks and usually there is an underlying motive for it that hurts the citizens but benefits a few corrupt people. This used to be a great open country but the government has changed it drastically. Please do not aid their path of destruction.

Please stop restricting my access!! I feel it more prudent to educate citizens to take care of our lands. The more you close the more congested the open areas become. This creates over crowding and thus damaging these areas. More open area would insure lighter use and thus less damage. I am sure smaller organisations would love to be in charge of there local areas I just spent a day in the forest for the forest service checking trails for the Memorial Day opening. I urge you to delegate the responsibility of these areas to local organisations.

Please stop the land closures. The land is not in any danger and closing it to all but the special interest groups is just plain wrong and BAD. Do the right thing and leave it alone.

Closing public land access is a crime! How are communities dependent on tourist dollars expected to survive if the public can't visit their public lands. Visitors enjoy accessing land from many locations and for many uses. To block this access is not protecting the environment but hindering due to the lack of management. These areas will be more susceptible to large fires destruction and decay. With management and access public land can flourish and be open for all to enjoy. Allow the PUBLIC on to our PUBLIC lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I like the old motto of the US Forest Service "Land of Many Uses" Wilderness is simply KEEP OUT You are not welcome NO MORE WILDERNESS !!!! A wilderness STOPS access at its border. All roads and many trails are closed. Only a few are allowed to hike or horse in an area. We need MORE not less accessible recreation areas for our growing and aging population. So make lands available for the us to use. Currently the US Forest Service and BLM control Public Lands. They practice conservation "wise use". Both services evaluate and manage: access recreation forest thinning etc. Keep our Public Lands open for more than just a few.

Closure to OHVs ensures increased illegal riding and damage to truly sensitive areas. Multiple Use land including OHV access is desperately needed.

Hello Thank you for reaching out and encouraging comments from the citizens who use the public lands. One challenge that has been very frustrating to my friends and me regards our use of the Ojito Wilderness in New Mexico for hiking picnicking and bringing our kids and dogs. Often we have encountered shooters who make quite a disturbance exercising their legal right to shoot on BLM lands or even within the Wilderness itself. Often they are just on the periphery of the actual Wilderness Area but the sound of high-powered rifles carries a great distance. On one occasion when we were within 100 yards of the Ojito Wilderness we literally had bullets zinging past our heads and we had to take cover. One of our group went down to pay the shooters a visit. It turned out that they were a few guys actually white-collar types with high-powered rifles including one AR-16 and they were firing into a very rocky area. The bullets were ricocheting off the rocks and over the bluff to our location. It almost feels like a war zone at times with 3 or 4 parties of shooters in different directions. It is very often the case that our wilderness experience is greatly deteriorated due to shooters. I would estimate that even if all these shooters were outside on the periphery of the formal wilderness area perhaps half the area of the Ojito Wilderness is subject to the noise pollution of high-powered rifle fire not to mention the hazard of stray bullets. This greatly restricts which areas we choose to visit. I believe that most of these adjacent lands are BLM lands. The federal government could be a more effective partner in helping to support recreation on Wilderness Areas if they would also partner with the appropriate BLM officials and perhaps others to appropriately manage the competing recreational activities like shooting in and near Wilderness Areas. I would suggest that the BLM might establish designated areas where target shooting is permitted at least 2 or 3 miles from official Wilderness rather than the current free-for-all arrangement where shooters can shoot virtually anywhere they like with high-powered rifles and sometimes automatic weapons (legal or not). The Ojito Wilderness like other Wilderness Areas is a place where families come to enjoy the wilderness experience. It should not feel like a war zone. Thank you again for this opportunity to comment on management of our public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am one of the people who attended last night's function in Seattle- I appreciate the effort this administration is putting out to try to get input. I am just a citizen that enjoys hiking and camping in the outdoors. I have no affiliations to any groups. I was a bit intimidated to talk last night because so many of the comments and suggestions were put forth by extremely knowledgeable and articulate spokespersons from different nonprofits and environmental interest groups. I have a few comments I will put forth now. What works: I have read of groups like Conservation Northwest that work with interests that environmentalists traditional have butted heads with hunters Logging companies and developers they have sat down and been cordial to each other to find ways to satisfy everyone's needs. I think this is the approach we need to use as we reach an era of resource depletion. Challenges: As I mentioned in what works- resource depletion- This will ultimately be the sticky wicket This will be the Government's role to educate the public and industry about the brutal facts of overpopulation and resource depletion and everyone can't have all that they want. There will have to be incentives and education to try to steer this country in the direction of sustainability. Federal Gov. role: My wife and I love to camp and hike and one thing we noticed that is frustrating is the different passes and fees at different outdoors areas. Couldn't the Federal Government oversee a single pass that all the states dipped into? Sometimes you go to a trail head up miles of poorly maintained forest and once there find out you need a pass to park there but you can't buy it there- same with some camping areas- A sign says to buy at the regular place you would buy a hunting or fishing license- but the sign may not be specific in the location and I don't know the businesses in the area. A pass for all the states we would gladly purchase. Tools- I would like to see websites that could give you information on hiking and camping and other outdoor activities that would tie together the disparate agencies involved State Parks BLM Land County Parks State lands etc just have one place to go to find out about outdoor opportunities. Another tool would be a website for volunteer opportunities. One last comment is that I think some of the traditional uses of public lands need to be reexamined. I don't believe that ranchers should be able to leave their stock on public lands-Cattle foul waters and destroy fish breeding habitat and they are unpleasant to encounter when out hiking. If Ranchers don't have enough of their own land they shouldn't be raising livestock. cattle are a big greenhouse gas producer and are not efficient for food production either. Thank you very much for your time and interest

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I attended the meeting at Franklin High School in Seattle on July 1. It was very interesting to listen to the comments and views from the people present in our group many of whom were leaders of the various organizations they represented. Although I am an ordinary member of some of those organizations I myself do not have any especially profound advice to give. However I would like to make one point which perhaps could be put in most of the categories suggested for comments: what works; the role of the federal government; tools I would like to point out the times that I have seen work done by the WPA (or whatever similar program) during the depression. Impressive buildings like Timberline Lodge on Mount Hood in Oregon. Or the amazing dioramas of ancient life at Mesa Verde in Colorado. I know that our national parks and trails and other units which make up our great outdoors have serious backlogs of funding and I would certainly support funding increases so that what should be done can be done. But the work that I have mentioned that was done by the WPA shows that we need to raise our sights. It is not just a matter of repairing roads and bridges or building accommodation units or whatever else funding is needed for as important as these things are. We should also be doing the extra amazing things that Americans are capable of doing following the lead of the WPA. Especially at this time when so many people are out of work (as at that time) let us find creative talent and people with the skills to bring exciting developments to our great outdoors. I am not an economist but my own inclinations are very much in favor of giving people work now when they need it.

I live not far from Washington and suburban sprawl is steadily encroaching on our battlefields. The mess near the Battle Of Franklin could easily be replicated around here. Please do all you can to preserve them.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To all parties involved in decision making processes concerning AOI and any other legislation potentially tied to it. This initiative is partly motivated by a need to enhance recreational opportunities on public lands. But increased recreation opportunities will not flow from a whisk of a pen in Washington D.C. Any successful recreation management policy must be accompanied by adequate budget staffing and above all management's priority to achieve critical on-the-ground goals. Federal agencies' allocation of budget staff and management effort should reflect the developing reality that outdoor recreation provides a greater good for more Americans than any other aspect of its multiple-use mandate. The time has come to make managed recreation the BLM and Forest Service's top priority. Prioritize all efforts on clearing the repair/maintenance/improvement backlog in the National Park Service before designating any new National Parks or other similar protective area designations. (The National Park Service alone estimates that it would need an extra \$9.5 billion to clear a backlog of repairs and improvements.) All too often "conservation" means reducing public access and recreational uses. The AGO Initiative should explore ways to enhance a diverse range of recreational uses including motorized and non-motorized recreational uses across federal state and private lands. Federal land managers too often limit or restrict public recreation activities. Federal land managers should focus on recreation friendly management plans that are not restrictive and embrace a wide range of diverse recreational uses including motorized and non-motorized recreation. The administration has prided itself in being open and transparent yet Representative Rob Bishop and Representative Doc Hastings have not yet received a response to their requests for documents. It will benefit the outreach function of this Initiative if the Department of the Interior would respond to H. Res. 1406. The new National Park Service management policy emphasis is on preservation of our National Parks. This limits land managers' options insofar as what recreation opportunities a Park may provide. The initiative should study a supplement to National Park management guidelines to emphasize providing a wide range of recreational uses for the visiting public. Similar supplemental guidance may be appropriate for the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The initiative and the public will benefit from a full understanding of the various public and private conservation efforts currently underway. Accurate information is critical for good decision making. Statements that state large areas of our nation's natural landscape have been lost to population growth and development or that a changing climate and new sources of pollution are affecting wildlife and watersheds must be put into an accurate context. The initiative must disclose how much land is being conserved. The initiative should work with the over 1600 privately run land trusts to find out how much land has been protected in recent years. The initiative should disclose how much land is conserved via federal conservation efforts such as the Department of Agriculture's Conservation Reserve Program. In addition it would help to disclose how much federal dollars are being spent on the various conservation efforts. Finally the initiative should disclose the conservation efforts underway via the Land and Resource Management Plans of units of the National Forest System the Bureau of Land Management and National Park Service. Millions of American families enjoy motorized recreation. It often forms a bond between parents and their children as they experience the great outdoors together. The OHV community supports conservation efforts including support of the "travel limited to designated roads trails and areas" paradigm as outlined in the Forest Service travel management regulations and BLM's planning directives. The OHV

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

community also supports conservation through environmental review and analysis in route designation processes as well as ongoing monitoring and maintenance of the OHV infrastructure. The OHV community supports conservation efforts by contributing substantial funds to implement OHV management and volunteers tens of thousands of man hours in volunteer work projects. Much of this funding is made available to federal land managers via state OHV programs. These programs exist today because years ago motorized recreationists voluntarily “taxed ourselves” via state OHV registration programs. Some of these funds are used to supplement the agencies' law enforcement efforts. ATV and off-highway motorcycle riding encourages and promotes physical fitness. OHVs provide access to the Great Outdoors for Americans of all ages shapes and sizes. Thank you for your wise consideration on all the aspects of managing our public lands.

To whom it may concern Please keep areas open so that young and old folks can go out and enjoy dirt bike riding-4 wheeling-mountiain biking- this will keep young people busy and keep them out of trouble and great exercise for everyone. Please make more places in California for riding as my family has to drive at least 2 hours for recreation they just keep trying to take more and more away from people that enjoy the great outdoors Thanks

Prior to the Station Fire in the mountains around Los Angeles we had the opportunity to go up into the mountains and get away from the city. This is so important to making life in L.A. livable. Now we have lost a lot of the wilderness that we relied on for our spiritual rejuvenation. I urge that you develop wilderness management plans that: 1) Eliminate fires of this size and 2) Help L.A. to recover from this fire more quickly. This might mean better planning and/or more resources. This is such a huge loss to us.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our public lands belong to all Americans and not just to the members of The Wilderness Society. I was a Professional Forester for 58 years now I am retired. I provided the Public with clean supplies of drinking water healthy air and an opportunity to experience wildlife and nature. I protected the forests from Insects Disease and Fire. And most of all I provided the Public with management that not only reduced Insects Disease and Fire that endangered the Forest Trees I created an Economy that maintained and built improvements for use by the Public. Unmanaged Forests cause not only Dead & Dying Trees but Dead & Dying Trees produce Carbon Dioxide. Managed Forest not only create a healthier climate but create values that create jobs that create an Economy that pays for the care and protection of Forests. Harvesting Dead & Dying Trees by Helicopter during the Winter can make the Forests more healthy but can produce this situation where there the Forests are profitable and create an economy that will produce jobs and profitable budgets. Why are Foresters prevented from practicing the Science of Forestry? I see stumps and downed trees in and about Camp Grounds and Recreational Areas. Why is their value being wasted? There is no evidence that supervised tree removal (Forest Management) causes significant Erosion increases the starting of Fires or destroys Forests. Our region hosts unique public lands of incredible beauty but these lands close to large population centers cannot be classified as wildness due to the presence of human beings. Investing in Forest Management in our region will permanently protect a large and varied natural landscape create economic opportunities for neighboring communities conserve the region's biodiversity and recover its wild species through habitat conservation and restoration. I urge you to implement the following priorities for my region: Conservation means proper use of the values of Forest Products. Proper Use or Conservation at a Large Scale of Large natural areas such as the Berryessa Snow Mountain region provide our best hope for addressing loss of species and open space preserving water quality and adapting to climate change while preserving the wildlife and lands we enjoy today. Protect our Wildlands: Wild places are some of our healthiest and most intact lands if Forest Science is used to manage it. Wilderness Areas were created by Foresters due to their lack of access. Permanently protecting the Berryessa Snow Mountain region and defending against threats to our wildest places should be the highest priority as the administration looks to leave a legacy of protected places for the public to enjoy. National Forests create such areas while Parks and areas where Forest Management are not practiced create lost revenue. Create Economic Opportunities: Protected public lands can provide economic benefits to their surrounding communities. Communities can diversify their economies by expanding forest industries creating Forest Management in forested regions will thereby increase demand for food and lodging services and increase property values by protecting the area's natural amenities. Improving Watersheds and Wildlife Habitat: By investing in Forest Management of the Berryessa Snow Mountain region we will create jobs that are built around proper stewardship of our natural areas. This restoration will enhance wildlife habitat preserve critical water supplies and connect people to the land. Connect people with Nature: The Berryessa Snow Mountain region provides countless opportunities for connecting the communities of the Bay Area and the Central Valley with nature. Existing outreach programs for families and children will only be enhanced by permanent protection of this natural playground where recreation and outdoor education opportunities abound. Thank you for considering my comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A changing climate pollution and poorly planned development have put a growing strain on our wildlife our waters and our lands and we must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support. I am thrilled that you have launched this important process and I encourage you to make sure this effort has the guidance tools and resources necessary to make the initiative's lofty goals a reality. Thank you.

As an emeritus member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS) I am encouraged by the launching of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. Protecting our public lands from the always increasing impact of unplanned overdevelopment mineral & fuel extraction the continuing chemical toxification of our bodies & environment & impacts of climate change must include conservation of large connected landscapes to build resilience to consequences of the human overpopulation explosion tsunami. Protection of large watersheds & their wetlands will mitigate impacts of flood & drought from changing weather patterns.

I worked in yellowstone national park in 2008. It was not something I did for the money haha. It was a once in a lifetime experience nevertheless. Everywhere I look I see forests being ripped open and torn down. The places I walked and fished as a child are now the property of rich developers. Please take a moment to consider this growing problem..

Thank you for launching the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. I hope that this will be a real effort and not die off like some of your other promises. There is a tremendous need address critical issues facing ecosystem services wildlife conservation outdoor recreation and clean water. Put your weight behind this issue and do not fade as you did with energy and war related issues.

As a former Alaskan and former Coloradan, I hope you'll lend an ear to me when I ask you to view any actions toward mineral extraction in the Bristol Bay headwaters with great skepticism. Below is a form letter from TU which I generally agree with but does not capture my love for that place as, I'm sure, the San Luis Valley does for you.

The most important aspect of this is to PROTECT the remaining wildlife and habitat, not to create wastelands, dust bowls and dead zones caused by off-roading vehicles, mountain bikes and foolish, dangerous poachers.

Ban jet skis, all-terrain vehicles, snow mobiles and unjustified hunting. Do not apply pesticides and keep everything natural.

We do need to protect our wildlife and wildlands. we can't develop every area for progress.

These public lands and waterways and wildlife must be saved.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

An observation I would like to make at this time is that the Secretary of the Interior, Ken Salazar is consistently cited as acting in contradiction to the goals and ideals of conservation. His priorities would seem to be elsewhere. I believe it would be prudent to thoroughly review and possibly re-evaluate Mr. Salazar's appointment. I will be studying future actions on this and other related issues and considering those actions as your response.

Additionally, we use far too much space for highways and parking areas. We need more passenger train service. That will entail building more tracks that are not owned by the private freight lines, but will save a lot of space. I realize the northeast may need high speed rail, but elsewhere we just need rail service--normal speed would be fine.

Please think about all the space in the world that we have used. We don't need to destroy anymore of it and some animals actually need that environment to survive.

Voters need to be educated to believe global warming is imminent to dispel the conservative lies. They need to understand that a vote for conservatives is a vote for global warming. People who haven't grown up with a closeness or love of the land probably have trouble feeling the reality of global warming. Perhaps some can be reached through their children. There are various organizations and camps for children that most people are delighted to have their children attend. Even encouraging people to recycle should trigger some consciousness of the environment. Of course, if they can be encouraged to vacation in one of the beautiful parks, even local ones, they should get the connection. Advertise.

So many animals are in trouble due to man's interference and so many are either already extinct or facing extinction. It has to stop and we seriously need to protect and save animals. If we continue then what do we leave for future generations?

So many things at risk in our Western states. So many places to save at least for now.

We are the caretakers of this planet and it is our responsibility to protect all creatures from man's evil and cruelty, his abuse and arrogance, his greed, indifference and neglect. Too long, no President has listened - please help those who have no voice!

These lands are so important to conserve not only for future generations of people, but also for future generations of animals. This needs to happen in order to keep the ecosystem flowing. Humans CANNOT takeover anymore land!

I have been to the website and cast my vote, but, noticed there seems to be a concerted effort by the ATV crowd to drown out any voice but theirs. I trust this will not go unnoticed come tally day. We cannot allow these few fanatics to ruin our wild (and preferably quiet) places. In addition, now more than ever, we need a comprehensive approach to safeguarding wildlife and wild places from the harmful impacts of global climate change.

And STOP hunting in our wildlife refuges. Dictionary meaning for REFUGE - a place that is safe for wildlife to live, a refuge for them. Hunting on these lands is not a refuge!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are especially concerned about the range cattle in our National Forests who overgraze the meadows and muck up the streams. There is currently a lot of pollution in Spring Creek that flows into Sheridan Lake in the Black Hills of South Dakota. Much of this, I fear, is from the cattle.

We NEED "REAL" INNOVATION and dedicated resources TO CONSERVE and PROTECT our land, water, and wildlife. 'for when the wild dis-appears, so shall we soon after' REMEMBER: 'for when the wild dis-appears, so shall we soon after' . . . soon is here!

It must be remembered that Thomas Edison wanted to go strictly DC back in the 19th century. A hundred years of AC has just about killed us. Our trees are sick from the acid rain. Let's get rid of those power poles and begin the job producing work of installing fuel cell sheds in every back yard in the nation!

As a retired Refuge Manager, having devoted a large part of my adult life to protecting wild creatures and wildlife habitat, I know, firsthand, of the pressures exerted by man's overuse and exploitation. We owe it to future generations to leave our wildlands and wildlife populations in as good as, or better, state of health as they were left to us.

Please help protect wildlife by protecting the lands on which they live. Thanks for your help in this important matter.

If we don't protect our land, water and wildlife... we will lose it all. Our lives depend on this.

Your active collaboration with every American is crucial to develop this conservation strategy for the 21st century. And when I say "comprehensive", I mean encouraging every citizen to do his/her part. We are stewards of this world and each person needs to learn about and develop respect for the many living things and living places that surround us.

We want wildlife protected from hunting and trapping, plus the hazing of last wild herd of bison at Yellowstone is totally unacceptable. Please help stop such atrocities.

If we don't act now, all these inestimably precious, irreplaceable national resources and treasures will be irrevocably gone, lost to us and our children; and we will have failed our responsibilities and obligations as custodians of this, the only world we have.

The survival of our wildlife is very important to my family. We have seen the struggle to survive in urban settings when habitat is lost. We need our wildlife to survive to assure quality of life!

Our wild animals need all the protection they can get. After all, all this wilderness was their territory before we knew it existed. As Mahatma Gandhi said, "The greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way it treats its animals."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We do NOT need ATVs anywhere, in ANY parks, as they have shown repeatedly that their noise, pollution, speed, recklessness, erosion and being motorized and gas-driven has an extremely destructive impact on wilderness and wildlife - we go to these places, to rest, escape, and relieve the stress of noise, pollution, traffic, vehicles and to enjoy the quiet. PLEASE respect the original purpose of these wild places, and protect them from the greed-driven industries who want their products EVERYWHERE, regardless of their cost and destruction to our fragile ecosystems and struggling wildlife and wilderness. If we don't act NOW, they will vanish forever, and future generations will be deprived of an extraordinary experience that we have destroyed by our carelessness and greed.

I am enclosing the prepared statement, because it is so well stated and complete. However, I am very concerned that we, together, take the intelligent action needed to preserve our wild natural spaces and the wildlife dependent on those spaces. It is more than a recreational learning experience for humans, it is a matter of survival. Preserving habitats preserves species and allows for the balance of nature that has worked, is working, and will continue to work, if we allow it to work.

This is an opportunity for the Obama administration to demonstrate that conserving our wilderness and wildlife, keeping our waters and soil unpolluted by toxins is more important than satisfying the greed of developers and business, and catering to ignorant and belligerent citizens who constitute a minority but ruin this country for everyone else. You need to live up to your promise to rule by science not politics. Instead, this administration has catered to the loud and brainless. An example is taking the northern gray wolves off the endangered species list so that many, including "Yellowstone's" Cottonwood pack, were destroyed.

In my rural hometown, poorly planned development by our town council and planning boards is destroying wetlands, aquifers and other water sources, forests, our rural landscape, and our beloved CT River. We've tried hard here in town to stop this onslaught against the environment, but unfortunately the developers own most of the folks in town government. A federal response to this issue, in the form of strong and enforced regulations and laws, would be a big help to towns like mine. I encourage you to make sure this effort has the guidance, tools, and resources necessary to make the initiative's lofty goals a reality.

The outdoors is a heritage that can not be replaced. We are borrowing it from our children.

For the most part, individual species will continue to reproduce if given the habitat elements that they need. As these elements become fragmented a landscape-scale conservation effort will be required to maintain continuous access.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our wild Mustangs have been under attack by the BLM for years now. They continue to eliminate them shrinking the size of herds that have become too small to sustain. WHY? The BLM should be making sure that those herds are protected but instead they are rounding them up and sending them to be slaughtered. This is not what the public wants to hear about and so this dirty secret continues. Please stop the rounding up of these majestic animals and allow them to roam free on our public lands and quit catering to the ranching community, we all own those lands and those mustangs have every right to roam on them free like they have for years. This subject should be added to the effort to ensure these lands are left as they should be for the mustangs to continue to live on as their ancestors did for hundreds of years. They are the symbol of what this country stands for, Freedom and strength, nothing sends the message like they do!!

As an active user of federal and state lands for camping, hiking, skiing and just plain enjoying, I want to thank you for launching the Initiative. One more thing I do want to add is the tragedy of the cattle grazing in our national forests. They ask camper and hikers to tread lightly, pack it and pack it out. The cattle are destroying beautiful areas all through the forests. As a resident of Montana I am appalled at the devastation they have created. Cow patty's everywhere, trampled grasses and flowers, destroyed stream beds. This issue should be a priority!

We need real innovation and dedicated resources to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife, so that future generations will still be able to experience the great natural places in our land. In my lifetime, across the country, I've seen great forests shrink away, felled to make way for housing and commercial developments.

All of these represent most of our critical national resources. Unfortunately they have been handled poorly for many years, consider the backlog of maintenance from which they and our visitation experience, suffer.

I am particularly concerned about the Florida Everglades, which I have observed declining over the past 40 years. It is such a unique and precious resource and yet it has been losing those special characteristics rapidly.

You don't seem to understand the needs of wild animals and their environment. I think part of the problem is that your Interior and wildlife appointees don't either. Therefore, I was glad to hear that you have launched Initiative.

This might be a good start, if the Department of the Interior and Sec Salazar is onboard. The "new sheriff" has been among the missing when it comes to protecting wildlife.

We have pushed nature and its animals to the brink, let's not push them over the edge. We must protect wildlife for our children and those in the future. They are God's creatures.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Where I live, farmland, natural landscapes and wildlife have been replaced by strip malls - half of which have no tenants and many of them close down for lack of business. Last week, we saw a hawk in our backyard. I am pleased to have attracted wildlife to my gardens, but hawks have been displaced from their natural habitat and don't belong in inhabited areas! You have the power to do this. Please keep your word to reduce our dependence on oil, to clean up our national reserves, stop poaching and stop poisoning our land! Big business has no right to put their money ahead of principle - and you shouldn't accept that.

Every living thing prospers from the planet and if the planet isn't taken care of then everything else is affected. We need to protect these lands to ensure wildlife and mankind alike stay healthy and prosper.

Our wild places and the wildlife that inhabits them are our greatest national treasures and they must be protected completely, no matter the cost. Once we lose them they will be gone forever. Let's not let that happen.

As you should be well aware the National Forest has been logged to the point that to view a large tree you'll have better luck looking in side some city limits. To save the forest in Indiana you should have started a coupl of tears ago

Help...our natural inhabitants are fading as fast and they need our help. Lets do what ever can be done to protect the habitat for so many creatures that rely on us to do the right thing...protect, we humans have destroyed too much already!!!!

The number one priority must be the ecosystem (Land, plants and animals--ALL animals!). Protect the resource. The second priority must be for the human visitors' enjoyment. While protecting the resource, give human visitors as much access as possible.

I live in a rural area. and try to implement integrated landscaping not only in my own backyard, but in others who ask me bout landscape design. We almost lost a state treasure this year, our Alamo Lake. People were horrified to hear that the state "misappropriated " monies that were left to the park for it's continual operation. My grandson has already missed out on so many treasures that we used to take for granted

It is past time to take this initiative. We must reverse the damage we have done and protect what we still have of our great outdoors before it is too late. Our great country will no longer be great if we don't take strong steps to preserve what we have been given to admire and enjoy.

I am 80 years old, have no direct descendants, and do not have a dog in this fight. That being said, we have done more than enough to destroy the parts of nature that support us. Nature doesn't care. Microbial life, human life, and no life are all the same to the planet. Doing the right thing FOR US is what's important.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Not part of this letter, as prepared by Defenders; The mining of the soil by agricultural interests needs also to be addressed; in 100 years we have mined a soil that took 10,000 years to build. The plan also needs to address the over grazing that has resulted in species eradication and lack of diversity, and permitted the introduction of invasive species. Invasive species account for the destruction of as much habitat as does development. Thus their control is a critical part of planning.

The rest of the note that follows is a script but I did not feel the need to change it. I do want to stress how crucial your leadership is in environmental concerns. The earth is our school and we are all co-dependent. We cannot live without the land and animals on this earth with us. America needs to seriously change our "We can beat the environment with our technology" attitude. It is from the pioneer days and it is killing us.

We, as human beings, have been horribly destructive where our planet is concerned. We have done nothing that improved it and almost everything we have done has, in one way or another, harmed those very systems that made life for us possible. If we can do one thing right it is to protect that which we haven't yet compromised or destroyed. Are we up to the job?

Few things are as essential to the spiritual/mental/physical well-being of a nation as the land it stands on. City dwellers many never enjoy the "great outdoors" because they have other priorities, another way of life. This is all well and good, however if the land we live on is over exploited, used without wisdom and only for profit, dilapidated of its vitality, then the whole country suffers.

BLM, MMS, USFWS, FS, NPS ARE ALL STAFFED WITH PEOPLE WHO DO NOT PROTECT BIRDS, ANIMALS OR ANY WILDLIFE OR TREES OR LAND. THEY ALL WORK FOR PROFITEERS. WHY HAVE YOU DONT ZERO ABOUT THIS PROBLEM. MONEY AND GREED AND BRIBES FROM PROFITEERS TO FEDERAL AGENCIES ARE RAMPANT. YOU KNOW THAT. YET YOU HAVE DONE NOTHING AND HAVE APPOINTEED VILSAK AND SALAZAR, WHO HAVE ALSO DONE NOT A DAMN THING TO HELP OUR ENVIRONMENT. YOUR ADMINISTRATION HAS BEEN MISSIGN IN THE ENVIRONMETN AREA.

NOW THAT A LONG, EXPENSIVE & DRAWN OUT LEGAL BATTLE HAS RETURNED THE GRAY WOLF TO ITS RIGHTFUL STATUS AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES (SADLY AFTER HUNDREDS WERE MURDERED), IT IS TIME THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT & THE DEPT. OF INTERIOR & ESPECIALLY SEC. SALAZAR PROPERLY PROTECT THE WILDLIFE ON THESE PUBLIC LANDS AS WELL! PLEASE REMOVE SEC. SALAZAR AND THE INFLUENCE OF HUNTING & RANCHING SPECIAL INTEREST GROUPS & MAKE SURE DECISIONS MADE IN THIS AREA ARE CORRECT AND UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF QUALIFIED SCIENTIFIC EXPERTS.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As an independent voter who worked to elect you in North Carolina, I have been deeply disappointed in Ken Salazar - who is far too cosy with influential ranching interests in Montana and Idaho - and has supported their ongoing assault on the grey wolves of Yellowstone, and the last free ranging buffalo in that area. He has no credibility in the environmental community, and has damaged your reputation. Therefore, one of your first actions in the initiative should be to replace him with someone who understands the irreplaceable value of our wildlife, its habitat and the environment, and who will not be beholden to wealthy lobbyists attempting to subvert the will of the taxpaying public.

In surveys women place the environment before the military when it comes to use of our tax dollars. As a woman and a mother and someone who has worked to save public lands in my community and state, I beseech you to take seriously the need to preserve as much habitat as possible. Mining and snowmobiles and cars can be handled at will outside your realm. Please see into the future and do everything you can to keep the wilderness as pristine as possible for us and our children. I suggest you get a book called the "War Against the Greens" it is a real eye opener.

Almost 75 years ago the pioneering conservationist and ecologist Aldo Leopold called for a new "land ethic", arguing that not only land managers but also the American people needed to reconnect with nature and understand the interdependence of all living things. In spite of Leopold's efforts and the contributions of those who followed and fought to protect our soil, water, air and natural resources we find ourselves a decade into the 21st century still struggling against powerful political interests to establish a clear environmental policy with any kind of widespread public support. Our present course is unsustainable and irresponsible. That is why I want to As a wildlife biologist and park naturalist I have spent the last 12 years monitoring threatened and endangered species, restoring habitat and educating the public about conservation issues. I have personally witnessed the transformation that can occur when people make a direct connection to nature and experience the wonder and beauty of our public lands.

I live in a place inundated this week by thousands of families seeking outdoor experiences. The same folks often want convenient shopping and luxury accommodations. And that's how we get a Hilton Head Island - and its overflow into my backyard - of manicured nature. Unfortunately the manicure methods destroy the very nature they claim to highlight. All talk of balance. But the balance we've seen here has clearly damaged the unique estuary where I live, crab, shrimp, oyster, fish, swim and make wildlife pictures. Oyster beds are closed. I fear swimming after heavy rains. You can see my pictures and more at <http://imediasmith.com>. In a few days, my wife, dog and I will embark on a weeklong tour of the West. I fear we will see more compromises - for golf courses that are now bankrupt, for coal mines that ship their bounty overseas, for "clean" natural gas wells that are exempt from paying for the environmental damages they cause, for "irrigation" projects filled with speedboats.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fist I want to thank you for listening (I hope that you really are) to those of us who do not always feel like we are heard. As much I am dismayed by many policies or lack of foresight in many areas of my countries government I hold precious my right to voice my opinion and hope it will not be an exercise in futility. I urge you to steer and steward our country into the future merging the technical and spiritual growth I feel is required for our longevity. And I feel one of the most logical places to start is our management policies and practices of the Great Outdoors. Our land and the wildlife that inhabit it are under our care and we need to start showing that we do care. My idea of management does not include unmanaged growth, inhumane rounding up of wild horses when there are compassionate and humane alternatives, poisoning of prairie dogs, rampant clear-cutting, allowing huge corporations, (many not owned by US companies or persons) pillaging, destroying and raping mountains and other habitat for minerals and so on. We cannot grow into the future destroying our natural resources along the way and expect the future to be lengthy and bright, can we? No one's money is more important than my future and my families, families future. No ones.

We are so thrilled that we have a "Green-Thinking" Government. Since President T. Roosevelt and the Naturalist Muir, our protected lands and wildlife flourished. The overpopulation and the pollution that goes with it, is threatening these wonders. Delani National Park takes the tourists sightseeing in a little train, so the cars of the visitors don't disturb wildlife and damage air quality. Maybe this process could be implemented in other National Parks also. The Great Smokey Mountains National Park is one of the most polluted outdoors in the country, There is bumper-to-bumper traffic, I think that it is the most visited place in the Nation. If this park would follow the example of Delani, the pollution would be cut down. Also, charging an entry-fee would help to hire more employees and create more guided tours, lectures and other educational efforts. The Everglades National Park was a joy to visit, but lately it has regressed, and there are not as many enjoyable programs as there used to be. The visitors especially enjoyed the tour through Shark Bite that started from the Visitors' Center in Flamingo. All that is gone now, even though it could bring in revenue and delight the public. The little train was taken out years before the hurricane struck.

I am pleased to read about the Initiative. Unfortunately it was launched at about the same time as BP's Gulf oil disaster so the Outdoors Initiative didn't receive the attention it deserves. Our country needs an integrated national strategy to protect our great outdoor parks, refuges, national forests, and public lands -- and the wildlife that depend on them to survive. I am so thankful that our ancestors saw the value of preserving representative sections of land before everything was developed. Continuing to protect our public lands from poorly planned development, mineral extraction, pollution, and the impacts of climate change should be a key priority for the Obama Administration and for all of us who care about preserving our great outdoors. There is a tremendous need to do comprehensive conservation planning to address critical issues facing: Large, connected landscapes, watersheds, and wetlands Wildlife and wild places Clean air & water Outdoor recreation

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is a critical time for our society. With economic and employment difficulties, it would be easy to forget the importance of our environment and the creatures that share the earth with us. We need to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife. We all share a responsibility to leave the next generation healthier and better connected to the natural world and your active leadership is crucial to develop a conservation strategy for the 21st century. Our parks, refuges, national forests, and public lands are the best of America. Taking a comprehensive approach to conserving our treasured landscapes and protecting our public lands from poorly planned development, mineral extraction, pollution, and the impacts of climate change and animal eradication (wolves, etc) should be a key priority for this Administration. On a national level, we need to address critical issues facing ecosystem services, wildlife conservation, outdoor recreation and clean water. It is important that you have launched this important process and I encourage you to make sure this effort has the guidance, tools, and resources necessary to make the initiative's lofty goals a reality.

I am very thankful that you have launched this important process and I encourage you to make sure this effort has the guidance, tools, and resources necessary to make the initiative's goals a reality.

We must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support.

Now more than ever we need a comprehensive approach to safeguard wildlife and wild places from the harmful impacts of global climate change. Thank you for considering my comments and listening to the public.

At this point in time it is crucial that we protect our natural resources and preserve our public lands. Please remember that our public lands belong to all of us. I am encouraged that you have launched this important process and I hope you will make sure this effort has the guidance, tools, and resources necessary to make the initiative's lofty goals a reality.

Your active leadership is crucial to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife. At the same time, there are multiple pressures facing these lands. To safe guard wildlife and wild places, it is critical to resist these pressures. As lobbyists urge drilling and pipelines, or vehicle access to wild spaces, your leadership will be needed to keep these spaces wild. As we and wildlife face the harmful impacts of global climate change, landscape-scale conservation will be needed more than ever, to create and maintain wildlife corridors and refuges. The protection of watersheds and wetlands will be equally important as demands on our waters increase and climate change causes floods and droughts.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear President Obama, Thank you for caring about conservation and the environment. I love wildlife and wild lands and am pleased about you launching the Initiative. We need to protect our land, wildlife and water for all Americans and for future generations. Your active leadership is critical to making this happen. Now more than ever we need a comprehensive approach to safeguarding wildlife and wild places from the harmful impacts of development and global climate change. I very much appreciate your caring about these issues and your participation in helping protect our environmental heritage.

We need real innovation and dedicated resources to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife, as well as our Nations Wild and Free Roaming Horses & Burros too. There is a tremendous need to do landscape-scale conservation to address critical issues facing ecosystem services, wildlife, & wild free-roaming horse & burro conservation, outdoor recreation and clean water. In addition, now more than ever we need a comprehensive approach to safeguard wildlife, our wild horses and burros, and wild places from the harmful impacts of global climate change. To assist fish, wildlife, wild horses and burros, natural resources and human communities in adapting to climate change, this initiative must include the conservation of large, connected landscapes to help build resilience to the impacts of climate change and other threats. A changing climate, pollution, and poorly planned development have put a growing strain on our wildlife, our wild horses and burros, our waters and our lands, and we must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support.

Connected landscapes are crucial in preventing habitat fragmentation, a major threat for some of America's most notable wildlife, including bison, wolves, and grizzly bears. A changing climate, pollution, and especially poorly planned development have put a growing strain on our wildlife, our waters and our lands, and we must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support.

friends of mine have just returned from 4 weeks in your wonderful National Parks, including Yellowstone, and sent me pictures and descriptions of the beautiful Blue Ridge and other spectacular places. At the same time, the tragedy with the bear attacks was reported in Australia on the main TV news services. Is there not some way you can deal with this without killing a bear which, seen from downaunder, was living naturally and caring for its young. Anyway, on the positive side, I urge the USA, as world leaders, to employ real innovation and dedicated resources to conserve and protect your land, water, and wildlife.

In addition, now more than ever we need a comprehensive approach to safeguard wildlife and wild places (not to mention humans) from the harmful impacts of global climate change. (Just look at what is going on in Russia right now due to heat. In addition look at the floods in Asia.) We take pride in our treasured landscapes and share a responsibility to leave the next generation healthy and better connected to the natural world.

We must also protect our wildlife. Earth Justice should not have to sue the federal government in order to protect wildlife such as wolves, jaguars, and horses wasting time and money.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I personally would rather not see politics playing any kind of role in protecting the land, water and animals. We should do it because it is right. We should do it because we are the caretakers of it all- not the owners. There is so little respect in this country for the land, water, environment, air, animals- each other for that matter. If we respected, there would be no aerial gunning down of wolves. We would not be killing each other and abusing cats and dogs at the alarming rate we do. We would not allow people's homes and farms to be ripped out from under them just because a state wants to run a road through. Nor would we sit blindly by while a city closes businesses and tears down houses in order to build a city center or some such ridiculousness. Don't get me wrong, I want to see this initiative work. I am just fearful it is just another layer of bandages on top of an already huge one. You know who should really be involved in this initiative? Native Americans. There is no one else better for teaching about respecting the land and the mother (Earth).

The very environmental fabric that supports our ecosystem is being seriously depleted. Our open space and wildlife habitat is rapidly disappearing. Along with it our opportunity for outdoor recreation, sustainable wildlife populations and clean watersheds is also vanishing. Your program, Initiative is much needed and appreciated..

In addition to protecting our public lands, we must restore the Gulf of Mexico and the coastal regions that have been damaged and degraded by the BP oil spill. That region must not be forgotten.

Please remember, we were put on this Earth to be God's caretakers for all His creatures. Please help them.

Dear Congressmen,                    These natural 'treasures' cannot be replaced. Just look at the destruction that mining minerals has caused.

The pollution, littering, and poorly planned development have put a growing strain on our wildlife, our waters and our lands, and we must act now to conserve the majestic landscapes and diverse wildlife they support.

Many, many thanks for launching the Initiative! We need this sort of real innovation and dedicated resources to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife. Your continuing active leadership is crucial for developing a sound, vigorous, conservation strategy for the 21st century. They set aside our most magnificent, treasured, and historic places. There has never been a more important time for a comprehensive approach to conserving our cherished landscapes. Pressures to "use" them as "resources" -- e.g. -- to exploit them for financial gain -- rise with the economic downturn. Too many of us are too fat, glued to video games and The Mall. What better way to get us to improve our personal lives, by promoting a vital and healthy interest in the NATURAL WORLD? We take pride in these treasured landscapes and share a responsibility to leave the next generation healthier and better connected to the natural world.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There's so much to fix after the Bush administration. We can't continue to place environmental issues on the back burner. Some of us take pride in our treasured landscapes and share a responsibility to leave the next generation healthier and better connected to the natural world.

They have been built up over the years through the administrations of several presidents. With growth in population and most people living in cities, With many species facing extinction because of climate changes and human activities, Now more than ever we need a comprehensive approach to safeguard wildlife and wild places from the harmful impacts of global climate change.

I am writing to express my gratitude for your launching the Initiative. As a Coloradan who lives in the high mountain country, I absolutely know that we need dedicated resources to conserve and protect our land, water, and wildlife. Prior to this, I have been extremely disappointed in Secretary Salazar's actions (and inaction) on crucial environmental issues. I hope that this marks a change in the Obama administration's actions in this area.

This is a very important step for us to take, and it needs to be taken NOW! We can no longer take our time on putting forth plans to protect our land and wildlife. We are losing, and have already lost too much.

Please also consider that Mountain Top Mining is destroying scenic vistas, entire ecosystems and perhaps even might affect weather patterns in unknown ways. Private and Government owned lands must be stewarded in a way that works to improve our nation not reduce it to rubble.

Too much has been lost because of the inaction of the previous administration to global warming, habitat for big business, and wildlife non-preservation. Another reality that must be addressed is the ever-growing human over- population!

Undoubtedly you will be challenged on the size of the conservation area and the scope of what needs to be done. change is hard. However I encourage you to stand strong in the face of opposition and do the right thing for the environment and the people of the world.

P.S. If you actually read this please note. The school day is too long!!! We should be fostering a love for the outdoors, we should be nurturing our teachers to go over written words. We are headed stressing out our school system and taking the imagination nature could foster from our people.

P.S. I have a GREAT idea! Stop killing all our wildlife i.e. buffalo, wolves and wild horses! And when Ken Salazar says he wants opinions on his actions and gives us a deadline for them, make HIM honor the deadline. He wanted public opinion on the last wild horse roundup but before the time was up he started a roundup which killed 20 horses, 3 of which were foals. How disgusting can this administration get! If this continues, do not expect me to vote Democrat again!

The wildlife needs our protection now more than ever.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I understand that in the tough times our nation faces, the environment isn't always top priority. But our world needs looking after, especially in tough times like this.

It is absolutely necessary for our survival to protect wild areas and curb urban sprawl. Our cities are decaying and should be rebuilt instead of allowing doomed shopping malls and housing developments in the wilderness that not only impacts wetlands, woods and wildlife but contributes to pollution and excessive gasoline consumption. Americans are, by nature, stupid and need to be educated!

For the sake of my children and grandchildren, we must act now while there is still time to save these priceless areas. By doing so we will insure that all future generations will be able to enjoy them.

In response to those people who keep arguing the whole "we have the right since we were given dominion over the animals", you are conveniently forgetting the charge that went along with that "right". We were supposed to be stewards as well; that means no killing, no pain and suffering, and to guard/protect the animals. For example, I have had many animals; in return for their help, it is my responsibility and obligation to keep them safe, healthy, and happy to the best of my ability. Our society has failed this charge and should, in all honor, forfeit this "right". Genesis 1:28 Further, God blessed them and God said to them: "Be fruitful and become many and fill the earth and subdue it, and have in subjection the fish of the sea and the flying creatures of the heavens and every living creature that is moving upon the earth." 29 And God went on to say: "Here I have given to YOU all vegetation bearing seed which is on the surface of the whole earth and every tree on which there is the fruit of a tree bearing seed. To YOU let it serve as food. 30 And to every wild beast of the earth and to every flying creature of the heavens and to everything moving upon the earth in which there is life as a soul I have given all green vegetation for food." And it came to be so. If you read what it says, it says Here I have given to YOU all vegetation bearing seed which is on the surface of the whole earth and every tree on which there is the fruit of a tree bearing seed. To YOU let it serve as food. God was talking about animals and people eating VEGETATION. ANIMALS ARE NOT FOR EATING OR FOR WEARING. ANIMALS ARE FOR CARING AND FOR LOVING THEM. God holds us accountable for how we treat animals. When Adam was created, God surrounded him with animals and call it "very good". If God brings our pets back to life, it wouldn't surprise me. It would be just like Him. It would be totally in keeping with His generous character. The planet, space, stars everything is his (GOD). Be careful what you do to GOD'S creation for he is always watching. And if you want him to remember you care for his animals. And if you believe in god or you do not you have to believe it's simple, you have to eat, drink, sleep, breath these are his rules and we all have to live by them. REMEMBER SOONER OR LATER WE ALL WILL DIE, SO WHAT WE DO, WILL ALWAYS BE REMEMBERED BY HOW WE ACT IN GOD'S WORLD.

THIS IS EVEN MORE IMPORTANT CONSIDERING THE EFFECTS OF GLOBAL WARMING ON OUR ENVIRONMENT!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I toally agree with the above. We can have no drilling, mining, wild 4 wheeling, regular people pollution and corporation pollution to the waterways - need strictly enforced rules. Another consideration is where to 4 wheel & snow mobile. Some people 4 wheel/snowmobile in a responsible way to travel one state to another (in Canada) to enjoy the outdoors..In USA we have no maintained cross country trail with police maintaining law & order. This is needed. Then we have the extreme wreckless people who have no regard to maintain the environment or protect the animals. They need a contained policed area like race tracks have so they cannot tear up the environment. 4 wheeling should be only in designated areas on well kept policed areas. The 4 wheel/snow mobile people should pay for the upkeep of the trails, if you 4 wheel/snowmobile you must be licensed & in good standing with a club who is approved by the environmental agency. People should be licensed thru an environmental agency & be in good standing - & take classes first as in Md. requiring hunters to take classes prior to being licensed to hunt. No Grandfather clauses - even farmres & their kids should go to classes & then licened.. Thank you

Hardwood forests in Virginia are being devistated in order to make more acreage available to Christmas tree growers. I would advocate the aluminum tree as tacky as it is!

Preservation of outdoor space is esstial to the mental health of all residents, especially children. That the furniture of the mind of children should be predominately paved over space is the condition for mass neurosis.

When Adam was created, God surrounded him with animals and call it "very good". If God brings our pets back to life, it wouldn't surprise me. It would be just like Him. It would be totally in keeping with His generous character. The planet, space, stars everything is his (GOD). Be careful what you do to GOD'S creation for he is always watching. And if you want him to remember you care for his animals. And if you believe in god or you do not you have to believe it's simple, you have to eat, drink, sleep, breath these are his rules and we all have to live by them. REMEMBER SOONER OR LATER WE ALL WILL DIE, SO WHAT WE DO, WILL ALWAYS BE REMEMBERED BY HOW WE ACT IN GOD'S WORLD.

Just one more thing. I am sending this with the very faint and fading hope that President Obama will prove us wrong, and begin to come through for those who elected him. It is hard to believe that he has lost the faith of the people who campaigned for him so hard. I never would have believed that he could lose all us faithful and hopeful folks within the first couple years of his service. I promised myself that I would give him two years before i judged him as harshly as nearly all of my friends have. But it is getting harder and harder. why doesn't he wrap himself in the flag and demand that the banks do their patriotic duty and loan money? does he not want a second term? Please, please, we are begging you to NOT let this historic opportunity pass by without fighting for us. He should demand that the business owners put their fear aside and do their patriotic duty and hire workers - take the risk for the good of our country. I seems that he does not even want to try. why didn't his wife and family vacation in the Gulf of Mexico - to send a message? why all the opportunities lost. we are crying. We are hurting. We need him to stand up and champion liberal values. Now!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I also want no roads, no ATVs, no snowmobiles and no cattle.

I saw gasland the documentary this must stop asap.....please for the children and grandchildren stop the Cheney Haliburton way of destroying this country. The Gulf is not clean nor will it be clean for decades.....please tell the truth. The American People want the truth not corporate liars running our country for greed .....they can't eat money.

Please remember that if we do not make protecting our wild lands a priority, they will continue to deteriorate, and we will lose more and more species and ecosystems that we depend on in both known and unforeseen ways.

It's time to realize that all living things are connected by our need for clean air and water, and space to live.

For a while it looked as if the immigrants of america had lost their mind when they went on with the brutal killing of wolves. How low that was. How ignorant. The judge in Idaho gave the immigrants their senses back. From now on no more killing on wolves for the sadistics I hope some ruling in the near future will the immigrant give there senses back for buffalo too.

Too many species are going extinct on this planet. Before long, humans will be the only ones left. How boring will that be not to mention unhealthy for all of us.

Dear Mr.President, The Great Outdoors, Wild Life, Great Water Ways, Lakes and Streams, Purple Mountains Majesty, these are the amazing things God gave us to visit and be awed by. I want my son to be able to enjoy these things as a youngster and be able to teach his children some day the importance of these great and amazing things ! Human greed has slowly put these great things in critical circumstances and I think that is so sad. It makes me tear now as I am typing this ! My Grandma was my girl scout leader when I was young and taught the importance of Nature and animals and to RESPECT them ! Camping, Nature, those are things that help to keep sanity in crazy times! They say City Livers get depressed being around concrete, and skyscrapers ! They say everyone needs nature in their lives or you could seriously go crazy ! We need nature and wildlife and so do future generations ! Sir, PLEASE Do everything in your heart and soul to keep these great things of Nature and Wildlife not only safe but growing and thriving and increasing in sustainability ! Please ! It is so important, without nature I know I would go crazy and be very depressed and so sad that future generations would not know what a forest or animals were ! God Bless America !

New and growing threats overdevelopment pollution and a changing climate demand a smarter sciencebased approach to protecting wild areas wildlife rivers and lakes and cultural and historic sites that connect us to nature to each other and to our shared past. Each generation has the opportunity the responsibility to protect our natural heritage for the next generation. Thank you for all you do for America's wilderness and public lands!

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

We can not take our outdoor spaces for granted. I live in the Adirondack Park. It is a state park with beautiful mountains lakes rivers ponds and vast acres of forests filled with wildlife. The United States has so much of these wonders with the US Govt.as care takers. These wonders have been around for thousands maybe millions of years. These lands need to be available for generations to come. Miningthe lumbering of forests the needless killing of wildlife such as the wild horse wolves and the American Bison need to be better controlled or even stopped. The govt. needs to explore/fund alternative fuel sources. The BP oil " spill " in the Gulf of Mexico is proof of this yet more plans for offshore drilling and drilling in the Arctic on on the table. Mining for coal and other minerals are destroying rivers mountains and families loose loved ones because of the deaths incurred while mining.

This is so very important for all of us now. Even though some may not acknowledge the fact. And more so for the future. It would be horrible if one day soon it was all gone for ever.

Indiana is blessed with natural areas and a balanced budget though it's timing and method is questionable (selling tollroad). In saying so than why is the Huntington Indiana mountain bike trail of 12 miles and perhaps even the campground will be closed but hunting will be continued?

I have seen tiny parks created out of small spaces on Long Island when I lived there. It was amazing how many people used those tiny spaces all of the time. People NEED to be connected to the outdoors and nature for their physical and emotional well being. This is a perfect time to maintain create and expand the parks systems; as President Roosevelt did creating JOBS that are much needed for many in this country.

SINCE YOU BECAME PRESIDENT MORE WOLVES HAVE BEEN KILLED THEN IN THE ENTIRE 8 YEARS OF BUSH !Yes the states are allowing this but you can take action to put an end to this. And you can easily stop all killing of wolves on all types of federal land period. Also your Sec. of the Interior is destroying the wild horse herds of America. RESTORE PROTECTION AND STOP ROUNDING UP THE WILD HORSES NOW. These are my top priorities plus the list below. Dare to be bold and make hope a reality instead of a hollow slogan.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Conservation needs to embrace a wide variety of areas including not only public lands far from civilization but near cities as well. It needs to include historic and prehistoric as well as "natural" resources. Within this realm wild horses need protection from the agencies charged to protect them the BLM the U.S. Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife etc. The National Academy of Sciences needs to be in the position to advise the Department of Interior as well as the Department of Agriculture in these matters. Unfortunately these departments seem to be only answerable to big business mega international corporations. Family farmers and ranchers are losing their way of life because of this abuse. Americans in general are losing their national heritage. Navajos have radioactive dust in their homes. Condors are being poisoned by lead bullets in the dead animals they feed upon. The Sheldon Antelope Range in northwestern Nevada is planning to remove all wild horses from its boundaries when these animals have been present in that landscape for hundreds of years. against the ravages of human beings both in terms of largescale removal of precious minerals by foreign interests that do little for the people of the United States. To be sure mining has its place but not at the wanton destruction of nature. ATV's should be licensed and riders found creating their own new pathways heavily fined. Wild horses should be considered native wildlife. As someone who watches them constantly I can tell you that they take the path of least resistance when they are seriously on the move they use human's dirt roads. The High Rock Canyon wilderness in northern Nevada is about to be destroyed by the Ruby Pipeline project one that should have avoided wild areas and followed for a bit more money pathways already blazed for such purposes. The Bureau of Land Management is ignoring the greater needs of the American People for the needs of a few. We don't want small islands of wilderness protected for future Americans we want to retain the larger areas we have now! but not by attempting to remove invasive species through poisoning. We do have serious problems with introduced species but attempts in the past has proved futile and only further damages the environment. The Yellowstone project of reintroducing wolves is an excellent example of how to improve wildlife habitat including waterways. Another way is to expand the use of highway overcrossings and undercrossings for wildlife to do away with the island effect for both plant and animal species. Unfortunately my state has done very little in this regard but continuing to make funding available through the Department of Transportation is starting to have an effect. One way to connect people to nature is through more transparency. The Bureau of Land Management is playing a shell game trying to prevent the American People from accessing their activities with both wild horses and family ranchers. I am involved with a wild horse ecotourism project that is doing a great deal to even local people. And yet at the same time the BLM and others Please but provide oversight using the National Academy of Sciences.

We should leave our children something on this Earth besides deadly polluted wastelands. Corporate America doesn't care if humanity joins the ongoing Great Extinction this year or next but I think putative future generations should have some say in this matter. Makes sense doesn't it?

Limit exploitative utilization of National Forests such as harvesting and mining EXPAND and areas Establish NO BUILD NO DEVELOPMENT guidelines for more government lands

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an 80 year old Episcopal priest and monk still able to get around and enjoy the environment that God has given us. In the years before WW II My family was able to spend the whole summer early June until Labor Day weekend at a family cabin at Priest Lake Idaho. Gasoline rationing limited the amount of time we could be there during the war years but afterwards we could resume spending periods of time in the beautiful Selkirk Mountains. Presently I live in Massachusetts where from time to time I can visit some of the natural wonders of this part of America. Even when I cannot so easily get to our National Parks and other wonders of nature but I can enjoy seeing pictures of them. But I realize that many of our wilderness regions are being threatened by the inroads of commercialism and industry.

It is extremely critical that every decision made considers the effects on the sustainability of humans on earth. This means our priorities must change from economic growth and a society based on violent competitive and forceful control of resources (war) to economic sustainability with controlled population environmental protections and minimal impact on our natural resources (peace).

Please conserve large landscapes that include our most pristine wildlands working forest and ranch lands private lands and the connections across these large areas. Large natural areas provide our best hope for addressing loss of species and open space preserving water quality and adapting to climate change while preserving the wildlife and lands we enjoy today. Wildlands represent some of our healthiest and most intact lands. Please use all tools available to protect our public lands including recommending new wilderness and national parks designating national monuments and expanding National Wildlife Refuges. Restoring our public lands helps protect clean water supplies and adapt to the effects of climate change. Please prioritize collaborative restoration projects on public lands making restoration a national priority. By restoring our forests we can spur economic growth by providing needed jobs and improve recreation opportunities. Please create new national programs that help connect people especially our youth with nature. Today youth especially people of color are underrepresented on our public lands and it is important that new policies and programs are developed to encourage more youth participation including nature education or recreation programs and a revived civilian conservation corps. No matter where they live all children deserve the opportunity to learn about and experience the wildlands that belong to all Americans. Recreation is a great way for people to experience nature and help develop a strong conservation ethic. Please ensure access is increased for all Americans. Please support fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund and other programs that foster conservation on private lands. These efforts would help keep wildlife habitat intact and connect wild areas protect lands around lakes rivers and streams. The fund can also be used to establish new local parks and trails or provide key wildlife linkage areas.

Please bring An end to efforts to Wipe out the wolves by so called government agencies who are striving to drive them to extinction.

We must protect the public lands that exist now and create more of these special places east of the Mississippi River for citizens residing there to visit and enjoy.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If we can't do this nothing else we do will matter. If wilderness can't thrive under the conditions we have created neither can we.

It is important to preserve these places for future generations!

Outsourcing singlehandedly degrades the care and the land: Turning over the management of national lands to private companies has radically changed the priorities for those lands. The result is damage and lack of upkeep. From protecting and enhancing to profit and loss this simple change has brought a profound disrepair. This single practice has been responsible for degradation of property and slow but steady limiting access though fee increases and elimination of discounts for the elderly and disabled. Disrepair and slovenly care is evident in privately managed parks. The companies hire people who are underpaid and whose goal of free rent and small amount of work is in direct opposition of any ideals to protect and enhance places for which they are responsible. Care and conscientious administration and funding is the basic responsibility with which our government is charged. Commercialization of the management of our parks and forests has nothing to do with preserving these areas for the American people. Further I would urge full funding for repairs upkeep and to make these areas available to the public instead of threatening to close because of lack of funds. Our public lands are being trashed through persistent underfunding and commercialization. One other point I recently revisited Emerald Bay California State Park Cascade Falls in Lake Tahoe California. I was saddened by the devastation from tree removal supposedly in the name of safety. The area has been denuded and looks urban. One of the most beautiful places on earth and ruined by thoughtless tree cutting. Further the so often noise of large maintenance vehicles loud saws and other (cleaning clearing) machinery was like a construction zone instead of a natural area. I realize this is a State park and not national but funding comes also from Federal sources for State lands and continued Federal cutbacks affect State funding.

There are already too many people. Let's save all the wilderness and wildlife we can and concentrate on curbing the human species.

PS Wilderness and time spent in the natural world has been the cornerstone of my adult life. It brings me joy shared friendship inspiration and peace of mind. It is in my humble opinion a necessary antidote to the stress of the modern world and a source of creativity and dreams. Please all that you can to protect our existing wild places plants and animals and oceans. Our future on Earth depends on it. Also more to encourage the younger generation especially the minority ethnic groups is needed. Without there love of the natural world they will not care to preserve it.

Try and do the right thing. So many of us are very disappointed in what has happened the last two years.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I have just returned from Glacier National Park. These precious areas need protection and improvement of habitat water and conservation education and implementation as a priority if they are to continue.

There is no room for compromise Mr. President. Talk of compromising on how much to preserve of the remaining five percent of old growth forests for instance is ludicrous. We want ALL of our remaining natural places preserved; no dispensation may be made for ANY extractive industry. None!

Provide Increased OHV Access and Recreational Opportunities

I'm a physician living in the nearwilderness of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Even here the forest is regularly threatened by motor vehicle enthusiasts who "need" trails every mile. Industrialists who believe forest is only beautiful when being clearcut and stripmined and right wingers on a jihad to end the concept of public property. Starting in our schools. Stop increasing the cost of access to public lands with endless "user fees"

As I am sure you will agree it is critically important to preserve the places we enjoy now for future generations. Overdevelopment has caused numerous issues (loss of natural habitat wildlife losing homes flooding etc.) and now is the time to stop it.

Please take every step needed to conserve and preserve these natural habitats and the creatures that live within them. Among other problems involved in reducing these areas as we reduce the natural habitats animals have nowhere to go . . . except to populated areas. The earth's future and that of our children and their children rest(s) on your decisions and actions today. Please keep nature natural?

Your children's generation will want to enjoy America's great outdoors. Corporations are shortsighted and their concern is what is in their best financial interests.

The people of the United States deserve their wilderness and it is your responsibility to insure that they have it at a reasonable cost. Hopefully you will listen to the people on this issue better than you have on others. Disappointed for the first time in the President.

As each area of the great outdoors is destroyed by building homes taking away the natural ecology of these places for animals trees plants and water we destroy our planet more and more and thus deprive man of the wonders of our earth.

Its also a PROVEN FACT that when we destroyed our wetlands we screwed up the environment making hurricanes more destructive. We have got to return the wetlands to nature and protect and make more parks and natural reserves Our country is TOO MONEY ORIENTED AND ARE KILLING THE POOR PEOPLE!!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Conservation means more than wetlands and virginal lands that have not been touched. It also means the beauty we have around us. I live in Kansas a state that is considered a wasteland. Far from that however it's beauty is within the peaceful rolling hills once farmland now becoming malls apartment complexes and housing developments while inner city buildings rot. We need to stop this waste. Money needs to go to rebuilding sites and not always into the creation of new sites that take away precious habitat from the states natural wildlife. For a state like ours this is probably most important. Our rains are feast or famine. It's little known but Kansas is one of the great migratory paths of birds. In fact there are two paths. One for Eastern birds and one for western birds. Birdwatching is a great hobby for many who live in this state. Only recently have we begun to look at this as a natural resource. This needs to be preserved in view of how energy plans for the country are developed. I do want to thank you for your leadership in shaping a bold conservation strategy It's great to finally have someone who seems to get it.

The great outdoors is only one part of our rich history. It pains me to see it getting less and less. If we were meant to live in cold steel cities that would have been here before the great outdoors.

I have a 15 month old greatnephew who lives in New York City. I want him to be able to enjoy America's great outdoors as I do.

FULLY FUND the US Forest Service and National Parks Service to maintain road maintenance control burns proper wildlife management (relocation and restoration not unnecessary harrasment/slaughter of bison wolves mustangs etc.) Restrict corporate use of public lands to environmentally safe usages only; grazing is okay OVERgrazing and grazing in areas supporting endangered species is not okay; strip mining oil drilling oil shale (not even worth the effort) and oil pipelines through environmentally critical areas should not even be considered!!

America is a beautiful country. Teddy Roosevelt preserved much of that beauty for all generations Americans to come. But in this current climate of exploitation for profit it has become a struggle to ensure these precious areas will continue to exist. Big money big industry bid energy would gobble up every last acre if they could and are succeeding far too well at present.

The Adirondack Park adjacent to my home serves as a wonderful template for preserving wilderness and a range of buffer areas. Come visit and enjoy what every American should know as their heritage. Watch the Ken Burns series on our National Parks then visit a wilderness area within one and understand the treasure that is America. Please please protect our natural environments our watersheds our clean air our biodiversity. Once tamed our wilderness is lost forever. Protect it from the pressures of industry and housing.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

dear mr president as an old woman retired after 50 years as a fulltime lawyer i wish you to know and understand that the natural resources and wildlife are every bit as important as present day jobs or economy. if we kill them off there will be no future for the next generations. expediency must never take priority over ethics and the long haul. thank you

Yes it blows my mind that we have to keep requesting this great open park system. For heavens' sake what is wanted more unsold housing or more oil wells or more shopping malls. Do we have to keep insisting that money isn't everything? One would suppose those super religious types might have a glimmer! Carry on let's do it right this century. And thanks for listening. CW

Varied development is threatening our wild lands all over the country. We need to continue to protect our wild places for people and wildlife.

This is about species survival our species. If we don't protect the environment habitat critical to the survival of innumerable plant and animal species will disappear. If enough of these species go extinct eventually so will we.

I have three children and someday they will have grandchildren. I've raised them all to enjoy and cherish the natural world and we have spend many happy times hiking and camping. I think that preservation of our wilderness is not just a good idea. It is also vital to ensuring that our future citizens are aware of and can engage with the natural world. Our protection today is for their sakes.

As our population grows and our cities expand the United States is rapidly losing its beautiful unspoiled wilderness. We need to protect these lands so as to ensure that generations to come can enjoy America's great outdoors too. Please work hard to include these priorities in all major legislative and administrative budget programs. Thank you.

Please make wilderness new parks and monuments and restoration of wetlands and wildlife habitat the cornerstone of America's Great Outdoors. New and growing threats of overdevelopment pollution and a changing climate demand a smarter sciencebased approach to protecting wild areas wildlife rivers and lakes and cultural and historic sites that connect us to nature to each other and to our shared past.

Here in western Washington State Mason County especially we need more public access parks on the waterfront. We are surrounded by water. South Puget Sound and Hood Canal have a few limited access parks. But there are several lakes rivers and many smaller creeks with very little or no public access at all. On a hot day it is so frustrating to be surrounded by all this beauty and not be able to enjoy the cool water unless you are rich and OWN the access.

The Special Interests have been having their way for decades now which has brought incredible pressure upon the natural resources open spaces and natural living creatures of this land. It's time for the Pendulum to swing in the other direction! Teddy Roosevelt one of our greatest Presidents knew and understood this. It's time to fight back in the spirit of TR once again. It's time to say NO to the special interests for the sake of our children if nothing else.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live in Pennsylvania's Appalachia Area. The land is beautiful but slowly being taken over for "economic" reasons. Tourism is really our industry and without our beautiful land we wouldn't have people coming here! Not only that we will have harmed the land for years to come. Once ruined you can't bring it back.

Once these places are gone they will be gone forever.

"You can never be too careful" when it comes to taking care of our planet since all life forms depend upon it. We need to practice good stewardship. Never being too careful it is better to err on the side of caution and protecting our environment. It is spiritually bankrupt to depend on fossil fuels especially oil. The lust for oil has caused more harm than good wasted more resources and human life and we should invest more in alternative energy. I can't vote for any politician that doesn't share these views.

Protect our current wilderness areas but also reinstate the government's ability to declare new areas as wilderness areas without building new roads or fullservice camping which harms the wilderness areas we are trying to protect

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I add here the text of other comments I have submitted but have so far received no acknowledgment. My comments are based on my professional knowledge training and experience that spans over four decades. I have a Ph.D. in chemistry that allowed me to pursue 30 years of biomedical research drug discovery and medicinal chemistry at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda where I ended my time as a section chief in 1999. I then became Professor and Chair of Chemistry at Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff where I served for eight years. During that time I was also appointed a Full Investigator at the University of Arizona Cancer Center and also appointed as Professor of Medicine at the University of Arizona Medical School. I have published over 200 scientific papers edited four books on drug discovery and medicine been granted several patents and was the cofounding scientist of a startup company. My concern expressed here is about the dependence of the drug discovery process on products of the natural world. Fully half of the medicines in use today arose from plant microorganism or animals. In the case of anticancer therapeutics that number approaches 70% or more. The 1990's saw big pharma turn away from natural product drug discovery efforts in favor of what appeared to be less expensive more productive means of discovery. The tough lesson learned is that our science is not advanced enough for that and a path is being beaten back to the natural world as a source of novel medicines as well as clues on what artificial molecules could be of medical use. While the challenges poised by common infectious diseases metabolic and genetic diseases and cancer are mind numbing we must also bear in mind the growing threat of emerging infectious diseases bacterial resistance to antibiotics and bioterrorism. We will never run out of the need for novel medicinals. However even though we are faced with medical problems as great as any in history we willnilly continue to impoverish the natural cornucopia that has given the best medicine in history. I refer here to the present humaninduced extinction crisis. I hope you have had time to read the writing of Harvard biologist E. O. Wilson as well as such preeminent authorities as Stuart Pimm Michael Soulé John Terborgh to name a few. I trust you are familiar with the findings of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and related scientific organizations. The message from all these sources is the same. We are destroying the fabric of life on this planet. Humans are causing extinctions at a rate approaching that at the end of the age of dinosaurs (Cretaceous) the one initiated by a massive asteroid impact. And perhaps we are going to compete with the one at the end of the Permian (250 million yrs ago) when life itself nearly disappeared from Earth. We also KNOW that at least 20% of mammals 30% of amphibians and 12% of birds 30% of flowering plants 20% of reptiles 40% of freshwater fishes and 70% of freshwater mussels and 20% of ferns currently are threatened with extinction. And that's just a few examples. The scientific fact is that humans use over 40% of the primary productivity of this planet! That is 40% of the products of photosynthesis every year go to human use directly or indirectly. We are only one species out of millions and we depend on all the others for our food clean water clean air pollination medicines wood and fiber recreation and many more services. I argue here from just the single perspective of a biomedical scientist. As we willnilly extinguish species we also willnilly destroy the future of a host of medicines for the American people and indeed the people of this Earth. Imagine the repercussions if someone had caused the extinction of the Pacific Yew tree before we discovered Taxol which has given breast and ovarian cancer patients hope. Or what if the

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Rosy Periwinkle of Madagascar had been doomed to extinction before we discovered the anticancer drugs contained therein. Vinblastine and vincristine have totally revolutionized the treatment of childhood cancer turning a nearly certain death sentence into a almost certain survival to lead a full productive life. Even the lowly and ancient horseshoe crab contributes mightily to our nation's health by making possible the detection of highly toxic bacterial toxins in medicines made for injection. Presently the greatest threat to species loss is the appropriation of habitat by humans. The most effective way to counter this is through habitat preservation and more specifically through the setting aside of large tracts of wildlands places where the forces of nature are dominant and humans have but a minor influence. I subscribe to a definition put forth some time ago: "[wilderness] is the ultimate source of health terrestrial and human." That encompasses all the values encapsulated by the Wilderness Act in a short simple phrase. It recognizes that for wilderness to remain "untrammelled" it must also serve as a Noah's Ark in an age when least 20% of mammals 30% of amphibians and 12% of birds 30% of flowering plants 20% of reptiles 40% of freshwater fishes and 70% of freshwater mussels and 20% of ferns and many more are threatened with extinction. Fortunately we have a mechanism for accomplishing this aim: the National Wilderness Preservation System. However just over 2.5% on the lands in the lower 48 states is protected as wilderness. Much more is of wilderness quality. Your administration needs to work diligently with Congress to place many more lands under Wilderness status. Such designation is also of benefit to humans in terms of nonmotorized recreation watershed protection wildlife fisheries carbon sequestration and rural economies. I suggest that your Presidential Legacy should involve the designation of at least 50000000 new acres of wilderness. And baring the ability of Congress to act quickly enough you should reach into your administrative toolkit to protect these lands by regulations and Executive Orders (e.g. National Monuments). Mr. President conservation biologists will tell you that in order to ensure species longterm survival these wilderness "cores" must be connected by means of wildlife corridors. You should order that Federal Agencies adopt policies to establish such corridors immediately and then your administration should work to have these embodied as the law of the land. Furthermore since many of our key core wilderness areas are beset with potential destructive private "inholdings" you should seek funding to buy out as many of these as possible. This does not have to add to the administrative burden of your Presidency. There already exists a very effective nonprofit The Wilderness Land Trust ([www.wildernesslandtrust.org](http://www.wildernesslandtrust.org)) that pursues this goal. They just need some additional funding to make it happen. In the interest of full disclosure I proudly serve on the Board of Directors of that organization. And I must make a special plea for my home region of Southwest Oregon called KlamathSiskiyou Bioregion. It is in the northernmost part of the California Floristic Province one of the Earth's 25 Biodiversity "Hotspots." These "hotspots" are biogeographic regions with a significant reservoir of biological diversity that are under intense threat from humans. Together they contain about 60% of the Earth's known species. The California Floristic Province is a zone of Mediterraneantype climate and with high levels of plant endemism characteristic of such regions. The KlamathSiskiyou region bridges the coastal mountain ranges of California and Oregon and is home to the most diverse temperate coniferous tree community in the world. Here in the KlamathSiskiyou Ecoregion we are blessed since almost 63% of the landbase is in federal ownership thereby providing a huge

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

opportunity for forward thinking biodiversity preservation actions. This ecoregion has been regarded as an area of global botanical significance by the World Conservation Union (IUCN 1992) a proposed "World Heritage Site" and UNESCO "Biosphere Reserve" a global "center of plant diversity" and a "Global 200" ecoregion by the World Wildlife Fund. The area is however being severely threatened and degraded by both federal and private actions. 1. There exist here low levels of protection (12%) compared to other temperate conifer ecoregions in the United States. 2. Extensive habitat fragmentation is common with more than 30000 miles of roads in the ecoregion. Moreover intensive logging has replaced biodiversityrich oldgrowth forests with sterile tree plantations at a rate of about 50000 acres per year since the 1970s. 3. There are 154 terrestrial species here with state or federal conservation status. This is largely a result of habitat fragmentation and degradation. 4. There have been five extirpations: grizzly bear (*Ursus arctos*) gray wolf (*Canis lupus*) pronghorn (*Antilocapra americana*) California condor (*Gymnogyps californianus*) and big horn sheep (*Ovis canadensis*). 5. Over half of the ecoregion's 877 watersheds show extensive degradation and are in rapid decline. This is caused by road building logging barriers to fish passage livestock grazing fire suppression overallocation of instream flows and water quality problems contribute to poor watershed health 6. Exotic species here are akin to a "biological wildfire. Most notably the endemic Port Orford cedar (*Chamaecyparis lawsoniana*) has been devastated by an exotic rootrot fungus (*Phytophthora lateralis*) that is threatening the functional role of this cedar as a keystone species of riparian areas. 7. Finally there is a decline of endemics and globally imperiled communities. Once these species are gone or once they reach a "living dead" population level and once these ecosystem begin to unwind we will lose more than the imagination could ever fathom. Not only will miracles like Taxol disappear but an all but invisible vital support and subsidy source will greatly decrease the economic and wellbeing status of every American. This is a national security issue of paramount importance to address. Fortunately we have many of the tools already at hand to rescue much of this biological and ecological wonder that supports us as humans. I refer to the Antiquities Act and the Wilderness Act. One of the priorities in my specific region would include the designation of a million acre Siskiyou Crest National Monument. With a single designation you could protect the wondrous biodiversity of this key biogeographic region provide a destination for recreationists of many kinds stimulate local economies and provide a biological corridor for genetic flow and climate change adaptation. A second priority encompasses what we here call the Siskiyou Wild Rivers National Salmon and Botanical Area. This would establish robust cohesive protections for the forests and watersheds of five Wild & Scenic Rivers on public lands. To conserve them commercial logging mining and offroad vehicle use will be restricted. Roadless areas will be protected as Wilderness and nine candidate rivers will be given Wild & Scenic River status. A key piece of this would be protection of southwest Oregon's Rogue River and the neighboring forests. You must nudge Congress in the right direction here for the benefit of America. Enormous opportunities await you administration if you are willing to chart a robust and healthy future for natural world which framed America and led her to be the envy of the world. For us for our children and onto the Seventh Generation I implore you to act on behalf of all the species of this beautiful Earth. We here who care about the future stand ready to inform your administration about the needs of people and nature in our ecoregion.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Give us a chance. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your American Great Outdoors Initiative.

I voted for our current president because of the lack of accountability of government. I WANT REAL CHANGE. I expect government agencies to act in the best interests of the majority of Americans middle class working citizens. Preserving our wilderness areas/wildlife habitat IS DEFINITELY in the best interests of we the people. It's our heritage. It belongs to the citizens of the United States. It's not to be bought and sold for the profitability of a few select individuals. I abhor the role government agencies have taken in poisoning/decimating wildlife for the benefit of cattlemen and Big Agra (or Big Oil or Big Lumber or Mining). You know what I'm talking about. I detest my tax dollars being spent by government agencies that DO NOT REPRESENT ME MY WILL MY IDEALS MY MORALS OR MY BEST INTERESTS! Cyanide and Compound 1080 and M44s and aerial gunning and leg traps and bullets.....Attitudes trickle down from the top. That's why so many people will NEVER forgive the Bush administration for the damage done to our environment our economy and our integrity as a nation. Get the corporate mindset out of Washington DC NOW! Get rid of the lobbyists! When is it going to change? Why can't the "Environmental Protection Agency" protect anything but corporate profits???? There's some real sarcasm in the name of that agency. We the people have lost all patience. Government by corporations has literally brought this country to its knees anyone can see that. I know the propaganda put out in the mainstream media hoping to keep Americans from focusing on the REAL issues. There's no accountability in media either and there should be. We as a nation can be no better than the worst among us and their worst actions. We must lead by example NO MORE PREEMPTIVE STRIKES! No more war! Protect our environment! Give real government incentives for clean renewable energy technology! Promote TRUE organic farming promote cruelty free natural sustainable farming methods and FAMILY FARMS. SMALL LOCAL FARMS. No instead our government continues to go in the WRONG direction. Promote truthful reporting in the media and punish spin and propaganda. Get Big Chemical Big Pharma Big Agra Big Media Big Defense Big Oil and all the rest of these corporate profit mongers out of the governing equation. As a nation we are on the edge of a precipice. We have run out of time. We cannot be a world power without the ideals of a world power. We must recover them now or forever hold a lower rank!

Besides it will simultaneously create and sustain JOBS!

The beauty of our country is disappearing "progress" has long since become regression as speculative building commercial development pollution etc. eat away at the heart of this land. Without immediate decisive action we will wake up one day in just a few years to discover a concrete country paved and fenced off from sea to shining sea. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create expand and better protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild

Connect people but NOT ATV's with Nature



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

As a person who likes to vacation on MARTHA'S VINEYARD.....I think you have begun to see more of the value of conserving our Natural Environment. Nature is God's Gift to Humans helping us to continue having healthy mental conditions. Nature is also a gift to all other animals.....not only for their mental conditions.....but also for food. Without enough protection of our lands as well as our oceans we lose food and habitats not to mention oxygen and a calming environment. Please help us on Cape Cod and the Islands to protect our Lands.....our Ocean and our Sounds (both Vineyard Sound and Nantucket Sound) and our Bays too.....from overdevelopment. We may all suffer for it in the future. There are more wide open ocean spaces that will be of less risk to human life. The Wind Farm in Nantucket Sound may prove to be destructive to that tiny section of water.....and perhaps to all the human life in that area. We have many small aircraft ferries full of people and small recreational boats all over the Sounds. A few years ago I remember reading that an SSA ferry from Woods Hole to MV broke down in Vineyard Sound. It floated at the whim of the winds until rescued.....as any boat that has lost power will do. Imagine that happening in Nantucket Sound.....after the building of 130 wind turbines. Will Coast Guard helicopters be able to get between all the turbines to save human lives??? Will any rescue vehicles be safe from so many huge towers.....in high winds??? (We have high winds with some regularity way out here in the North Atlantic Ocean as we are.) Imagine a nor'easter coming through with 5570 mph winds or higher.....at the same time as an engine break down. Remember the deaths that occurred in NYC about 5 or so years ago when a ferry bumped into the wharf while docking? Quite a few lives were lost. I don't know what that dock was made of.....but turbine bases are cement !!! It can't be good to bump into one of those !!!! I do not mean to be selfish or dramatic about this.....as though we are the only people with these gifts. However we have such a tiny amount of land and water I am truly trying to have people in positions to help understand that we are being squeezed out. Most other states in America have much more in resources than we do.....(except maybe Hawaii.....as you well know !!!.....but even HI does have more land and ocean than we do). I hope you will understand what the Kennedy Family truly understood.....and took steps to protect. Our little bit of the world needs help to save it from a construction and destruction the might ruin us in less than 100 years. PS: I was on MV last Saturday. I didn't "get to see you and your family" on our rounds !!!! {;) I hope Sasha and Malia have had a chance to have a ride past the Bus Stand in Edgartown. There is a great sign there.....addressed to them.....painted by the "Y" kids. I think they should be able to take it home with them. There is probably a nice place on their playground.....or in a playroom.....or somewhere.....where they could put it !!! (They might have fun showing it to their children when they are grown !!!! A Great fun memory !!!!) I was a teacher for almost 40 years.....I trained on the Big Island for Peace Corps (1969).....then I began a Head Start (type) PreSchool in the Fiji Islands. After teaching outside of MA for so many years I am happily back home on the Cape.....and I hope to see it remain the beautiful place it has always been. Please help !!!!! THANK YOU for all you have done since 2008 Election and your Inauguration in January 2009.....to straighten out so many issues and problems. I am quite aware of all the successes in just 2 years. Hope to see you and the family vacation on the Cape sometimes too !!!!!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are at the end of a road wrought by more than a century of the most intensive human intrusion into nearly every corner of the Earth. Many ecosystems have been almost entirely destroyed while others have been lost forever. For those nearing that point there is still time as long as our actions are swift committed and meaningful.

Our survival depends on a healthy ecosystem....clean water clean air biodiversity.....the outdoors is so much more than a great place to play!

Thank you for your leadership in attempting to restore sound conservation and environmental policies to our country. Much remains to be done. Specifically it is absolutely vital to make preservation of wilderness establishment of new parks and monuments and restoration of wetlands and wildlife habitat the cornerstone of America's Great Outdoors. New and growing threats specifically overdevelopment pollution and a changing climate demand a focused approach to preserving and protecting the wild areas wildlife rivers and lakes and cultural and historic sites that connect us to nature to each other and to our shared history. I beg you to make these your highest conservation priorities.

I remember the heartbreak I felt when Bush's regime violated much of our public lands and placed immediate profit over longterm social enjoyment of the lands we have for the public. I would like to tell my children that all the lands that have been disregarded and ravaged in the past eight years are now brought back under government protection so that their children and generations to come can enjoy the experience of being in the woods the desert or the mountains and connect with nature once again on the most basic immediate level. Everyone should have that opportunity. Please protect our nations parks and fund the ability to conserve more for generations to come.

I believe that we are not only responsible for ourselves but also responsible for future generations. They are dwindling so rapidly it is heartbreaking. The very things that give America its unique character among nations is being lost.

The nation must preserve its natural environment and serve the sacred trust inherited from previous generations. protect air & water quality everywhere Improve Watersheds and protect Wildlife Habitat Build renewable power generation plants and retire fossil fuel power plants convert all existing coal plants to clean coal plants with carbon sequestration and construct energy storage systems to give the electrical power distribution system a backbone that empowers distributed power generation on a robust scale.

I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too and you as the leader of our country have the power to make certain that happens. Here in California for example development and conservation are in constant contest against one another. With your help work toward restoring the Eastern Sierras' Mono Lake toward historical water levels and preventing development around can continue. Outdoors. The America we love cannot survive without them:

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I know you get pressure from every side & it's impossible to please 'em all. Thanks for all the good you do!!

Don't cave to corporate pressure to extract more natural resources from public lands. Expand conservation efforts.

In addition I want to preserve wild areas for native plants and animals. We need to protect and preserve these areas. Humans are not the only living being on this planet and it is time we started thinking about all living creatures. We need to stop building instead we should rebuild areas that are dilapidated. We need new cleaner sources of energy instead of depleting our earth of all its natural resources. I know it is expensive to make these changes but the our future the earth's future depends on it.

.I would like to make sure that our national parks are made accessible and affordable for visitation by low income inner city children and adults. Provide Increased Access and Recreational Opportunities

Living in Michigan near the recent 1000000gallon oil spill I'm acutely aware of the preciousness of our surroundings and all of its inhabitants.

I grew up visiting our national parks with my parents people of the "Greatest Generation." I want my grandchildren to have those same opportunities and more. Please take every action needed to protect and enhance the parks and monuments that preserve our heritage and culture. Also STOP the "let it burn" philosophy that became popular within the national forest service. Please don't let forest fires burn up Yellowstone or any other national treasure again in the name of misplaced trust in the "natural processes."

I understand that in this political climate that allocating money for these things may be challenging but timing is very important and we should make this time something that will be recognized as a point at which we really did something to make these opportunities for recreation and protection a reality.

This planet and especially the beautiful areas of it this continent need to be protected conserved and kept free from development. We have and continue to destroy so much of it...

Oil dependency pollution and urban sprawl have contributed to encroachment and resulting destruction of our wilderness areas not to mention funding cuts and the repealing of laws that once helped protect them. Once they're gone they're gone. Encourage the development of green energy sources

I grew up near the natural wonders of the Everglades. I worry now that my daughter might never experience the beauty of the Southern Florida wilderness let alone my grandchildren or greatgrandchildren.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

One great concern of mine is the generation of electricity from solar power plants. Solar is just one of the components that will allow this country to lessen our dependence of fossil fuels. My concern is the solar power generating facilities that use water. Water is one of our countries most precious resources. Using our water resources in the generation of solar power will put extreme pressure on our water resources. Please do not allow Federal monies for this purpose. Droughts are still a reality in many parts of the country that have great potential for solar power. Lessening the threats to our wildlands is important. Conserving them is extremely important especially our water resources.

We must conserve and preserve our wilderness. There is so little left. Conservation of our publiclyowned open spaces is a winwin situation. All Americans benefit. The more we lose open space the more we allow industrial concerns to degrade our publiclyowned land the more we lose as a nation.

I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors and not have to clean up after our mess. Increase funding to protect federally protected wildlife from overzealous state governments

If have been to many beautiful parks and wild life area around the country. It was very moving for me to get to see these places. I walked through many of them and I would be very disappointed to see there areas disappear. Just camping in local parks has been a great experience. Listening tp the wild life at night and see them at twilight. I am an early riser so I watch them throught the window of the trailer so I don't disturb them. Having people dig drill and build new homes in these places would be an injustice to future generations Please do everything in your power to stop the cruelty to our land.

I know these are tall issues to address (along with everything else that needs your attention) but our children are worth it and this beautiful spot on this beautiful planet is worth it.

The healthy natural presence of our wild places is the foundation on which the rest of life rests and thrives. We have no greater task before us than protecting it.

I want our future generations to enjoy America's great outdoors too. I raised my daughter from infancy to love and respect all that we call our great outdoors. As a result she is now working on her Masters degree in Outdoor Education so that all of the children's lives that she touches will have a greater appreciation for all that the "great outdoors" encompasses.

Without your leadership in shaping a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century our future generations will not have the opportunity to enjoy and appreciate what many currently take for granted. Thank you in advance for your decision to create a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century.

Perhaps one of the greatest mistakes of our time is putting biomass incinerators on the renewable energy list. The co2 and particulate pollution from incinerators are not acceptable.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most of the great parks are overcrowded illustrating the need for nature in our lives to repair our souls in this hectic world. These places are sanctuaries that reflect the beauty of our planet and are irreplaceable in this rapidly expanding civilization. We simply need to do a better job of protecting them and creating more for future generations before it is too late. We don't need to mine every mineral log every forest and carve every access road in this brief generation.

The great outdoors is one of the only things we have left to exercise freedom in this great land. The fresh air the exploration a place for children to learn about the world and roam. I have a 2yearold boy and he's going to be out and exercising his mind and body instead of staying inside and playing video games...

for the 21st century even if the militaryindustrial complex is running our country at this time you can do something that will benefit your very own family particularly your two fine girls who deserve a fighting chance in our environment. I never could understand how the real rulers don't seem to care about their own families when it comes to the environment. Is the money and power that important when one jeopardizes their very own?! I realize the executive branch no longer leads the nation but the least you can do is make it as difficult as possible for those who do. Thanks very much for doing something to help the situation!!

And a resident of the Great Lakes region of the U.S. I feel the Great Lakes need special protection from oil drilling industrial pollution and sewage as the major source of fresh water for millions of citizens. and the Great Lakes

We can't afford to allow the erosion of pristine places to continue in the name of development or for profit. We must also protect these fragile habitats from the effects of global warming and our lack of stewardship. To protect other species from extinction is to protect ourselves as well.

If the next generations have only stories of what it "used to be" like to live in this country their emotional bodies will grow cold and die from lack of nourishment. Memories are nice but do not nourish. Maybe that is already taking effect as observed in the attitudes and opinions and careless "care less" attitudes of today's unhappy hate filled egotistical expressions of intolerance. Cement tall buildiings. fast food and unethical practices will produce exactly what it consumes. i hope it is not too late we live here taking for granted that Mother Nature won't crumble .....our memories are very short when it comes to disturbing something we are \$\$\$\$\$\$ to.

Experiencing Nature and protecting it is so important to all of us. Especially as our climate changes we need to take action now.

Preserve pristine nature and prevent contamination through genetically engineered species. Recognize that animals and nature should be treated as the valuable resources that they are Eliminate pesticides herbicides and fungicides

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ensuring that ecosystems do not become fragmented "islands." Ensure that wildlife corridors are part of the park system. that are in keeping with the peaceful experience of the landscape that the great majority of park goers are seeking.

On a personal note if we do not take care to ensure the healthy conditions of beautiful planet Earth now we may not get another chance. The recent disastrous oil spill will take its toll on Earth and future generations for many years to come. If we don't reach out to preserve the wild and historical magnificence we have left in America it will slip uncontrollably out of our hands forever.

I think of Teddy Roosevelt often these days. When he was a kid he used to think the Great Seal of the United States was actually a seal one that ate fish. I wonder what he would think of his wild places today the ones he loved so much. Please do everything in your power to save and protect our remaining wilderness areas. It's so disturbing to see what we've done to our wild areas in my lifetime alone I hate to reflect on it. When I was a kid the rains resulted in an amazing explosion of frogs everywhere on a biblical scale. Big ones little ones smooth ones bumpy ones frogs the size of my pinkie nail hopping all over the place like crazy super balls dropped from the sky. It was a sight to behold. Wish my kids could see it but it's gone. Vanished. Just a memory in my mind's eye. Today frogs are disappearing faster than a popsicle in Palm Springs. I used to watch baby horny toads (what silly scientists call the Texas Horned Lizard) frolic by the hundreds at my bare feet; I'd scoop them up by the handful. Now they're endangered. I used to watch pronghorn antelope bound gracefully beside our family car on the freeway at 50 miles per hour now my kids think I'm making this up. The creek and wetlands where I caught pollywogs and powderblue damsel flies is now a cement drainage ditch. There's still a lot to save. But we must act now before it's all gone. I want my children to enjoy America's great outdoors too. Obama carpe diem! Hurry. Seize this moment to create to expand to better protect America's shared outdoor spaces. Wilderness whispers words of wisdom: let it be. Monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild and scenic rivers and historic sites all these must be protected. My \_\_\_\_ should always be able to enjoy our public lands. Please consider these priorities for America's Great Thank you Mr. President. It's a new day in this brave new world. Help us and help Congress shape a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century.

I am thankful for the foresight of past generations that set aside Wilderness State and National park lands for us to enjoy. These are one of the largest assets and treasures in our country. I spend most every weekend hiking snowshoeing and biking in my backyard paradise the Wasatch Mountains of Utah. My favorite vacation is to backpack and reconnect with nature. I feel lucky to live so close to many wild places that can make this a reality. I never tire of exploring the outdoors enjoying wildlife and the remoteness. I notice every year more and more Americans are discovering the outdoors and these paradise settings are getting crowded. Further those lands not protected are often challenged with access issues development and grazing/mining/drilling interests. It is with real concern that I write to you to ask that you help to ensure that future generations will always benefit and enjoy our public lands please consider these priorities for America's Great

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think it should be at least a felony to introduce a foreign species into any ecology.

It's so depressing to travel across our country and to see the wilderness disappearing under strip malls and mega churches and ubiquitous gated communities. We need to plan smarter plan better! We also need to consider it our responsibility to protect the animals that live in the few remaining open spaces. !!!

Above all make sure to decrease pollution through enforcement of existing regulations which should be protecting our environment thus protecting the public's health and wellbeing. Continue to fight for an increase in renewable energy which will help as well.

My kids are 10 and soon to turn 13 I hope that they get some of the same chances I had to be inspired by the Wildernesses and wildlands of this country that have shaped our heritage. I also believe that all things on this planet are interconnected and our future is dependent on the good health of all species and environments on our planet. We need to do a better job of protecting and even enhancing the health of these environments and through protecting Wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails and wild and scenic rivers and historic sites we are on the right track but with the threats facing our world we need to do an even better job. More protection is necessary!

This is IMPORTANT! And now is the time to act because soon it will be too late and our irreplaceable wildlands wildlife wilderness and entire natural heritage will be destroyed and gone forever. Please prove that all of us who voted for leadership and change did not make a dreadful mistake that leader and break with past pollution exploitation and destruction. Take a stand for conservation and preservation.

This is also a great opportunity to create new jobs! Privatizing and / or exploiting our public lands can never be undone so we believe it is extremely important to protect first!

My parents' generation is remembered as The Greatest Generation; my generation will surely be remembered as The Irresponsible Generation. For decades our government has put the interests of the few superrich ahead of the best interests of the US. The horrendous proof is all around us today. Please Mr. President for the sake of your daughters of my daughter of all of America's children help enforce a sense of responsibility and priorities on our legislators. Please stop the efforts to leave a legacy of The Most Reckless Generation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In my first college English class we were asked to write an essay on our home town. I thought about that for a while and realized that my true home town the one that nurtured my soul was all the many summer long camping experiences I had in the Sierra Nevada high country of California. I wrote my essay about that "home town" the place from which I gained a love of the Earth and nature and all that lives on this Earth. I now have a bumper sticker that sadly reads "Daddy what were forests like?" I urge you Mr. President to do all that is possible to preserve my "home town" so that no child in this country will ever need to ask the question that is on my bumper sticker.

Once these treasures are gone they're gone for good. Leave what we've had the chance to enjoy to our children grandchildren etc.

As more and more people become disconnected with the land there is less understanding and less concern about the importance of healthy watersheds wetlands forests and the need to protect working lands. It makes it easy for them to dismiss or misconstrue the importance of these lands to their food sources and the rural people who manage and sustain them. Access to wild lands and recreational opportunities in nature at least provides a connection point many will otherwise not experience.

On a more personal and local note I call your attention to Sterling Forest in New York just an hour's drive from New York City. This area had been an outdoor enthusiast's paradise under private management a decade ago but since relegated to the perversely limited vision of the Palisades Park Commission of NY & NJ it has become a wilderness museum "Look but don't touch" with all former activities circumscribed or banned. Please do not let this become the norm for government administration of our wilderness lands.

Being a student at the University of WisconsinPlatteville who is pursuing a degree in civil engineering I have learned through my courses the importance of our natural habitats. As our population grows we are continuously increasing our quantity of residential and agricultural acreage. To make room for this growth natural habitat is taken and developed. If we continue this process our wildlife will be ruined and may become extinct. Also the natural wilderness is key to helping us control our runoff by slowing it down and letting it infiltrate the soil thus recharging our water table. With water resource concerns growing out west we need to take control of our bad habitats and start preserving the natural engineering we see in the wilderness. Push sustainability into the forefront of land development. Thank you so much President Obama for taking the time to consider my email with a clear and accepting mindset. Your leadership is key to shaping a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century and future generations.

I realize that there are major economic worries to be dealt with at this time. However I feel these ideas are very important as well.

We need to stop thinking about ourselves and consider what we will leave the children.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our government needs to stop selling off public lands and/or leasing them to oil and gas companies. These lands need to be preserved and protected from pollution so that they can be enjoyed not only by people today but for generations to come.

And the American MustangBLM has killed 200 wild horses this year in their cruel and inhumane roundups. Those horses belong to the American people not to the BLM killers. Save the Wild Horses Save the Wild Horses Save the Wild Horses Save the Wild Horses Save the Wild Horses

I know times are tough to find funding but think long term like Teddy Roosevelt.

Perserving our wilderness AND THE CREATURES THAT LIVE IN IT is essential to preserving the beauty that is this nation. You open it to ranchers and oil interests we all know they will trash it ALL....for profit. What kind of legacy is that? Stop the commercial interests NOW before it's too late.

Stop allowing government agency's to wipe out wildlife in the name of big money pleasure hunters.

I have been a long time lover of Yosemite National Park. Ever since I moved to California over 30 years ago it has been one of my favorite places to visit. Yellowstone Bryce and the Grand Canyon may not be what they are today had they not been protected. and Foster programs that educate all ages especially young children so they will grow up seeing and understanding the importance of living in harmony with nature.

We need more money to fully fund National Parks upgrades! I look forward to your reply.

You have the power to keep the beauty of our great outdoors intact for all generations to come. So please create expand and better protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild and scenic rivers and historic sites. Please ponder as priorities the following list bearing in mind that our great outdoors are not only for recreation they are for the mental and physical good health of all. Thank you for being a leader. Please lead now in one of the most important aspects of the century.

Once it is paved over & built upon it is gone.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a member of the boomer generation I want to be sure that wilderness the outdoors parks etc. are preserved not only for my own use as I retire but for my children and grandchildren. Camping and hiking are a great joy for our families and our children need to be able to experience areas that are pristine and support wildlife clean water etc. The natural beauty of this country is the heritage we pass on.

My father's family left the coal mines in Pa. to homestead in Wisconsin. My father taught me to love and respect Nature. I have been able to pass that view to my daughter. It is my hope that she may have the same chance if there are any unspoiled wilderness areas left. Hunting and fishing have always been a part of my life so I understand at a personal level the delicate balance of Nature. I have seen in my lifetime the effect of the destruction of wetlands and loss of habitat. I urge you to save what little wilderness is left and not put profit before posterity.

Our own personal "wealth" may be diminishing for ourselves and for those to whom we might want to pass on whatever we have earned; but that doesn't mean that the natural treasures of American must diminish and deteriorate as well.

#### When children families have parks wildernessplaces of peace it has been shown the crime is less....People need places to rest reflect appreciate our world...The bang for the \$Buck is better if we do not have violence in our streets communities & towns... The \$price for parks/wilderness is off set by what we do not have to repair by violence. All children should have a place/chance to play & appreciate beauty. If the only consideration is co\$T.....Consider the value in peace less valalism more beautiful America AND\*\* HEALTHIER ENVIRONMENT(trees etc). As you know the republicians want to cut funds for parks etc...soon after that crime rises (not seeing the connection to value).....Children have no place to run off energy so possible distruction occurs. The republicians have their own "private" parks then want tax paying citizens to have less....This is not The Good America that promotes giving less to children/citizens than what the wealthy have. Cannot put a value on healing powers of Nature to all. I trust you'll do the prudent/just thingtrue meaning of "Conserve" in this case:)cb.

"Shared use" isn't really shared if one use destroys it's value for another. For example who wants to visit a clearcut on their vacation?

In the face of exponentially increasing population the pressure on open lands and undeveloped areas is ever increasing. We have surpassed the ecosystems ability to process our waste and replenish resourses. Absent the wisdom to control population only the preservation of natural resourses can slow the ultimate consequences.

Now you can prove to the world and the Republicans that although you have had to increase the national debt for the next generation you have also insured that you have protected the environment for the them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a 79year old who will not live to see the fruits resulting from your positive action to improve and protect our national parks and monuments. However I desire that my children grandchildren etc. are able to enjoy the wonders of our wilderness areas and national parks just as I did. Please prevent the opportunists from stepping in and diminishing or destroying whatever we already have.

Act now or it will be lost forever

help us all to become better citizens of our beautiful country. ; those quiet places where we can soak up peace away from the clang of our daily life! before all our wildlife disappears in this century! ... Mother Nature is the ultimate healer. \* Please protect our beautiful parks forests and trails from those who run roughshod with mobile/sports vehicles! ...don't whitewash your promises.

I am ashamed of what is happening in our wonderful country. Only you can correct the direction now being pursued. Are you courageous enough to listen to the people who voted you in??? I hope so!!!!

Once it's paved over it's gone forever.

Since the early 90's our family has had a blessing in that the vacations we have taken included many of our national parks and forests. The awe inspired reactions by my family are priceless. Watching everyone stop "dead in their tracks" and stare at moose along side the road in the Grand Tetons. Later in the same day we watched new born bison in a meadow frolic with their siblings in Yellowstone. This isn't scratching the surface of almost two decades experiencing the wonders of our nation. There are some possessions of the American people that have to be protected against greed and exploitation at all costs.

no dirt bikes or snowmobiles which spoil the experience for everyone else for example.

Franklin D. Roosevelt said "The nation that destroys its soil destroys itself".

Our Earth is in ecological crisis! Now is not the time to destroy what's left.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Twice I have had the experience of exploring and being a part of the northern Minnesota Boundary Waters. My experience in the pristine lakes where we could drink the same water on which we were canoeing provided personal and professional growth for me. My heart is heavy with continuing news of the devastation of not only wilderness areas but other more urban lands in this country. And I am saddened to know that conservation is not apparently one of your considered priorities. Our children and grandchildren deserve to have a planet that can still be seen as the little blue dot in the universe...not a dullhued orb.

"Just think how senseless and lifeless a youngster's life will be if they are not able to enjoy the outdoors by being in it conserving it and sharing this with others. Being in the great national parks like Yosemite teaches an individual not only respect for nature but expands their love for it and inspires creative ideas harmony and peace." "Involve our youngsters in conservation by making it an academic standard to fulfill in the curriculum"

My husband and I have spent many wonderful vacations enjoying our national parks and monuments and other wild areas. We are environmental consultants in NJ who treasure the opportunity to study the wildlife and plants of very different areas throughout the US. If we don't preserve unspoiled habitats we will never know what we have lost from our biodiversity heritage as development and resource exploitation devour the land.

In the face of rising population and its everspreading development as well as its desperation for extractive energy sources the importance of conserving natural landscapes for future generations has never been greater. Failure to hold a strong commitment to this value will eventually alter the character of our nation's great outdoors irreparably and with it the character of our citizenry who will have fewer and fewer places to experience the restorative value of the natural world. Even now that experience is foreign to some especially in urban areas. Electronic technology has also begun to diminish our youth's interest in connecting with that natural world which portends a perilous loss to the American psyche. Furthermore in order to not exacerbate the existing polarity between environmentalists and their opponents I urge you to be realistic about the scope of envisioned projects. Some megalandscape multimillionacre complexes envisioned by wellmeaning groups while admirable in idealism will only panic those threatened by these prospects (e.g. ranchers) and will galvanize all sectors of opposition. It is strong enough already. Conservation projects must be viable apropos existing stakeholder interests not decreed as government fiat with winners and losers. This is challenging to say the least; but respectful and patient collaboration is essential to longterm success.

During the Bush takeover of America we suffered tremendously environmentally economically and strategically in the world and at home. PLEASE make a difference and bring America back to where it used to be!!

It is inexcusable the way humans have trashed this planet! I don't want to be known as from the generation that did nothing but make it worse. Please do what you can to protect it from those who are so selfish and greedy that they don't care about the trashed up planet they leave for their grandchildren.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

From ancient times to the present the greatest and most valuable assets humanity relies upon are based in healthy intact natural ecosystems. Food shelter medicinal and spiritual needs are satisfied within these natural environments. The past century has seen unprecedented use and decline of natural resources to the point that future generations may only know it from photographs and stories. I have been blessed to have grown up and thrived through ready access to recreational areas. public lands please consider these priorities in protecting and preserving America's recreation and wilderness lands:

It is imperative that we protect national parks forests preserves monuments and add to that more wilderness areas parks monuments forests and wetlands. The very life (both animal and human) that are protected in these places is threatened unless we take action to both protect what we have and extend it. National Parks need buffer large buffer areas to stop encroaching growth and to protect what is in them animal life forests woodlands watersheds etc. We need these things to and to preserve the life sustaining things that they provide to us as humans water supply clean air sanctuary for our souls. You must fully fund the Land and Water Conservation fund increase funding for all of our national treasures and make additional funding available to state and local governments for the outdoor and open areas they protect such as state forests parks wet lands and woodlands. Thank you for your time

Within my lifetime I have seen the gross degradation of all our natural wonders and the wise stewardship replaced by corporate greed and encroachment: the Grand tetons are now for sale the Grand canyon is endangered by uranium and carcinogens my Adirondacks are supersaturated with neurotoxins heavy metals and destructive exotic invaders...fossil fuels acid rains and \$\$\$\$\$\$\$\$ burying our legacy condemning future generations to a lifeless wasteland and oceans hypoxic. It is more than I care to bear.

P.S. Please don't overpromote our wild areas to those who have not yet learned how to respect them first and play by the rules of the parks. This means not bringing in a myriad of plastic containers and other forms of packaging that will likely end up as garbage or worse...litter. People need to understand why we need to respect these areas and this means behaving appropriately with respect to nature. Additionally...NO noise from any electronic devices is essential too..no booming cars ipods cell phones and obnoxious illegally modified exhaust pipes on motorcycles or cars. If such is how people want to behave in such a setting or any setting for that matter..and cannot take 5 to do a digital detox and hear what the world sounds like naturally and discover the joy in peace... Then perhaps they need to stay out of these precious treasures.

Save our wildlife particularly those at risk; Ask for the current Secretary of the Interior's (Ken Salazar (sp)) resignation. Appoint someone who really cares about saving public lands and wildlife for the public and future generations.

If public lands are used for private businesses they will be lost to our American citizens forever. A very unwise move!

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Sir what a legacy for your children grandchildren you would be leaving them to see what wonders GOD has created. How sad if they would not be able to enjoy the wilderness and all its beauty because we didn't expand create and protect the sites and the animals that live in these spaces. Will you not help protect this beauty for all to enjoy now and in the future.

engage public and private corporations to assist in conservation in their regions. Consider tax advantages if necessary. for us and for our children. Really seek out alternative energy sources and develop them for use. No more drilling!! let's not have any more species face extinction because we neglected these important areas. engage children teenagers and young adults with innovative electronic campaigns. Engage adults thru electronic and print media. Make it cool to be outdoors! help the states maintain and fund their outdoor recreational areas. so America keeps the wilderness it already has and can return important overdeveloped areas back to the wild.

As an avid outdoorsman and user of our public lands I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create expand and better protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild and scenic rivers and historic sites. The Monongahela National Forest here in WV has just designated several new wilderness areas that will benefit generation to come. However we need this type of vision across the board in all our public lands management. Many roadless areas across our great country are prime for wilderness designation but they languish due to petty political concerns.

I participated in the listening session Poughkeepsie NY and wanted to repeat concerns I voiced there. The job cuts taken by the New York State DEC have resulted in lack of enforcement of environmental conservation law which causes destruction of wetlands and degradation of water quality. Furthermore cumulative impacts of development on a watershed level are not being considered causing additional degradation.

As a nation we are quickly expanding with no end in sight please save these wilderness lands.

Mother Earth does not belong to us. We belong to her. She is in critical condition and "Yes We Can" do something about it. Hopefully before it is too late. My focus is on 'clean water for all living things'. That does not include putting an UNapproved prescription drug considered a toxicant by the FDA in our drinking water. We drink only about 1% of that. Just think where does the rest of it go?

We all know it is our responsibility to care for this planet for future generations. I don't understand why I have to fight so hard for something we should all agree on.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Our future generations deserve the chance to experience our National parks system as my family has had the opportunity to do for many generations. Personally I would like to see Point Lobos on central California's coast and the Pajaro River State Park also on California's central coast as well as the many State Parks at Big Sur California added to the list of National and State parks that should be preserved for the future. I'm sure it's a difficult decision on your part given our Nation's current economic condition on what parks will stay open and which ones will need to be closed due to a lack of State and Federal funding. I hope that funds will be found to keep all of our National and State Parks open.

We need to stop openpit coal minningNOW. And we need to cleanup coal ash mess. I think the best place to keep the coal ash is to put in the yards of big coal Officers and that of the power company. If more room is needed then use the yards of Congressmen of help the coal company.

The wonderful world of nature cannot be replaced if it is exploited by money seeking companies and persons. Responsible and careful development practices must be followed by all so this heritage is preserved.

however restrict access by offroad vehicles to reservations set aside for that purpose outside forest areas where they can tear up the ground all they want without destroying the forests and wildlands and terrorizing wildlife. There is no reason why 510% of the population should be able to dictate policy on managing public lands.

One of my past peak experiences was kayaking down the Ichnetucknee River here in North Central Florida. Until several years ago it was pristine clear water where many herons and otter would come to drink and play. As you floated down the river you could feel as if peole two hundred years ago would have the same scene. Now agricultural runoff and over extraction of water for lawn watering and other nonessential uses has rendered this jewel eutrophied and murky.

perhaps enact the 'Buffalo Commons' park idea in the upper midwest all of it and protect more by designating more wilderness by designating preservation areas by an ecosystem approach by promoting green rails through developed areas every year!

I am a proud natureloving American. I love my beautiful country and We need to capitalize on all of the green energy resources we have in this country keep our natural resources clean and accessible and get off oil and other polluting methods of powering our lives.

and educate them Stop the coal oil and nuclear power industry from further pollution Educate people about how bad coal oil and nuclear energy is Start programs for cleaner energy uses and educate people about "going green"

We want our tax dollars spent here not on war people need jobs but not war jobs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Protect wildlife from being exterminated by the Bureau of Land Management

Anything less than a large scale would be insufficient to the task at hand. I personally have always loved and respected wildlife and the wilderness and over the course of my time on earth have seen the elimination and destruction of massive amounts of our wilderness. This deeply saddens me to think that future generations may very well never have the opportunity to view what America has always been known for: purple mountains waving fields of grain our "sea to shining sea" is already in jeopardy. The detrimental impact on wildlife is already abundantly clear. If one does not or is unable to connect with nature one cannot truly understand himself or connect with others on a fundamental level. Communing with nature allows one to fully relax and center oneself. It works for me and countless others. Please do not deny us. Walking hiking photography pure enjoyment of the sheer beauty and the awe of places such as the painted desert grand canyon black hills Sunset Crater petrified forest the "forests" here in AZ which are cacti...all amazing and quite honestly if you think about it recreation sites often lead to EXERCISE which will decrease the obesity rate in this country. If you want to decrease the obesity rate why take away free & low cost means for Americans to exercise?

The Native Americans knew that the Earth does not belong to us but we to the Earth and that we have an obligation to hand it down to succeeding generations in good shape. It means we need to be good stewards. We have failed miserably in so many ways (and yes we have some successes).

I think especially important is to prevent our precious public lands from being over run by off road vehicles. I know that we cannot continue this degrading and destructive use of off road vehicles as we are currently doing. I don't want to die knowing that I am passing on a legacy of noise pollution and habitat destruction. That is my greatest concern regarding America's Great Outdoors.

I find that of late I am becoming more and more concerned with the direction the whole world seems to be taking regarding protecting our environment.

Stop abuses of public lands by off road vehicles snowmobiles and helicopters

Address Conservation on a national scale and wild places

If we don't leave it better than we found it my mother is going to be upset with us. And neither you nor I want that to happen.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Stop the invasion into the oceans lakes and rivers by the oil and gas companies. Put a stop to energy created by coal plants Put a stop to the slaughter of Wolves Horses Wild Burros and other endangered species by the BLM and forestry departments. Enough is enough. You whiteeyes have stolen everything of any value and are destroying all of Mother Earth. It is time to CHANGE the direction and starting acting like Stewards of the Land Water and Air instead of abusers.

There is so much banality surrounding us here in the United States. Cheesy television programs sleazy radio talk shows junk food restaurants strip malls etc.; where does one go to find true beauty and affirmation? We cannot let more pristine land be turned into fodder for more of this type of trash. We must protect our beautiful planet so more and more of it does not fall prey to the cancerous spread of this sort of mindlessness. We need wilderness to remind us that nature truly feeds our soul. Once we trash our planet where will we go?

I believe that each generation is responsible for doing whatever they can to improve the world for those who will follow in their footsteps.

Please find a creative way to work with corporations Park services & government to rebuild our seriously deteriorating National & state Parks & to turn back the vast neglect to them by the previous sic administration I implore you!

All of the above are connected as they connect us with our threatened planet and are part of what we need to do to protect it.

TERRACE POND AGE 61 MR. PRESIDENT PLEASE PROTECT THE AREA AROUND THE DELAWARE WATER GAP ON THE PA/NJ BORDER...FROM THE PROPOSED ELECTRIC FEED LINE. IT WILL RUIN THIS BEAUTIFUL HIKING PLACE. WE NEED TO GO MORE INTO SOLAR AN WIND TO PRODUCE ENERGY INSTEAD OF BLOWNG OFF MOUNTAINTOPS. PS OF COURSE THEN ARGUMENTS WILL ARISE AS TO..WHERE..TO PLACE WND TOWERS AND SUN PANELS. it never ends...so it goes....

If we don't take care of Mother she won't take care of us. We are in the midst of seeing what Mother can do when we don't take care of her. Please take a responsible leadership of our Mother.

Continental scale wildlands habitat corridors and connect them to adjacent wildlands

The natural areas that we still have are a part of the biodiversity which is the origin of all the resources and wealth we enjoy as humans. Protecting sites that are not only a resource for all but which also allow us to better recognize the importance of natural environments for our future is not just about leaving areas for future generations to enjoy it may also make the difference between allowing those future generations to have an enjoyable future or leaving them a future littered with hardships.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is a precedent for involving youth corps and WPAlike programs to better our public places. Strongly suggest combining above priorities and creating needy jobs.

It is time to understand that time in nature is becoming more and more important to our population. We are all stressed by the pace of our lives and by the noise and assault of electronics. Nature can help us all be more balanced and peaceful and productive citizens. Environmental issues are very important to a great many of our citizens and should be important to all of us as a clean and healthy environment is necessary to provide clean air water food and a healthy quality of life to all of us. It is also necessary for a healthy economy. Please try to educate your self on these facts so that science will be respected and used in your decisions. We cannot continue to ignore science in our decisions about energy water air etc. We need you to get behind environmental legislation. Climate change is upon us and your children and mine must not be left with a degraded and unhealthy planet. Thank you for your consideration of this message. If you would like to spend some time learning about the value of nature and the out doors to all of us. I would be happy to organize a meeting on that subject.

PS. Mr. President... I feel you are as anti American serving as The Commander & Chief of this beautiful country. But YOU are human you have children that I would hope that you would wish to conserve this earth this land this country for them to have a secure safe future in! Please keep in mind that this Earth is ONE giant circle and what happens in one continent will eventually surely effect the other!

You have so much to consider Do you think your children would like to have the chance to see more than the problems in our immediate field of vision or the relaxation that comes from a walk in nature?

I am blessed to live in Oregon a state that is overwhelmingly beautiful. I well know the value to the human spirit of having urban places for renewal like Forest Park and beautiful mountains like Mt. Hood to visit and enjoy. The outdoors needs our protection now more than ever.

Address Conservation on a larger Scale than previous adminstrations have

It is imperative that a bold stand on defending the wildness that America still has be taken by the administration. The vision of John Muir and Teddy Roosevelt preserved our national treasures and in creating the National Park System enriched the lives of millions of Americans. We need our chosen representatives to play a similar part today as our water air and climate are under extreme threat. Right where I live corporations are still clearcutting the thick forests that surround Mt. Hood. It looks like a war zone. It is insane. Cant we protect our forests and the quality of our streams and thus our fish runs? Please do all you can to stop the destruction before its too late and our children are left with a biosystem that has totallly collapsed because business wanted to make a profit.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In addition I would like to now inform you of the importance of one place in particular. You see I am from the Bronx New York and am a horseman/social work undergrad student at CUNY's Lehman College. I am envisioning to some day become an Equine Psychotherapist. I once spoke to Adolpho Carrion during his terms here as Bronx Borough President at the Home Depot. He encouraged me to pursue my dreams and fight to conserve a plot of land that me some other urban horse people and our horses inhabited for generations upon generations. Unfortunately we were disenfranchised in the name of development however with the proper resources finances and luxury of time to advocate I would've probably been able to maintain a little piece of Bronx History alive. Due to certain situational constraints and an unequal playing field my dream was undone by the political and developing entities whom desired the land. I thank the good lord that I was able to relocate my animals to a family members homestead in upstate New York. But the dream is not dead. I do intend to someday (sooner than later) implement and create an equine facilitated therapy program to the less fortunate inner city urban youth of the 5 boroughs as well as the mentally behaviorally and physically challenged youth and traumatized veterans of our communities. The message I am trying to get across to you is that I am here I am willing and I am waiting for someone of influence to take a stand and conserve places like the special place in the Bronx where generations upon generations of Bronxites were able to connect with each other and nature. Please empathize with me and help me see to it that we facilitate and provide more access and recreational opportunities to the people of the Bronx. Mr. President and respected officials of your administration please do consider me as an ally in the quest for a better tomorrow. Allow me to be your go to guy when it comes to equine facilitated therapy as it is my dream and I wish to share with as many people as possible. I am a prior service member and wish to continue being of service as a civilian. Please send my fellow Bronxites Adolpho Carrion and Justice Sotomayor my warmest regards and let them know that they make me soooooo proud to be a Bronx Latino. Peace and God Bless You All Your Bronx Social Workin Horseman!

Once gone it's gone. Once developed or drilled or mined or clearcut it will never be the same. This may be our last chance to preserve public lands.

I believe that future generations may look back as we do now on the time when doctors did not know to wash their hands before delivering children or performing surgery! It's our responsibility to provide the ecological balance the Permits their 'looking back' at all.

I would also like you to help take back Americas "public" lands from the tiny fraction of the population that has held sway over policies regarding: Livestock grazing and the damage it does. Predator control by the Federal Government to benefit livestock interests and hunting interests. Especially the killing of wolves and using spreading poisons on our public lands that targets predators and kills many other animals. Sack Sec. Salazar and replace him with someone who does not represent this tiny special interest group that see our public land as their personal grave train.

I want my grandchildren to be able to enjoy the great outdoors as much as our family does. We need more parks and our wilderness preserved. Please .

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

All my life I've enjoyed the outdoors. Provide more funding for our National Parks

Our wilderness is priceless: we can't afford to lose it.

Our California redwoods are irreplaceable and provide recreation and solace to me and many other people. We must do what we can to protect these areas for use by people and to preserve them for use by wildlife.

The survival of our species and wellbeing of our species depends on biodiversity adequate and clean water supply healthy and abundant natural resources and a balanced approach to development.

I spend my vacations in the national parks and find great satisfaction in doing so but I have noticed that many parks need more funding to maintain the quality of the environments there both for visitors and for wildlife.

Maintain responsible access to wilderness Please protect our health and the health of wildlife and the environment by protecting and preserving our remaining wilderness rivers and streams from corporate and industrial abuse intrusion and pollution.

We are not the last generation that will have to fight these battles. If we give an inch and industry takes a mile what will be left for the next generations of conservationists? We do not need to destroy our natural heritage for today's economy and for the greed of some low fruit pickers. Create some more green jobs (really lots of them like hundreds of thousands yes really a lot!) and stop our participation in tar sands development while you're at it.

Our environment was ignored or mishandled badly during the eight years of the Bush administration so there is a lot to do to make it right. Please do all you can. It is vital.

Although this letter was written for us who are concerned please be assured that I believe now and have always believed in the protection expansion and creation of America's outdoor spaces.

PLEASE PROTECT OUR NATIVE WILDLIFE!!! I want my children & Grandchildren to be able to see our native wildlife in their natural Habitats NOT in a MUSEUM FOR EXTINCT SPECIES. We NEED to protect their environments! AND MORE Importantly Protect OUR ENVIRONMENT & PROTECT OUR SPECIES...THE HUMAN RACE!!!

One of the important areas to me that needs protection are the Appalachian Mountains. Beautiful panoramic views and clear fresh springs are what I grew up visiting. Blowing away half a mountain for a Walmart and mountain top removal that destroys those views and contaminates those streams are mere examples of the destruction of this most beautiful natural space.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As Teddy Roosevelt once did please continue to honor his legacy by adding more land for national parks that Americans can enjoy animals can continue to have enough of a habitat & to add to the beauty & health of our country.

Bring back the CCC. Bring back the New Deal. Bring back FDR. The country is dying while you sit on your hands.

Address conservation at the ecosystem level. It does not make sense to preserve a single species without protecting the wildlife habitat in which that species lives. Killing predators such as wolves and bears is destructive since it allows prey species such as deer to grow out of control and denude vegetation. Therefore the entire ecosystem must be protected. That means we must stop encroachments such as mining fossil fuel extraction roads that break up habitat and construction of housing. In particular we must ensure that the lands surrounding watersheds must be kept free of development so that we continue to have clean water to drink. For the reasons stated above it is important that we fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund

Build more fish friendly reservoirs that give us water and protect natural runs

The recent oil spill (gusher) in the Gulf of Mexico certainly shows how quickly our environment can be degraded and how many lives can be affected.

Don't drill for oil work on other technologies. Oil is a MESS!

Each generation has the opportunity the responsibility to protect our natural heritage for the next generation. What would we have if our forefathers had not preserved wilderness for us to enjoy?

I have fond memories of visiting both the Grand Canyon and Yellowstone Nat'l Park as well as hiking in the Blue Ridge and Smokey Mountains please protect these beautiful places (to name just a few) for generations to come. Thank you.

I am concerned about the future we are leaving for all of our grandchildren yours and mine particularly the environment the depletion of natural resources and the loss of beautiful natural places still left in the country. If we continue taking and using what every we want or feel we need now to satisfy our every whim there will be very little left for future generations. We need strong leadership in the country to change our ways and convince us to pay a price now so future generations will not have to pay a much bigger one in the future.

Let's keep big business out of our National Treasure from..."sea to shining sea".

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please Mr. President please save our beautiful country from sprawl greedy landowners and destruction.

I am doing my part three times a week by working beaver dams to ensure fish passage and that trails don't flood. In response to complaints that the beavers were flooding trails the forest service three years ago decided to kill the beavers. Seniors like myself stepped up to volunteer to help. After three years we have a partnership with the FS. In December for the late Coho run the work is pretty cold but the rich habitat created by beavers and the educational value makes our efforts worth it. Please step up and do your part for a healthy ecosystem too. Thank you for your leadership.

Provide education on the environment for the youth of America

I am hoping that you will allow your administration to fulfill the promise of your campaign and to work for the people the land and the wildlife of our country.

I most definitely want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors and I am worried that this possibility is decreasing due to greed and lack of understanding or conscious awareness that a conscious commitment is vital to maintain our lands and the future of our American life. Personally I don't think anyone who is not American should ever own any American property for one thing.. Money is not the issue here saving our country from being possessed without thought to the welfare of future generations should be valued and what we do own that has been designated wilderness needs to be maintained and this concept needs to be honored and valued and the contract that started the refuge park etc.should be HONORED. Protecting America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild and scenic rivers and historic sites is absolutely necessary to maintaining our heritage; why are we even considering disturbing any lands for commercial purposes which are protected.

There is too little wildlands left to allow any more to be destroyed. Provide wildlife corridors and protect them

Improving watersheds is especially important. Remember when NYC invested in its watershed instead of investing in a new water treatment plant? The healthier watershed made a new treatment plant unnecessary. We need to be investing in our wildlife habitats as a solution to current issues and for future generations as well.

Save the great outdoors for my four grandchildren and all the grandchildren in the U.S.

I am hoping a bold move to protect our great outdoors will be part of your legacy.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I grew up traveling to and camping in America's beautiful National Park system. I want to be able to share that with my daughter. For this to happen we need to act to protect and expand the system.

Too many people are so divorced from nature that they think that if it is only a tree or a bunch of grass it isn't worth anything to have worth it must be "developed". It would be a better world if we learned to appreciate and respect the world of nature from childhood onward. The only way we can do this is to show respect for the natural environment. But please: when it comes to access and recreation leave out the ATV's.

conserve species diversity in our native flora and fauna

We have a moral obligation to protect the environment for our children and future generations to enjoy.

That way after we are gone all those places will still be there for the enjoyment of everyone in the future. Our history will never die.

\*\*Protect our species cancel the killing of wolves. Wildlife are under stress all over the US because of bad agricultural practices and logging.

I am 84 years old and I have seen many beautiful places in this country despoiled by so-called "progress." Because of this I have joined the Wilderness Society in an effort to preserve some of the special wild places that are still left.

I believe we Americans are stewards of our country and its vast outdoors and I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too.

We have unconscionably failed to address the threat of global warming. This makes it all the more urgent that we do more to protect our wilderness areas. I therefore support the Wilderness Society in making the following request:

With a growing population the US needs more shared outdoor spaces for people to find peace away from the crowded cities.

Protect & maintain what WE already have; do not allow the desecration of land or water.

I live in central NY and I'm also concerned about the health of our lakes. I sail the Great Lakes and camp in the Adirondacks enjoying those lakes. Fresh clean unpolluted water is one of our most valuable resources. Our lakes need to be cleaned up and protected.

Also fire Tim Geithner & make Ron Paul Treasury Secretary!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please protect public lands from rape & pillage by resource extractors.

Fully Fund the National Park Service Reduce pollution by converting our energy to renewable sources

We must protect and preserve our habitat this is the only home we have and its resources as well as its beauty are integral to our continued existence.

These natural spaces are the last line of defense for our naturebased life support systems against the chemicalinfused waste and pollution generating reality of modern human civilizations.

An increasing number of natural disasters is already causing tremendous losses. Please help to regain some of our national wonders for the next generations.

Our parks belong to all of us and also future generations of Americans and need to be protected. And you also need to protect wilderness areas from too many off road vehicles. Whenever I visit areas where off road vehicles are allowed the trails are in terrible shape and the overuse of such vehicles leads to erosion and loss of habitat.

We need to save our wilderness!

Future generations rely on us to ensure that they will be abler to enjoy America's great outdoors too. from unregulated industry Stop the illadvised hunting of threatened species such as wolves and bears

Protect upstate New York from HydroFracking Gas Drilling

It's not been that many years ago that I could walk outside my door listen to all the birds watch the deer and just enjoy all the wildlife around me. My parents would take us to State parks some National parks and just for rides around the country on a Sunday afternoon. Today I see no deer and I have to go farther and farther to see any wildlife whatsoever. Houses have been built factories some already empty & out of business have taken over the landscape I once enjoyed. I fear that the generations behind me wil not have the pleasure of enjoying any of the outdoor activities that I did as a child. Big Business has taken over Greed has shown it's ugly head. Our parks forests and even the wildnerness would be gone if it was left up to Corporate America. A large part of it already is. We MUST protect our precious lands and all the creatures that inhabit them. We must protect the lakes rivers and even streams that feed into them. Where will they be for the next generation? Where will they be in 20 years? They are disappearing at an alarming rate.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The native Americans thought seven generations ahead in trying to minimize the consequences on the earth their actions might have. We must do more than they did; our technology and its long term effects demand we do more.

We have a moral and spiritual obligation to be good stewards of this planet.

Protect more wilderness and establish more national parks Protect and restore Wildlife Habitat and Wetlands with special interest in the areas damaged by BP's reckless oil disaster Keep our forests healthy and permanently ban all permits for extraction of natural resources from within our protected forests Push this country towards negative population growth because overpopulation is the root cause of all problems created by humans

Limit the use of offroad vehicles in sensitive areas

Stop creating logging roads into forests interrupting forest and wildlife habitat Stop selling off old growth trees for timber Assure healthy diversity of tree species in our forests Let the citizens of America know how we can help in keeping our outdoor spaces alive clean and functioning as they should

Protect and expand our wilderness in designated areas while continuing to protect and expand wilderness areas. Stop wild horse roundups until the BLM can devise a more effective plan for herd management.

As the president I realize that you have many issues to attend to' however this is one area that is vital to the survival of our world as we know it. Please take action for our natural wild places.

Protecting our wild places will help the next generation fight obesity. The great outdoors provides Americans a place to exercise.

FLOODING EVERYWHERE BECAUSE YOU REMOVED ALL THE TREES AND GRASSES AND NATURAL FLORA TO PUT IN ASPHALT ROADS AND MORE PESTICIDED HOUSES WITH LAWNS!!!! TEACH BIRTHCONTROL AND SAVE SOME SPACE FOR OXYGENATING TREES!!!! want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create expand

Thank you for all efforts to conserve and restore our natural resources. An important area too often overlooked are the oceans and rivers. Can the oceans be considered wilderness? Thoughtfully monitored and biodiversity and health fostered? Educational opportunities are essential; I am trying to do my part as a private citizen.

I voted for a change from the previous administration of corporate greed. Please be courageous and stand on solid environmental principles.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

and i think we need to do something before its to late. cos this world is a beautyfull place and we only have one world and if we cant take care of it it just shows how lazy we are as people and how uncareing we are as people. so lets make a change. :).

Protection of American' great outdoors is a heritage we own to future generations. T

Preserving the beauty and health of our planet for generations to come is the single most important thing we can achieve . Take care of the environment and help the wild animal population worldwide.Thank you for your leadership in shaping a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century.

In addition we need to find ways to protect forests from insect infestations that threaten them and all species dependent on these forests. On a recent trip to Alaska I found that the pine bark beetle is begining to cause problems there and there are new invasive species threatening the Eastern forests too.This problem needs to be addressed now.

with all the environmental degration now going on preserving national parks wild areas and pristine water sheds is critical!

Please don't cut the funding for our Conservation programs.

These kinds of investments can also contribute to a better financial recovery and future for this country. Work with private industry and strengthen those private industries around the different conservation areas and parks that depend on those facilities to keep their employees and possibly even grow. Thank you for your leadership in shaping a bold conservation strategy

As I become older I realize even more the importance of the natural environment. It is a way to connect with nature that is spiritually physically and mentally healing. If we don't protect it it will be lost and we as human being will be the biggest losers.

And it's not just humans that need the wilderness preserved. We humans are so selfish and greedy we forget that there are other forms of life on "our" planet that need places to live.

In a world which is rapidly being alienated from nature it is imperative that our outdoors be preserved...protected. Unless we see ourselves as part of the natural world rather than dominating it we will become physically socially psychologically and spiritually diminished.

I took my twin 13 year old nephews to Yellowstone and Grant Teton N.Ps this sumer. Their sense of wonder was amazing. They are now hoping that to visit Colorado's outdoor wonders next year. We must protect wild places permanantly.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have laid waste to this tragic country for too long. We have squandered its natural resources disrespected the land and now the people and it's time to start living up to the morals that we profess.

The US was the first country in the world to understand the unifying power of PUBLIC landland that belongs to all its people. Getting out into the great parks we created has been one of the most effective engines of assimilation because these wonders belong to all Americans equally. That's why I ask you to seize this opportunity to create expand and better protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild and scenic rivers and historic sites. Not to mention that they are great tourism engines and buffers against pollution and balm for necessary urban density! Don't let the legacy of your leadership be the diminution of this great legacy! Keep public lands in public hands don't put profit above the public interest. Shape a bold conservation strategy for the 21st century and leave us with more and better protected parks and wilderness for the future.

Stop mining activities near the Grand Canyon!

Your family weekends to different parts of our beautiful country helps to emphasize the variety of treasures of nature ...wildlife scenic rivers and mountains...the list is endless. We are so fortunate! Please continue to do your best to preserve these treasures for our children and future generations.

Places saved now can be used in the future for resource development when ... well IF and only if the can learn how to do it right. Land used up now is gone from its natural state forever!

I am 58 years old. For as long as I can remember I have visited National Parks wildlife habitats hiked in the woods and enjoyed this beautiful land. As a child my parents saw the importance of exposing me to all our land had to offer. I am from the Gulf Coast area and can appreciate more now than ever how critical it is to address all of the concerns to protect our great outdoors.

To ensure that every plant animal & human can survive & thrive we must protect our wild places and natural habitats.

So far I have been very disappointed in your conservation efforts.

There are many beautiful outdoor places in America so I won't name any specifically. But there must be a policy to maintain these splendid examples of nature in all its glory. The cities and other developments where we live and do business are unnatural habitats created by humans. Most of the land in these areas are covered by blacktop or buildings preventing the earth from breathing in these locations. Our parks and natural woodlands are what nature created and we must preserve as many of them as possible to keep nature in balance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am not talking about Agenda 21 or the United Nation's plans to change our country forever. I am talking about protecting these wild and beautiful places as Americans as our heritage as something that needs to be preserved and held precious for all.

I have been very fortunate to enjoy our protected wilderness lands most of my adult life. This has had a profound effect on my positive philosophy and worldview. I have also had the opportunity to share our wilderness areas with my (now adult) children during the time my wife and I were raising them. We still get together for hikes and river trips. As our population grows and the demand for natural resources grows with it we need protection for as much of our remaining wilderness lands as possible.

I feel privileged to be able to enjoy our beautiful natural American landscapes even here in the crowded Northeast. From our local National Seashores to the great forests of the Catskills Adirondacks Vermont and New Hampshire I've found solace from the stresses of urban life in our natural preserves. But our preserves are always under threat from development pollution and misuse. with rocksolid legislation

As population increases and urban sprawl increasingly encroaches on our open spaces it becomes increasingly difficult to find natural areas to commune with nature and periodically to remove oneself from the fast paced society we are now living in.

I live near a large lake that is beautiful. However it is full of carcinogens. This doesn't have to happen. Instead of people being able to fish (and eat the fish) or swim in the lake all they can do safely is look at it. This causes a loss to the local economy.

Once these things are gone they can never be recaptured or restored during the life of this planet. There is no mitigation by developers that can replace or substitute what it took millions of years to create. Only by conservation and protection will there be a viable planet for future generations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If for no other reason it should be understood that environmental protection ensures or at least helps ensure our national security. If and when the earth is degraded enough that such resources are imminently important to our health and future survival whether in terms of larger environmental viability or resource availability or for food production our dependence on sustained and protected natural resources will be clear. It should be clear now. We can no longer afford if indeed we ever could to think only of the now and not consider future generations. There is no excuse and no possible sense in doing anything less than realizing and understanding the vital part that such protection plays. The despair and social unrest that would result in not doing so would be beyond anything we have seen. The best current examples are all around us in the aftermaths of storms and other disasters such as Katrina Haiti Pakistan. Without intact natural resource areas there is no fallback of hope for clean air water and all of the many other needs including hope for survival. These areas are not a luxury. They are of vital necessity and vital national security. Energy production comes not only in obvious forms. In fact by far our greatest energy resources are NOT as obvious and lie in such resources that the United States is blessed with. Please consider this carefully and make a case there is ample evidence for the impact of doing anything less than conservation of these areas on our national security.

Without a President's strong commitment the unique beauty of our lands will be destroyed in the name of profit for big oil big gas condomoniums shopping centers anything that will turn a profit. We need our nature preserved especially with the increasing population growth.

It is not too late to preserve what's left.

The life of our planet is more important than the economy.

I am concerned about the future of our wilderness areas.

Besides being an inspiration and source of beauty our parks forests rivers and wetlands provide real benefits to people both physical and mental. They clean our air and water allow for biodiversity to continue and flourish are sources for medicines as yet undiscovered and more. Once they are gone there is no way to retrieve them. We cannot allow them to be destroyed.

I think the condition of this beautiful earth for which we have given responsibility and blessing overshadows all issues of my lifetime.

Your constituents placed you in office for change for the better.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One we believe as taxpayers this is an appropriate path. But we should not have to drive 25 miles to get to an outdoor space. (And I am not talking about the golf course or the baseball fields or soccer fields we are not allowed to use anyway). But real space in every town or city. Nor does a sidewalk make a nature trail. What do people travel to see the beautiful shoreline the state parks the architecture. We don't say lets go look at the miles of urban/suburban mall sprawl. The "Ugly America"! We look for the unique characteristics areas offer. What is it the richest Americans seem to create they have nice big beautiful homes with beautiful grounds or surroundings or travel to beautiful places buy ranches in Montana .....or behind walled communities with amenities. I despise what developers have done across America squeezing people onto plots 15' front and back yards. And most seem to continue to do everything the same old ways even though we know more. Towns and city's need may many more open spaces. But citizens are not people the corporations get far more ear time than we do. Example: My family came from a town called Brunswick Ga. we think we may retire there however it has not always been a successful downtown Its been taken over by the political powers and it has been turned into an area just for the government offices schools recreational park with the historic homes hanging on. Now an old hotel went down some boat slips built and even condos were going up they would have a great view across from the marine which has brought a ton of people into the town. Anyhow there is this open area a blocks worth that the people like but a local judge wants to build a correctional facility right there. Now 70 percent of the people oppose this but the judge wants it so now it is in court 23 years later. Neighborhoods are built with people and not all of them can afford the beautiful "amenities" some developments offer. We need many many many more public places.

If we lose our wilderness areas we probably won't be able to survive on this planet. We need them. And so do future generations.

When I was growing up I went to a nature camp for several summers. It was my first real experience of being in and learning about the outdoors and it made a huge impression on me. I fell in love with nature and came to recognize how powerful and important our connections with the natural world are. Over the years many of my favorite great outdoor places have changed and not for the better. Many of the big trees in the forests are gone and with them much of the wildlife that we all love to see. The beaches I grew up with formerly teeming with life are now largely barren and have been for quite some time. People have been losing touch with the natural world that sustains us physically and nourishes us spiritually.

We do our children a great disservice if we fail to protect our natural places for their benefit and enjoyment in years to come.

Preservation of nature for future generations and for the survival of our species is my primary concern when casting political votes. I know there is political pressure and lobbies attempting to thwart preservation efforts that appear at odds with corporate interests/money.

We don't need NEW roads...we can't take care of the ones we have...we need forest.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Once the land is destroyed built on developed and ruined it's too late.

IF WE DON'T PRESERVE OUR WILDERNESS OUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN WON'T KNOW THE MEANING OF THE WORD.

Once they are gone there is no turning back.

These days the natural environment is under the greatest threat from humans that it has ever experienced. As a huge population with vast technology at our whim we have continually nibbled away at more and more of our natural heritage so that the cumulative loss is sizable. Furthermore after a decade of a far Rightwing Republican Congress with a far Right wing president for eight years the environment and the laws and agencies that were to protect it has been massively eroded.

I was raised to appreciate and care for all wildlife. As a birder I have visited many of our national and state parks & wildlife refuges during the past 35 years. Flying over the northwestern U.S. often over the years I have seen more and more habitat destruction vast stretches of oil & gas facilities and large areas of denuded forests in the Oregon & Northern California Cascades where lumber companies did not replant any trees. Our nation's waterways have become very polluted. Years ago the numbers of bird species were plentiful to see during spring and fall migrations. Now when I bird along the C&O Canal I see far fewer numbers and some species have become so rare that I miss them altogether.

Our wilderness lands and parks should be the enduring legacy passed from each generation to the next. Such lands have been decreasing with each generation the land plundered for the primary enrichment of the few leaving ruined landscapes and ecosystems for all of us for many generations to come.

I am very concerned that the next Congress will not be as environmentally friendly as this one....so there's not much time to get things going.

Please don't let them take our wild places away before I get to see them all.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I have spent most of my life in the outdoors in the Olympics the Cascades and Mt. Rainier here in Washington State summer after summer. Over and over when forced to return to "civilization" I've noticed I had to fight depression due to the shock of returning to the filth and degradation we live in and accept as normal here "down below" and then gradually over the winter I too began accepting trash derelicts bad tasting water air so thick buildings disappeared dust incessant noise violence as "normal." However the contrast between "out there" and "back here" gradually became more and more blurred as the years went by while watching air pollution slowly day by day approach the west flank of the Cascades pile up against the Mts then one day send streaks of brown/gray across the Cascades into Eastern Washington. It got so bad some summers I could not see from my fire lookout if there were any smokes to report just this slowly roiling brown/bluish air. At Mt. Rainier we began having contests to see which of us would collect the most used disposable diapers from trails and roads etc. ( I even found one in a water source! ) I have no idea of the amount of trash I personally hauled out of the back country when on trail patrol. We all felt in our gut a simmering rage and utter helplessness to stem the pollution flood even as we too began accepting it as normal. And then Earth Day. Year after year after year. Hope! We no longer felt "weird" for our efforts to clean/protect the outdoors as our efforts gradually became applauded to the point we began seeing small efforts to clean and green our cities transportation systems etc. And now from the Obama Administration this new program Americas Great Outdoors. The simple conclusion for me as President Obama has put it so eloquently is hope. Let's move forward on protection restoration and acquisition of new wilderness areas. My quoted poem moves from rage & helplessness to that hope.

Cathedral Slipping through the dappled forest Quietly with deer foot step A Seeker comes to worship there In grand cathedral of the trees Douglas Fir with solemn visage Wrinkled from their centuries lived Grandpa trees enormous grave Provide a living sanctuary Sunbars for the candle light Music from birds insects streams Incense from the fragrant forest vanilla leaves and nettles ferns red wood cedars hooded priests Line of seedlings on a nurse log Altar servers dressed in green The Message given in the silence Directly to the Seeker's heart In anguish praying there that the dreadful wreck we've made of this The planet home entrusted us Be forgiven healed in time as We didn't know at first And then we did not care avarice would cause our Earth despair While greed for MORE o'erwhelms us all plants and animals die off extinct Our weather turns bizarre against us Nature plans our punishment Sick at heart he cries for shame "O Great Spirit take me as A sacrifice to heal this land My blood and bones be taken up Multiplied like loaves and broken by your kindly hand to dust Blessed and used by Spirit Wisdom Sown in healing 'round the world" Long moments pass there while he weeps anguished whimpers screams of rage spittle flying eyes aflame then it's over and a broken sobbing Seeker Tear blinded stumbles on away the huge old trees with wisdom faces nod and murmur to themselves as the Hand of God encircles him

Losing the wilderness will mean losing a part of our soul and the spirit of America.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Protecting the wilderness America has left is about more than recreation spiritual renewal and creative inspiration although all of these are important. It is about the future of life on Planet Earth including human life. Species extinction is increasing rapidly as is the spread of diseases and pests around the planet. Our wilderness areas are the last refuges of many potential solutions to humancaused problems as well as incubator sites for environmental restoration. They are where healing of the planet can start. The question is not so much whether the next generation will be able to enjoy America's great outdoors but will they have a liveable planet?

If the great outdoors are not protected now they will be lost for future generations.

It is a Planet not an Empire and the term Mother Earth is not just words. The Earth is our mother and if we do not take better care of her all will suffer as is happening now with both Flora and Fauna being tremendously exploited with little or no thought of the consequences.

I just don't get where Obama is coming from: Siding 80=9% with the GOP or their nasty representatives in and out of Congress. I believe your hypebut was I a sucker. Now we get to watch you Bushclone the rest of government that you promised you would preserve for American citizens. How do you sleep at night? I find it difficult to thank you for your failed leadership in shaping a bold conservation strategy I hope you are going to resurrect your campaign promises before 2012.

What will your legacy be to our children our grandchildren and our nation?

What's the point in any effort if we have no earth to survive on.

We can best keep enjoying the great outdoors by not decreasing what protection there is and increasing regulations designed to protect the great outdoors and it inhabitants. We can also continuation to enjoy the great outdoors by cleaning up the pollution in government. There is a rotten spell that has been emanating from government for some time now from all three branches of what is supposed to be a representative democracy but the only ones getting representation are the corporations...need I say more.

I am an elementary teacher who is alarmed at the lack of experiences children have beyond the walls of their bedrooms and computer screens. I have children ask me "What is nature?" Of course they know after a few weeks inside and outside of my classroom. wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild PS Michelle has the right idea with her White House Garden. Kudos to her!

Once it is gone it is too late to save it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's so easy to take our lovely country for granted. Because of our behavior countries that have little impact are suffering at our expense. PLEASE fight the corporations!!!!!!

I want my kids and my grandchildren to be able to enjoy the beauty of nature when I'm long gone. I don't want them to grow up in a world that doesn't appreciate the great outdoors and only cares about material things. I wish for them to see nature and actually enjoy it and want to be there. I know so many people who don't care about the environment and it's because they don't realize how important it is. I want all people to realize the importance of nature and to be able to enjoy it. It really matters.

Reverse the deterioration of our National Parks by overuse

Priorities for me are that we do not compromise existing wilderness by allowing mining logging road building which would harm the water the forests the natural beauty of these areas. That the department of interior cannot sell public lands to the highest bidder. That science and nature are used to determine how to best protect areas that are open to development for business as well as citizens to create a win-win. That we enforce clean air and water regulations. Businesses that pollute are held responsible.

I teach too many students who have never been exposed to nature and an appreciation of all life forms. The first reaction of many of them is to step on a bug shoot a deer or use a street as a trashcan. We need to not only preserve our wilderness areas but to add programs accessible to all citizens especially the young ones that will teach responsibility and an understanding of the web of life.

This is not just about the next generation being able to enjoy the great outdoors. Whenever we take away protected land it usually is a stopgap measure with no long range provable positive solution in mind. However when we destroy the land the impact is long range with an irreplaceable loss. Please do not engage in stopgap measures. As the Native Americans say one must see the effect of your actions on seven future generations. We are so untrained in this thinking and you have the power to shift that.

It is of paramount importance to protect our wild spaces. As our population continues to grow these areas are necessary to provide spiritual relief to our every day grind

We are quickly using up the earth's resources. Now is the time to become conscious of the real facts to begin conserving preserving and restoring all that nature has given us.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Beauty especially natural beauty is being pushed aside in our fastgrowing and sometimes outofcontrol world. The sanity and awe that come from being in nature are what have sustained me and my children through times of stress and adversity. It is a comfort that is ours by right and citizenship. It is also our right and responsibility to maintain and conserve the diversity that will surely provide life for our descendants into the future. I am doing my part by becoming a woodland steward and supporting conservation causes. I know I can do more.

I know you think LONGterm and of future generations as a parent and a responsible citizen although so many people don't have the luxury of thinking for the future. Sustainability is not just a catch word it is a necessity for all life. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors and REAP the benefits of the watersheds bigeochemical cycling pollutant filtration and nutrient sources of the future.

This is the most important issue for me. The loss of the middle class is important but without a connection to Nature we will be lost as a species.

As a mother a person who appreciates the grandeur of nature a student of nature who realizes all the critical services nature provides to us which we eradicate at our peril and a citizen who votes and assesses voting records I want the next generation to be able to enjoy and benefit from America's great outdoors too.

Improve Watersheds This great country has always protected its wildlife and their habitats with the Endangered Species Act. Now however it seems that no one in our Congress Senate or leaders of our states care about what has always been one of our greatest assets. Do we want our children grandchildren and future generations to look at these wonderful animals in history book pictures because we have slowly destroyed them by the greed of the American people. These animals have no one to protect them except us. God created them for man to take care of they are a vital part of our heritage please insure that they are a vital part of our future. Thank you for getting protections for our wildlife and their habitats.

I am fortunate enough to live with the redwoods in Northern California which were nearly wiped out by lumbermen before protective laws were passed. It is up to our elected officials to advocate for the preservation of our national treasures. We are counting on you.

If nothing is done to save this your children and grandchildern will never know the joy and beauty that was originally created by our Great Father in Heaven.

We need to protect future environment including wildlife and all elements of ecosystems for future generation. Please stress to the public that we must overcome with vigor the selfishness and selfcenteredness that seems to wish to use up resources and kill the golden goose that is our planet that provides our water and air and that sustains our life. We have obligations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to protect our public lands for future generations!!!!!!

I am aware that in this time the main goal is to make corporations happy but we must think of our future and the future of our kids. It would be a sad day when there is nothing for them left to see besides trash and buildings.

We cannot continue to destroy/degrade wild America. The repercussions are too awful. We are supposed to be stewards of this planet. We need to do a much better job.

With all the carbon dioxide in the air our country is in need of as much oxygen as we can produce. Green plants and trees give off oxygen. That is why I want you to protect and conserve America's land parks and forests. Clean water is a top priority for America. We need to protect our scenic rivers lakes and creeks. Americans take oxygen and clean water for granted. These two commodities will not last forever if we do not conserve them.

Having space outside connects people to the land and supports care for the future of our planet. If we do not have space outside we lose the ability to care about it and our future on a livable planet.

The key points are well covered in the letter above but I would like to add my personal feelings to this. In the past few years I have spent time to go internally and discover my true core values. Many people do this maybe before they are in their 50's but they do the self examining to find these. In the truly hard uncertain times of this era I know Nature is my core. To be unable on a daily basis to enjoy the fluttering butterflies the song birds busy taking care to find their next meal a box turtle slowly crossing the flowering wildflowers the beautiful sky at night would be unnatural to me. I am one of the lucky individuals who has the opportunity to live in an area that is being protected. While not a National Park the NJ Pinelands is a National Reserve. Protecting all of our land should be our priority. The land does not belong to anyone we merely babysit it for the next generations. On my watch I'd like to believe we will continue to do just that save it for all to come. Enjoying the wonders of this great Earth is OUR right. Please continue to go to all lengths to save every possible inch of America.

I am asking you to preserve the Great Outdoors in the face of indiscriminate development urban sprawl increasing population and fewer and fewer open space for people to experience for a sense of peace and to reconnect with our natural world.

We need to work together to undo the past administrations bad policies and protect these lands instead of giving them up to special interests and dirty fuel industries.

fire salazar! Then do the right thing and stop corporate/congressional greed and save the planet....you do have children don't you? Do you want to leave them an unlivable poisoned planet??? Take action now or consign your descendants to a horrible future and a terrible present!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Knowing that there is some wilderness left and that there exist wildlife refuges give me spiritual solace even though I live in the urban environment of the city of Philadelphia. Nature has sustained me in my often difficult life on this earth as a refugee immigrant from World War II. I deeply worry about the protection and survival of the American flora and fauna against corporate greed.

I am concerned with the WILD HORSES AND BURROS being roundup and often killed by getting in to the hands of the wrong people from the BLM we need to protect our western states from Uranium digging. WE must protect our vast forest land and wildlife. The past 2 yrs. have been nothing but killing wolves horses dying from roundups and for what? to bring in the big oil companies to destroy our lands meant for our wild life. Is our greed for money so important to rid our country of any historical location? This country has to slow down we have destroyed what God has provided. Our government has done a lot of harm to our great outdoors.

Limit access by offroad vehicles which ultimately degrade the land

Too many of our youngsters do not have the opportunity to be in the outdoors in the beautiful places all over our land. They do not get to have the experiences of how nature works and balances itself. Suburbs and tenements and concrete pavements not only take away any beauty but also increase our environmental pollution.

We have polluted our waterways and land in the interests of massive food production so it is more important now more than ever to help protect what remains of our wilderness and waterways from further toxification. It is so disheartening to fly across the country and no longer see blue waterways below. Please help save our land.

I'm an American and I've seen enough housing developments strip malls and strip mines in this country. We need LESS development and MORE of the natural outdoors preserved!

I grew up spending most of my summers in the Adirondacks or St. Lawrence river and can't imagine my Grandniece and nephew not having that opportunity. PLEASE not only save and protect our wild spaces even more importantly help America be a benchmark for saving our Planet (as a habitable space for people and wildlife). To me that is one of the key things the world needs to wake up to before it is too late. Make us the leaders not the followers in this effort I beg you...

I enjoy the great outdoors a lot myself and always clean it up so that there is something for the next generation; therefore I expect the government to help ensure that there is a great outdoors too.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To be more specific how about starting with protecting what is ALREADY supposed to be protected but isn't? Like the WILD HORSES and their ancestral land given to them by court order and law but wildly disregarded and blatantly ignored by BLM who rounds up these magnificent creatures with OUR TAX DOLLARS! In addition these millions of acres that are supposed to be protected need to be managed responsibly and that includes getting CATTLE and SHEEP OFF THE PUBLIC LANDS! These lands belong to the American people and if we continue to let cattle ranching mining and other destructive activities on these lands then our grandchildren will inherit deserts devoid of wildlife and soul. I'd like to see species protected on a much larger scale such as WOLVES which we have treated horribly! These animals should have sanctuaries where people can visit but not harm or destroy the land. We need to become stewards of the land with a mentality that we ought to take care of it for many future generations and not merely to profit from it in the short term. For the 21st century I trust that you will take our public comments seriously and into consideration.

One of the largest failings of our conservation "system" is the lack of connection between various reserved area. Without these connections populations become isolated and much more fragile than a larger combined population would be. The Adirondack Park is a prime example of what is needed.

As our population continues to explode creating and continuing wildlife refuges and protecting new wild places were never more important.

As a child my parents took our family to many of the National Parks in almost every state and I have many fond memories of the beautiful mountains rivers canyons oceans forests etc as well as the wildlife. It disturbs me to see mining, logging drilling and otherwise destroying the integrity of the environment that belongs to all of us.

WE STILL HAVE SPECIAL LANDS THAT NEEDS PROTECTED FOR US AS WELL AS FUTURE GENERATIONS FROM MINING DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL USE.

I've live most of my life in southern California. I'm now living in central Florida. I've enjoyed the incredible beauty of our country's southwest and now am getting to know appreciate and love the southeast. I've also had the opportunity of enjoy other areas of America's great outdoors. The very health and wellbeing of our nation and its people depends on maintaining the integrity of these areas. Our great outdoor spaces and wilderness areas must be protected.

Nature doesn't have a chance without purposeful conservation. We can't afford to destroy more please conserve and restore

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have just come home from a vacation in southeast Alaska and Glacier Bay. I am overwhelmed at the expansive beauty of this place and the abundant wildlife on land and in the sea. I had the opportunity to speak with many who grew up in this area or have been visiting here for many years. They have seen the changes here from overfishing ignorant trophy hunters and clearcut logging and none of these changes are good. I am not naive to the needs of growth but we are just beginning to understand the urgency of conservation.

Corporations have WAY TOO MUCH POWER especially as concerns our environment!  
Corporations are NOT PEOPLE! MONEY IS NOT SPEECH!

I have been backpacking in the western US wild areas for over 40 years and have begun to share this experience now with my children. I am concerned that there is less wild land now than even a few decades ago and feel strongly that we need to take steps to preserve what little is left.

For those of us who live in a watershed environment like we do in Michigan the water becomes vital. What we put in obviously we take out. One simple example is that of salmon. Over the 25 years of living here we have gone from being able to fish for salmon from Lake Michigan to not being able to eat it. Our efforts are beginning to pay off for Lake Erie I hope that we are wise enough to continue to clean things up.

Our country is blessed with a wealth of beautiful natural areas that should be preserved. Too often these types of concerns fall to the wayside when issues involving power and money take precedence. But these are the things that are not replaceable. They are treasures and should be treated as such.

And more importantly I also know that there is a careful balance in nature to the benefit of all and everything. When we upset that balance for man's convenience we are inviting disaster for man animal plant and indeed our planet.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My husband and I both work in land conservation in North Carolina. While we've seen tremendous strides in public lands acquisition funding and management we are all too aware of the largescale threats of population growth and global warming. The first inevitably places more and more pressure on our natural resources through inappropriate land use. The second places more insidious stress on all of our natural lands since global warming is likely to cause more erratic weather increased catastrophic fire sea level rise including saltwater inundation of freshwater resources and increased exotic invasion in natural areas made more vulnerable by environmental stress. Setting aside MORE and LARGER natural areas is not the only solution; we obviously have to reduce the source of global warming limit population growth through education and engage in wise land use planning. However acquiring and protecting large blocks of forest will help reduce global warming acting as a carbon sink and a source of oxygen. Acquiring natural areas with high diversity clusters of rare species and relatively little evidence of disturbance will ensure that these areas act as reservoirs to minimize species and natural community losses. And acquiring extensive areas along rivers and streams (of at least 300 feet in width) will ensure that aquatic resources are protected for our drinking supply as buffer against flooding and for the rich diversity of species which rely on riparian resources.

I am a teacher and mother who values above all else the need to pass on to our children a clean environment rather than one damaged beyond repair by humankind. The most important challenges now facing us as a society a country and as human beings are (a) the need to develop sustainable methods of producing energy (b) the need to protect and preserve the outdoor spaces and wilderness areas we have left are.

As someone who has found the wonderful and much needed respite in getting into a wilderness setting to recharge and relax I cannot encourage you enough to protect what seems to be rapidly disappearing. Wealthy "owners" of lake shores here in Minnesota seem to believe they can do and build anything they want destroying the God given blessings I believe need indeed must be preserved. Why do a few always think they have all the rights that ought to be shared with all? And when those "powerful" folk buy legislators even governors with their wealth so no rules or regulations get passed we have destroyed what may never be reclaimable!

I look at the mountain top mining and see how easily we destroy beautiful places in the name of progress. I fear how readily we kowtow to corporate demands and claims of saving the economy by destroying nature.

As a parent I am especially concerned about the legacy I leave for my children.

Mr. President we need to protect our environment and wildlife. If the Gulf is not a lesson this nothing will ever be. To more in that direction we need to fire Ken Salazar and replace him with an environmentalist. Unless that is done we are spinning our wheels. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a Cubmaster for my sons' Cub Scout Pack 58 in Fairmount GA and we frequently go on hikes and camp around our area of NW GA. It is very important to me that my boys and the boys of my pack have the opportunity to experience the wilderness. However if we don't continue to take care of our wilderness areas they will disappear to development. We encourage our children to do their part by cleaning up trash and leaving things better than when we found it. It is very important that this is a priority on a national level also.

Our shared outdoor spaces provide the opportunity for human interaction with the natural world and as a result of this interaction improvement in our collective physical and emotional health. Understanding the advancing threats placed upon many of these natural areas we would wisely protect what we have now. In order to do this our nation's people need to know what they have even if they do not live close to these resources and do not have first hand knowledge of these resources. The way in which they will have this knowledge is to visit natural areas and enjoy the splendor that is there. For this reason I ask your administration to take the lead in this America's Great Outdoors project!

...Dear President Obama. PLEASE TAKE TIME NOW TO HEAR OUR HOPES AND CONCERNS FOR OUR AMERICA'S FREE AND OPEN SPACES. SOMETHING MUST BE DONE PLANS FORMULATED TO PROTECT THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF OUR COUNTRY. I ASK YOU TO TAKE TIME AND TAKE NOTE PLACING CONCERNS ON THE HIGHEST LEVEL AS THE LEADER OF OUR COUNTRY I KNOW YOU SEE THE NEED.

My husband and I are retired and have been lucky enough to travel across this country enjoying some of the wild and historic places as we go. The young people of this country deserve to have the same opportunity now and in the future but what will be left for them?

THE MAJOR DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WHAT I WANT TO DO WITH AMERICA'S RESOURCES AND WHAT OTHERS LOBBY FOR IS THAT WITH MY METHOD THE LAND AND WATER REMAIN NATURAL WITH NOTHING DESTROYED OR CHANGED THAT CAN NOT BE UNDONE. WITH OTHER METHODS THE PRESENT GENERATIONS USES OUR RESOURCES AND LEAVES LITTLE OR NOTHING FOR THE FUTURE. PLUS ONCE USED UP AND PERHAPS DESTROYED IT CAN NOT BE UNDONE. WE WILL ALL DIE EVENTUALLY AND TAKE NOTHING WITH US SO HOW WE USE THIS EARTH IS WHAT WE LEAVE FOR THE NEXT GENERATION. LET'S STOP BEING SELFISH RIGHT NOW.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness areas in this country have been under siege by corporate interests usually energy recreational vehicle enthusiasts or ranching and any other organization that might find interests in public wilderness areas. Our wilderness areas need to be protected to preserve them as wilderness. We need a movement much like at the birth of our national parks as many of the same forms of environmental destruction threatened those lands so many amazing habitats are being destroyed like the hilltops of Appalachia. This kind of land preservation offers benefits more widely and in a more sustainable way than developing or extracting from the land which is a net loss to the public. Preserving wilderness improves watersheds and wildlife habitat critical in a time in human history where species are vanishing at an alarming rate due to human habitats and when over 6 billion people on need fresh water on a planet where less than 1% of the water is drinkable and 50% of that is accessible. In addition now more than ever we need places where we can have experiences in raw nature to help counter and balance our immersion in technology. Finally providing increased access and recreational opportunities to the public is the highest and best form of land use we can pursue. More than the deficit which comes and goes wilderness is a true gift we can give to future generations.

I also have a very specific request: the elimination of mountaintop removal mining. Companies have had free reign for decades to destroy mountains in the Appalachians mountains with names trails homes and histories and have wreaked environmental havoc in the country's oldest and most diverse ecosystems; indeed one of the most diverse in the world. It is not an exaggeration to say that they rape the land and then leave it broken. It is a practice that should be stopped not one that should simply be regulated or diminished. Many of our most beautiful spaces have been permanently lost.

I can't believe what a bunch of ignoramuses you guys are when it comes to the environment. You just don't get it. Shooting wolves from helicopters. Allowing the BLM to poison animals because of some outdated unscientific erroneous policies. Giving into red states on environmental policies getting NOTHING in return and allowing pristine drinking water and air to be polluted and cause disease and death in the surrounding populations. Grow a spine

Inter alia I absolutely deprecate the intrusion of ORVs into wilderness areas.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our Great Outdoors need to be protected by empowering the local land managers with the authority to enforce the land usage laws already in place. We DO NOT need any more wilderness or land areas closed to the public. What we need is for our public lands to be more accessible by the public including motorized travel and better access for the handicapped. Address Public Awareness of responsible OHV usage Protect access to all public lands including OHV trail systems by increasing land use education and etiquette and by increasing motorized access to public lands including motorized access Fully Fund all motorized and offroad trail opportunities Fully fund our local USFS districts to enforce the laws and regulations already in place to protect our public lands. Fully Fund land use education programs Please DO NOT lock us out of our Public Lands but instead create a way for our lands to be better accessed and protected by better land management.

The great wilderness is sadly gone. The open spaces that remain however are still of immense environmental and social value. These spaces must be preserved and enhanced for us today and for future generations.

Please consider that people aren't the only beings on our planet and the rest of the natural world needs to be protected from our heavy footprint.

Regulate Toxins in our Waters More Stringently The EPA and agencies in the Department of the Interior should be monitoring and regulating pollution and toxic dumping and land use issues. Their concern should be in protecting the environment not in helping corporations abuse our land and waterways. I want the children of my children's children to enjoy our beautiful country. Please follow through!

We have already desecrated so much of America and the resources the land has given us. Enough is enough. Global Warming is here steps MUST be taken to not only preserve what we have but to rebuild restock our resources. The future IS with our generation. Please know and realize how very very important this is.....

We have been altering our environment in radical ways for too long.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have spent my life of 56 years stewarding America's landscapes and productive farms. I teach natural history environmental science and land conservation. The connection we humans share with the one great life force of nature is essential to the wellbeing of this generation and future generations. I have spent many weeks and months experiencing our great wilderness areas forests and parks. The solutions for our future as a civilization depend on preserving intact healthy ecosystems and our planet's biodiversity. Without these resources we will lose the basis for our greatest commodities and economies. Please be bold in creating new wilderness areas expanding our national parks and forests adding watershed management protection and conserving our precious natural heritage so that my children and grandchildren and all future generations. While camping in one of the beautiful New York State campgrounds in the Adirondacks this August I was struck by how these facilities benefit the poorer families. For many the summer vacation consists of packing up the camper truck tents and moving to a campground by a lake. The respite from daily life and work is palpable in the woods and on our waterways. Spending time outdoors around a campfire fishing hiking or paddling renews our souls and restores our health. Being in nature is a necessity for us all. I was on a nearby island in Maine when you visited Mt. Desert Island with your family this July. I was so thrilled to know you were taking time for yourselves surrounded by the immense beauty of Acadia National Park. It made me extra happy.

Please pay attention: This is a much bigger issue than recreation. This issue is about our human soul and our relationship to Life. We have no soul or life without respect and reverence for nature. This protection of the natural world is the most pivotal critical aspect of human life today all other crises are rooted here.

Less than 3% of the United States original forest remains. Where we are fortunate to have old growth it is often in fragmentary plots broken up in a way not conducive to protecting animal populations especially migratory ones. Please make preservation of native forest and restoration of multispecies and multistage forest ecosystems an urgent priority. In many cases the Forest Service is selling timber permits for less than it costs to manage the sales build and maintain the roads and it is putting timber on the market when demand is low due to slow housing starts. Who benefits? A few extraction companies who do not have an investment in the future of the environment and seek only shortterm gain. We can do better. If we are to ever cut the majestic oldgrowth it should be for timeless projects such as those of the CCC and WPA building the great lodges and parks of the depression years.

We also need to be more proactive in preparing to counter global warming as much as possible. Most scientists consider this not an issue any more in that unfortunately global warming is clearly happening right now. The issue is getting our political leaders to communicate this as a national priority.

Please ignore those ranters and ravers from the Tea Party who would have you believe all Americans agree with them and their big oil big business partnerships. The majority of us want our shared outdoor spaces protected from drilling and mining.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I ask you to create expand and better protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild To ensure future generations will always benefit and enjoy our public lands please consider these priorities for America's Great Remove cattle from grazing on land within 50 miles of bison Close sensitive areas with endangered plants and animals to any offroad use Stop drilling along our coastline. With two explosions and oil spills in ONE year it's time we went green as a nation. That alone will save thousands of species from extinction and put America's labor force back to work . Once we ruin them they're gone forever. especially inner city children. They are our hope and future.

It is insane to drill out the few reserves we have anyway for security reasons. I used to vote Repub figured it was pick your poison. But they have gone off the deep in over the past few decades into the land of total stupidity. They think we can get back the resources that we have used up over the past 200 years or the capital we accumulated at the end of WWII like magically when in fact this country really needs to change quite a bit to survive in any viable form in the future. BTW not everyone in Kansas is a total idiot. Majority idiocy takes root west of Lawrence. ::::: boilerplate

I want America to be the leader in hte heavens energy wind sun and water bio fuels .Time for America to be a leader agin move on from hells energy (bellow ground) oil and coal

For too long we have sacrificed these lands to drill for the fossil fuels which are destroying us and all we cherish. We must break free from our dependence on oil create new jobs in renewable energy and protect our wild lands for the future.

I have particular enjoyed our Texas state park through out my life time. I grew up on summer trips in to the wilderness it is there where I learned about the world and our great nation! The wilderness is where I hope to teach the next generation! GSA

I think drilling in the Chukchi sea is much to risky. Any oil spill in ice and water is almost impossible to fight.

We have had both the benefits and responsibilities of vast wilderness that sustain innumerable species of plants and animals that fit the intricate pattern of our world and survival. Interfere at any level (from microbes to humans or elephants) will upset the balance and potentially create problems to the rest. Destroy the wilderness areas and add to global warming new diseases insufficient potable water polluted air etc etc. We cannot continue to let those with the most money and the least ethical commitment to protecting our global "inheritance" to destroy everything we value.

American's are tired of big business calling the shots! Exploiting wildlife at will!

if we don't pay attention to the natural world humans will be preserved in formaldehyde !

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

If I were to be selfish I wouldn't be writing to you. I wouldn't be taking your time or mine. I've seen the beauty of this great land. I am still enjoying it. Why should I care what happens to it after I die? Well I do care. You should care as well. I think you do. I also think you have a lot of tough choices to make. But I think that this is one tough decision that you have to make in favor of your children and grandchildren. And you have to make it now.

The National parks are the visions of another forward thinking President. He would be very upset and not what he envisioned of how a treasures are being whittled down by leases and permits. The Parks are being nickle and dimed to be a Disneyland atmosphere and for profit for a few.. Stronger protection for all life within parks. boundaries . Public or BLM lands need to be added to Nat'l Parks to make" Green corridors" for migrating wild life. Summer and winter ranges. Decrease the number of leases for mining and grazing. They are being given first priority by Government Agencies to the detriment of wild lands and wild life.. Have an environmental group be in charge not a government agency. No building. create a buffer zone near all rivers and no clear cutting. Ban mountaintop removal. poisoning the future.

ALL OF THESE OUTDOOR SPACES ARE NECESSARY FOR THE PEOPLE OF OUR COUNTRY TO HAVE A PLACE TO REST RELAX AND TO JUST TO BE IN A PLACE WHERE THEY CAN THINK ABOUT THE THINGS THAT ARE IMPORTANT IN THEIR LIVES ... HAVING PLACES WE CAN GO TO THAT ARE STILL PRISTINE AND UNDEVELOPED WILD PLACES WHERE WE CAN OBSERVE THE NATURAL WORLD HELPS US TO KEEP THE PROPER PERSPECTIVE IN REGARD TO OUR OWN SURVIVAL IN THIS HARSH WORLD ENVIRONMENT THAT WE NOW LIVE IN .... AND GIVES US HOPE THAT WE CAN MAKE IT A BETTER WORLD. PLEASE PROTECT OUR COUNTRY'S WILD PLACES ... SEND THOSE WHO WANT TO MINE AND DRILL AND BUILD TO OTHER PLACES THAT ARE ALREADY DEVELOPED OR THAT WILL NOT BE DESTROYED BY SUCH ENDEAVORS BECAUSE THAT IS WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF THEY ARE ALLOWED EVEN LIMITED ACCESS TO OUR WILD PLACES.

Please we need to make a change before habitat and wildlife is ruined and species extinct. Before it's too late make a difference

My generation and my children's generation have enjoyed the great outdoors for years. We really need to keep it going for future generations. This is so important to me. We already are in dire straits with Global Warming we need to help even more.

I have a number of concerns about environmental issues including the destruction of habitats our consumption of fossil fuels and the numbers of children growing up without experiencing nature.

We need for the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too.

As an avid outdoorsman I have noticed many changes in the quality of our air and water since my childhood. Even though I live in the great state of Wisconsin with it's limited population and and copious open spaces the impact of our species on the environment is noticeable.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dr. Mr. President Unlike many Americans I grew up with access to hundreds of acres of woodlands streams and clean quiet country air. Today that land like hundreds of millions of acres across this country is being threatened by pollution and rampant development. Please before more wilderness is lost to corporate greed or unchecked development take this time to protect America's shared outdoor spaces including wilderness monuments wildlife refuges parks forests trails wild

I live in Southern Appalachian Ohio. It is a beautiful area to grow up and live in or even just to visit. However I worry that this will not always be the case.

Teddy Roosevelt kicked off the preservation of America's great wild places so that future generations would always be able to experience the grandeur of our natural resources. The past administration as has been typical for Republican presidential administrations made only token efforts in this area while instituting policies and legislation which encouraged business interests to exploit and damage our lands and environment. This must be rectified and in a more permanent manner. Please make this a major initiative of your administration. In particular I would like to see less corporate subsidies and more permanent conservation of wilderness to ensure largescale biodiversity and habitat.

As we all should know we are watching our world fall apart all around us. Areas that are normally moist are drying out. Areas that are normally dry are flooding. The icebergs are melting at a distressing rate. Our water supplies are becoming polluted.

This is so important because there are those out there who are greedy and only think of where they see the already protected environment as a source.

We need your help.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My husband and I just returned from a vacation where we visited several national parks and scenic areas including Mesa Verde in Colorado Canyonlands and the Arches in Utah the Snake River in Hell's Canyon Idaho and Crater Lake Oregon. We drove along the Columbia River Gorge from east to west and down the Oregon coastline. Finally we drove through Rocky Mountain National Park from west to east on our way home to Arkansas. What beautiful and irreplaceable sights we saw. When I was 12 my dad took me up to the timberline of Mt. Hood outside of Portland where I had my picture taken standing in my shorts on a snow glacier right outside the hotel. That was some 60 years ago. We went back of the mountain this year hoping to recreate that photo. Unfortunately the snow fields have withdrawn so far up the mountain that they are now unreachable by foot. Protecting conserving and understanding how to best protect our natural resources is vitally important to our country and to our national psyche. These special places must be preserved no matter what the cost. We have been to Yellowstone the Grand Canyon Yosemite and many other natural wonders in the U.S. There is no vacation we would rather take than to visit one of these wondrous places and we want our children and grandchildren to be able to have the same experiences as we have had.

Frankly it is disgusting that we have to continue to fight to protect our outdoor spaces! But we will continue to do so until future generations are assured that they will have these benefits. We've GOT to preserve and conserve this great country's greatest assets our outdoor spaces. We have already lost too much as it is; just consider the original sizes of our national parks as compared to their sizes now for only one example. ENOUGH ALREADY!!

Sir ... you enjoyed your New England coastal vacation with your family this summer ... imagine what that time would have been if Corporate illogic had been allowed to have its way in the areas you visited ...for profit at the expense of our wildlands ...

In a related issue I DO NOT and CANNOT understand your worsethanPresidentBush policies re: wolves. I am shocked and amazed by it. It is one of your worst environmental debacles.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have worked within several wilderness areas on projects that provide for increased environmental protection and recreation. The original wilderness areas plan included areas that fit the intent of the designation and protected pristine and unique lands accomplishing tremendous good for those fortunate enough to have the time and physical ability to enjoy such wonderful country. I continue to work on volunteer projects within and outside of Wilderness areas of Sequoia National Forest. As additional areas were sought to add to the original wilderness areas that meant the intent of the wilderness law. Some of these were private in holding, lands that needed to transfer from other agencies others were areas that took time to survey and to process. The Wilderness system grew for good reasons. As the years went by the term Wilderness began to be misused and politicians learned they could stir up emotion by claiming to ? protect at risk Wilderness areas? with new legislation. So the original definition and purpose for wilderness areas, a quite noble one? became skewed and often were based on emotion, politics and not on any science. Wilderness designations in many of these areas can do harm by restricting the abilities to conduct land management activities that are needed to protect the lands, public and adjacent communities . There have been areas closed to 4x4 over the last 20 years based on no logic just emotion. Such as areas proposed in this bill. In these areas prior to wilderness designation vehicle use had been restricted to designated routes that due to soil and rock and infrequent use no environmental damage was occurring. This was all based on scientific studies. Many of the areas that were closed under the desert wilderness act have no other ways to access them due to distance traveled to and from water and the severe environmental conditions. Without 4X Jeep type access there is no other way to recreate, protect or study these areas. The USFS and BLM have spent many years studying and improving the roads that can be maintained to allow for recreation, and environmental protection, while closing those that do not provide for all those issues. Protection of public safety and protection of the area from invasive species, disease and from the effects of catastrophic wild fire is greatly impacted by the designation of wilderness area to areas that do not meet the intent or definition of Wilderness area. Non Wilderness lands can be managed for any type of recreation opportunity that is eco friendly for that area and in a much more cost effective manner. Designating more Wildernesses will discourage the public from enjoying the outdoors because many unintended and cumbersome regulations that automatically apply. The President said he is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet none of the local user in these areas that I am involved with have been contacted. Only national interest groups who do not use the area at all have been promoting the changes in our area. The Initiative seeks to address Climate Change and should use the best science, which has been determined to be the need for fuel load reduction, (logging, chipping, masticating and control burning) to promote forest watershed health and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These activities are restricted by wilderness areas. Reduction of hazard fuels from our forests to provide for public safety and to reduce emissions by the reduction of plumes that transmit huge quantities of material into the atmosphere daily from catastrophic wildfires requires renewable resource harvesting in America, also known as logging. In the US we have now evolved logging practices to mimic natural fire in the forests. Our logging is done under the strictest environmental regulations in the world. Wilderness designation generally eliminates logging and all other fuels management practices. There are many scientific reports how logging can reduce the wildfire threat and the emissions of green house gasses. An



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Increaseing wilderness acre has already increase the occurrence of large fires and the emission of green house and toxic gasses by wildfires. The Klamath County seat in Ca. the city of Yreka, 2 years ago had un healthy CO2 levels for weeks above the Federal Permissible Exposures limits due to fires burning in wilderness areas. .

It pains me to see what this country is becoming. The taking of "public" lands from the public is not what this country was built on.

It's such a nice area for a family to go ATViing in; it would be such a shame to have this area closed. Having ATV'd in the area; closing it would have an impact on the small towns nearby who rely on our business, while enjoying this area.

Most american families came from contries that a few controlled most of the land. We consider our right to public land part or our freedom. Most of the land is only accessable by off road rides. Why keep us out.

My area allready has huge areas closed to vehicle usage. As I am partially disabled I will never see these areas. Even though there are roads into and all over these areas. Made by logging operations many years ago.

My family has enjoyed Off Highway vehicle recreation for over 30 years. We treat the environment with respect and help keep it clean. I sure do wish the Federal Government would quit spending money they do not have.

My family, three generations, are utilizing these off road areas on a routine basis. Closing these areas will drastically diminish our use of these lands. It will not only be bad for us but also for the economies of the small towns which depend on the revenue going to these areas provides.

My fiance and I both are tired of seeing the American Owned Public Lands being taken away from us and from all future generations to enjoy. These lands are all of ours to enjoy and use.

My name is and I live in Midvale, Utah. I am 53 years old and passionately enjoy riding my dirt bike with friends, family and fellow members of the Utah Desert Foxes Motorcycle Club. Up until 1999 when I was 43 years old, I had never had the opportunity to ride a dirt bike. Once I started riding, I was hooked and look forward to every opportunity that I have to get out and experience riding in Utah. One of my biggest disappointments is the fact that I discovered this fulfilling activity so late in life and that I probably won?t be able to explore all of the beautiful Utah riding areas that I would like to before I?m too old to ride them.

Not only do Wilderness and Monument areas close access to Multiple Use recreation but harms the economy of the small communities that depend on Off Rosd Vechicle and Mountain Biking to servive.

Off Highway motorcycling has enabled me and my family to experience, enjoy, and respect the California deserts and mountains. Access has been greatly restricted over the years and further closures will all but eliminate this great escape from city life.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHV, four wheeling, and mountain biking are activities that my entire family enjoy. It gives me a chance to teach the kids to both enjoy and respect the outdoors. My kids are in 6th and 8th grades and due to the family time we spend together we have not had to deal with the challenges that face families that do not spend time together. By closing more areas to motorized or bicycle traffic you are reducing the chance of my family and other families like mine from doing the same.

OHV's are also used in hunting which would also, be effected by these proposed changes.

Public land is intended for Public use, not use by a few who despise motor vehicle use, I would also question the constitutionality of setting any rules for Public land use that would not be voted on by the Public, Not just corrupt Politicians that have ulterior motives.

The closure of any more lands for our recreation, namely offroad riding would make this form of recreation practically impossible. We already have given up much of the areas that we were allowed to ride. The State of CA has made two classes of vehicle, restricting when we can ride. When will you people listen to the real Americans that pay the bulk of the taxes that you see willing to use against us? For the most part the Offroad community are families that care about the environment. We take care of the trail, clean up after hikers that litter the backwoods and spend our capital and labor maintaining the areas we ride.

The creation of Wildlife corridors will have a disproportional and severe negative impact on rural communities. It appears that organizations such as The Nature Conservancy stand to make huge illicit profits by swapping lands to the government for Wildlife Corridors.

The current state of this Nation's economy, and the best interests of the Citizens across the Country, will not be best served by creating a land grab, which will all but eliminate a multi million dollar industry in the recreational vehicle and mountain bike industry. Drive across this great land and you will see that our natural wildlife areas are plentiful, and healthy under the existing stewardship already in place. This entire plan of Wildlife corridors is yet another sham put out by the Nature groups to close all public access, against the wishes of the vast majority, and in spite of very essence of what outdoor recreation truly is in this Nation. Shame on them, and those who support this type of closed minded and self serving Initiative.

At this time of economic uncertainty we should not be creating additional tax burdens for the American people and we should promote the use of the public lands by as broad a segment of the population as possible

The President is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. If Off Highway Vehicle Recreation groups were involved, the President would understand why this is a mistake.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public lands are for the PUBLIC i.e taxpayers.

I will allow the representatives I vote for to take care of the big issues. But THIS issue affects what I enjoy doing most in my free time, Riding dirt bikes and mountain bikes. It's what I look forward to doing at the end of my work week. And I am not one of those stereotypical drunk riders with a lifted financed truck littering my food and beer in the parking lot!

. The current access that I have enjoyed throughout my lifetime and my familys have tought me the values that I practice everyday. I have ridden off highway motorcycle my hole life and enjoyed growing up with my mother and father and have passed onto my family and now thay are grown up and productive citizens. This access is very important and we need more access not less. Sincerly

. I object to spending over \$2 billion of my tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations!

. Our rural community (Orofino, Idaho) has had severe negative impact due to the locking up of public lands.

Access to public land is very important to me and my family. You say this is youth access, but it adds more limits and reduces access. Thank you for reading my letter. Please keep public lands open to the public!

Additionally, I live here and enjoy our public lands - more designation takes land away from the folks who fall under the AMERICAN DISABILITIES ACT! Many of my friends are not as lucky as I am and need motorized assistance to enjoy their public lands. They are already restricted to places that allow such types of activities. Please think about ALL the citizens in our country, not just those that are able to walk without help. Thank you for your time!

Also, it is just another step in which we loose a little bit of freedom everyday. This is suppose to be the land of the free, but instead it is becoming the land of the regulated. I strongly disagree that we should lock up our wilderness and observe it like it is a museum. We belong in the forests recreating responsibly. I grew up riding dirt bikes in our awesome national forests, and I want my sons to enjoy the great outdoors like I have and do. However, there are bodies of people who believe we should live in high density cities and never venture out doors to enjoy this wonderful God given earth. We as a species were not meant to be locked up in our cubicles and condos and live our lives hooked to the T.V. to be entertained until we die. We are suppose enjoy what little time on this earth we have enjoying the true beauty of it all. By denying the people from public land that belongs to the people is downright criminal. Shame on you all who want to take our God given right to be human beings enjoying the gifts the forest. Shame on you all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Although I understand the intention in designating the land as such, restricting access to most of the public will be a disservice to the intention of what public lands were intended for. The general public generally uses this land for recreation. It also appears that many recreation groups have been shut out of the decision process of how the lands are allocated. Please include more lands in this designation, and include more outdoor recreation groups in the decision process. Thank you for taking the time to consider my views.

And frankly, aren't there better ways to spend over \$2 billion in tax dollars than locking the majority of the public out of public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations? Thanks for listening...

Any normal person would believe this also. We want to have fun in life and I want to be able to show my daughter what fun I had. Its an experience that everyone should be able to encounter. Plus it brings in money not only in the area but hundreds of miles away it creates revenue by the motosports shops that sell dirk bike gear and merchadise of the sort. Jobs obviously come with retail sales and manufacturing of where this items are made throughout the country and the world. So it will make a huge negative impact if we cannot spend our money and have fun at the same time. Beilieve me its not a free type of fun. It takes money to go have fun and that is how the world turns!

As a kid growing up, I have enjoyed recreating in the outdoors using ohv's and mountain bikes. I belong to clubs that build trails and maintain existing trails. Now that I have kids, and grandkids, I take them along to enjoy our great outdoors. How dare you disguise this initiative as away to get kids outdoors. Strange this was trying to be passed without public knowledge or comment.

As a tax paying voter I am tired of seeing land closed to multipurpose use. Time and again I hear people who never leave the city on the weekend talk about how we must preserve our land by closing it to multiple use. Yet they never even leave town to enjoy the outdoors. As an Avid offroader I leave for the mountains about every other weekend, waking up at 5:00 am to do so. I buy gas and meals in the small communities near these areas, and often stay in hotels there. The more areas that are closed to my choice of recreation, the less money I will be spending in these small communities. I volunteer my own time and money to maintain trails as well. Obviously as more land access is shut down, I will not do this.

As an avid ATV enthusiast, I am concerned with any legislation which could prevent me from riding ATV's in woodlands.

Please do not close any more land to the people of the great and vast country, in California alone we have lost several areas in the past 30 years and now the drive to get to one from where I live is many hours longer than it used to be. Open more land to the public don't close it!

As an off road user, I do not want to see land abused or "trashed". We stay on designated trails and enjoy responsible use of puplic lands. This new plan is not going to improve and encourage responsible land use, rather it will sit empty or be abused by someone willing to break the law.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

As an offroad enthusiast myself, I have been experiencing our available land shrink more and more, crowding more people into smaller areas. This creates dangerous conditions.

As much as disapproved of the Bush administration the president was a mountain biker and recognized what the sport and activity offered besides physical fitness.

As past president of a large ATV Club and current secretary, my interests are along the lines of recreation, although from other standpoints as well. Many of the areas we enjoy and take careful care of are so vast, no one will ever see them close-up the way we have been able to. I think, in particular, of the San Rafael Swell. An all day long ride on an ATV takes through on a small portion of it, which is so rugged to hike very quickly so it could never be seen if it were closed to motorized travel. I would like my grandchildren and beyond to enjoy these areas, as well. I do not think those in Washington who are so willing to close and "preserve" an area are even aware of what they are doing.

At what point does the Government stop being dictators and begin to be the Government that our fathers designed it to be. You know "FOR THE PEOPLE BY THE PEOPLE". This is just another Bullshit attempt of Socialism to take Control from the people. We have the right to use public land as we see fit and not to be governed by CLUELESS BURECRATS! Period.

By closing these lands i will not be able to continue take my family off roading please do not deny my children the ability to access these lands the way i have growing up.

California is becoming a look but don't touch state. It needs to stop, the lands are useable!

Careful consideration needs to be addressed for the continuation of outdoor off road recreational use as well as mountain bicycle riding on designated hiking trails etc here in california we are restricted already to minimal & excessively small confined off road desert and forest managed areas This has gone too far..... Please include off road recreation groups in the discussions and decisions of any future plans for expansion of any closure of public lands that may be used for recreation for youth & family to enjoy the god's creation for all of us to share and enjoy ..... nick dally hiker, mtn biker, & offroad motorcycle enthusiast

Closing of these lands.. Can and WILL cause hardship to MY FAMILY.. as our business rely's on people enjoying these area's. My family has been in the business of selling products for OFF ROAD vehicles for many years.. and we are all ready struggling to make it now with the poor economy. DON'T waste my TAX DOLLARS to put me and MY FAMILY out of business.

Closing off more public land makes no sense. Living in California, which already has more land closures by the day, is getting ridiculous.

Closing public lands is absolutely wrong. Taking away what little freedoms we have left in this country is the going down the wrong track. OHV use is more popular than ever, yet land to conduct this form of recreation is shrinking, closing public land is the WRONG thing to do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Closing public lands will take away needed economic input to the communities that survive on the money spent by citizens that utilize these lands for recreation. This would most certainly lead to more economic hardships for these communities that are already struggling due to the harsh impact of the downturn in the economy.

Currently, the majority of us - the public - recreate on Non Wilderness lands. Designating more Wilderness will discourage the public from enjoying the outdoors. The President says he is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. We rely on YOU to make sure our lands are managed in the best interest of US ALL, not just some selected few. Please consider this:

Dear "Leaders," This is in effect thievery. People who think their personal recreational preferences are the only option are attempting to prevent other from enjoying their recreational activities. In effect, they are stealing my ability to to enjoy -- without damaging -- the wilderness. The thing that bothers me most is the blanket assumption that using a piece of land for something like dirt biking or mountain biking destroys it, while hiking does not. This is complete bunk. First, we're talking about dirt and rocks. Needless to say, the dirt and rocks will still be there are we are long gone. Second, hiking is just as detrimental to trails as any other activity, and believe me, hikers can be messy pigs. They are not saints. God gave us the wonder of nature to enjoy. Not to be put on a shelf. Keep the lands in this great country accessible to all! Thanks,

Dear Legislator, Please represent me and do not take away our recreational access! I am an older American that can no longer hike or backpack. Responsible 4x4 is the only way I can access and enjoy our PUBLIC lands. I practice "Tread Lightly" and am a responsible recreationist and belong to several organized groups that share the same ideals. Stop the closure of PUBLIC Lands and the "Wildlands Project!"

Dear Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed to read of the ideas being put forth concerning the use of outdoor lands. In addition, I greatly object to the closed nature of this action- the fact that only one viewpoint was represented during the planning of this.

Please vote to end this Federal land grab. Thanks for your attention to this matter and for your earliest response to my concerns.

Dear Sir, I feel enough land has been locked away from the public. Please keep our public lands open and available to all,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir, I and many friends and family are against any new closure of any public lands to Off Road Recreational Vehicle use. As an American citizen having lived in Oregon, California and now Arizona, I have seen the closure of many areas previously open to Off Road Vehicle use and am deeply concerned that these places are becoming fewer farther to reach. Closing public lands to Off Road Vehicle use not only impacts the end user but also the community and local businesses small and large who support our sport. I entreat you to reject any Initiative to close any public lands to Off Road Vehicle use, for these are the sanctuary of tax paying American citizens who use these lands to recreate and live free. Talor Kelman

Dear sirs, I have been an avid recreational user, not abuser for my entire life, dirt-biking, hunting/hiking, and pay an enormous amount of fees for licensing, tags and taxes to use this great land we have here in Ca, and would find it disgraceful to see our forest lands which I am part owner; taken away for a couple billion dollars. Keeping it hush hush by not inviting the main people that actually use and upkeep the land is politically as well as morally wrong to be sure.

Designating Wilderness will degrade our public lands which will be overtaken by invasive plants and fire. Non-management is not the way to preserve our Great Outdoors. No more wilderness!

During my life have have witnessed an ever shrinking area in which to enjoy Mtn biking and motorized recreation. Enough is enough already, the ever shrinking lands open to these sports is an affront to these freedoms and has a polarizing effect amongst the American populace. There is plenty enough land that is already off limits to all but hikers, a group to which I also belong. In other words, the balance of land use has already been met. Just not in the eyes of totalitarian extremist, whom are not interested in anything short of a total ban on anything they deem unacceptable. Please keep America free, for everyone! Proud citizen and voter,

Enough is enough. We need more areas open to the public at large, not limited to the few.

Every year I pay over \$200 in off highway vehicle registrations. If the areas where I ride are severely limited, I will find a different activity and not pay these fees any longer.

. I have to ask if those creating this legislation - have ever even visited these areas; let alone recreated in them. I challenge you Mr. Secretary, along with the President and his cabinet and constituents to come camping and OHV exploring with me and the organizations I work with - only then can you begin to appreciate why Americans should continue to have our constitutionally and God-given access.

Following is my feedback on the presidents America Great Outdoor Initiative. As a concerned voter I want my views to be known. I cherish my right to use the outdoors recreation areas but think the designation of further wilderness land will not benefit my use rights in any way and strongly oppose it!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For myself and my family, the most enjoyment we have is going to the out doors and enjoying it together and with friends. This legislation assumes that all Americans will have the same sort of experience and will attain that experience in the same manner. I do not agree or support legislation that does not address the concerns of all groups that use an area. I may not agree with OHV use in all manners but the groups that are dedicated to an area that have established use should not be shut out of the process or out of the use of that area. For many of us, it is why we live where we live. I appreciate your concern in this matter. GIVE US A SAY!

For the past 20 years of my 30 years alive, I have ridden and enjoyed off road motorcycles at least 40 times a year. I don't think I can count on one hand, the times I have not seen some form of wildlife, in the areas I ride in. To me that shows that ohv use is not removing or hindering any wildlife within their natural habitat. There is absolutely no need to prohibit, Us as Americans from the very lands that Us as Americans are entiteled to, with much thanks to our fore fathers. Your thoughts and considerations on this matter are greatly appreciated. Thank you,

Greetings, I am a resident of California and am 49 years old. I am writing this to express my objection to the Presidents Wildland Project. I believe this is a thinly veiled attempt by special interest groups to lock out a large portion of Americans from their public lands by designating vast areas as "Wilderness". Alot of these areas being discussed do not even qualify as true Wilderness, due to roads and utility corridors, etc. These designations sound nice and people like the idea of Wilderness when asked, but in reality, most folks are not capable or desire to hike into these areas (Wilderness means foot traffic only). I believe Managed Recreation is a much more balanced approach and all local stakeholders should be heard when making such important decisons. Thank you,

Having given 20+ years of my life to my Country and the Marine Corps if feel that I have secured the right of my family, myself, and millions of Americans to enjoy and recreate in the great outdoors. More and more land in my state (California) and many of the surrounding states of the great southwest are being closed and restricted thus creating overcrowding and increasingly dangerous environments for the outdoor activities that I and many Americans enjoy. Whether it be hiking, boating, off-roading, shooting sports, camping, fishing, etc, everyone who enjoys these activities are running into less and less areas and opportunities to do so. Please end this madness.

Hello, This upsets me and many families. Do not use my tax dollars to take away land that belongs to the people.

Help promote a healthy America by keeping our lands open for use. By closing so much of our lands you are promoting a fat, unhealthy youth that is forced to stay indoors instead of hiking, mountain biking, camping, fishing, and enjoying the great lands that the USA has to offer. I am saddened by the amount of our freedoms that are slowly being taken away.

Here me well, I'm a tax paying American and I demand that our elected government officials stop spending Millions & Billions of our hard earned dollars against the will of the people to close public lands, only to serve a special interest group, and lock out the the masses who enjoy them.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

How can the government justify closing these areas for urban youth? Since when are the rest of us excluded from land that our tax dollars go to maintain? Why do citizens have to pay for closures and the result is we get shut out? After the work week is over and we have paid into the gov money pool, a huge portion of the populous heads outside to enjoy our country side. I can't believe what the "audicity of hope" has delivered. What a utter shame and disappointment this governement has become.

How much more damage do you plan to do to our country? You want to save the land for future generations by closing it to this generaation. At what point do we get access agin? This is not a good idea as we have lost almost all of our access to public lands to ORV in and I'm against any more closures.Let the people that use the land decide it's future, not the Searra Club. Seirra Club should be renamed to the anti access closer club.

Hunting also takes a blow with the President's new direction. Wilderness areas allow no vehicular access and an inability for older hunters to transport their game out of the field. Hunters are the world's greatest conservationists. Locking them out of their hunting stopping grounds could result in fewer and fewer hunters - this results in less revenue for state game agencies to manage our precious wildlife.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a 61 year old-tax paying , native born American citizen who has accessed the wilderness areas of this country since I was old enough to walk. The last two or three decades I have witnessed the closure of more and more areas to four wheel drives, motorcycles, Atvs, bicycles and horses. In my experience, the individuals who access and enjoy the wild areas of our country by these means outnumber those advocating denying such access by 100 to 1. Extremely seldom do I ever see anyone from the Sierra Club, even in the areas that I have accessed where no trails exist, and I have to backpack in. There are already TENS OF MILLIONS of acres of land in this country that are protected as national forest, wilderness, national or state park areas. In a large percentage of these cases, the state or federal government appoints itself as the financial custodian of granting access. Personally, I am fed up with poor management of these areas by the Federal and State personnel. The public ends up paying for entrance fees, wilderness permits, unreasonably high salaries and benefits to support an area where the land and trail maintenance was done much better and less expensively by private user associations/organizations. The last time I took a 2 day wilderness backpacking trip in the Desolation Wilderness area of the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California, the trails and areas I traveled were the worst maintained that I had seen while frequenting them in the past 40 years, yet I had to travel to the nearest Federal Ranger Station, pay 20dollars for a permit, be ignored by a staff of 5 or 6 federal employees who obviously, judging from their physical condition, have NO experience in the wilderness let alone any business providing "guidance" or oversight to people like myself and others. They should have been outside, removing the trees that hindered access along the trails, restoring areas of erosion etc.. This is the type of work and public service (done at no expense to the taxpaying public) is provided by countless local and national interest groups of 4 wheelers, mountain bikers, equestrian clubs etc.. ACCESS, NOT CLOSURE is the means by which far more people can enjoy the outdoor wonders of this nation. Hunters, Fishermen, Hiking/mountainbiking/four wheel/atv/equestrian clubs given the charge of stewardship is FAR superior to federal or state closure and oversight! If you REALLY want to enhance the wilderness experience for the public, give financial support to organizations of these users, and charge them with the custody and maintenance of the land.

I am a citizen, a taxpayer and a voter. I do not want more public lands closed. Now more than ever, Americans need the opportunities for recreation and relaxation afforded by public lands. Like millions of other Americans, I do not want the Wildlands Project to be pushed through by President Barack Obama and special interest groups such as the Sierra Club. Keep these lands open for all Americans to enjoy. Limit recreational land use only through limiting immigration.

I am a land user in many ways. I like to 4 wheel, but that is not the only activity for which I use our national forests and public lands. I hike, bike, camp, fish, snow mobile, and I really love to just site there and relax. This is a big land grab and it is being done in secret and without the input of the people who know and frequent these individual parcels.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a member of a Dirt bike club that puts on 3 events a year. Each one of these events brings in thousands of dollars to local communities, this stimulates the communities. We see 200-500 parents and children per weekend spending quality time together ( not on a computer ). The kids are physically active, getting in shape. The riding areas are getting closed down due to a earlier Wilderness bill so this would just compound the closure problem. Thanks for your consideration to this letter.

I am a mountain biker, hiker, fisherman, backpacker, and off road motorcycle rider. We have plenty of wilderness areas, in my opinion. The multiple use areas have become smaller and smaller, and need to be expanded. Typically the multiple use areas are not true wilderness areas, and plenty of Americans will suffer if locked out of them. I object to this proposal and the use of my Tax Dollars to lock me out of public lands

I am a senior and am physically unable to hike local trails but I do like to go out on my ATV to enjoy nature and to fish in the high mountain lakes. Locking up more land will certainly not be beneficial for myself and many of my friends. Sincerel

I am against any further wilderness designation. This is essentially closing the door to many seniors, disabled people and older people who do not want the "experience" of hiking down a mountain trail or up a mountain trail, or any other trail for that matter! It also closes the natural resources to any type of development at a time when we need our natural resources to reduce our dependency on foreign energy. Windmills and solar power will not run our industries and everyone knows it. Taking out the dams in rivers to "preserve" the sucker fish and delta smelt will further increase our dependency on foreign energy. To lock up our reserves is pure stupidity! You cannot have it both ways, wake up! Wilderness closures are devious and politically motivated. This has nothing to do with "saving the wilderness!"

I am an avid off-road vehicle participant. In recent years we have been limited more and more in the places we are allowed to ride/recreate. In an era when it is important to provide our children a constructive outlet, they are being denied the right to use these outdoor areas. In addition, I object to spending over \$2 billion of my hard-earned tax dollars locking the majority of the public out of more of their public lands through inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations. We do not need more government involvement in "protecting" our open spaces. Thank you,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an enthusiastic mountain biker and motorcycle rider. I was raised in the outdoors of Idaho and having these tools allowed me to ride the trails and see public lands that most people will never see. Sometimes riding a mountain bike or a motorcycle is not the end result. Quite often we use this mode of transportation as a means to an end. For example we use them to get into the backcountry for mountain lake fishing, huckleberry picking, and just plain spending time in some beautiful country. Idaho already has nearly 5 million acres of wilderness (including the recent Owyhee Wilderness). Enough is enough in the State of Idaho. We will no longer be able to tap into our natural resources if this continues. Do you expect wilderness to carry our economy in Idaho? It will do just the opposite, because most folks are not backpackers and horsemen, and that is all you can use the land for. The President needs to include the two largest forms of recreation as a priority in his plan to reconnect Americans with the Outdoors. That would be Off Highway Vehicle recreation and Mountain Biking. More areas need to be opened to people who enjoy these most popular ways to enjoy the outdoors. You wonder why our economy is in the tank. The radical environmental groups such as the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club etc., are slowly choking our country of using our natural resources to make a living in this country. Now they want to further lock up our natural resources where nobody can physically visit these places, but only by backpack and horse. Mountain bikes are not allowed in wilderness areas. The radical environmental groups only have one agenda and that is to make everything wilderness if they can get away with it, especially with the current administration, and it may very well happen. This type of radical thinking of our public lands could very well sink this country. Do you expect "Craigslist" and "E bay" to keep this country afloat? Another problem with the radical environmental groups is they will lie and show the worst possible scenes, as far as OHV use etc..., when in most cases it is a small area of concern and managed accordingly. If policy is driven by this, then we are doomed. The President is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands. Maybe President Obama should come out to the west and see what is really going on, and decide for himself rather than second hand information from environmental special interest groups. Not everyone is gifted like Carol King as a singer and make millions and then use her riches to shut down this country for the common person. The same goes for John Marvel - Western Water Sheds Project (Haily, Idaho) who is trying to destroy cattle grazing on public lands for folks who make a living ranching in Idaho. There has to be some sort of sacrifice when making a living from our public lands, and we have learned to do both responsibly because of the environmental movement, which has worked out great. However the environmental movement is going too far and destroying huge amounts of recreating freedom and ways of making a living from our natural resources on public lands. Our public lands will no longer be public lands but managed for the environmental groups' mindset. For example the President wants to place windmills on public lands for a cleaner energy source. Areas of public lands will have to be used in order to accomplish this. Sacrifices have to be made in order to use our public lands, and we just have to be smart about it. Creating more wilderness or national monuments will shut down any possibilities of progress in this country as far as energy growth, natural resource extraction, and multiple use recreation. The initial Wilderness Act envisioned about 20 million acres as suitable. Today we have over 120 million acres of

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness where public access is restricted. The majority of the public have been forced onto smaller and smaller areas outside of Wilderness. In order to encourage Americans to enjoy the outdoors we do not need any more wilderness areas.

I am both an avid backpacker and OHV rider and this initiative threatens both of these recreational opportunities! OHV and wilderness CAN go hand-in-hand. Restricting OHV access to wilderness is the easy solution, but not the right solution if government is truly representing its constituents. Don't take the easy way out, do the right thing.

I am completely against any new designations of monuments of any kind.

I am disappointed that the President is supporting closing down public land to the public. As a disabled American I cannot hike into the forest like I did in my youth. Motorized transportation is the only way I can get into the back country now that my knee is shot. This land grab is discriminatory against disabled Americans, many of which received their disabilities fighting for freedom of the land you want to close to them.

I am not in favor of land being closed off to motorized vehicles anywhere. In the past I may have supported some, but it is now becoming just a political scam by the environmental groups who don't care what or how the majority of the public thinks. The motorized rec. groups have not been heard and no level of professional review of impacts seems to help. Thus, I don't care what they say anymore because frankly, I DON'T BELIEVE IT MATTERS! If it's money they want, open access to forests promotes and OUR land provides tourism to real places. Driving through a paved road looking at signs is not a substitute for actually driving on a dirt road into the woods and being prepared to get yourself back out. So I say, get yourself informed and stop being sheep following the herd. VOTE NO THIS and ANY OTHER BILLS LOOKING TO REDUCE ACCESS TO OUR LAND!

I am outraged over this latest attempt to seal off public lands from the public.

I am tired of having our country taken away from us and Obama has been a great disappointment. Please help.

I am tired of the back door deals. Let the people decide the future of our public lands.

I am very concerned by the potential loss of available lands for OHV recreation. Specifically,

I am very disappointed that Wilderness and Monument designations are being used. This is the most restrictive classification and essentially limits access. If the President's goal is indeed to promote urban youth access and for all Americans then this designation is not the way to reach his goal. This makes me think his goals are other than stated.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing to express my concern regarding the recently announced, "America Great Outdoor Initiative". As I understand it, the goals of the America Great Outdoors Initiative are laudable, to encourage local involvement, increase access to public lands and encourage the Public to get out in the Backcountry. However, the land designations being considered will restrict access, not encourage it and the purported goal of engaging local involvement has been betrayed by that fact that the only groups thus far consulted have been national environmental organizations such as the Sierra club whose avowed goals are to outlaw any form of recreation that fail to meet their narrow definition of what is acceptable forms of outdoor recreation - i.e. hiking and backpacking.

I do not believe that the president is interested in input from anyone other than special interest groups desiring the most extreme restrictions preventing the people who own the land from enjoying it.

The use of monument status has gone way overboard and has gone way beyond what it was originally intended to do.

There is enough wilderness already, the interest in making more wilderness does not effect the people who want it wilderness, it affects us who ACTUALLY use it. You can find me in the mountains all year, from riding snowmobiles to glassing for trophy mule deer to pursuing these magnificent animals. I am outdoors and I speak loudly against wilderness, I can hike in during the summer months and not need it wilderness to this. Then when the snow gets deep I can take my sled in the same country where I pursue trophy mule deer and enjoy it in a whole different way!!

These proposed wilderness and monument areas amount to more government land and power grabs.

This goes against the belief that this is our land to enjoy and TAKE CARE OF so our children can have the opportunity to experience it first hand (NOT from books)!!!

This has gone on long enough, closing up all this land and no one will ever see it.

This plan will destroy local businesses throughout the U.S.

Closing our public lands is not what America is about. How is our youth going to know how to conserve if they aren't allowed to take part in using the public lands. As a concerned mother of 3 beautiful American children,

The closure of millions of acres in California has had a very negative effect on the off roading sport forcing more and more people into smaller more crowded and dangerous areas. Off roading is a quality family sport, supporting thousands of businesses.

I am an active outdoor enthusiast. This plans seems to limit my ability to enjoy public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

we do not need anymore wilderness areas.

We need to balance the federal budget and add to the deficit! Why do we need another federal program?

What good is closing off huge areas that are inaccessible by any means other than offroad vehicles? Who are these lands being preserved for if people are not allowed to use "public lands"?

What good is nature & the outdoors, if we cannot access it? The majority of outdoors enthusiasts are respectful and make certain the environment we explore is left in the same condition as it was encountered. But again....closing land is too extreme of a solution.

what is happening to our country. Everyone wants to make new law and stop people from enjoying life. they think they can just make up any law and get away with it. I would like to keep my freedom if we have any freedom left. I do care about our animals and forest but this is taking it too far. please do not let this happen.

Wilderness designations severely limit the ability of parents with young children and the elderly from enjoying outdoor activities such as fishing, camping, photography and other pursuits in remote areas. Instead they are forced into campgrounds that are noisy and crowded at best. I have even been forced to abort a vacation and return home because all camping spaces were full. All this is just another form of discrimination.

You have seemed to OVERLOOKED Access for the HANDICAP PEOPLE [ROADS] not Horses or Hiking!

As an avid OHV rider, hunter, fisherman, hiker, outdoorsman I fear for preservation of these activities due to special interests groups, who DO NOT represent even close to the majority's opinions, mindless campaign to close off land to American citizens. Let's keep this country great by allowing its citizens to enjoy what it has to offer as well as preserve the land for future generations use. Land use and land preservation complement each other. They are not mutually exclusive.

As an avid snowmobile rider and supporter of equal access I find it very discouraging that OHV groups are not included in these discussions. I encourage our government to solicit involvement of all interested groups and not just a select group of anti outdoor recreationalists.

Dear Sirs: My family and I recreate on public (and some private) lands on almost a weekly basis. We enjoy hiking, camping, hunting, and OHV riding, and have done so for many years. The time we spend together as a family enjoying our public lands is priceless and irreplaceable. We encourage you to consider the following comments while drafting public lands planning and management agendas. The President is interested in local involvement in his plan, yet no multiple use groups have been included or invited. The initial plan has clearly been created by a small segment of special interest groups who seek to limit access to our public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a Father, American, and a DirtBiker... It sickens me when I hear about plans to close the already diminished available lands for riding and camping and enjoying this beautiful country. Near and dear to my heart is the CCMA or Clear Creek, which has already shut down 35,000 acres of the best MC riding land in the western U.S.

I have lived in Colorado all my life. I am a multiple use advocate. I am very frustrated having to fight for use of our public lands. Every week there is another proposal to shut down our forests or BLM lands to wilderness. I agree wilderness has it's place but limiting our access to millions more acers of wilderness recently proposed is a crime. Every time we go out to ride in an area there is another trail closed. Leave the trails we have been riding for years alone. The President needs to listen to the public who uses our public lands not the small group of special interest who want to limit access of our public lands to everyone. Over Labor Day we went to Taylor Park ATV riding with many of our friends. I was shocked to see how many people were out enjoying our public lands. It was great seeing fishing, bicycle riding, jeeping, hiking, motorcycle riding, OHV's, and boating all in one place. The people were having fun on our public lands. We need to encourage not discourage this kind of activity.

I love to ride motorcycles on single track trails. I've done it for 45 years and have seen many of my favorite riding areas closed or restricted. Some of it is unavoidable due to development. To many gov mandated closures will cause overuse in areas remaining open. Closing everything will result in a lot of disobedience. Thanks for this forum.

My family has enjoyed camping and OHV recreation for 3 generations and now our favorite form of recreation is going to be shut down by you?! The majority of Americans enjoy recreating on multiple use trails, how could you close these lands to us?! Billions of dollars annually is spent recreating in areas that provide multiple use trails, our country BADLY needs this monetary velocity and spending, and you want to put the brakes on our economic recovery?! I voted for Democrats across the ticket in 2008, because I did not like many of the policies of the Republican party. Our country (and our planet) has huge problems with economics, nuclear weapons in countries with aggressive foreign policies (Iran, Korea, and Isreal just to name a few), overpopulation, the poor and hungry in the USA, etc. And, you choose to spend your valuable time closing our public lands? I will NOT vote Democratic again, because obviously you would rather placate a few constituents than work on some serious problems.

These Lands are public and no one has the right to say one group can or can not use them.

This letter is my effort to express my concerns about our government secretly taking control of things that powerful groups seem to want to change. Probably for reasons relating to the almighty dollar. I came from Arizona, where we raised a family and traveled many of the western states enjoying the sand dunes because my son, daughter, wife, and I enjoyed sharing these dune camping trips. Due to California Government , and Federal Government. rules, this recreation has become too expensive to enjoy. This letter is my attempt to keep the Government from ruining many families enjoyment of Multiple Use Land.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To whom this concerns, As a land owner and a recreational vehicle owner Multiple Use lands are where the majority of people recreate, as well as where much of our timber and beef products come from, but these lands have been closed at an alarming rate. The President must keep the Federal government from over stepping it's Constutional bounds and mandating anything. They need to turn over the lands to the states and do what they are suppose to.

Maine's forests provide countless benefits for human and natural communities. Over 70 million people live within a day's drive of Maine and rely on them for clean water and air, as well as for their outstanding recreational opportunities. These diverse forests also contain a dizzying array of flora and fauna, including many endangered or threatened species, as well as rare tree and plant communities. Increasingly, we are confronting the reality that our forests face more urgent threats than ever envisioned. These threats include sprawling growth and development that are diminishing forests in Maine at an alarming rate, and climate change will have tremendous impacts on forests and on plant and animal species in Maine, New England, and globally. As the climate warms, species will generally shift their ranges up to higher elevations and to the north. The more our forests are fragmented by development, roads, and shopping malls, the harder it will be for species to successfully shift their locations, adapt, and survive.

The Western Mountain and Lakes landscape totals over one million acres, encompasses both the Mahoosuc and Rangeley Lakes/High Peaks Regions, links the Northern Appalachians as they pass from New Hampshire to Maine, and serves as a bridge between the White Mountain National Forest to the south and the Maine Woods. This region comprises the southwestern boundary of the Maine Woods closest to population and tourism centers making it the demonstration landscape that is most vulnerable to development pressures that could fragment the forest. Loss of lands from the timber base and severing recreation corridors, such as snowmobile trails, would undermine the area's local economy which relies primarily upon forest products and tourism. This provides us with an unprecedented opportunity for addressing loss of species and open space, preserving water quality and climate change adaptation while preserving the wildlife and lands we enjoy today.

. Natural and cultural sites and landscapes areas whose constituent resources are closely related to one another are inextricably linked because environment shapes human societies, and people, in turn, affect their environments.

These historic and natural sites reflect a wealth of locations, resources, histories and voices whose interpretations help all Americans celebrate our shared earth and heritage. There has been a lack of parity for over a decade between funding for our historic and cultural resources in our National Parks and other public lands. Please bring funding for cultural resources back into balance with our natural resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When declaring September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that ""we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places."" However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country. The Bush administration's ""No More Wilderness"" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. Climate change, the overriding influence on the health of BLM lands, got just three paragraphs of the same boilerplate language in each of the 1,000-page Environmental Impact Statements instead of any real analysis.

Throughout my life of hiking and exploring wild places whenever possible, I have seen the disappearance of ever more rural and wild land beneath encroaching unnecessary development. Much that has not disappeared has changed for the worse ecologically and spiritually through prolific invasion of ATVs and the beer cans, guns, and littering trash and paraphernalia carried into remote areas and left there by their riders. I feel great sorrow from this.

Where I live, the green spaces are being eaten up by businesses and housing additions. I want my children to enjoy the out-of-doors without having to drive an hour to get there!!!!

Many of our National Parks need projects to maintain facilities, study wildlife, and to do education for visitors. Many State Park Systems are cash strapped and need federal assistance to stay open and to maintain their facilities and programs. America's Natural Heritage needs a greater commitment than ever.

Most urgently is the loss of bird habitat which is the primary reason why birds are disappearing. Forest, parks, grassland need to be restored, with less commercialism and development to provide safe refuges for breeding and migratory birds, the latter needing these wild locations including urban open spaces for survival.

Seriously! oh, and let's try not to cut down all the trees every time we need to build houses, high rises, parking lots/garages...there are many ways of incorporating what is already there versus bulldozing it all down and replanting new just to say, "Well, we planted new trees!" Yeah, trees that will take 20+ years to mature again as if the ones that were already there in the first place weren't good enough! Take some actual design time to plan around nature as it should be versus nature around us, because we will just lose in the end! Thank you!

I want to continue to enjoy camping in the great outdoors but I have a problem in Illinois with Reserve America. We don't need this reservation system. It's horrible! Go to the website "reserve america sucks" to see campers' comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have been mountain Biking for a couple of years now and have found that there are fewer and fewer places to go biking or hiking around here. I believe that we need to preserve our great outdoors so that families everywhere will have the same opportunities that we and the generation before us had. Thank you for your time Mr. President.

We must start now if we are to synchronize our efforts to save this planet, this will be one of many stepping stones on the way to a greener, better future. What is our Dollar going to be worth when oxygen, clean water, and food are scarce, are you going to explain to your grand children why our once great country has turned into wasteland of parking lots and overdeveloped land for an ever lazier society who cant even walk to their mail box anymore. How in a matter of a couple hundred years we have burned enough fossil fuels to choke ourselves out, and although there are greener more efficient alternatives all around us we wont put forth the effort or money to invest in our own lives. There will be a price to pay for what we have done to our environment and that price will be grand in scale. i love to pedal and hike through the great outdoors and the walls of highways and over sized houses are closing in quickly, There are so many ways we can help our friends and family by giving them a head start to saving our world.

In Illinois, the proposed Prairie Parkway will cause urban sprawl and destroy one of the most unique landscapes, water tributaries, pristine waterways and thousands of acres of prime farmland nearest to Chicago through the heart of Kane and Kendall Counties. Progress and growth in the form of a highway system in the middle of nowhere is not the answer to solving traffic problems, To support your jobs act, spend the earmarks improving existing roadways with turnarounds (without traffic lights) to keep traffic moving (I-47, I-71, and I-126).

If we don't do something soon, we risk losing our national treasures. In a time of climate change, environmental degradation over searching for oil, and stressing ecosystems, we need your leadership to address motorized recreation which has been recognized as one of the number one threats to our public lands and ecosystems. It is important for people to find their connection to nature. Preserve this opportunity for future generations to enjoy these places like so many before us have, before they are gone forever. We need more Wilderness Designation NOW!!

We just came back from visiting the Santa Barbara area and were sad to see the oil spill 26 miles north of Santa Barbara where the rigs on. This was my 7 year old's first visit to the pacific shores and how disappointing for him to have a picture next to the water with the oil spill right behind him. How would I explain to him that because of some people's green he shouldn't even set foot in the water? Thank you and I am proud to have you as president.

If we don't protect it, what will happen to it? Will it be turned into another oil field? Or clear cut for the lumber? For once, listen to those that put you in office.

Please, Mr President. All the kids these days are turning to drugs and sex, when we the people should be educating on the natural beauty & spice in life as the great outdoors. thank you for your time.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If we give the land away for commercialization, we will never get it back - not in many lifetimes could the environment recover. It is most important to have lands close to the city because people need the proximity to where they live. The outdoors should be in reasonable reach for everyone, not just those who live in rural areas. It is also crucial for wilderness areas to allow mountain bikes - they are non-motorized transport that do no more harm to trails than hikers, and do LESS harm to trails than horses. This inequality has to stop.

I am a natural sciences major and I don't want to have spent all this money, time and effort toward a field I am so greatly involved in to have it all taken away for some set of condos no one can afford to live in.

Snowmobiles don't damage the land or wildlife.

We do not need any more land closures. This is a family sport and we need to keep public land open for our future generations!!!

PORT fervently believes that the conservation of America's working lands is equal in importance and as deserving of funding as enhancing urban parks and acquiring additional federal lands. In the states in which we live and work, the majority of residents strongly support land conservation. However, many also oppose the acquisition of additional federal acreage. The current inventory of federally-owned lands in some western states already requires substantial private and state dollars to address invasive species, habitat management and recreation expectations. However, we recognize that this is not the case in other parts of the country.

Fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) and expand the program to allow LWCF dollars to be utilized by qualified conservation organizations. Presently, the Land and Water Conservation Fund provides money to federal and state agencies to acquire land and recreation facilities. The criteria should be expanded to include competitive grants awarded to land trusts for conservation easements. These awards could be in the form of matching grants that would enable land trusts to leverage private and non-federal funds to protect critical wetland, riparian, agricultural, forest and recreational resources.

Eliminate the requirement for the cash match for Farm and Ranchland Protection (FRPP) and Grassland Reserve Program (GRP) dollars. The current requirement of the 25% cash match is an unnecessary limiting factor. Many landowners are willing to donate a greater percentage of the conservation easement value. In many western states, there are simply not enough state or municipal dollars to meet demand.

Allow funds from LWCF, FRPP and GRP to be utilized by land trusts to cover transaction costs for donated easements. Transaction costs are also an unnecessary limiting factor. Landowners considering a full donation or partial donation via a bargain sale of a conservation easement often do not have the cash to pay for the cost of an attorney, certified appraisal, geologist and/or other professional assessments. Similarly, land trusts struggle to meet the cost of their own counsel and operational costs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Make the now-expired, federal conservation easement donation tax incentive permanent. This landmark legislation has resulted in more than 525,000 new acres placed under conservation easement, especially on working family farms and ranches throughout the west and across the country. By providing cost-effective tax benefits for modest-income landowners, including family ranchers and farmers, to donate a conservation easement, family lands can stay intact, in the family and in agricultural production and continue to provide priceless ecosystem services.

Most development before 1950 focused around centers, surrounded by expansive rural and natural landscapes. Forming a combined ecosystem, cities and smaller centers concentrated diversity and innovation in commerce and culture, while large areas of farms, woods, and wetlands generated a wide diversity of natural species. This interconnected pattern of central places and surrounding greenspaces, evolved over centuries and embedded in nature, has now segmented into suburban forms that mandate driving for every major movement. Commercial strips line most highways and residential sprawl spreads far into the countryside, fragmenting both communities and nature. Auto-dependency also fuels a basic contradiction: low-density sprawl creates high levels of traffic congestion.. Limited land, unlimited traffic aggravation, and escalating local taxes to service all those scattered subdivisions make the continued strip-and-sprawl conversion of outlying areas unsustainable. Global energy and climate concerns make policy changes even more urgent. A Greenway-inspired Centers and Greenspaces approach that re-centers most new development into walkable, mixed-use forms can protect our natural and agricultural heritage, end wasteful land, energy, and pollution practices, and provide a wider range of transportation choices, from walking, biking, and cars to transit alternatives

Small acreage farms have always been deeply woven into the fabric of America. While rural communities have retained much of this classic culture, urban communities, having largely fallen victim to the pressures of urban and suburban sprawl and the resulting spike in land values, have generally lost significant ground-both literally, in numbers of actual working farms, and figuratively, in waning community and municipal support for agricultural enterprise. Rockland County is a prime example of this. As recently as 1920, Rockland County was home to over 900 working farms. Today, there are 10. In fact, The American Farmland Trust reports that the Hudson River Valley ranks within the top ten regions of the country in danger of losing all of its agriculture. There is no retreating from the economic realities that drove our farms from the community. For agricultural enterprise to survive and thrive it must embrace a new paradigm, based on a reciprocal relationship whereby the farm supports community and the community, in turn, supports the farm.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In recent years, the concept of growing food for local consumption has become iconic to a healthy lifestyle, especially in light of the endemic obesity, diabetes and other chronic disease rates that have swept the nation as a result of poor dietary options and a lack of consumer education. It is against this background that the Rockland Farm Alliance (RFA) was formed in 2007. What began as a modest group of concerned citizens in Rockland County, with the help of the local Soil & Water Conservation District (SWCD) and USDA's Resource Conservation & Development (RC&D) office, has grown into an impressive coalition, poised to create much needed change. The goal of the organization is to create local food production into our suburban community in a portable model that can be adapted to and successfully deployed anywhere.

According to US government sources, 81 % of the US population now lives in either cities or suburbs. There are many programs available to support rural agricultural development and under HUD, there are a few that are designed to address struggling urban populations, but there are no programs available to support agricultural development and food production in America's suburbs. For communities to truly reconnect to a local food source, it is critical that that food source be accessible. This means we must bring the farms to the suburbs and the small urban centers. The overall goal of the Rockland Farm Alliance is to develop replicable models for increasing local food production for these communities that house the majority of the population, through the creation of community agricultural models. We have already begun this process in suburban New York City, in Rockland County, New York, where we have created a nonpartisan community lead and government supported effort to reverse the exodus of local food production from our county.

Like any agricultural enterprise, launching the Cropsey Community Farm will entail significant initial capital investment. The Board of Directors have calculated that the start up costs for this project will be under \$100,000. We have instituted a membership drive, which we anticipate will raise \$25,000. We have also aggressively pursued grant funds for both the agricultural and educational initiatives planned for the Cropsey Farm. We anticipate that this two pronged fundraising campaign will cover the capital costs of creating the working farm. Future revenues to support the farm's long term overhead and maintenance will be generated by the CSA program and educational programs, which are targeted to both the local schools and general community.

Funding for planning, development and management is the major challenge to implementation of this plan. Many programs exist to assist with and support infrastructure development, but of course, reaching this stage successfully depends in large part on the unifying guidance, support and management of a skilled project manager. It is essential that funding be sourced to support this critical position early in the process, unfortunately, there is a dearth of programs available to assist with such costs, particularly at the local level.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Yet as the 21st century takes shape, there have been dramatic changes in forest land ownership that had been relatively stable for decades. Millions of acres of forest land once owned by paper companies as the resource base to feed their Maine mills have been sold to a new generation of forest land investors. This has been a wake-up call that there are no assurances that the valued resources, traditions, and economic enterprises that define Maine's forests will be there in the future.

In today's world, with landowners under increasing pressure to realize returns from their investments, one cannot necessarily expect forest owners to sustain these practices.

For much of the state's history, the forest landscape of the Maine Woods was predominantly owned by vertically integrated paper companies; they owned vast acreage of woodlands and used these lands to supply their mills. However, over the past two decades land ownership patterns in the Maine Woods have undergone dramatic changes. Many point to the sudden liquidation of the holdings of the Diamond International Corporation in 1988 as the beginning of a profound transformation. Following his hostile takeover of Diamond International, billionaire financier Sir James Goldsmith, seeing unrealized value in forest lands, elected to sell off the company's lands separate from its production facilities. This action initiated a new trend in forest ownership that, driven by global economic pressures and rising land prices, has continued to this day. By the 1990s the shift had begun in earnest. Familiar names such as Great Northern, S.D. Warren, Champion, and later International Paper, Boise Cascade and Georgia-Pacific sold their land and then their mills, ending historic connections that had endured for nearly a century.

When these companies elected to sell their lands, a new generation of non-industrial owners took their place. Many of these lands were acquired by timber investment management organizations (TIMOs) and real estate investment trusts (REITs) that brought investment capital from pension funds, wealthy individuals, endowments and other sources to invest in timberlands, often as a strategy to diversify the portfolio of these investors. Large timber contractors, looking for lands to harvest also have been a significant buyer of industrial timberlands as have some conservation groups such as The Nature Conservancy and The Appalachian Mountain Club

In 1988, industrial owners owned 7.7 million acres of timberland in Maine, while large non-industrial owners held 3.1 million acres. By 2004, however, these proportions were nearly reversed, with 3.2 million acres held by industrial interests and 6.5 million by non-industrial owners. More than half the industrial acreage was held by a single company, Canadian-based Irving, one of the few major timber producers still holding to the integrated model.

In addition to managing for returns from timber production, which relies upon vibrant timber markets, the new timber owners must consider other means of generating returns from the timberland where they exist.

Today, there is no clear consensus among forest interests as to what this shift in ownership will mean for the future of Maine's forest resources and traditional uses such as timber production, wildlife habitat and public recreation.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Some conservation interests will point to second home developments that subdivide productive forest land and develop pristine lakeshores and maintain that the integrity of the Maine Woods will be lost if action is not taken soon.

Some timber interests and motorized recreation groups have voiced concerns that some large tracts of land are being acquired by preservation-oriented owners who are less interested in timber harvesting than previous owners and more restrictive regarding motorized recreational access

The fundamental challenge is to find ways to provide these assurances in a manner that is both acceptable and attractive to today's forest landowners and the public.

Today, a forest landowner interested in pursuing the sale of land or a conservation easement funded by the Forest Legacy Program faces the reality that there is a queue of worthy projects in Maine already awaiting funding and that they may have to wait several years or more to have their project funded.

Landowner interest in selling land for conservation or working forest conservation easements is outstripping available funding creating situations where conservation opportunities will be lost due to a lack of resources.

The time to act is now. It would be imprudent to wait-once landscape integrity is lost it is prohibitively expensive to restore. We need to heed lessons learned the hard way elsewhere where massive amounts of money are being spent attempting to restore a broken ecosystem.

The Keeping Maine's Forests Steering Committee is composed of very diverse forest interests. Included in these ranks are environmental, conservation, hunting and fishing, recreational, and tribal governments, major forest landowners and representatives from Maine's forest products industry. A number of these interests had clashed repeatedly over forest issues in years past. Similarly, Northern and Eastern Maine communities have often been skeptical of land conservation proposals hatched from afar, fearing that such initiatives could threaten the local economy and traditional way of life.

Secretary Salazar and DOI have offered an ambitious and far-sighted agenda for protecting the country's most treasured landscapes stating that "The great outdoors that fuels the American spirit and the American economy is fast disappearing under the pressures of population growth, habitat fragmentation and climate change. Over the last 60 years, as our nation's population has doubled, millions of acres of open land have disappeared to development. We are losing - and losing touch with - the places where we fish and swim, woods where we hunt and hike, and wild lands where we find solitude. This new conservation legacy will protect the places that fuel our nation's spirit and contribute to the health of its people and local economies."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The past dozen years have seen unprecedented levels of conservation investment in the Maine Woods increasing conservation ownership (both fee and conservation easement) from less than 8% of the Maine Woods in 1998 to around 23% today. The purpose of this proposal is to maintain this momentum by embarking upon a new initiative that offers a comprehensive array of conservation options and stewardship tools for forest landowners who wish to take advantage of them.

Overview: The Western Mountain and Lakes landscape totals over one million acres, encompasses both the Mahoosuc and Rangeley Lakes/High Peaks Regions, links the Northern Appalachians as they pass from New Hampshire to Maine, and serves as a bridge between the White Mountain National Forest to the south and the Maine Woods. This region comprises the southwestern boundary of the Maine Woods closest to population and tourism centers making it the demonstration landscape that is most vulnerable to development pressures that could fragment the forest. Loss of lands from the timber base and severing recreation corridors, such as snowmobile trails, would undermine the area's local economy which relies primarily upon forest products and tourism.

It is important to note that not all landowners in the demonstration landscapes have expressed interest in taking advantage of potential conservation or stewardship options. Some would prefer to not participate in any government programs and others have indicated that they need additional details before determining their level of interest.

Healthy Forest Reserve HFRP, a relatively new program, has been used in Maine for Canada lynx management but not easements.

The requirement that HFRP easements be held by federal government and an easement template that includes holder approval of all harvests and strictly limits motorized recreation makes the easement option, as currently proposed, unattractive to many Maine timberland owners. However, the management side of HFRP (listed in the stewardship table) has been successful in Maine.

Land & Water Conservation Fund Keeping Maine's Forests would benefit if federal-side LWCF could be used to acquire conservation easements to buffer national wildlife refuges and other federal lands. Increasing LWCF funding for stateside programs would also benefit Maine's ability to utilize funds for other projects.

Working with willing landowners, Keeping Maine's Forests seeks to create new opportunities for forest landowners to benefit from enhanced stewardship of their lands that provide an important suite of public benefits including maintenance or improvement of wildlife habitat that benefits a broad array of forest species, storage of carbon, protection of water quality, and assurance of public recreational access (generally referred to today as ecosystem services). Today, landowner stewardship programs are fragmented and in many cases unavailable or of limited value to large landowners in the Maine Woods.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The federal agency that currently has the greatest responsibility for forest stewardship, the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), has eligibility requirements for many of their programs that exclude large forest landowners or income limits that limit their appeal, even though their lands encompass important habitat, valued waterways, and popular recreation areas that would greatly benefit from stewardship incentives. Programs that have substantial potential to benefit the Maine Woods (e.g. Healthy Forest Reserve Program) have received minimal funding at the national level.

Environmental Quality Improvement Program Landowner participation in EQIP in the Maine Woods has been limited, with the exception of tribal and land trust ownerships, because most large forest landowners do not meet the adjusted gross income eligibility requirement and landowner payment limits are too low to be attractive to large ownerships.

Conservation Stewardship Program Landowner participation in CSP in the Maine Woods has been limited, because most large forest landowners do not meet the adjusted gross income eligibility requirement and landowner payment limits are too low to be attractive to large ownerships.

Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program WHIP has been an important contributor to Atlantic salmon restoration efforts through the involvement of non-profit organizations and also greatly benefits wildlife management on tribal lands. However, the annual \$50,000 cap on payments greatly limits the ability of organizations to initiate major habitat conservation efforts. Landowner involvement is limited by the adjusted gross income requirements.

Partners for Fish & Wildlife To date, Maine projects, due to limited funding, have focused primarily on restoration of degraded environments and projects on tribal lands.

Traditionally, stewardship incentive programs have been focused on specific activities that provide a particular benefit or are limited to small areas. Increasingly, applied scientific research has been looking at stewardship benefits in a more holistic and integrated manner. For example, wildlife biologists are finding that in certain forest ecosystems, management for certain "umbrella species", such as Canada lynx and pine marten benefits a tremendously broad spectrum of wildlife species from neotropical warblers to moose and provides an array of other ecosystem services as well. Likewise, managing cold water habitats for species like brook trout may offer the same benefit to a broad range of aquatic species. As we wrestle with new challenges such as adaptation of forests and wildlife to climate change, it is time to rethink the design and administration of forest stewardship programs in the Maine Woods.

Along with compensating landowners for the expense of providing important ecological benefits from their forest lands, Keeping Maine's Forests also seeks to address the costs incurred by landowners who allow the public to recreate on their lands. In most other states, large forest landowners profit from the recreational use of their lands. In Maine, landowners typically bear the cost of recreational use. This issue needs to be addressed.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If the important tradition of public recreational access to Maine's forest lands is to continue, new mechanisms will be needed to reward landowners who make their lands available for public recreation. Ideally, Maine could develop the inaugural effort of the Voluntary Public Access & Habitat Incentive Program authorized in the most recent Farm Bill or utilize funding from an already established NRCS program.

Ensuring a secure and productive future for the Maine Woods is a daunting challenge. In asking USDA and DOI to make a major commitment of resources to Keeping Maine's Forest, Maine realizes that it must make a commensurate pledge to the effort, both monetarily (discussed in a separate section below) and in other equally important ways including the following:

Keeping Maine's Forests began two years ago with the idea that diverse forest interests, many of whom have been on the opposite side of issues in the past, could find common ground on the goal of keeping forests as forest. That idea was put to a test when Secretary Salazar visited Maine in June 2009 and sat down with a delegation to learn about the Maine Woods. He challenged those present to bring forward a proposal to DOI that had buy-in from conservation interests, recreation groups, forest landowners and the forest products industry. That challenge helped to transform Keeping Maine's Forests from an exercise without a clear path to implementation to a hard-nosed discussion about specific forest initiatives.

Every year, Maine's Forest Legacy Committee needs to make difficult choices among high quality forest conservation proposals put forward by Maine landowners and their conservation partners. Landowner interest in selling conservation easements (and in some cases fee interest in high value ecological and recreational lands) has consistently outstripped available funding for such projects.

Maintaining the environmental and economic integrity of the Maine Woods (of which approximately 2.8 million acres have already been protected along with approximately 200,000 acres of tribal Trust lands) represents a major funding challenge in the best of times to say nothing of today's current environment of scarce resources.

Consider that: The cost of restoring the Everglades, an ecosystem of comparable size to the Maine Woods, is now estimated at \$10.9 billion (approximately \$1000/acre);

In 2008, Congress spent \$250 million (50% of total cost) to protect 310,000 acres of forest land in Montana (at a cost of over \$1,600/acre for fee purchase of lands);

The Steering Committee has identified a variety of challenges and issues that require its future attention that can help to refine and improve Keeping Maine's Forests and strengthen the partnership and resolve of its participants.

These include: Evaluating how the different elements of the Keeping Maine's Forests initiative (fee acquisition, conservation easement acquisition, and stewardship programs) may impact wood supply over the long-term (positive or negative) as compared to anticipated wood supply in the absence of such programs and strategies that can be used to increase wood supply;

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Evaluating how the different elements of the Keeping Maine's Forests initiative achieve: Biodiversity, protection of significant wildlife habitat, and preservation of unique ecological areas including exemplary natural communities and late successional forests; and

Availability of diverse high quality outdoor recreation opportunities (including motorized and backcountry recreation); and

Sustainability of forest management practices.

Reviewing existing working forest conservation easement standards and assessing: How to provide the best "bang for the buck" for conservation easement investments (e.g. where to target conservation easement acquisitions and what rights to purchase, including simple no-development easements);

How to ensure that working forest conservation easement requirements do not impede the flow of timber off well managed, conserved properties;

Identify those easement standards that have been most problematic for landowners and determine whether the public's interests can be adequately protected through alternative approaches that better align with landowners' needs; and

How to provide conservation easement standards that are not cost prohibitive for the easement holder to administer or for compliance by the landowner.

Encouraging local and regional planning efforts that identify appropriate and strategic areas necessary for future economic development or that are the highest priority for conservation so that conservation acquisitions can be sited and designed to protect valued resources without precluding important future economic development opportunities;

Exploring how the objectives and strategies of Keeping Maine's Forests can be applied to the forest landscape in southern Maine;

Determining how best to establish an economic and legal framework for stewardship programs that pay for habitat management and other ecological services that benefit society; and

Monitoring development pressures and trends to help ensure that Keeping Maine's Forests efforts are designed and focused in a cost-effective manner.

The challenges facing the Maine Woods are greater than ever before, ranging from global competition in the woods industry to climate change to the ever-increasing pressure to develop our country's last remaining open spaces. Without concerted actions to maintain the Maine Woods and ensure the wise stewardship of all its resources, these and other forces will inevitably diminish the integrity and viability of this forest landscape over time.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is a multi-year backlog of quality Legacy projects in Maine awaiting funding. Maine has nationally significant project opportunities due to its high proportion of private forest ownership. Current caps on Legacy funding (\$10 million/state and \$7 million/project) limit the use of Legacy in Maine. An exemption from these caps for high priority conservation areas such as the Maine Woods would allow additional high quality projects to be funded.

I am one of the few Democrats remaining in Georgia. I have two adult children and have been working as a Professional School Counselor at the Middle School level for more than 20 years. Additionally I am the Environmental Committee Advisor. I promote environmental consciousness. In fact under my leadership our school has recycled [the first in Georgia] over 1 000 000 (yes ONE MILLION) pounds of paper. I hope that my students my family my friends my neighbors will live in a country where the environment is cherished and preserved. No matter what wars we find ourselves fighting no matter what turns our economy takes our lives cannot continue if we do not preserve the Earth. It seems that the American public only reacts to the mighty dollar. When gas prices were very high in recent years and lines at the stations were long people began to use less fuel to economize. It is sad that our the people of our nation only responds to what is good for our Earth if it benefits them without additional expense or inconvenience. I am happy that you put a moratorium on Gulf drilling- that oil should stay put- it is there for a reason and that reason is not for us to mess with. I hope you continue to support preserving and protecting our habitats our land and all of the Earth's inhabitants. If I may perhaps one day you would go on National television and say something like this: "Being President of the United States is a great honor and a great privilege. One that I take with pride and humility and with responsibility. There are only four living citizens who know what responsibility this position holds. I want to assure you that when a decision is made from the Oval Office much advice has been listened to and research has been done. I would not serve me my family or my country well if I were to make a decision that I did not think was the best choice to make. As I have said in the past I always welcome your input. But please realize that in taking that input I must also consider the input of others and what is best for the United States not only at this time but in decades to come. Thank you for listening Mr. President.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I grew up playing outside in the yard and the woods behind our house. What I thought at the time was a normal experience I've realized now was actually somewhat of novelty. Now as an adult I've come to realize how much an oddity playing outdoors and having access to the wilderness is for today's children. The disconnect between the two is distinct. That really concerns me as our nation moves forwards. The creativity developed the wonderful experiences had by being in the outdoors is something I relish and hope future generations of children can relish as well. As I think about this a linked question that's been asked many times before arises "How do we protect instead of relinquish the lands that we as a nation cherish in the face of potential capitalistic gains?" It is a very difficult question to answer but a question that I ask of you as our nation always should to answer it with a long-term mindset. What will we lose with the decision made and how will affect it our nation long-term and the heritage that defines us? Our country is blessed with incredible treasures in our national parks but just the same in our state and city parks right down the street. In the constant rush that all of us experience these places allow us to slow down and truly enjoy the land around us if for a moment. Not only is it our duty as a country to protect these special places from our short-term immediate wants but it's just as important to develop the programs that allow all of us - from the inner-city child to the suburban one - to truly have the opportunities to reconnect with the lands that surround them in a way they've never experienced. If it opens their eyes even close to the ways it's opened mine the blessings on so many of their futures will be abundant.

Dear Sir As an American citizen born in the UK I have observed many differences and similarities between the two nations. When I was young I became a member of Friends of the Earth and was enabled to travel to other countries to work on archaeological digs etc. Having lived most of my life in Florida near the university town of Gainesville it impressed me to see many students play volleyball football and other games outdoors. Now that I'm back in the UK looking after my elderly parents my mother passed away last year I see less people motivated to go outside. It seems they throw garbage everywhere as did many people in the U.S. and there is little thought for the wildlife. I personally took care of a baby wren whose leg was caught in a piece of plastic garden string because he was unable to fly out of the nest like its siblings. How cruel we are to make do with things that are harmful to future generations such as over use of oil and nuclear power instead of alternative technology plastic bags instead recycling our own over production of new gadgets and more and more noise producing machines such as boom boxes and turbo engines in public automobiles food that has been sprayed with long term life threatening chemicals etc etc. Since my arrival in the Alachua area in 1990 I've seen the Itchetutnee springs for example turn from a pristine spring fed river to one that is dying from over fertilization of farmlands. The nitrogen input is at dangerous levels increasing the algae and suffocating the fish and snails in the Florida University breeding area. Is there a way to provide a system of permanent mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund? Surely there could be more education in schools to promote knowledge about our back yards and beyond.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Whenever I tour our great country the places which I choose to visit first are the units of the national park system. These parks provide me with substantial open spaces unmarred by damaging land uses such as grazing mining or logging activities. In order to improve the park system I urge the following improvements: The parks system should be protected and preserved according to the findings produced by the National Parks Second Century Commission respected individuals who developed a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans to them in the next century. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been in existence for over 40 years yet funding is always well below the 900 million authorized. The fund must be fully funded. This program should be fully funded in order to support and protect our parks seashores forests and waterways across the country. As our population continues to increase we need more parks for people to enjoy. There are still segments of our country and history which are not yet represented within the park system. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent our changing country and protect remaining natural areas before they are lost to development. National parks often protect only portions of critical watersheds and wildlife corridors. We must provide for complete corridors in order to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and breed successfully outside as well as within park boundaries. Therefore there must be cooperation between other federal and state agencies as well as private landowners since wildlife does not understand the concept of ownership boundaries or property lines. From an economic perspective national parks are generators of local jobs. According to the recent study by the National Parks Conservation Association for every dollar of federal money invested in national parks there is a four dollar return in economic value to the public. This means that jobs are created where there are national park units. Even in 2009 a recession year visitation to the national parks increased by nearly 4 percent. Parks generate local revenue even in tough economic times. The national parks are very popular. Americans and foreign visitors travel great distances to visit them and spend substantial dollars to do so. They must be protected with adequate funding and proper protections so they are not "loved to death"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My family and I are cosigners of this petition to improve and support the National Park system because we believe strongly in the protection and also "enjoyment" of our national parks. As a child my first exposure to them in the 60's made lasting impressions on me as to nature the beauty of this country and protection of our precious unspoiled regions. The majesty of our National Park system is a true shining bright spot in our country and an advantage that Americans created for themselves that led the way to a worldwide movement to imitate us. Our national forests protected lands and especially the uniquely American concept of vast protect "public" land set aside just because it exists and was worthy of protection and able to add a joy to our lives that nothing else could do should not be allowed to wither. We have deplored that under the previous administration the National Park funding has been ripped apart. Parks suffer from closed facilities lack of maintenance rising fees etc. all to fund wars overseas that you were unfortunate enough to inherit and are literally starving our country's economy to the breaking point. My wife and I made decisions years ago when we married to make certain things in our own lives sacred and non-negotiable. To us the National Parks are one of those aspects of being "American" that should be funded "first" above majority of what we do otherwise which of course changes as time goes on. The parks though stay the same as they are timeless and will surely outlast our own species. We truly appreciate all you are doing to turn the tide in our country toward the future and more enlightened lives. We also appreciate how you have managed to handle the wars that you inherited from your predecessors. However there are some things that should be truly transcend other politics and even foreign policy and that is quality of life here at home. I'd be hard pressed to think of a more deserving recipient of our taxpayer dollars than our public parks forest and lands. The light in a person's eyes viewing the Grand Canyon Lower Falls on the Yellowstone River Zion National Park and any of our other great parks cannot be easily duplicated. Please as you go about the business of leading this country back to the task of fulfilling it's long held promise consider the huge role our National Parks play in what it means to be an American and to be human above all.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing to give my support to the National Park System one of the few federal bureaucracies that provides an efficient and necessary service to the American public. Although my wife and I are senior citizens and haven't attended a National Park in a few years I can remember many vacations of camping picnicing sight seeing and day use excursions with our children in the National as well as the state parks. The park system is a wholesome relatively inexpensive way for everyone to enjoy the wonders and beauty of the United States. While I want to see the National Park System kept up to date for all Americans I do not want our taxpayers to have to incur further debt to do so. Instead I would recommend that either existing stimulus funds (already earmarked for federal departments) or cuts in other areas be utilized. As a taxpayer (one of the only 50% of our citizens who pay taxes) I believe that our tax burden is already too high and will become unreasonably high when we undergo a huge income tax increase on Jan 1 2011 and the taxes you said didn't exist in the healthcare bill that hardly anyone read before passing it and the proposed cap & trade tax you want to push onto unwilling taxpayers and the myriad of other taxes that will go into effect during the next two years of your reign. President Obama the majority of Americans are not with you on the tax borrow spend and print money program you are on. If your goal is as is most progressives to enlarge government and to control as much of our lives as you can supposedly to our benefit then we are not behind you. We want a president not a dictator and we want a president who will stand up for America and who

Due to the fiscal crisis being felt nationwide funding for our national parks and park staffing has suffered. Though not an outdoorsman myself I appreciate nature and its right to co-exist with man. I believe that priority should be given to preserve open spaces not merely national parks.

Disconnection from the natural world is a prime reason there is such despair in our environment. Funding Organizations such as the National Parks and promoting environmental awareness in school from K-12 is a goal worth attaining. Children need to be introduced to the great outdoors at very young age to create a connection and respect for the world that sustains them. I believe the national parks are one of many great ways to do this.

When I think of America's Great Outdoors I think of the great expanses of open land upon which native americans lived which pioneer families settled which riverboats navigated; all now reduced to token national and historic parks. This is an unfortunate thing but nothing we can do anything about except to preserve what little of this heritage remains. Forget connecting Americans to these places. They are Amerca. Keep corporate enterprise out especially the British (once and for all) except as necessary to maintain the integrity of the locations. Give the casino mongers fast food dealers and trash entrepreneurs a one way ticket to China. Thank you for your attention to the real America.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am very fortunate to live near the Point Reyes National Park and it is my church. I have always found the outdoors to be a soothing magical place where whatever is weighing on me comes back in a more manageable perspective after I've been hiking or out somewhere in nature- open spaces open us up. Our national parks remind us all of what is truly important and beautiful and it keeps us small and wondering and in awe. Many of our parks exist solely because someone loved a tree or a stream and wanted it protected from private enterprise and development. Ken Burns' documentary on our national parks said it all so perfectly and clearly portrayed them as our greatest treasure and as a creation that makes us a truly great country. And yet our parks are still threatened daily- our only designated wilderness area here within the Point Reyes National Park is currently facing serious threats from private enterprise which could begin the slow encroachment of our parks throughout the country. I am turning sixty this year and so was fortunate to grow up when kids could bump around in the outdoors and explore the wonders of their local creek and forest. These are critical components of a child's education and our current generation has been denied these experiences unless they are lucky to have parents who have the time and money to make it happen. I believe we need to make these experiences available to all kids. I am also old enough to remember when the schools had money to include outdoor education weeks in their curriculum and as a teacher I see the yearning and excitement the kids have for any experience out in nature. Somehow as a country we have learned to value a sole quest for money and have lost the spiritual balance that an experience out in nature can provide. You can't love the environment unless you've been given the opportunity to be out in it. The parks feed our soul and also protect habitat for wildlife while many species are slowly disappearing from our planet. I support your initiative- and perhaps more government jobs within our parks could be created thereby helping the parks and helping with unemployment. Your initiative will support national parks and bring them the national attention they deserve and the continued protection they need. Thank you for all you have been attempting to do and for considering my comments.

I think Obama should take our Youth through A slaughter house and explain to them why our wild horses Are being took from their land where they was born free and now are being Instilled with fear and pain and butchered and their meat is being sold and where the money is going that is made off them going Now that's A field trip and A truth our Youth needs to know about horse slaughter is America"s Disgrace.

In recent years a reduction of trails, trail heads and the closure of federal lands to horses and pack animals has been a growing concern for recreational riders around the country. There is a clear feeling among recreational riders that access to trails historically open to equestrians is being lost and a bias against equestrians by land managers is more prevalent. However, there is a lack of specific information regarding access issues on federal land including detailed examples, data on the scope of the problem, causes for this trend, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It should be noted that this is not a scientific survey. Individuals are self reporting based on their experiences and on their personal assessments. Reports have not been confirmed by the AHC. As previously noted, the primary objective of the effort is to collect examples of access issues on federal land. The AHC to date has received 36 such reports. What follows is a basic overview of these reports.

- Loss of access due to a maintenance issue (maintenance related)
- Trails or areas where equestrian access has been restricted or a trail closed (restricted access)
- A trail or area has become unusable due to user conflict (user conflict)
- Several reports fall into an “other” category where the issue is not entirely clear or the respondent would like some improvement even if access has not been restricted or a trail closed.

There are several reports concerning maintenance issues on federal land that have effectively close areas to equestrians or limited the number of trails open to equestrians. This issue affects the recreational riding community as well as all recreational user groups. This issue seems to be particularly prevalent on lands managed by the National Forest Service.

Respondents also reported significant numbers of trails that they had previously had access to closed to equestrians in recent years. Many did not know the reasoning behind these closures. Some reported new management plans that resulted in the loss of trails, and some reported rumors of bias against horses by local land managers or complaints by other user groups for the closures. It is difficult to make absolute assertions at this time.

It is clear that some equestrians are losing access to trails, and that this loss of access is not attributable to any one cause. It will be the continuing goal of the AHC to determine the extent equestrians have lost access to trails, the reasons behind these losses and develop strategies to combat the loss of access.

In 1994, one in five visitors to Fredericksburg Battlefield also visited the battlefield at Chancellorsville (both battlefields are part of Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park, VA). In 2009, only one in fifty made the drive. Increasing traffic and commercial development along the connecting highway have made the eight-mile trip less attractive to visitors.

Lowell is home to the second-largest Southeast Asian population in the U.S., many of them Cambodians who sought refuge here from the Pol Pot regime in the 1980s. Although the park protects historic buildings and runs museums scattered throughout the old part of the city, many Cambodian families are not aware of it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Yet, as the National Parks Second Century Commission found, our country is barely scratching the surface of our national parks' tremendous potential. Using the substantial contributions that parks already make as a springboard to achieving its aims, the America's Great Outdoors initiative (AGO) can foster a legacy that connects all Americans with the rich heritage that national parks represent.

At San Antonio Missions National Historic Park, budget shortfalls have the park running with about a third of needed staff. The park covers 835 acres in five separate sites—one of which has never been open to regular operations because of lack of funds.

- Eleven interpreters staff four full-time contact stations serving nearly 1.8 million visitors in 2009;
- Three law enforcement officers patrol the park, which is located in a downtown urban area. Forced to focus on high-visitation areas, in a recent two week period, the patrols were unable to stop an armed robbery, break-ins, vandalism, and the theft of \$20,000 in government property; and
- The park's historian position remains vacant. There is no staff historic preservation expert, and no museum or curatorial staff to care for nearly a million Spanish colonial artifacts.

The National Park Service depends on operational funding in order to serve the public and surrounding communities, while also protecting our parks for future generations. Unlike other federal agencies, funding for the parks goes almost entirely to fundamental personnel needs, including rangers, interpreters, educators, and scientists. These are the people on whom achieving many goals of the America's Great Outdoors initiative depends.

Parks are hamstrung by funding shortfalls that have hit interpretive and educational programs particularly hard. In fact, the portion of park operations funding devoted to visitor services actually declined by \$40 million from 2001 to 2010, despite recent steps toward eliminating the large, ongoing shortfall in the National Park Service operating budget.

National parks are able to meet only a fraction of the demand for youth and adult programming, often with severely outdated materials, exhibits, and technologies. Staff is stretched thin, unable to commit as much time to the community engagement, innovations, and partnerships as will be needed to widely realize AGO's goals.

Inadequate funding of key programs such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Historic Preservation Fund makes it difficult to protect core areas and resources. The National Park Service has been unable to acquire key private lands within or adjacent to parks from willing sellers—an undertaking the LWCF is designed to support. This creates challenges for protecting park resources and limits public access to areas that should be part of our National Park System. Shortfalls in the Historic Preservation Fund pose similar challenges to preserving America's historic resources and the cultural education and tourism that they underpin.

The Park Service has a long-standing commitment to partnerships that benefit communities, historic sites, and recreational opportunities outside park boundaries. But inadequate funding impairs the ability of the Park Service to support community initiatives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance program has enormous leveraging potential in helping communities expand access to healthy recreation by preserving open space and building more trails, yet it receives barebones funding. The National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom helps protect and connect local historical sites, museums, and interpretive programs associated with the Underground Railroad. It, too, is underfunded.

Another successful partnership program, the Centennial Challenge was begun in 2007 to foster projects and programs that protect parks, enhance visitor services, and foster hands-on learning. In 2008 and 2009, \$24.6 million dollars in federal funds were matched by \$32 million from partner organizations in 35 states and the District of Columbia. While the Centennial Challenge was successful in aligning resources to advance some local and park priorities, it suffered from a few key problems, including short fundraising timelines that made it difficult for smaller partners to participate.

During youth listening sessions across the country, Administration officials heard from young people eager for outdoor learning to be part of their school experience. Participants also underscored the need to provide experiential education opportunities relevant to students' daily lives, empower kids to translate what they learn into actions they can take in their homes and neighborhoods, and use new technologies to connect to the younger generation. The National Parks Second Century Commission identified this need as well. It pointed out that parks need to embrace technology to facilitate park-based learning anywhere, at any time, and to take advantage of social media and new media initiatives to augment park-based programming. Barriers include security policies for government-supported websites, legal concerns with service agreements, and challenges integrating the Park Service's traditional strength in place based education with tools such as the Internet and social media.

Many national parks are leaders in learning to speak the language of youth and different cultures and connecting them with outdoor opportunities. But national parks are able to meet only a fraction of the demand for youth and adult programming, often with severely outdated materials, exhibits, and technologies.

In 2009, the NPS Intermountain Region received 320 applications for the TRT program, but was able to hire only 74 teachers. Additional funding and more onsite housing would enable this program to expand.

America is changing, and our National Park System needs help keeping up. Today's racial and ethnic "minority" groups will collectively become the nation's majority before 2050. Native, Asian-American, and African-American populations are expected to grow in both number and percentage of the total population. Leading the way will be the Hispanic population, projected to triple in size and jump from 15% to 30% of the nation's population by 2050. And many of today's immigrant groups wish to maintain their cultural values and identity even as they become loyal U.S. citizens.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

At the same time, shifting age demographics put new demands on parks. An aging Baby Boom is expanding the ranks of the “over 65” crowd—still active but perhaps more inclined to safer, more convenient recreation. And America’s youth are already presenting a more ethnically diverse, technologically savvy face, challenging parks and the National Park System to connect to them in relevant ways.

At the same time as a diversifying population presents new opportunities for expanding both the park system and the cultural stories it represents, the footprint of development continues to march across the landscape, presenting its own imperatives to the park system. The National Parks Second Century Commission noted that the development of over a million acres of farms, forests, and wild spaces each year places a premium on quick action to protect nationally significant places.

The 21st Century Conservation Corps engages young people from all backgrounds as resources to provide service ranging from urban tree planting to wildland firefighting while gaining valuable job skills on public lands. Engaging young people in paid service on public lands is a pivotal strategy to address pressing national issues including:

- disengagement of young people from the great American outdoors;
- lack of diversity in both public lands employees and users;
- youth obesity;
- record high unemployment among youth and young adults;
- millions of dollars of backlogged maintenance on public lands; and
- need for future federal public lands employees.

The impacts of climate change on our planet and our lands are happening right now. Even if we cut global warming emissions 80 percent by 2050, the natural world is threatened today and the impacts are projected to become more severe in the decades ahead.

In an era of climate change, not only must we be thinking about managing our lands differently, we must think about protecting lands differently. The old model of drawing lines on a map and protecting an area is not sufficient for a warming world. Certain species of plants and wildlife have begun migrating further north and higher in elevation, numbers of caribou, moose, and bighorn sheep are dwindling in some areas, and fish kills resulting from rising water temperatures are becoming more common. It is the job of land, water and wildlife management agencies to anticipate and react to these changes and determine which areas will become vital habitat in the future. The agencies must then actively work to secure protections for these habitats to give fish and wildlife all the help they can adapting to a changing world.

We need to aggressively implement climate smart management solutions on our public lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Climate change is and will continue to impact the natural resources of the United States. Sea level rise threatens to swamp the Everglades. Scientists predict that there will soon be no more glaciers in Glacier National Park. The coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge, one of the most remote places in the country, is eroding into the sea.

To safeguard America's Great Outdoors resource planning processes and resource management plans themselves should include the conduct of resource vulnerability assessments and identify specific management actions that conserve the best remaining fish, wildlife and native plant populations, increase population size and habitat in isolated populations, reduce outside habitat stressors, conserve and reconnect core and other crucial habitats and restore migratory life histories.

Highly disruptive activities such as logging, mining and drilling multiply the stresses on wild lands and wildlife already struggling for survival due to climate change. An integral part of climate-smart management is to limit or eliminate non-climate stressors. A good example to build on is the decision earlier this year to ban off shore oil and gas drilling in Alaska's Bristol Bay, a pristine ecosystem and fishing ground. We hope that the America's Great Outdoors initiative will prompt action to deal with these stressors with climate change in mind.

Between them, the U.S. Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management oversee close to 195 million acres of forested lands. Around 49 million acres of these lands are carbon rich forests that are more than 100 years old but lack permanent legislative or executive branch protection (many of these forests enjoy administrative protection under the Roadless Rule which governs the national forests. But this rule is under legal challenge and has been undermined by the previous Administration, demonstrating its lack of permanence).

Recent years have seen numerous large tracts of formerly industrial forestland purchased by investment organizations and real estate developers with economic objectives inconsistent with managing these lands for wildlife benefits and outdoor recreation. More than 5 million acres of forest have already been converted to development<sup>9</sup>. While the loss of these valuable habitats has slowed, we continue to lose over 80,000 acres each year. Some areas have seen extensive losses, such as the Prairie Pothole Region, the nation's "duck factory," where 66 per cent of the original wetlands have been drained or filled.

Despite the expanse of these working lands and potential utility for conservation, only slightly more than 36 million acres are enrolled in federal conservation programs such as the Wetlands Reserve Program, Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program or Conservation Reserve Program. The level of funding for and engagement in working land conservation programs is not commensurate with the value of these lands for fish and wildlife habitat, flood control, carbon sequestration and outdoor recreation. Adding to the challenge is the presence of disincentives to conservation on working lands within otherwise well meaning and effective federal conservation programs.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Over the last few decades, childhood has moved indoors. This phenomenon has had consequences for the health and wellbeing of our children and the future of the conservation movement. On average, children and teenagers are spending more than seven hours each day "plugged in" to electronic media and just minutes engaged in outdoor activities.<sup>11</sup> One in three American kids is overweight or obese, with a higher prevalence in African American, Latino and Native American communities.<sup>12</sup> More than half of all children in the United States have insufficient levels of Vitamin D (the Sunshine Drug).<sup>13</sup> Rates of ADHD are on the rise and stress, anxiety and depression rates among youth are increasing.<sup>14</sup> Studies suggest that spending time outdoors in green spaces can improve the mental and physical health of children and youth.

At the same time, today's children and youth are inheriting a warming world. The responsibility to ensure that the next generation is given the tools it needs to address climate change and other environmental challenges lies in our hands. Emerging research suggests that children who spend time in natural settings grow up to develop positive attitudes towards the environment.<sup>16</sup> The 21st Century Conservation Agenda must grow and sustain a constituency for conservation for the long haul. The America's Great Outdoors initiative should set children and youth on a course that is both good for their own health and for the future of conservation in America by reconnecting them with meaningful experiences in the great outdoors.

Through the America's Great Outdoors listening sessions, young people across the country have had an incredible opportunity to inform the dialogue about reconnecting youth to the natural world. Sierra Club programs have helped engage young people in the public listening sessions where they have shared some of the reasons children, youth and families are not spending much time exploring and enjoying the great outdoors.<sup>17</sup> Barriers include inadequate infrastructure, including insufficient access to safe and nearby parks and open spaces, lack of interest, fear among parents and youth alike, and alternatives luring kids indoors.

Solutions lie at all levels of government, across agencies and in the private and non-profit sectors. Coordination at the federal level is critical to address the societal trend that has moved an entire generation indoors. The America's Great Outdoors initiative is an important step towards developing a greater understanding of the problem and identifying cross-agency solutions to tackle the widespread cultural shift taking place today which has been best described in best-selling author Richard Louv's "Last Child in the Woods" as Nature Deficit Disorder (NDD).

More than 85 per cent of the region's forest lands are privately owned, with a rapidly increasing threat of fragmentation and development. The sheer size of the current forested landscape provides a unique opportunity to practice conservation in way that enhances the resiliency of key habitats across the region to lessen the impacts of climate change. In order for a comprehensive forest conservation program to succeed, it must encompass the broad mosaic of private, state, federal and tribal lands and waters. It will also require partnerships between federal, state and tribal agencies and private interests to acquire key habitat areas, obtain conservation easements and promote land stewardship incentives.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Alaskan Arctic's rolling tundra and wild rivers, wetlands, ponds, deep lakes and sparkling coastal waters are home to a stunning array of wildlife. Every year nearly 200 species of birds migrate to the region's tundra and wetlands to breed. Caribou, muskoxen, wolverines, grizzly, and polar bears roam the vast expanse of land while walrus, bowhead and beluga whales ply the Arctic waters. Now, throughout their Arctic home, rapid climate change is altering their fragile habitat and the push to drill for oil is mounting. While global warming is causing average temperatures to rise around the world, the effects are being felt most dramatically in the Arctic, where temperatures are climbing at roughly twice the global pace.

With so much of Alaska's wilderness already feeling the heat of global warming impacts it is irresponsible to create additional sources of global warming pollution from oil development in the Arctic Ocean to coal mining in the foothills of the Brooks Range Mountains in these wild places. To understand what's at stake, one need only look as far as the Prudhoe Bay oil fieldstone of the world's largest industrial complexes. Hundreds of spills involving tens of thousands of gallons of crude oil and other petroleum products occur annually. Decades-old diesel spill sites still show little vegetation regrowth. Gravel fill, excavation, and waste disposal alone have destroyed 17,000 acres of wildlife and marine habitat.

The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem is an iconic set of two national parks and six national forests that anchor roughly 20 million acres in the Rocky Mountains. Unfortunately, this area is under attack from the effects of global warming. Snowpack in these areas is being reduced dramatically, white bark pine beetle infestation is running rampant and threatening a prime food source for grizzly bears, and , increased threats of expanding oil, gas and coal mining developments are just a few examples of the pressures on this prized destination area. The effect of climate change on the greater Yellowstone region is widely recognized by both agencies and NGOs as a driving factor for future lands management. There is a great opportunity for DOI to help shape the direction of new policies both from a land protection and resource extraction/energy development perspective. The National Park Service has already directed both National Parks to develop Climate Change plans. Now through AGO Initiative, this visionary work can be enhanced through public awareness.

The Olympic Peninsula, Puget Sound, and North Cascades iconic ecosystems in the Pacific Northwest that are critical to the survival of wildlife, local economies, and communities are under attack from the effects of global warming.<sup>19</sup> Billions of gallons of fresh water are melting into the sea as glaciers in the North Cascades, Olympics, and Mt. Rainier continue to retreat. Meanwhile, snowpack in these areas is being reduced dramatically. As glaciers disappear, important salmon and trout streams warm dangerously and sea levels rise. Tourism and sport, tribal and commercial fisheries, and the health of threatened species like orca, which uses Puget Sound as an important part of its life-cycle, depend on healthy ecosystems. Local communities on the east slope of the Cascade Mountains are experiencing more frequent and intense fires, trees of all types are dying at double the normal rate in Pacific Northwest forests, and disease and pest infestations are getting worse as droughts intensify.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Current threats are not gloom-and-doom prescriptions they are signs that the traditional protections we have in place are not sufficient in the face of climate change. Some continued climate change is inevitable, but we have a small window of opportunity<sup>21</sup> to avoid the worst projected scenarios by doing two things: 1) reduce global warming emissions (80 percent by 2050) to slow and stop global warming and 2) reduce the vulnerability of species, lands, and communities to climate change already in motion. The following vision is our view of how to increase habitat resilience on the Olympics Peninsula, Puget Sound, and the North Cascades.

**SITUATION:** Outdoor recreation is proven to be good for America and the American people. Regrettably, across America, access to our public lands and waters, and ultimately opportunities to explore and enjoy these special places is disappearing with startling speed. Needed most are sustainable revenue streams and a mechanism to distribute funding properly<sup>1</sup>. If revenue streams to help support conservation and sustainable outdoor recreation in balance with healthy flora and fauna are not established, outdoor recreation is in jeopardy of being lost or greatly diluted as an American way of life.

**SOLUTION:** A united consortium of industry and non-profit partners establish a national, apolitical mechanism, Great Outdoors America™, to collect funding from the private sector –through voluntary surcharges, per unit fees or annual endowments – and distribute in the form of grants based on needs.

**PURPOSE:** To establish a nonprofit foundation to pool and distribute private sector funding to assist America's public agencies in providing a full-range of year-round recreational opportunities, both economically and environmentally sustainable, with minimum risk of conflict through legislation and litigation and maximum probability for collaboration among diverse stakeholders.

It seems to me that The Great American Outdoor Initiative has a lot of people that are trying to put forth their own agenda and it really has nothing to do with getting people in to the great outdoors. It seems its more about keeping groups out and closing areas that the environmentalists deem to be endangered without having any input from the public.

A cattle rancher that has leased property from the BLM will be in danger of loosing his lease if he stands in the way of some environmentalist whim to create a monument or some Indian Tribe that says all this area is Holy Ground.

A lot of the people that I know make weekend trips into family camping trips with fishing, hunting, riding horses etc. These types of family trips will not be possible if the Government continues to close off our Public Lands in the interest of special interest groups.

The OHV industry supplies many, many jobs and contributes billions of dollars to the economy of these United States as shown by studies done in Utah, Arizona, and West Virginia back East. The state of New Mexico has proposed a study to be done here , however I don't know the current status of that study.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I feel that this initiative is little more than a ploy, perpetrated by the environmentalists and certain government officials with deep and long relationships. To close off lands that are recreational and just by coincidence contain large deposits of , gas, oil, coal and uranium. To me this is unthinkable, to do this, at this time in the history of our country. When we are struggling to put people back to work, to meet the demands of our economy and now to deal with cap and trade legislation, a health care bill that adds millions to our national debt. That, in and of itself, is another tax on the people, without their permission and against their will.

America has a long and successful conservation tradition and Americans still believe strongly in conservation of our natural and recreational resources. Today, however, our country's remarkable conservation legacy hangs in the balance. A new wave of threats could well undo what has been accomplished.

The cumulative impact of these trends, if we do not respond to them, will be an accelerated fragmentation of the American landscape—the separation of plants and animals from their essential habitats, of watersheds from downstream estuaries, of people from experiences in the outdoors, and of Americans from our common historic and natural heritage.

It is difficult to imagine our children, the extended family of this great nation, ever being anything but eternally grateful for our acting now to create a durable America's Great Outdoors Initiative to provide the means for the American people to work together to save the land, the rivers and streams, the ocean coasts, and great marshes that they will need for their health and happiness in the years long after we are all gone

Because of all of our years working in the American countryside, the Conservancy believes in the wisdom of the American people to guide the conservation and management of this country's natural resources.

North America and the United States are blessed with a diversity and abundance of natural resources, natural systems and habitats that have been central to our growth and prosperity as a nation and a foundation for our way of life. Despite urbanization and the increasing use of technology, our health, welfare, economy, culture and identity still depend heavily on the quality and productivity of our land, water, oceans and coasts. While we rely on nature for our well being, no place in our country is immune from at least some human impacts. We depend on nature, and it now depends upon us for its survival.

A still growing population and sprawling residential and commercial development are consuming more than 3.5 million acres of rural land each year, including ranches, farms and timberlands.

Farmers, ranchers and forest land owners are finding it increasingly difficult to retain their lands in natural resource use in the face of increasing taxes, development pressures, competing land uses and changing markets.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Climate change is affecting the productivity of rural lands and the viability of wildlife habitat; it is altering traditional wildfire regimes, hastening the spread of forest pests and diseases, producing more erratic weather patterns—more floods, droughts, and major storms, and will affect our coastlines with rising sea levels.

Demands on water resources are exceeding the supply placing particular pressure on rural water users; we have drastically altered the flows of rivers and streams through dam operation and water withdrawal.

Conventional and alternative energy development and power transmission lines are expected to affect vast areas of land.

Excessive nutrients particularly from agricultural runoff and other non-point sources of pollution are damaging rivers, lakes and coastal waters.

Intensive use and development is stressing coastal areas, near-shore waters and estuaries.

Invasive aquatic species and other pests and pathogens are becoming particularly damaging to our freshwater and forest resources.

People, particularly young urban and suburban residents, are losing their connection to the land and to experiences in nature.

The Conservancy's science confirms the value of an ecosystem-based approach to meeting the many challenges America's great outdoors face over the next 50 years.

It is our view that the only effective response to the combination of threats facing America's land and water today is to use multiple tools and techniques to conserve whole watersheds and natural areas that can then provide habitat for the range of native species, productive areas for the use of natural resources and the full range of benefits to human communities.

Providing the American people, working as individuals and through their governments, associations and institutions with the means to achieve these goals and attain this vision is a great challenge especially given the very real financial problems now faced by governments at every level. But we cannot turn away from the threats to the health of our land and water.

Landscape Partnership Projects: Large landscapes that have become focal points for conservation through strong private-public partnerships. Projects could launch within the first year, with substantial and measurable progress made toward achieving sustainable conservation goals in 25 such projects within 5-10 years.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Large Watershed Projects: Expansive aquatic systems that are already a national focus and in some phase of restoration Including: the Great Lakes, Mississippi River, Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, Gulf of Mexico/Louisiana Wetlands, the Greater Everglades, California Bay Delta, and the Colorado River Basin. Projects could launch within the first year, with substantial and measurable progress made in achieving sustainable conservation goals in all of the named projects within 5-10 years.

Metropolitan Greenspace Projects: Metropolitan/urban greenspace corridors that may also include cultural and historical features. Projects could launch within the first year, with substantial and measurable progress made in achieving sustainable conservation goals in 10 such projects within 5-10 years.

Build on the successes of the past and the use of existing government authorities wherever possible

Minimize new cycles of planning where plans already exist

Increase flexibility of funding and program delivery by removing bureaucratic obstacles to on-the-ground action

Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, Mississippi River, Gulf of Mexico/Louisiana Wetlands, California Bay Delta, Greater Everglades, Colorado River. These specific places are often talked about in the context of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. All of them, however, already have some level of multi-agency Federal and state involvement. Some, like the Chesapeake Bay and the Everglades, have been underway for many years, but they have proceeded slowly with considerable difficulty and with varying levels of funding. Others, like the Gulf of Mexico, have never been funded comprehensively and require accelerated investment and cooperative action. Large amounts of money, invested in targeted and strategic ways, over a long time period are required to accomplish restoration of these areas and in most cases there is also a significant regulatory component required to reduce water pollution and prevent further habitat degradation.

The challenge of climate change only underscores that imperative. Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCCs), focused in part on climate change, can facilitate this cross-jurisdictional engagement, operate within a broader climate context, can be utilized to evaluate AGO project selection and design, and can inform the ongoing management of project areas.

Our country faces many challenges and a good deal of uncertainty as we prepare to enter the second decade of the 21st Century. Americans are struggling, as well, to find the common ground required to solve those problems. For more than 100 years, however, most American's have agreed on the importance of conserving our country's legacy of rich and productive land, water, and coastlines. While we have made substantial progress in protecting America's environment and conserving our natural and agricultural lands, there are, today, many threats to that progress.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In a time of soaring federal deficits, this renewed commitment to conservation will require increased funding. But much can be done by more effectively targeting existing resources and by making conservation and restoration spending more reliable, predictable and responsive to on-the-ground needs.

“It is time for us now as a nation to exercise the same reasonable foresight in dealing with our great national resources that would be shown by any prudent man in conserving and wisely using the property which contains the assurance of well-being for himself and his children.”

In the Middle Tennessee area, our trails are quite limited. The trails that we have are heavily used. Metro Nashville Parks Department has one mountain bike trail. We also have one short beginner trail at a state park east of Nashville. 24 miles of trail was built by club volunteers at Montgomery Bell State Park, 30 miles west of Nashville. As a demonstration of the popularity of the sport, that mountain bike trail has routinely recorded more than 10,000 visits per year. Most of those users are driving more than 30 miles from Nashville to use this trail.

A major issue has just come to a head in the Cherokee National Forest in the vicinity of the proposed Corridor K highway route in southeast Tennessee. Both the northern and the southern routes of this proposed highway will destroy existing important and heavily used mountain biking trails. While it initially appears (to me) that the northern route will do less damage to our trails, we request that agencies involved agree to replace these lost trails with new mountain bike trails in the same vicinity, and to provide new connectors to trails that are cut off by the construction. This situation is made more complex by the recently proposed Tennessee Wilderness Act of 2010, in that this Act seeks to expand the Big Frog Wilderness. If a southern route is chosen and trails are eliminated from the Tanasi Trail System the Act may make it difficult or impossible to construct replacement and connector trails in the same area.

Other important points regarding the mountain bike trails in this area:

The Tanasi Trail System is an important recreational trail, having received Epic status by IMBA in 2004.

The Tanasi trail is responsible for a positive economic impact in the region, as it plays host to a number of outdoor events. Specifically, the Black Bear Rampage mountain bike race, the SERC Race #6 mountain bike race, and the Cohutta 100 race, routinely attract 200+ attendees and their families annually to each event.

The economic impact to the region would be adversely affected if the above events would lose a venue where they could continue to host these events. The economic benefit to the region not only positively affects the event promoters, but restaurants, campgrounds, hotels, gas stations, and other retail establishments.

SORBA Chattanooga has completed untold hours of trail maintenance on both the Tanasi Trails and the Chilhowee Trails. For of these efforts SORBA Chattanooga received a Certificate of Appreciation from the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Prior to that time SORBA received a letter of appreciation from the Ranger noting that chapter's and IMBA's efforts in rehabilitating the Thunder Rock Express trail in 2004.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have been reading about the renewed push for Wilderness Designation for more and more wild areas in our country. I have enjoyed the wild areas of especially Tennessee and North Carolina most of my life. What troubles me greatly is that, under present rules, wilderness designation does not allow mountain bike usage or mountain bike trails in these areas. Designation of wilderness in Montana last year eliminated mountain bike use on hundreds of miles of trails. I think this is a major policy mistake. Because of this policy, there are hundreds of thousands of mountain bikers who find themselves at cross purposes to proposed designation of wilderness. As a lover of nature and wilderness, I hate being put in this position. Mountain bikers are a user group that should be allowed in areas protected by Wilderness status. Mountain biking is a quiet sport, in keeping with wilderness experiences. Many studies have shown that mountain biking on properly constructed trails has less impact on these trails than even foot traffic. I would ask that the federal agencies involved please reconsider this flawed policy.

I read an article in the newspaper recently that reported that Tennessee ranked last of all states for adults that are considered physically active. That report noted that the number of Tennesseans who met the definition of "physically active" ranked 13 percent less than the national average. The promotion of mountain biking and trails can help change that statistic. I find that mountain biking gives me an engaging sport that I always look forward to, and as a secondary benefit, provides my much needed exercise. The fact that I am enjoying this exercise in America's Great Outdoors, makes the sport that much more attractive.

As most people are aware, New England has experienced massive forest change over the past three centuries. To look at this landscape today, it is almost impossible to imagine that clearing for agriculture once reduced forest cover to a fraction of its current extent. The remarkable return of the region's forests through the mid-1900s and the tremendous opportunity that provided is a story many know well. What is less apparent is the quiet but equally significant second wave of forest change we are experiencing today. In the Wildlands and Woodlands report, we highlight the fact that forest cover is now declining in all six New England States (Foster et al. 2010). Parcelization associated with shifting ownership patterns<sup>1</sup> and sprawling development throughout the region is driving this hard deforestation, which will be much more difficult to reverse than the historic soft deforestation that preceded it. Moreover, with just 10% of the New England landscape held as public land, opportunities for public use are limited and forest management activities are subject to variable market forces.

The Central Virginia Battlefields Trust (CVBT) applauds the Obama Administration's initiative to promote land conservation. As a successful Civil War battlefield preservation land trust operating in the Fredericksburg area of Virginia, we can not emphasize enough how important battlefield preservation is to this initiative. Statistics show that an average of thirty acres of Civil War battlefields are lost daily to development. Now is the time for the Federal government to aggressively support the preservation of these endangered sites.

All Americans own our federal, public lands equally. But federal land agencies, and Congress make decisions about use, trade and disposal of American land, without considering the views of most Americans. In fact, agencies use procedures designed to prevent public input!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Americans who happen to live near public land, and who want to enrich themselves from that land, are given extra influence in agency decisions. They believe that these American lands belong only to them, not to all Americans. Federal land agencies encourage this wrong thinking.

Occasionally, Administration officials have openly colluded with local interests to repeal wilderness studies, and instead open that land to extractive industry.

Agencies, influenced by local extractive industry and elected officials, arrange and stack hearings to get the opinions they want. The voices of other Americans are not heard.

Western Senators push through Congress laws that order that public land be handed over to local government and exploiters in their state.

Most Americans are excluded from planning. The USFS and BLM cooperate with local "Collaborative Groups" or "Resource Advisory Committees," who are asked to give expert advice on land use planning. These groups are stacked with members of the exploitive industries and local politicians, who support them. For example: The famous "Quincy Library Group" in California was formed to advise and change plans of the local USFS managers. It had 38 members: logging company owners and staff 16 members; local county commissioners and staff 10; other groups 8; and.....environmentalists; The federally mandated (USDA Reg 1042-142, 2007) Resource Advisory Committees (RAC) for Montana are required to have these members: from local businesses, labor and officials 8; miscellaneous groups (e.g., tribes, historians, wild horse devotees, etc.) 5; ... environmentalists 2 members. What do we expect the RAC to recommend?; In 2008, Utah BLM officials met secretly with local county commissioners to get their "wants" prior to release of the DEIS's for five BLM land Resource Management Plans. Environmental groups were not allowed to participate, nor learn what the BLM and commissioners had discussed; Even within one state there is unfair representation. The Monticello, Utah BLM RAC has 12 members, six from the Salt Lake City counties (total population 1,710,000), and six from local SE Utah counties (total population 58,000). The people in the local counties have 25 times the per capita representation as do citizens in northern Utah!

Less often there are ethically-challenged, collusive lawsuits aimed at exploiting oil/mining in American land. • In 1996 the lawsuit, Utah vs. Babbitt, was filed to stop the Utah BLM from evaluating federal lands for possible wilderness designation. After years of contention, in 2003, Interior Secretary Gale Norton representing the United States, suddenly conceded defeat, even though her case was strong, and an appeal was underway! This collusive settlement was shortly followed by opening of these land parcels to drilling. I note that President Obama's Interior Department has discussed issuing orders to protect these lands as Wilderness Study Areas, but there has been no action.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

“Hearings” by federal agencies don’t hear most Americans. Almost all hearings are set in local towns, the state capital, and sometimes, Washington DC. But hearings on western land decisions rarely if ever occur in Miami, Los Angeles, Chicago, and other cities where most Americans live. • Hearings are stacked with shills for the extractive industries, such as local city officials, Congressmen, and labor groups, who are allowed to speak first, when the media are there. The American public is often shut out of the hearings, being allowed only to submit written comments.. In 2009 the Superior National Forest (Minnesota) held a hearing in Minneapolis on the DEIS for toxic, Sulfide Mineral mining next to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Only pro-mining people were heard. The public was not allowed to address the hearing panel and media!

Members of Congress feel free to give away or damage federal land, if it lies in their state. Near Las Vegas, a huge federal land conveyance was pushed through Congress. Currently, Senator Tester of Montana has introduced S1470 to order the Beaverhead and Deer Lodge National Forests to create logging cuts that must be not less than a specified minimum per year. This bill would totally override the existing Forest Plans!

Why are Americans living near our federal lands given the privilege of deciding how these lands are used, while other Americans have no say? How can American public land be protected from these destructive influences? Can we ever have a fair process for deciding uses of OUR land?

The TGC appreciates the opportunity to present comments to this Initiative to enhance land conservation and reconnect the public with the great outdoors. More specifically, these comments address the needs of urban populations that have the equal and potentially conflicting needs for both conservation and public use within their urban environments

In 1959, William H. Whyte coined the term greenway in his monograph “Securing Open Space for Urban America” for the Urban Land Institute. Over the past five decades the term has been used and misused for everything from freeways, to abandoned rail-to-trail corridors, to landscape scale ecological networks. These comments are intended to advance the need for greater attention to creation of urban greenways systems that accommodate the dual purposes of conservation for ecosystem function, as well as for appropriate public use.

Raleigh’s population has just been projected to have exceeded 400 thousand. Its metropolitan statistical area including Durham, Cary, Chapel Hill, and numerous smaller communities is well in excess of one million population. As the northeastern anchor of the Piedmont Atlantic Mega-Region, the most rapidly growing of the eight mega-regions identified across the country, the future is clear and challenging. Given its thirty-five year head start with greenway implementation, Raleigh currently has 3,660 acres within its greenway system and 63 miles of greenway trails. Its system is already interconnected with adjoining communities, and about to be interconnected with adjoining counties into a Triangle-region network. While this is advantageous, it is not the norm across the country. The PAGO Initiative is an opportunity to create a support structure for conservation and public use that can lead to a nationwide network of interconnected greenway systems.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Limiting or even prohibiting continued development within floodplains would have beneficial water quality and ecological effects, but it would also reduce the ever increasing vulnerability of life and property to river flooding hazards. Flattening this curve will have long-term positive economic effects at the local, state, and national levels. Nevertheless a great deal of past development, encouraged by Corps engineering projects and FEMA subsidized insurance, remains vulnerable to recurring flood cycles. Some local governments utilize post-disaster funding to acquire and remove damaged structures from flood prone areas. More local governments would consider and undertake such activities, if there were a more robust national program with sufficient funding for matching grants to incentivize pre-disaster acquisition and removal of structures. After-the-fact enthusiasm should be projected for this programmatic approach, and significant funding over many years will be required to correct the failure of past policies. Such program should have significant dedicated and continuous revenue from multiple sources, and the reclaimed lands should be conserved and managed in perpetuity for their environmental/ecological system values and appropriate public use. Perhaps part of the program budget could come from a major assessment (fixed amount or percentage) added to each annual subsidized flood insurance policy premium, as well as a nominal assessment added to all other homeowners and corporate building insurance policies to take advantage of scale.

Green Infrastructure is a current “hot topic”. The foundation of the term is its relationship to systems function. The City of Raleigh addressed this in their recently updated Comprehensive Plan, by including greenways in its definition of linear public infrastructure along with roads, sewers, and potable water systems. This reinforces the holistic characteristics of these systems and the negative impacts of their fragmentation. Further, some engineered systems, such as stormwater, sometimes forget to include their natural components that can benefit from and function best where conserved. Unfortunately, attention is most often given to techniques, such as green roofs, rain gardens, bioswales, permeable pavement, etc, rather than a better understanding system function. S3561 & HR 4202: Green Infrastructure for Clean Water Act has the potential to address the weakness. If it is ratified the EPA will be charged with its management. Hopefully its research, guidance, grants, etc will identify and advance the greenways concept, as well as conservation and appropriate public use of riparian corridors in the urban systems context.

eastern state and local governments are likely to carry a greater burden for the provision of comparable parks and recreation opportunities for their citizens,

landscape ecology based conservation networks may strive for maximum function in the west, while struggling for optimum/minimum function in the east,

Thus, great caution should be exercised in the recommendation of one-size-fits-all strategies and programs for nationwide implementation of the PAGO Initiative. The greenways concept can embrace both ends of this spectrum [such as Yellowstone To Yukon in the west and Raleigh’s plan in the east] but PAGO recommendations must be context appropriate.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The HUD, DOT and EPA Partnership for Sustainable Communities is a breath of fresh air. Yet, the CDC is a conspicuous mission agency. It is the agency with the most robust research program on the impact of development patterns on quality of life issues, but without direct programs responsibility for development pattern creation. Thus, the CDC can play the role of a neutral expert/arbitrator among the other partners. Again, the greenways concept aligns well with many HUD, DOT, and EPA programs, and will hopefully be encouraged as a development pattern and systems solution through those programs.

North Carolina and Virginia have jointly pursued preparation of a draft EIS for their portions of the proposed High Speed Rail system, and are working through the NEPA process. An interesting element of the proposed project is a trail for non-motorized use between Raleigh and Richmond adjoining the realigned rail corridor. At its proposed terminus in Raleigh the trail will interconnect with the Capital Area Greenway system and the rapidly evolving Mountain-to-Sea Trail. This initiative is on the scale of interstate highway projects, but there is no comparable program structure to support implementation. Existing funding opportunities available to these state agencies and their federal program partners will be severely challenged to complete this project within any reasonable timeframe. Perhaps some of the following existing and proposed funding sources could be enhanced to assist in this process.

Urban and urbanizing areas are perhaps the most difficult place to pursue conservation, open space, and public use initiatives. They are the areas with the greatest total population and density, they are the most disrupted by development, with the highest fair market value on remaining lands, and the least available grant funding opportunities. In this difficult context, greenways offer a system scale conservation and land use pattern that provides multiple positive public functions. The Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act provided some funding from 1978-2002, but has been unappropriated since. Currently, HR 3734 The Urban Revitalization and Livable Communities Act is proposed as an updated replacement. It better recognizes and responds to the complex multiple issues and needs of viable urban areas, and deserves widespread support. The proposed appropriation is greatly needed to fill part of the void in grant funds availability to address close to home conservations and public use where the vast majority of people live.

The North American Wetland Conservation program is a valuable resource for addressing international scale conservation. Yet, the North American areas subject to the greatest growth pressures may be losing their conservation resource base faster than protection can occur. More could be done to promote conservation friendly development patterns and invest in more urban conservation systems. While these may not be the most pristine large landscapes, they can be reasonably viable and functional smaller habitats that can prove to be important parts of a conservation landscape scale mosaic over time. To pursue this vision, enhanced levels of funding and reordered priorities will probably be necessary.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Support public Investments in family forest conservation and restoration. Private forests across the United States generate many public benefits – clean air and water, wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities. Many times family forest owners lack the technical and financial support to keep their forests as forests to maintain these public benefits.

The initiative presented by the Department of Interior is an honorable one. Urbanization, and all its ramifications, is a big concern to everyone, not just government bureaucrats. Without a BALANCED FEDERAL BUDGET, all honorable initiatives are meaningless. Redundant regulations, policies, rules, and resources need to be eliminated (in the best interest of the taxpayers within the next 6-months).

With each square foot of battlefield land that is developed, whole chapters of America's history are being ripped out of the book of national memory and an irreplaceable piece of our heritage is lost forever. Today, rapid growth and development threatens what remains of our Civil War heritage. Most of these battlefields are in close proximity to cities because cities were strategic objectives for both contestants during the Civil War. According to a 1993 study (updated in 1997) commissioned by the U.S. Congress, the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report, fully 20 percent of the hallowed ground of the Civil War has already been destroyed forever--covered by roads, housing developments and other inappropriate development. Battlefields such as Chantilly and Salem Church in Virginia are just two examples of battlegrounds all but destroyed. The Civil War Preservation Trust (CWPT) states that due to current rates of development and rapidly increasing land prices, the nation loses approximately one acre of hallowed ground every hour and estimates that the fate of the remaining unprotected ground will be determined within the next five to fifteen years, depending on its location.

There were literally thousands of armed conflicts all over the country during the Civil War and many Americans know very little about them or care if these sites are preserved.

In 1994 Gov. Arne Carlson introduced Minnesotans to the eminently sensible concept of sustainability. Since then, however, neither governors nor legislators have demonstrated the vision or the courage to develop the truly innovative, long-range policies and programs needed to protect and preserve one of the critical targets of the overall sustainability idea: the state's water resources -- its lakes, rivers, streams and wetlands. The current legislative session was no exception. Promises, yes, but little in the way of delivery.

My particular interest happens to be lakes. For more than 80 years I have fished and boated Minnesota lakes from the southern border to the northern lakes region. Those experiences and the testimony of other observers have convinced me that, to a greater or lesser extent, almost all lakes are suffering from a variety of "ailments": property development that is either inappropriate or excessive, septic and other waste contamination, air-borne and non-point source pollution, overly heavy fishing and boating pressure, wind and water erosion, agricultural runoff, industrial and municipal discharges, invasions of exotic species, habitat destruction, careless shore land management practices, and more.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Each alone is a clear threat to long-term resource health. Combine them and they spell looming disaster: serious and continued damage to the jewels in Minnesota's crown -- the thousands of lakes that annually draw hordes of visitors to the state, entice natives to vacation at home (and, increasingly, to make it their retirement choice), thereby providing a mega-boost to the state's economy. All of that bounty will fade as surely as the lake country is allowed to slide into decline.

Can anything be done? Yes. And, thanks to initiatives by individuals, lake associations and other local groups, and to the leadership and support provided by Minnesota Waters, whose goal is to preserve and enhance Minnesota's water resources, a few hundred lakes are benefitting from protection programs. But on far too many nothing of that sort is happening, virtually guaranteeing existing problems will only worsen.

All lakes age over time. The immediate challenge is to slow that process, reduce the effect of man's footprint, and even, where possible, reverse negative trends. Because no two lakes are alike, what works for one may need modifying for another. But certain basics are applicable to any lake. It's important to understand, though, that positive results don't happen overnight. Adopters should be prepared for a long-term campaign whose aim is steady, measurable progress.

It is difficult to find words to express the level of my disappointment with President Obama's performance in the environmental area -- particularly with regard to wildlife -- to the present date. The disappointment began with President Obama's appointment of Ken Salazar of Colorado as Secretary of the Interior, succeeding Dirk Kempthorne of Idaho, who succeeded Gale Norton of Colorado, a protégé of an earlier infamous Secretary, James Watt of Colorado. Secretary Salazar's ranching background in the West virtually assured that the days ahead would be difficult for wildlife, and that certainly has proved to be the case.

In March 2007 the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service ("FWS"), an agency of the Interior Department, removed ESA protection for grizzly bears in the GYA. At the time of delisting there were only about 500 bears in the GYA, an increase of only about 200 during over 30 years of ESA protection. There were only about 1,200 of the bears in the western United States; almost all of the bears not in the GYA were in the Glacier National Park area in Montana.[1] Three lawsuits are pending against Interior and FWS to invalidate FWS's delisting of the bears. Two, including one in which I am the plaintiff, are pending in a federal district court in Idaho.[2] The third was filed in a federal district court in Montana, and in September 2009 the Montana court issued a decision in which it invalidated the delisting and restored the bears' pre-delisting protections under the ESA.[3] President Obama's Interior Department, rather than accept the decision of the Montana court, has appealed that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in San Francisco.[4] In other words, the Interior Department continues in litigation to preserve the Bush Administration's removal of protection under the ESA for the relatively few grizzly bears that remain in the GYA

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many good and dedicated people worked incredibly hard to reintroduce wolves in Idaho, Montana and Wyoming after they had been eradicated by human-caused mortalities, but the slaughter resumed in Idaho and Montana due to the Obama Administration's removal of the wolves ESA protection in April 2009. A federal district court in Montana (the same court that issued the decision for the grizzly bears) issued a decision on August 5, 2010, restoring the wolves' ESA protection. The Obama Administration, through the Interior Department, instead of accepting the Montana court's decision, has stated that it is considering whether to appeal that decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. In light of the Obama Administration's appeal of the same Montana court's decision with regard to grizzly bears to that court, as previously mentioned, it appears likely that the decision will be to pursue an appeal in the wolves case

In May 2009 FWS issued a News Release stating that a special rule issued in December 2008 for protecting polar bears under the ESA would be retained and that FWS would closely monitor implementation of the rule to determine if additional measures are required to conserve and recover the polar bear and its habitat. Polar bears are listed as threatened, not endangered, under the current rule. The rule also states that incidental take of polar bears resulting from activities outside the bears' range, such as emission of greenhouse gases, are not prohibited under the ESA. The rule has been properly criticized by many persons on the ground that it does not sufficiently protect polar bears.

President Obama signed a law in May 2009,[1] originally introduced during the Bush Administration, with the backing of the National Rifle Association, that allows loaded, concealed weapons to be carried in our national parks if permitted by state law (as is the case for three states within the GYA). That law surely will lead, among other adverse consequences, to the deaths, through poaching and otherwise, of wildlife in our national parks. We already know of the shooting death of a grizzly bear in Denali National Park in Alaska in May 2010 as a result of this new carry law.

These and other examples show why those of us who care very much about the environment and who were euphoric about the Obama Administration's replacement of the Bush Administration have been let down by President Obama. Today we feel that President Obama's campaign slogan, at least in the environmental area, should have been "no, we won't" instead of "yes, we can." President Obama's Interior and Agriculture Departments appear from the standpoint of wildlife to be carbon copies of those departments under President Bush.

The most important land and water issues facing North America —including land use patterns, water management, biodiversity protection, and climate adaptation—require new approaches. While most of these challenges need to be addressed at several scales simultaneously, ranging from the local to the global, it is increasingly imperative to address them at the scale of large landscapes. The territory of these issues often transcends the legal and geographic reach of existing jurisdictions and institutions. Since no single entity has the power or authority to address these types of crossboundary issues, there is a gap in governance and a corresponding need to create informal and formal ways to work more effectively across boundaries.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

With the increasing movement toward large landscape conservation, several barriers still must be addressed for this approach to land and water conservation to endure. Barriers include the lack of both scientific information and knowledge about the structure and function of large landscape conservation initiatives; the lack of capacity to organize, achieve, and advocate for large landscape conservation goals; the lack of a strategy to facilitate coordination among fragmented efforts and to foster innovative experiments; the lack of policy tools to implement large landscape conservation; and fragmented financial investments.

Growing numbers of conservationists, policy makers, and practitioners agree that the most important land and water issues facing North America require new approaches. Some of these challenges involve protecting ecosystem integrity and connectivity; restoring and protecting water resources; providing access for recreational opportunities; sustaining the working farms, ranches, and forests that are critical to local economies and cultures, and provide important wildlife habitat; protecting and interpreting cultural resources as part of our national heritage; enhancing economic viability and resilience in rural and urban communities; and adapting to climate change.

While most of these conservation challenges need to be addressed at several geographic scales simultaneously, ranging from the local to the global, it is increasingly imperative to address them at the scale of large landscapes because their territories transcend the legal and geographic reach of existing jurisdictions and institutions. Since no single entity has the power or authority to address these types of cross-boundary concerns alone, there is often a gap in governance and a corresponding need to create informal and formal ways to work more effectively across boundaries

The case for the large landscape conservation approach is readily apparent by examining a map of emerging megaregions in the United States. All of these regions, no matter how large the metropolitan footprint, include and rely on resources the cities cannot live without—water, food, energy, wood products, open space, wildlife corridors, and recreational opportunities—sometimes referred to as ecosystem services.

Other considerations such as drought and wildfire create a growing need to develop a capacity to address land use at a more appropriate scale (Stewart, Radeloff, and Hammer 2006). At least in the western United States, much of the rapid growth in recent decades has taken place at what is called the wildland-urban interface. Most of the wildlands fall under the jurisdiction of state or federal land management agencies, while adjacent land development is usually subject to the authority of local governments. Wildfires that start on public land often threaten nearby private homes, whose owners expect to be protected from the advancing flames. Land management agencies, their budgets already stressed, have to make judgment calls about which fires to suppress and which ones to leave burning. In the long run only a shared, cooperative approach to development decisions, operating at the landscape scale and involving local, state, and national entities, can provide a solution to this kind of problem..

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Like land use patterns, water does not respect the artificial boundaries that humans impose on the landscape. No major river basin in the United States conforms exactly to the contours of a state boundary. As a consequence, water resources administration has been characterized by multijurisdictional conflicts from the first days of the republic (Kenney 1994). The need to develop the capacity to manage water at an appropriate scale is heightened by the fact that many of the most arid regions have been, and are likely to remain, the fastest growing parts of the country. Growing populations mean more pressure on scarce water resources, the even greater likelihood of conflict, and the need to manage those resources at the watershed scale. The expansion of metropolitan regions throughout North America that are dependent on the quantity and quality of water often pits upstream and downstream interests against each other. As the frequency and severity of droughts increase, the tendency of water issues to divide rather than unite communities also increases.

Wildlife and plant species inhabit geographies of different sizes and shapes, none of which conforms to legal and political jurisdictions. For many threatened or endangered species, particularly megafauna and migratory birds, the range required for viable populations is very large, and almost always includes parts or all of several adjacent political jurisdictions. Concerns about what we now call biodiversity were present from the earliest stages of the conservation movement over a century ago, and they bore lasting fruit with the enactment of the Endangered Species Act in 1973. Since then, and especially over the past decade or two, there has been a steadily growing awareness that the preservation of many species depends fundamentally on the protection of habitat at a more substantial scale than had previously been understood or thought possible. Spatial scale is now considered critical for biodiversity, both to provide essential habitat and to protect multiple species. The resulting expansion and deepening of commitment to provide adequate habitat and connectivity to preserve these species is clearly a major contributor to the large landscape conservation movement.

Land use patterns, water management, biodiversity protection, and many other conservation issues facing North America are even more challenging in the face of climate change. A report by the U.S. Global Change Research Program (2009) concludes that current and future impacts of climate change are pervasive and wide-ranging, and affect the core systems of society—transportation, ecosystems, agriculture, business, infrastructure, water, and energy. Given this scientific understanding, the report asserts that it is imperative to take action now to adapt to changing conditions.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Climate change provides one of the most compelling cases for the need to develop governance capacity at the scale of the problems. Because greenhouse gases pay no attention to national boundaries, the individuals, communities, states, and nations affected cannot effectively address climate change by reducing carbon emissions unless such efforts are simultaneously undertaken worldwide. Within that global context, specific actions to mitigate climate change can and should occur at national, state, and local levels. At the same time, strategies to adapt to the effects of climate change on land, water, and wildlife must occur at the scale where the impacts are most apparent and the solutions most effective, often at the local level and, increasingly, across regions. When droughts occur, for example, they affect landscapes that bear little or no relationship to existing political jurisdictions. This simple geographic fact of life becomes much more important when climate change makes drought even more persistent across some of those areas. Many of the other effects of climate change, including shifting patterns of vegetation and species composition, and the frequency and intensity of storm events and wildland fire, will likewise manifest themselves regionally, regardless of legal and jurisdictional boundaries.

One of the key challenges facing Freedom to Roam is the lack of a central organizing theme to bring together all the existing, disparate, species-specific or geographically defined corridor efforts, and to harness the potentially great conservation values that would be associated with such a coordinated effort.

The central challenge for America's Longleaf Pine Initiative is moving from plan development to implementation and evaluation. Implementation of the plan relies on voluntary collaborative efforts among many partners. Establishing an effective network for communication, sharing opportunities, managing issues, solving problems, and consistently tracking accomplishments is proving to be a challenge. One specific need is to inventory and map existing longleaf pine restoration efforts in order to prioritize and target available resources. Several partners have already developed the internal strategies and additional capacities that will help them carry out specific components of the ecosystem conservation plan.

Platte River Recovery Implementation Program: The basic barrier or obstacle is to satisfy competing interests during implementation of the plan. Through joint fact-finding and adaptive management, participants are seeking ways to meet the environmental and species protection goals articulated in the plan while simultaneously attending to the competing interests of states and individual water users.

The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor faces the challenge of sustaining momentum into the future—nurturing existing relationships and partnerships, securing more diverse and ongoing sources of funding, providing collaborative leadership, and adapting to new needs and circumstances.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

**Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan:** The NRC also concluded, however, that agency implementation of CERP to date has been mostly programmatic. The NRC and other analysts have noted that (1) the condition of the Everglades ecosystem is declining; (2) the CERP is entangled in procedural matters involving federal approval of projects and lacks consistent infusions of financial support from the federal government; and (3) without rapid implementation of the projects with the greatest potential for Everglades restoration, the opportunity for meaningful restoration may be permanently lost. Other critics fault an unbalanced stakeholder process, which they see as emphasizing development interests concerned about maintaining water supplies over environmental water needs.

**Las Cienegas National Conservation Area:** During negotiations over the bill, Congress and the Arizona State Land Department removed the area between I-10 and the wilderness area from consideration under the SVPP program, thus creating a gap in coverage. The area, known as the Cienega Corridor, is important for cultural, economic, and biological values. Ongoing efforts to protect the Cienega Corridor show promise, but commentators are quick to point out that there are no guarantees. Implementing the adopted plan also seems to be a challenge. Funding staff and monitoring work also remain pressing needs, and the SVPP is currently exploring new organizational structures that allow it to be self-sustaining and play a more active role in helping the BLM implement the plan.

**Tahoe Regional Planning Agency:** TRPA's central challenge is to make continued progress toward the ETCC in the face of changing circumstances, including future and proposed development; fiscal constraints brought about by shrinking state budgets in California and Nevada, as well as uncertainty in federal funding; evolving relationships with local stakeholders; and changes in the environment brought about by climate change.

Policy makers and conservation leaders have responded to a number of emerging large landscape opportunities, but it is not always clear who is doing what within a particular region or across the country as a whole. In addition, the results or outcomes of these efforts often are not well-documented to show how they are building knowledge and relationships, shaping and implementing policies and programs, or improving on-the-ground conditions of natural and cultural resources and local economies. In short, there is no comprehensive inventory of existing and emerging large landscape conservation efforts and their effectiveness.

Likewise, the lack of scientific information and databases on the conditions, trends, and disturbances within large landscapes makes it difficult to set priorities, identify gaps in terms of what is being done and what should be done, and explore opportunities to link existing and emerging efforts. All of this baseline knowledge is critical to facilitate the advancement of well-designed and well-managed large landscape conservation initiatives. Clarifying the nature and scope of these projects, including both scientific and governance factors, will also help frame this important body of work in terms that will resonate with policy makers and the people who inhabit these places

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Another factor limiting the short- and longterm effectiveness of large landscape conservation is the lack of capacity, which plays out in two distinct ways (Center for Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and the Lincoln Institute 2009). First, there is a need to improve the capacity of individuals and organizations to work across boundaries at the scale of large landscapes. Regional practitioners have consistently expressed an interest in acquiring additional information, skills, tools, and resources; learning from one another; and expanding contacts and interaction with government agencies, universities, foundations, and nongovernment organizations. A related need (or opportunity) is to further develop and refine metrics for measuring the progress of large landscape conservation, which in turn will help clarify what is and is not working and why, and how to replicate best practices. Second, as more and more regions organize to advance the objectives of large landscape conservation, it is critical to bring various constituencies together to exchange ideas, identify lessons learned, and clarify best practices. Such efforts will help to develop a community of practice that can advise local, state, and federal government officials, and advocate for policies to promote and support large landscape conservation projects.

A third major challenge limiting large landscape conservation is the lack of an explicit strategy to facilitate coordination among fragmented efforts and to promote and support a variety of innovations and experiments. Policy makers at all levels are becoming more interested in conservation at the scale of large landscapes, but most of the emerging policy responses are still situated within separate legal and institutional “silos” created in the past. Parallel efforts exist within the federal departments of the Interior and Agriculture, for example. Even within Interior, the Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Geological Survey are all pursuing different initiatives according to different spatial and administrative boundaries and overlapping objectives. While there may be good reasons for the variety of current programs, this new era of large landscape conservation requires a more integrated approach.

The nation’s major environmental laws and policies, including the Endangered Species Act, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), National Wildlife Refuge Act, and Clean Water Act, have created strong foundations for conservation through environmental planning, regulation, and public lands acquisition and protection (Coggins et al. 2007). Other laws and policies have established grant programs to enhance private stewardship, particularly conservation grant provisions of the Farm Bill and some Interior Department programs. Some state laws also support conservation on public and private lands. However, these federal and state policies were not designed to facilitate large landscape conservation projects in which multiple agencies must team with other public and private partners and landowners to pursue shared conservation goals.

Furthermore, many government agencies have developed tools and regulations within the context of their traditional statutes to facilitate multispecies protections, collaboration in the NEPA process to identify preferred management alternatives, and other measures consistent with landscape-scale conservation. As currently employed, however, these tools have limited applicability and often are not appropriate to promote and assist large-scale conservation efforts.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As demonstrated earlier, large landscape conservation requires and relies upon partnerships. Among the policy constraints faced by some federal agencies is the lack of clarity on the use of cooperative agreements through which agencies can partner with nonprofit organizations, academic institutions, and other nonfederal entities.

It is also not clear whether and to what extent federal agencies can expend federal funds to support partnership activities, including land restoration and conservation projects.

Another barrier is determining which types of federal relationships with other entities constitute contracting relationships for the purchase of goods and services subject to federal acquisition regulations, and which types constitute partnerships to advance a public purpose. The distinction is important since most contracts must be allocated through competitive bidding processes that are not designed to facilitate the types of ongoing conservation partnerships associated with many landscape-scale initiatives.

Most large landscape conservation initiatives rely on a medley of public and private funding, and over the past two decades diverse public funding sources have emerged to support these efforts. The Department of Agriculture provides billions of dollars in annual conservation funding through multiple grant programs, some of which support large landscape conservation initiatives. The Department of the Interior, Environmental Protection Agency, and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, through its estuaries program, also provide conservation funding. As in the policy arena, however, these programs generally were not designed to support large, multijurisdictional conservation initiatives.

Most funding for landscape-scale conservation and restoration efforts remains within annual budgets and appropriations, thus limiting the potential for multiyear, integrated, and sequenced project planning and implementation

Many large programs must involve multiple federal (and nonfederal) agencies. However, budgeting typically occurs within bureaus that miss opportunities for coordinating and integrating priorities through cross-cut budgeting. Several exceptions that might serve as models for the future are the CALFED Bay-Delta Program and restoration funding in the Everglades and Klamath Basin regions

The Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) focuses on specific projects and land acquisition, rather than strategies to promote and support large landscape conservation partnerships.

The Army Corps of Engineers budgeting for restoration projects has generally been undertaken within the context of the Water Resources Development Act, placing these efforts in competition with more traditional infrastructure projects and requiring them to use cost-benefit processes ill-suited to evaluating restoration benefits.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Funding levels for cross-agency restoration budgets are not commensurate with actual project and program authorizations and needs, and these gaps will grow as the effects of climate change unfold. They are already apparent for large projects such as the Bay-Delta, Chesapeake Bay, and the Everglades, as well as in spending programs such as LWCF, which is authorized at \$900 million annually but has seldom been funded above several hundred million dollars per year (with a few annual exceptions) over the past 20 years.

Some agencies face limitations on their authority to expend funds on lands other than those under their direct jurisdiction, or to pool agency resources into a common restoration fund dedicated to a specific, cross-jurisdictional restoration initiative.

Available funding typically has a targeted focus, such as for habitat conservation planning or wetlands restoration. Few programs are available to support general governance, planning, and monitoring of landscape-scale efforts or multiple project elements that transcend individual program purposes.

Federal agencies use both grants and challenge cost-share programs to fund conservation partnerships and leverage other federal, state, philanthropic, and private funding sources, but several factors limit the full potential of these opportunities. First, matching fund requirements by potential partners sometimes exceed their capacity to meet the match. Second, there is little coordination among grant programs to better leverage funds to focus on the highest priorities. Third, while agencies are improving the use of performance criteria for grant allocation, their application remains inconsistent.

Large landscape conservation is attracting increasing interest in both the public and private sectors, but numerous barriers must be addressed for this approach to land and water conservation to endure:

- the lack of scientific information about large landscapes and their governing structures;
- the lack of capacity to organize, achieve, and advocate for large landscape conservation goals;
- the lack of a strategy to coordinate fragmented efforts and foster innovative experiments;
- the lack of appropriate policy tools to implement large landscape conservation; and
- fragmented financial investments, especially at the federal level.

**Incentive-based Tools for Landowner Conservation** The participation of private landowners is essential, since large landscape conservation initiatives often include both public and private lands, but this may be difficult for several reasons. First, their engagement typically requires investments in time and resources, which may be limited. Second, privately held lands that could usefully serve conservation purposes are often dispersed and fragmented, suggesting the need to assemble multiple blocks of contiguous, high-priority conservation lands. Third, federal laws currently constrain the ability of federal agencies to engage in some types of conservation partnerships by limiting the conditions under which they can operate and share project funding.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many federal grants and other programs provide conservation funding, but current practices limit opportunities to encourage large landscape conservation. Key challenges include how to better coordinate funding across programs and agencies to focus on shared priorities; sustain multiyear funding for projects with phases and sequenced implementation steps; better ensure program effectiveness by allocating funds based on performance criteria; and use funding to create incentives for conservation.

The Flathead Indian Reservation of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes is a shining example of the conservation leadership, commitment, and sacrifice of many native nations. Our reservation encompasses over 1.2 million acres of some of the best fish and wildlife habitat in the nation, including over four hundred miles of streams, seventy thousand acres of lakes, over a quarter million acres of uplands and wetlands, ninety-two thousand acres of tribal wilderness, nearly one hundred thousand acres of primitive areas, fifteen thousand acres of fish and wildlife conservation areas, seventy-two miles and ten thousand acres of scenic river corridor, over one hundred miles of trails and over sixty five recreation sites.

Under the US Fish & Wildlife Service's existing formula for allocation to the states and territories of Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson monies, license holders who utilize tribal lands and water contribute hundreds of millions of dollars annually (over \$740 million in 2009 alone and \$18 million to the state of Montana in 2008-2009). Despite this, American Indian tribes do not qualify for either Federal Aid funding or Land and Water Conservation funds..

Tribes also do not receive funding under either Section 6 of the Endangered Species Act (some \$67 million in 2009 to state and US territories, the Multi-State Conservation Grant program (\$6 million in 2009) or State Wildlife Grant Programs (\$9 million in 2009). Again, this is a particular concern for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, who for many years have successfully managed numerous threatened and endangered species, including grizzly bears, wolves, peregrine falcons, and bald eagles, and have successfully introduced others, including trumpeter swans.

Tribes also do not receive any funding through the Clean Vessel Act (\$14 million in 2009) or Boating Infrastructure Grants (\$2.5 million in 2009). Again, this omission is a special concern for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, who actively manage fish, water quality, and boating activities on Flathead Lake, the most popular fishing destination in the region, as well as other major bodies of water such as the Lower Flathead River, all of which are currently threatened by the potential introduction of non-native plants and mussels.

Today's children are spending less time outdoors in nature than any generation in history. Best-selling author Richard Louv coined the phrase Nature Deficit Disorder to describe this relatively recent phenomenon that is shaping the way our children relate to the natural world.

there is not ever going to be enough.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of the greatest attributes of this country is it's great natural beauty. Once it's gone, it's virually impossible to get it back. We don't want our great land turning into a barren, toxic waste dump! That's not a proper legacy for our children and the generations to follow them.

I sincerely feel sorry for anyone who doesn't love the outdoors and wild places enough to protect them. They should not be used for any individual or companies monetary gain.

Now more than ever, we need places where we can go for quiet recreation and to see wildlife and the natural world.

I recently spent a week in the Mammoth Lake/Devils Postpile area of the California Sierra - half the trees are dead. I then spent 2 weeks in Yosemite National Park - half the trees are dead. On the way back to Oregon I passed through about 70 miles of the Fremont Nation Forest in south central Oregon - half the trees are dead. Spreading bark beetle infestation due to a warmer climate. It may already be too late

To Whom it May Concern, Please stop closing our Public Lands. Access to the outdoors by the public helps keep our citizens physically and mentally healthy, thus reducing medical costs. Not all public land users are able-bodied youngsters. Vehicular travel (from motorcycling, ATV's and four wheel drive travel) is a neccesity for many so many Americans to see the beauty of this country. Please don't take any more land away from us, the people who love and recreate on our Public Lands.

What disturbs me the most is that Washington does not seem to be listening to the wishes of the masses. I want access to the public land that allows me to recreate in the manner I prefer. I believe we need wilderness areas but not everything needs to be wilderness. Remember not all Americans want limited access.

Provide Increased access to Our national Forests stop all logging in the national Forests fire Ken Salazar!He is no conservationist.

Preservation means saving from destruction. Why do we always have to fight to keep our natural resources and preserved lands from corporate greed. These wilderness should be saved for the American people to have and to hold as pristine as they were when our grandparents seen them.

We must share land with the rest of the inhabitants on earth, instead of conquering. Decreasing our dependence on fossil fuels (all the mining accidents and oil spills are evidence of this need) will also decrease the destruction of nature.

It would be unforgivable for us to eradicate the remaining wilderness areas in this great country and leave our children and grandchildren with no natural spaces, no wolves, no free-roaming bison or mustangs.

As an Arizona resident I am very concerned about the constant attempts to create industry and mining claims near the Grand Canyon that jeopardize what I consider to be an irreplaceable natural wonder. We simply must do all we can to protect our parks.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Oil and coal mining pollution has destroyed our landscape and done little to improve our energy resources. We are lightyears behind other countries in inventing and utilizing alternate energy solutions and if nothing serious changes we will destroy our beautiful lands.

When push comes to shove Nature is what makes life worth living. A future with nothing but concrete sidewalks and structures is a very bleak one in my eyes.

We need to keep as many natural places as possible. For one reason, they are much more healthier.

They are priceless and should be one of our country's top priorities.

Those who deeply love Nature are the most devoted stewards of the environment. If everyone truly loved our natural environment, climate change would not even be a concern. We must teach future generations to appreciate the wonders of Nature, and to do that, we must ensure that our great wilderness areas remain unspoiled.

Only a fool doesn't take care of what's taking care of him!

This year has been among the most brutal on our beautiful country's environment and we must take decisive action to correct the damage or we risk losing what we have.

I and many young people like myself care about animals and the environment. I only vote for those who protect and make laws to protect animals and will vote accordingly please please think and vote for these issues. I voted for you and hoped you would get a shelter dog due to puppy mills would you please do something in this area thank you.

It's a sad commentary that to camp out in our national parks it is necessary to reserve with tickets, months in advance. I want my grandchildren have open spaces and more parks available to them, not less.

Our country is unique in that it has a huge variety of landscapes and wildlife all in one nation, do we want future generations to view us as destroyers and takers of nature, or do we want them to view us as stewards of our natural and breathtaking surroundings?

I object to the idea of "fast-tracking" big solar projects. These projects are NOT green and will provide few permanent jobs and little energy. On the other hand, they are extremely destructive to fragile desert ecosystems and threatened species and are highly consumptive of precious desert water reserves. Unfortunately the current approval process allows for the best available science to be disregarded, just like under Bush.

It's time we take responsibility for our actions and do the right thing



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We are at a critical point in our history. The decision made now will irreversibly affect our children and our legacy.

Our very existence depends on how we preserve our land.

I am lucky to have open spaces near my home: the Allandale Woods and the Arnold Arboretum. My wife and I have personally seen mountaintop removal coalmining when visiting friends in West Virginia. We've been horrified by what it does to surrounding communities, their water supplies and their overall environment. It must be stopped. We must switch to a green economy and train those miners for green jobs.

End Mountaintop Removal Coalmining

Man NEEDS to preserve wilderness to save his sanity. Our minds and bodies were designed to be outdoors. Concrete and buildings only suppress our true nature and leads to depression and schizophrenia.

Stop "managing/killing" wildlife populations

Stop leasing public lands/wilderness areas for mineral exploitation by Big Business

Address Conservation at a Large Scale and from a mental and physical health standpoint

Consider the impact vanishing open spaces has on children

In North Carolina we added new state parks recently. But land is being developed quickly and we need to protect more of it before it is too late.

There are too many parks that have now been closed due to lack of funding for basic maintaining.

Fully fund the National Parks

Fund to eliminate the maintenance backlog by 2015

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

\* Fund to increase the parks that need it, and to buy new land for new parks.

Expand and protect our National Parks and Wilderness areas

Honor the endangered species act

It's too precious to waste!

I am fully confident that this administration is already aware of the importance of our environment, so this note simply serves as a 'reminder' and that it is of vital importance to me. Our planet has been evolving for millions of years; how can we destroy it in mere hundreds?

I grew up in the beautiful State of Maine, in a rural area where the elders taught me to recognize the native plants and trees. I knew them by name. I lost that connection to the land, which I took for granted, when I moved to the other side of the country. Whenever I return to Maine, I am shocked and saddened to see how many of the wild spaces I remember have been built up, cultivated, or "prettified" so that all you see is grass, rather than Queen Anne's Lace, daisies, milkweed, and joe-pye-weed. This is a huge loss--those who never knew those plants will not know what they are missing. I hope you will make the conservation of natural areas a top priority.

Please preserve Montana's Bitter Creek & Montana Glaciated Plains as National Monuments. Since the majority of these lands are already Federally owned, this will be a chance to preserve the great plains and re-establish Bison and Grizzly Bear in their original territory. Lewis & Clark first encountered Grizzly in this area and its time to preserve the Big Open. There are a lot of misconceptions and lies about taking over these lands from (heavily subsidized) ranchers, claiming the 'king is taking over our lands' (Congressmen Rehberg email). Its a shame that some politicians play the hate and misinformation games.

I grew up in the Pacific Northwest enjoying Mount Ranier, the North Cascades and the Olympic Peninsula and believe strongly that the National Parks, National Forests, and all our natural treasures are irreplaceable!

Not just for people, but for the animals that make these places their homes.

What we have is all there is - or will be. We must be faithful stewards of the earth.

We should be ashamed that it takes a letter to the White House to save a piece of nature for our children.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ban all Mineral extraction and exploration, both currently and in the future

Ban all Fossil Fuel extraction and exploration, now and in the future

Ban all off-road, snow mobile, and ATV from Public Lands forever

Ban all hunting on Public Land

Make hunting on Public Land punishable with a 20 minimum sentence

Make hunting of Wolves punishable with a 50 year minimum sentence

Ban all current and future logging on Public Land

Fine anyone damaging Public Lands \$1,000,000 per incident

Buy more Public Lands and prevent any development on them forever

I am very worried that many people, especially people in metropolitan centers, often feel very disconnected from what people refer to as the 'natural world'. They may lack the opportunity or the inclination to become exposed to the 'natural world' that I believe is crucial to them developing that personal connection that I mention above.

In the United States, we are blessed by having public lands that are set aside for the use and enjoyment of all the people. The federal role in the administration of these lands is invariably driven by the agenda of the administration in power. The current administration appears sensitive to the interests of the conservation community but there is no guarantee that the next administration will share this perspective. I believe that a more comprehensive understanding of the 'natural world' serves all people regardless of political affiliation. As a world population we are presented with many natural resource challenges (e.g. climate change, deteriorating air quality, limited access to potable water, loss of arable land, etc). I believe that the federal government could be of great assistance in promoting the education of people with respect to the natural resource challenges that we face.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe in you, and your abilities to transform our nation into a better place.

I truly believe that if more people would go outside and reconnect with nature, that the world would be a better place. It always feels so good to be with the trees, breath fresh air and forget about one's problems. Nature is peaceful and replenishing, but the large corporations that run the world are exploiting it for profit. If something isn't done to protect the wilderness pretty soon, it will cease to exist and we'll only be left with cities and concrete - - how depressing!

We've been witnessing the devastation of our environment by private enterprises unconcerned with the future.

I grew up camping, fishing and doing many other outdoor activities. I want these opportunities to be available to the next generation. Without stronger protections for the beautiful wild spaces we have, and making additions of protected wild places, we will lose these beautiful places and have only concrete and polluted air and water to live in. I want fresh air, and tall trees to escape to, no concrete jungles and noisy traffic.

Roadless areas should remain roadless

The government was intrusted with public lands by American citizens for conservation not: mining, drilling, nor logging

Once it's gone, it's gone and very difficult to bring back.

It has been very hard for many of us this summer with so many parks being closed down. We are supposed to be working toward making our country better for the future not selling off our wonderful reserves. I so hope the funding can be found to reopen and fix up these parks so we all once again can go for hikes and camp in our wonderful park. We need to keep adding more new nature park areas not cutting them back.

I live in an area that is blessed with abundant natural beauty, and it is beginning to be eroded

Also, I feel it is imperative to re-green our cities to the fullest extent possible by reducing asphalt cover, introducing bioswale catchments around parking lots and roadways, and by planting native plants everywhere possible to create wildlife habitat, reduce flood damage and improve livability and quality of life.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It has been very hard for many of us this summer with so many parks being closed down. We are supposed to be working toward making our country better for the future not selling off our wonderful reserves. I so hope the funding can be found to reopen and fix up these parks so we all once again can go for hikes and camp in our wonderful park. We need to keep adding more new nature park areas not cutting them back.

Let's not forget that in order to protect these "outdoor" spaces that you MUST REGULATE THE EXCREMENT out of the greedy and power-hungry Capitalist Corpotechnocratic elements of our Plutonomy (Democracy died during the Bush-Cheney years). The richest people and corporations must not be allowed to pollute or develop these areas without receiving huge fines and prison sentences.

The wild places are becoming fewer and fewer, and far too few are presently being developed for short-term personal gain.

I am an Interpretive, Naturalist Guide, in Denali National Park, Alaska. It is clear that Denali, and the FEW places, left, like it, are dwindling islands. We ARE on the brink and I, sincerely, doubt anything can be done to change the non-caring, destructive and greedy, mostly, corporate tide, destroying OUR environment. Somebody should take notice and do something NOW!

Thank you also for all that you are doing to hold this country, this world together. Please don't let us lose our 'outdoor spaces' as we move on with progress. Once our nation is nothing but sidewalks, asphalt and shopping malls, well, it won't be much of a nation.

Saving America's nlast r emaining natural p[laces is not only about recreation. It is about survival for many plant and animal species and their habitats. And ultimately, it's about preserving our nation's character and legacy form further development and encroachment. We have already lost more than we should have. The destruction of more forests, grasslands, archaeologicvalk sites and other heritage resources is unthinkable. Conservation of these priceless resources is the only way to save them from destruction. It will take courage and bold leadership to resist pressues from many corporate and other special interest groups. To ensure that our nation's wildlife, plus its natural and cultural resources are protected and always available for future generations, please consider these priorities for America's Great

I do not feel our public lands should be used for business purposes, (ie timbering or mining) those ventures have their own capital to purchase lands and do not need the public lands, NO MATTER WHAT RESOURCES ARE THERE OR UNDER THERE. Timbering and fire burns for land management are necessary within reason, but not clear-cut thousand of acres in a swath.

Here in the northeast, so much land has been squandered in shopping malls, parking lots, and suburban sprall. These are so few natural areas left where we can walk, ride a bike, and generally enjoy the country side.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am amazed at how many petitions we have to sign and how many letters we have to write to try to secure some sort of legislation for what should be obvious; we need to respect and protect our natural resources! Isn't this apparent in the wake of these recent disasters? Isn't this a no brainer? What type of governing body would want to sacrifice our natural resources, which once destroyed, are nearly impossible to recover? And for what? Fuel, convenience, PROGRESS? How progressive will it be to future generations when they have no resources to fall back on? No land to cultivate or parks and forests to enjoy? What about the invaluable role these resources play in our fragile ecosystem? It is scientifically proven that when our forests and streams are irreperably altered, our country and the entire planet feels the effects and suffers for the mistakes we have made. The Forest Service is currently spending millions on road reclamation projects because of the now-realized damages that were done to the national forests when they built logging, lookout and recreational roads. While this is a step in the right direction, it will not restore the landscape to what it once was and it will not undo that damage that has already been done. It is so much more expensive to try to go back and fix mistakes that were made than it is to see the big picture and make decisions based on all the variable not just the current bottom dollar and instant gratification mentality the US has become infamous for.

I AM A REGULAR CAMPER AND I HAVE SEEN MANY AREAS WHERE I USE TO CAMP DISAPPEAR PLEASE REVERSE WHAT I HAVE SEEN.

Our beautiful land must be protected, not only for the next generation, but for ourselves. right now. Little by little we are exterminating forests, whole animal species, water resources, and we will end up exterminating ourselves! You are a great leader, and I am sure you can make a historical difference by taking the urgent steps for this important matter.

Address conservation issues - particularly poor city dwellers who do not have these opportunities - that do not include invasive or harmful roads or trails for noisy motorized vehicles - - Increase funding of programs that reintroduce top predators to natural ecosystems

There is so little left of America's great outdoors. We need to preserve it for future generations.

About twenty years ago, my wife and I enjoyed the privilege of visiting Glacier National Park. I wish every American, every human being in fact, could experience that beauty. Unfortunately, the glacier is receding and in a few more years will disappear entirely. This is due to global warming, but can serve as an apt illustration for anyone who would like to know what it would be like to lose any of the natural beauty of our wilderness.

If we don't protect it now, it could be lost forever! Nature is awesome!!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

wild We have nature today, but future generations may not. As leader of the free world, please stand up for what is best for all people and our fragile planet.

The protection is important in more ways than just the enjoyment of the natural state. Areas like water sheds are vital to protect cities from flooding and water supplies purity

Remember, without protection for our planet and conscious stewardship of her many resources, we may soon have no planet upon which to stand.

As a concerned citizen and someone who exercises my right to vote, I am very concerned about the potential damage done to our country's wilderness areas and our now very fragile ecosystems.

For years now my touchstone with spirituality has been the time I spend in the natural world. My trips into the mountains, particularly the Sierra Nevada have been one of the strongest connections with my family as well. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand At a time when the corporations are taking over our government, buying up farm and timberlands for their own exploitation, the preservation of what remains untouched is of paramount importance. - - - This is of the greatest importance to me, my family and future generations.

The world's wildlife habitat is shrinking at an alarming rate, despite ample evidence that the health of the planet and the human race depend on wilderness.

Without adequate funding, these ideas and proposals will not produce the desired results.

Urban sprawl has spread over so much of our increasingly congested, noisy and overpopulated nation. So much of this country has been paved over and "malled".

When I think of all God's creatures who have been killed, left homeless,ect.it really makes me sad. Animals, flowers, lakes , trees, mountains, oceans,praires, how we are destroying them and by doing this we are slowly destroying ourselves. All of us are a part of this universe and we all have a roll to play. I read this morning that people have the right to go out and kill wolves, adult and young. Who are we to go out and kill animals. Soon wolves, polar bears, tigers, elephants and more are being knocked right off this earth for selfish reasons.With abortion, killing of innocent animals, destroying our forests, taking away our farmlands for building houses which no one can live in because they are too expensive, leaving our own citizens on the streets with no source of fooding, clothes and shelters, killing other human beings because of a crime they may or may not have committed, treating Native Americans as something to forget about, and of course our still abiding racism. Our culture is a culture of death. I guess I went further into this than what was called for because the purpose of this email is to Protect America's great outdoors, but I want all good things to be protected

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I want the all of the next generations, human as well as non-human, to enjoy America's great outdoors. Our legacy as a species is wearing thin if we do not take some very bold steps to ensure life and beauty for future generations.

I relocated from an urban area to a rural one in order for my children to have greater access to nature. I am concerned that timber logging and water pollution will endanger the rural area in which I now reside.

Preservation of America's great outdoor environment was neglected, even endangered, for eight long years under the Bush-Cheney administration.

If we don't take serious measures to curb Global Warming, none of these other measures will matter.

, I am concerned about the future of America as reflected in the care we take of our natural beauty. We are a country of immigrants who have come to love our new homeland. In essence we do not own this land, it has been loaned to us by future generations.

Having access to the outdoors and learning about the natural world has always been an important part of my life, whether living in the Northeast, Oregon, or in Arizona. The recent loss of state funding for parks in Arizona, resulting in the temporary or permanent closure of many of my favorite beautiful, wild areas, including Red Rocks State Park, Tonto Natural Bridge State Park, and the park in Jerome, has been a horrible and scary loss for this state. Please do all you can to expand protections of natural lands and resources across the country, and to set in place policies that will protect these lands and connect our citizens to them for generations to come.

We have seen too many disasters in our generation that have spoiled the beauty that the US has to offer. Let's not keep making mistakes and let us have something to cherish now and for the future. I love all the wildlife and trails that the state of Washington has to offer, it wasn't until I was able to actually see the beauty firsthand that I started to discover and enjoy the diversity that we have in our nation.

The Obama Administration has a unique opportunity to set the course for America's newest system of protected public land, the National Landscape Conservation System- our National Conservation Lands. Without a clear vision, BLM lacks the direction to manage the National Conservation Lands as a truly unique collection of extraordinary places. The BLM needs clear guidance from the Secretary of the Interior in order to make the internal changes necessary to properly manage the natural and cultural treasures found within the National Conservation Lands.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

#### Name Change

One of the biggest issues facing the "National Landscape Conservation System" is the name itself.

The American public will have a hard time learning about and embracing a collection of lands, when the name is long, confusing and misleading. Our National Parks invoke an image of Yellowstone's Old Faithfull and the Teton Mountain Range. Based on focus group testing throughout the west- National Landscape Conservation System invokes an image of shrubbery or a bureaucratic system. Please officially adopt the name- our National Conservation Lands to describe this relatively new but important collection of lands, waters and trails.

#### Name Change

One of the biggest issues facing the "National Landscape Conservation System" is the name itself.

The American public will have a hard time learning about and embracing a collection of lands, when the name is long, confusing and misleading. Our National Parks invoke an image of Yellowstone's Old Faithfull and the Teton Mountain Range. Based on focus group testing throughout the west- National Landscape Conservation System invokes an image of shrubbery or a bureaucratic system. Please officially adopt the name- our National Conservation Lands to describe this relatively new but important collection of lands, waters and trails.

#### Name Change

One of the biggest issues facing the "National Landscape Conservation System" is the name itself.

The American public will have a hard time learning about and embracing a collection of lands, when the name is long, confusing and misleading. Our National Parks invoke an image of Yellowstone's Old Faithfull and the Teton Mountain Range. Based on focus group testing throughout the west- National Landscape Conservation System invokes an image of shrubbery or a bureaucratic system. Please officially adopt the name- our National Conservation Lands to describe this relatively new but important collection of lands, waters and trails.

#### Policy Recommendations

1) Make the conservation, protection and restoration of the National Conservation Lands a clear management priority within the BLM

Despite the clear conservation-focused management priorities set forth in the organic legislation and presidential proclamations for areas within the National Conservation Lands, the BLM is not consistently managing the units of the National Conservation Lands to protect the values that led to their creation. As a result the National Conservation Lands are a hodgepodge of inconsistent management regimes. The National Conservation Lands deserve strong policy guidance from the Department of the Interior that ensures their protection.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This year we celebrate the 10th anniversary of the National Conservation Lands. Even with much to celebrate, our National Conservation Lands still lack a unifying management vision as well as the necessary policies and procedures to ensure adequate protection of their outstanding resources. It is time for the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management to set the management directives that will protect the National Conservation Lands in a way that recognizes and protects their significant natural and cultural values and responds to this unique time in history.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Denver Post, September 19, 2010 opinion editorial

Ensuring full funding for Land and Water Conservation Fund

By Andrew Currie, Ken Strom, and Erica Stock

If you live in Colorado, you know that we are privileged to enjoy countless breathtaking vistas, magical wilderness areas laced with free-flowing rivers, and highly-rated urban parks and trails every day for recreation, sports or just some peace and quiet.

What many of us might not know is that a large number of our most beloved lakes, streams, woodlands, local parks and playgrounds have been protected for us by the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). The LWCF is the principal source of federal dollars for protecting land in America's national parks, forests, and other public landscapes and ensuring recreational opportunities for Americans in every state in the nation. LWCF helps fund many of Colorado's recreation areas like the Platte River trail system, Castlewood Canyon State Park and Garden of the Gods, as well as national treasures like Yellowstone National Park, California's Big Sur Coast, Florida's Everglades, and historic Civil War battlefields.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was created by Congress in 1965 and is authorized to receive \$900 million annually in federal revenues from offshore oil and gas leasing. Unfortunately, the LWCF program has received full funding only once in its history. In recent years, it has steadily declined to a low in appropriated funding of \$155 million in 2008, and in total has been shortchanged about \$17 billion since its inception. Despite this, the LWCF has worked in every state of the Union - indeed nearly every county in every district in America - to fund state and local park activities. These projects contribute not only to our natural environment, but also create jobs and draw visitors for recreation, sporting and other activities.

Colorado's treasure of mountains, rivers and great outdoors brings in hundreds of thousands of outdoor recreationists annually - participating in bicycling, camping, fishing, hunting, paddling, snow sports, hiking, climbing and wildlife viewing - who generate an estimated \$10 billion in state tax revenues and retail sales and services across the state while supporting over 100,000 jobs.

LWCF began as part of a simple deal: as America's oil and gas was extracted from federal lands and waters, a portion of the associated revenue was intended to be reinvested in conservation of the lands and waters Americans care about. But even though there's been more than enough revenue year after year from the oil and gas leasing to fully fund LWCF at no cost to the American taxpayer, Congress has diverted the funds and failed to use the money for its intended purpose.

Efforts are underway, supported by groups across Colorado and the nation, to insure the long overdue full funding for LWCF. Recently on July 30, the issue to fully fund LWCF passed in the U.S House of Representatives. We applaud our Colorado delegates heartily for their efforts and role in this success. Congresswoman Betsy Markey, 4th District Colorado, cast her affirmative vote that day joining Jared Polis and Diana DeGette, and Colorado U.S. Senators Mark Udall and Michael Bennet were instrumental by cosponsoring legislation in the Senate that would ensure a dedicated source for permanent full funding of LWCF.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

But the fight to make things right is not over. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has tabled the Senate's discussion and vote on the L WCF until after the August recess, fearing he would not have enough votes to pass the issue. We must ensure that full and pennant funding for L WCF remains a priority in September.

Let's make this extraordinary value crystal "clear" for Congress. We greatly appreciate what Congresswoman Markey, Senator Udall, Senator Bennet and others have already accomplished, and we urge our Colorado Senators to keep up their strong leadership as the L WCF goes before the Senate, and to continue their robust support.

A victory here will finally and rightfully ensure full and dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, one of our best tools for conserving the Nation's great outdoors, increasing recreational access to our favorite parks and natural places, and supporting the tourist and recreation industry jobs and businesses that in large measure contribute to Colorado's economic health.

Andrew Currie is founder of Conservation Havens, LLC Ken Strom is the director of Audubon Colorado, the state program of the National Audubon Society. Erica Stock is the outreach director for Colorado Trout Unlimited  
Denver Post,

#### 3) Get youth more involved in their community

a. Drinking and drugs inhibit outdoor recreation on reservations and youth who want to get outside are made fun of. Adults need to get the message that they need to set better examples for the young people on reservations.

#### Conservation in America Faces Significant Challenges

While there is broad public support for conservation of natural, cultural, and recreational resources, these resources are threatened by an ever-growing population, unplanned development, climate change, and unsustainable demands on water resources. The cumulative impact of these threats, if we do not respond to them, will be an accelerated fragmentation of the American countryside, the separation of plants and animals from their essential habitats, of watersheds from downstream estuaries, of people from experiences in the outdoors, and of Americans from our common historic and natural heritage.

Protect natural system integrity and connectivity. Healthy lands safeguard our watersheds, providing clean drinking water for millions of people and habitat for the diversity of America's plant and animal species. Our protected lands and waters, however, are not always well-connected or large enough to maintain viable wildlife populations or sustain natural ecological processes.

The protection of wildlife corridors maintains the integrity of our past century's conservation investment and ensures that American citizens can be connected to the natural places they need for health and recreation. To not connect, to not protect, will jeopardize not just wildlife but the values in life that we Americans have enjoyed for more than two centuries.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Recent data indicates that the increased incentives have resulted in the protection of upwards of one million acres a year since they were first enacted in 2006. Despite this success, the incentives are set to expire at the end of this year.

There is a policy shift occurring in the U.S. toward enacting tax credits against income due for conservation related donations. Conservation experts agree that credits are a broader and more effective incentive than deductions. Two main factors are causing this shift. First, conservation tax incentives are a sound mechanism for creating certainty during times of inconsistent and unpredictable conservation funding trends. Second, growing concerns about uncontrolled exurban expansion (particularly relating to forest intrusions around metropolitan areas) continue to galvanize support for greater federal investment in private land conservation.

While the underlying policy rationale for the enactment of transferable credits is sound, there are a number of perceived and real difficulties inherent in establishing functional, sustainable, and enforceable credit markets that must be overcome to generate the support needed to enact federal conservation tax credits. Many of these difficulties can be reconciled through administrative adaptation as part of the implementation and enforcement process while others can be addressed through public education.

The science demonstrates that trees take up the carbon from the atmosphere which is then released upon combustion. To sustain the greenhouse gas benefits of the biogenic carbon cycle, trees and crops are re-grown, thus continuing carbon absorption across forested and agricultural landscapes and ensuring future supplies of biomass. When national inventories, such as in the United States, demonstrate that forest and other feedstock inventories are maintained or increased, there is no additional carbon released to the atmosphere.

If left unchanged, EPA's Tailoring Rule will impose significant and unnecessary regulatory burdens and economic impacts on biomass power producers and rural communities, and threatens to chill investment in renewable energy production. This will frustrate the environmental goals of shifting to renewable energy and will contribute to an international competitive imbalance with countries that do recognize this scientific principle. Ultimately, these impediments to the use of biomass for renewable energy generation will eliminate this market for working forests, thus adding to the economic pressures on maintaining forestland.

Furthermore, the Tailoring Rule and other related policies will depress markets for biomass energy in favor of fossil fuels and weaken the economic viability of working forests and the rural jobs they support. This contravenes both the President's renewable energy and AGOI objectives and creates significant confusion regarding the role working forests will play under the policies of this administration. NAFO explained these principles and consequences in detail in its recent comments in response to EPA's July 15, 2010 Call for Information. These comments may be reviewed at <http://nafoalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/NAFO-call-for-information-comments.pdf>.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To maintain their land as forests, landowners require economic and sustainable management practices. We support the government's conservation programs that support this management, but costs may be imposed on management from various sources, including tax, equipment, and most recently, regulation. Since 1976, the forest management has been considered a nonpoint source under the Clean Water Act. This means that forest landowners employ best management practices to protect water quality rather than obtaining NPDES permits from EPA or the applicable state authority. Studies have shown that nationally, the overall BMP implementation rate is 89%, and has been increasing steadily. Ice, G.G., Schilling, E., and Vowell, J. Trends for Forestry Best Management Practices Implementation. Journal of Forestry (September 2010).

Despite this record, recent federal court decisions have eroded EPA's regulation establishing forest management as a nonpoint source. EPA is proceeding with a general permit for pesticide applications pursuant to one decision. The second decision, affecting forest roads with stormwater control systems, has just been issued and its impact is unknown at this time. No matter how EPA proceeds, NPDES permits for these activities are redundant regulatory systems that will increase forest management costs.

The Mid-Atlantic Highlands Region of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania is within an hour's drive of 25 million people, supplies drinking water to 15 million people, and is under constant threat from suburban sprawl and industrial development.

To the vast majority of youth, the valleys, mountains, deserts and plains across our Nation are connected. Ribbons of highways and trains, skies, waterways, make a yet unrecognized frontier. But for many, their playgrounds are concrete, their food sources unknown. Their best friend may be a television.

On behalf of the youth of the Hudson Valley, the Hudson River Sloop Clearwater (Clearwater) is submitting the enclosed recommendations entitled 'The Next Generation of Environmental Leaders: Local Solutions for National Challenges' for your consideration.

'Start young, we should start with young people and getting them outdoors...We need jobs for young people, not just jobs but jobs that bring them out into the outdoors... I think the outdoors is such a great way out of poverty, of the life that people are living in today...The outdoors is a great solution.'

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

With America's Great Outdoors Initiative (AGOI), President Barack Obama has made it clear that it is a national priority to engage young people, especially those who live in our Nation's under-resourced innercities, and to find the means and ways to get them outdoors to experience our unique natural heritage. As Americans, we have conquered many new frontiers in our nation's history—one could say it is inherently American to strive for that next lofty goal. In the 21st century, we must ask what will our children's new frontiers be? In order to allow them to conquer the new frontiers of economic depression, childhood obesity, lack of access to the outdoors, and training in sustainable green jobs, we must support programs that implement the goals of this initiative. First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move initiative is yet another example of an attainable goal of combating childhood obesity within a generation. We must ensure that our next generation of leaders can succeed and, with the AGOI, we can solidify the groundwork for success for our children.

Children living in underserved and urban areas are the people most vulnerable to the effects of pollution: poor air quality has contributed to record asthma rates; lower income families are eating contaminated fish; exposure to contaminants lowers IQ and contributes to developmental disabilities and cancer. Yet it is our children who will be asked to solve the daunting environmental problems of the future. Too often urban children feel disconnected from the environment. Faced with the daily pressures of city life, the exploration of their available natural environment becomes an abstract concept, never mind the preservation and protection of their outdoors. If we want our children to grow up to be active and continually involved problem solvers they need to see that the environment is a vital part of their lives. In truth, they must realize there is no separation from human health and that of the health of their surroundings: public health is environmental health. Children from underserved and urban communities have the most to gain from such experiences, but these communities often have the fewest resources to devote to such programs.

According to a recent study through the University of Illinois, Chicago, more and more children are not experiencing the outdoors, leading to a detachment from nature and a trend in unhealthy lifestyles. Participation in nature activities is down 18 to 25 percent since peak levels (National Academy of Sciences- Oliver Pergams, University of Illinois Chicago, Feb. 2008). "The replacement of vigorous outdoor activities by sedentary, indoor videophilia has far-reaching consequences for physical and mental health, especially in children," Pergams said. "Videophilia has been shown to be a cause of obesity, lack of socialization, attention disorders and poor academic performance. We don't see how this can be good for conservation. We don't see how future generations, with less exploration of nature, will be as interested in conservation as past generations."

On the ground and on the water, Clearwater has consistently found that the cities that we all live and work in are all different—the main exception being that they all share the same environmental problems. These communities are cut off from the very river that first gave them their historical and cultural identity. Train tracks, highways, and industry disconnect these communities from the river: the biggest natural feature directly in many of their backyards. Such a separation cannot foster the development of future leaders willing to solve the serious environmental and health issues of the next decades.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Environmental education is widely recognized as vital in developing an informed and engaged citizenry. The National Science Foundation's Advisory Committee for Environmental Research and Education noted that "in the coming decades, the public will more frequently be called upon to understand complex environmental issues, assess risk, evaluate proposed environmental plans and understand how individual decisions affect the environment at local and global scales. Creating a scientifically informed citizenry requires a concerted, systematic approach to environmental education..." (www.cbf.org)

Fostering Young Americans to Become Hunters and Anglers – The past decade has seen a decline in the number of hunters and anglers in this country. This is attributable to many causes, but is undoubtedly reason for concern. Children today are spending half as much time outdoors as children did 20 years ago, which has immediate health impacts and long term conservation impacts. Young Americans who hunt and fish are more connected to the outdoors, more likely to develop strong conservation values, and will help support conservation efforts throughout their lifetime.

Supporting Private and Public Land Conservation and Partnerships – Wildlife does not know political boundaries or boundaries of public and private land. Wildlife habitat must therefore be conserved on public and private land across the country. Habitats such as grasslands, the prairie pothole region, forests, coastal wetlands and marshes, and sage brush are critical breeding ground for game species as well as good hunting habitat, as such they should be conserved and managed to support and enhance healthy wildlife populations. The Administration should support efforts to help private landowners enhance, restore and protect these and other natural habitats on their land, while ensuring that public lands are managed in a way that supports healthy fish and wildlife populations.

Providing Recreational Access – As many private landowners continue to restrict hunting and angling opportunities on their lands, and many public lands are developed for resource extraction, opportunities across our nation to hunt and fish are dwindling. The Administration should retain and enhance sportsmen access to public and private lands. Hunting and angling opportunities need to be given stronger weight during consideration of public lands development and resource extraction. Invaluable and irreplaceable wildlife habitat areas need to be conserved and properly managed to retain their values while other public lands must balance development and recreational uses.

Funding Conservation – Whether it's hunter/angler and outdoors education, land conservation or protecting clean water, inadequate funding is a major impediment. To conserve America's Great Outdoors for the 21st Century, the Administration must prioritize funding for conservation, including \$900 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As you all explained, the administration is in the process finalizing the basic organization of the AGO Initiative report and settling on a handful of unifying themes. Given the huge amount of data generated through the various listening sessions, reports and online submissions, this distillation process is exceedingly important to the overall success of the AGO Initiative. The themes need to be thoughtfully crafted so that, as one of you put it, “people can see themselves in the report.” We could not agree more.

Rocky Mountain Front Initiative, Montana. Where Montana’s dramatic peaks give way to the Northern Great Plains, the Rocky Mountain Front forms a landscape unlike any other in America. With its large working ranches, the Front represents some of the nation’s rarest wildlife habitat – where grizzly bears still roam freely from the mountains to the plains, as they have for centuries. Our changing climate is warming temperatures in the region, creating shifts in wildlife habitat and migratory routes. For example, grizzly bears are ranging farther north than ever before. While the habitat needs of wildlife shifts, increased demand for recreational property and vacation homes threatens this natural area.

Millions of acres across the West have been subdivided over the past 15 years. New homes and roads disrupt wildlife migration routes, and cut off access to breeding grounds, food, and safe haven. For generations, family ranchers have owned large swaths of the land in this region, enabling wildlife to freely migrate. But as financially-strapped ranchers sell off their land, this landscape becomes fragmented.

East Texas Forestland Ownership Use and Change – Longleaf Pine Focus Area. For more than a century, the culture, social fabric, and natural history of East Texas has been shaped by a prosperous, forest-driven economy. During this time, land ownership in East Texas has been relatively stable, with industrial timber companies owning 32% of all East Texas lands, including the majority of the most productive forestland which form the watersheds for a number of rivers that flow into the Gulf of Mexico. These large tracts of working forestland provided economic security and critical wildlife habitat. However, in the last ten years, this longstanding balance has all but disappeared due to global forces that have caused the sale, conversion, and fragmentation of forests across the country.

Since 2000, over 3.5 million acres of forestlands have changed hands at least once in East Texas due to increased global competition, tax policy, and investor demand. Grappling with these changing competitive dynamics, the forest products and paper sector suffered declining stock values, generating concern among Wall Street analysts that the companies had too much capital tied up in forests. These companies, including Temple-Inland, International Paper, Champion International, Louisiana Pacific, and Georgia Pacific, responded with a wholesale divestiture of all of their forestlands. Overall, an estimated 75 million acres – an area larger than the land mass of 45 states – have changed hands nationally, passing from forest products companies to investment companies. Much of this movement occurred between 1996-2006, culminating in International Paper’s 2006 sale of 6.6 million acres and Temple-Inland’s 2007 sale of 1.8 million acres to investment firms.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

These investment firms, called Timber Investment Management Organizations (TIMOs), were well-positioned to buy timberlands because they were flush with capital – most of it provided by large institutional and high-net-worth investors who were attracted to timberland’s modest risk profile and history of impressive returns. Unlike forest products companies, which focused almost exclusively on timber production, these new investment-oriented forest owners also seek to generate returns from parceling, fragmenting, and selling land to private recreation buyers, timber liquidators, and real estate developers.

This shift to short-term investment-oriented ownership has had serious implications for forest conservation. By over-harvesting timber and fragmenting large tracts into smaller parcels, these sales erode the region’s ecological integrity and long-term ability to maintain a viable working forest infrastructure. At stake in East Texas is a multitude of endangered and rare plants and animals, miles and miles of Neches River bottomlands and globally-threatened habitats, and the loss of community identity and population. The Neches River hardwood bottomlands and longleaf pine forests have long been identified as one of the South’s last best intact ecosystems by the FWS, the State of Texas, The Nature Conservancy, and TCF. Downstream, these forests and their watersheds protect drinking water, minimize urban flooding, and clean the air breathed by millions of Texas residents.

Of these lands for sale, The Conservation Fund, with our partners, identified for protection 350,000 acres of East Texas’ most pristine and ecologically valuable river bottom and longleaf pine habitats. For the nation, this is a rare opportunity to conserve forever the best of the East Texas forests that forest products companies, in particular Temple-Inland, assembled, managed and enhanced for decades. These large tracts along the Neches and Sabine Rivers and within Longleaf Ridge are still relatively intact, however as lands continue to change hands, these forests will be fragmented into increasingly smaller pieces and managed in ways incompatible with wildlife protection and regional economic development.

America’s Great Outdoors campaign should recognize that Americans typically take great pride in where they live – their neighborhood, town, metropolitan area and region – but may need some help in understanding how the natural and cultural assets at these various scales can provide increased sustainable economic returns as well as environmental and social ones. Small grants for various forms of technical assistance and education can be essential in increasing access to outdoor resources, developing stewardship needed for the long-term sustainability of land and water resources, and ensuring a livelihood can be made by those taking the lead to conserve America’s many special places for current and future generations. There are several proven ways to build on the pride of place to address environmental, economic, and social challenges, for example:

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

At the Fund, we believe kids have a basic right to a healthy childhood. With major advances in medicine, education and other fields, kids today should enjoy a higher quality of life than ever before. But children are developing chronic health conditions, such as obesity and depression, earlier and more frequently than ever before. Researchers suggest that the decline in children's health is linked, in part, to their growing disconnect from nature and outdoor activity. Children's disconnect from nature, if left unchecked, shortchanges their health and happiness now—and creates a future generation of adults that are less healthy. At the Fund, we also believe that young people who grow up without experiencing nature are much less likely as adults to be strong champions for protecting the outdoors. Kids today already are developing new ways to coordinate, collaborate and communicate for the issues they care about. Let's get the outdoors back on the agenda.

In addition to our wildest public lands, Americans enjoy city parks, waterways and green spaces. While experiencing nature is part of our heritage, we need to ensure that future generations have the opportunity to reconnect with nature.

While conservation successes are significant, so has been the pace of development, resulting in fragmentation of habitat and threats to water quality, as well as the ever-increasing effects of climate change. Our society needs to act boldly to address threats and protect nature for future generations.

We envision a future where there is a recognized national network of natural lands, ranging from city parks to national parks, wildlife refuges, waterways and wilderness areas, that are recognized by all Americans as part of our natural heritage.

These lands need to be protected and connected into the network. But America's Great Outdoors also is about better connecting people, especially our children, to nature. And it is about connecting people to each other, acknowledging that the best conservation outcomes occur when people work together.

While some of our public lands are pristine, many other areas have been degraded due to development in the form of road building, logging, oil and gas drilling and grazing. Many of these lands are the most productive and ecologically diverse lands in the public estate.

People are losing their connection with nature and America's Great Outdoors can focus efforts to help restore people's connection to nature.

As population pressures grow, so too will public demand for additional portals to nature. It is our generation's duty to carry on the tradition of previous generations to protect special places as national parks, wilderness, city parks, waterways, picnic areas and greenways. At the same time, we need to bolster our programs to ensure people have access to these lands through recreation and education programs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While the boundaries and configuration of public lands that have been reserved for particular purposes such as parks, forests, watersheds and wildlife refuges have some semblance of order, the 254 million acres of BLM lands do not. They are a crazy-quilt pattern that does not lend themselves to effective or efficient land and resource management. As we look to manage for habitat connectivity and climate change adaptation, these land tenure patterns become even more onerous, reflecting the 19th century mentality of public lands for private purposes instead of a 21st century ethic of public land conservation.

In addition to private in-holdings, hundreds of thousands of acres of isolated state trust lands are dedicated to generating revenue and reside surrounded by BLM lands. Between 1862 and 1871 Congress granted 128 million acres to corporations for the construction of railroads. These railroad “checkerboard lands” cross vast swaths of the West making management of wildlife and habitat a nightmare. Nearly 150 years later, this legacy is most notable in Montana, Wyoming and Nevada, but can still be seen in states such as Idaho, Oregon, New Mexico and Arizona.

Core wildlands also are the cornerstones of large landscape protection. The ecological health and longevity of wildlands relies on the health and resiliency of larger landscapes. Therefore wildland designations are integrally linked to landscape-scale conservation. Wildlands designation efforts need to balance community needs and interests, economic issues and realities, and bring together a range of stakeholders in order to be successful in both the near and longer term. The Administration can play a key role in supporting both informal and formal collaboration to develop wildland designation proposals as part of landscape-scale conservation. For example, the Administration can encourage and support lawmakers to designate new conservation units across land management agencies, promote more integrated cross-agency planning and management of wildlands and landscapes, and develop and promote agency policies that ensure our wildlands are managed to retain their integrity and contribute to the conservation and connectivity of larger landscapes.

There are currently iconic special places that are unprotected and in need of immediate protection to forever protect the wildlife, cultural, historic or wild land values these lands hold.

In addition, there are some iconic landscapes that merit protection. In many of these areas, there is already strong on the ground support, comprised of diverse stakeholders that fully support National Monument designation as a way to protect key values found on the lands.

Past BLM leadership has never realized the untapped potential of ACECs, yet all of the authority currently exists to vastly improve conservation on tens of millions of acres of sensitive BLM lands. Unfortunately, BLM has not distinguished between ACECs that have been designated due to fragile or sensitive soils from those designated to protect rare archeological resources or unique wildlife habitat. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has designated 25 million acres of BLM lands as critical habitat for listed and sensitive species, yet BLM has not used the ACEC designation to further the protection and management of these critical environmental resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While some of these lands hold some of our most pristine wilderness areas, other areas have seen much development in the form of road building, logging, oil and gas drilling and grazing. In the case of the Forest Service, nearly half of its 193 million acres have been roaded and developed.

Without question, one of the leading causes of water quality and watershed impairment on our national forests is sediment derived from decaying and under-maintained roads. The Forest Service manages about 375,000 miles of roads, enough to circumnavigate the Earth 15 times, yet only maintains to standard on average 20% of this massive system each year.

In 2001, the Forest Service estimated that its road system was oversized by approximately 25-40%, and promulgated a rule requiring it to identify its minimum necessary road system and roads for decommissioning. The idea was to develop a blueprint to guide the rightsizing of the over-extended system in a way that restores water quality, fisheries, and endangered species, reduces long-term costs, facilitates access to popular recreation destinations, and creates restoration jobs around road decommissioning and stormproofing in rural communities.

Create a team to transfer knowledge around successful collaboration efforts to other staff of the Forest Service, partners and future collaborators. Too often, some efforts are successful, but the agency fails to spread the information of that success to other parts of the country.

In the view of many past and present agency employees, a budget that is tightly prescribed/micromanaged by Congress and that has far too many line items is one of the biggest deterrents to the agency spending more time, energy and money on restoration. While poorly framed and rolled out, the intent of the new Integrated Resource Restoration line item in the President's Budget was to create more flexibility for regional foresters and forest supervisors to plan and fund for interdisciplinary restoration projects at the landscape scale. The following changes could help address this:

Work with appropriators to ensure that Stewardship Contracting does not score on the budget. It hasn't up to this point, but some on the Hill are advocating to ensure it does score. If this happens, its use could decrease greatly.

Roads to Trails Program. Roads are the biggest threat to clean water in our National Forests. In 2001, the Forest Service estimated that between 75,000 – 115,000 miles of these roads were no longer needed. In addition, the Forest Service is about to kick off a nationwide effort to identify mile-by-mile every unneeded road. By converting even a small percentage of these roads to hiking and biking trails, we can turn an environmental liability into a treasured community asset. Roads-to-trails projects are already being accomplished on a limited scale (for example, on Mt. Hood National Forest in Oregon, where the recent wilderness bill authorized roads-to-trails conversions), but could be easily scaled to a national level.

Address the worst barriers immediately through rapid administrative action, including seeking a letter from the head of each land management agency interpreting their policy guidance in a way that prevents groups serving disadvantaged youth from being captured in the "commercial guides" class, but still requires these groups to register with the agency before taking trips out.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

\_\_\_Says- " I just want some trails and the wilderness to remain off limits to them, so I can safely recreate the way I want to. " Then it seems selfishness is your motivation, eh?

Just because you can drive in an area and it is not over run and tainted does not mean there is no need for preservation and conservation. We need to plan carefully today if we are to preserve wild areas into the future.

Do you understand that Wilderness designations are a Federal Govt program? Do you honestly believe that steps are not being taken constantly by local land managers from the BLM and USFS to preserve wild areas? Do you think the Federal Govt knows better than the people schooled in this field and working on site? Do you know that Wilderness means trying to access millions of acres of land on foot? There are much better solutions than Wilderness, the land of no uses. What good is land, while "pristine", that nobody will ever see?

There is more to our remaining wild lands than what recreation we can use them for. I believe the only way to preserve land for the long term is through the federal government. I don't see how some people feel "locked out" of anything when the only thing not allowed in wilderness designated areas is motorized/mechanical vehicles. There is only 2% of the land in the lower 48 states that is designated wilderness. It seems some want roads in every last part of the country. If these areas aren't protected in some way, eventually they will not be wild anymore. You have to look past the next few weeks. I think steps are being taken to preserve wild areas. I also think steps are being taken to develop wild areas by others.

I suspect the question has been answered to your satisfaction but I would like some scientific proof regarding the implication we are sacrificing species in their natural habitats. Steven, You once again choose to manipulate the numbers to suit your argument. How about 33% of USFS land is designated Wilderness. Hits home a little more effectively when you put it in context. Do we really need to close more than 1/3 of the forest? There is enough Wilderness designation to cover the state of California. I have told you specifically why I feel locked out, 8 Wilderness designations within an hour of my home in addition to millions of acres of "closed to motorized use" USFS land. You don't THINK we are being squeezed, I KNOW we are because I live in the places you want to close. Fact is, the Federal Government is in violation of the Constitution of the United States of America for meddling in States issues. Land protection within states borders is NOT a Federal issue, it is a State issue. We need local solutions, not you clowns living thousands of miles from ground zero making choices for us.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I will stick by my comment you quoted. These remain local land use issues, unless you have been visiting often, I am not sure why you care? Is it because the sky is falling, the temperature and the oceans are rising, entire species of wildlife are sucked through the engine of my snowmobile and gone from the earth forever. Spare me the tug at the heartstrings. Steven, On the issue of compromise. Compromise is when there is a give and take between parties. In this case we have the environmentalists that want public lands closed to motorized use. We then have the motorized users who want to keep the lands open. The question is simple, if it is a compromise, why has the motorized community only lost access to public land? And if compromise is what you seek from me, here it is. Rather than file for a federal protection that ties the hands of land managers so tightly it is often detrimental to the forest health. Manage the land via the local level. Land Managers are college educated and have a passion for the public lands. These people know better than you or the bueracrats in Washington. If you can not see Wilderness designations as motorized access closures, that is a choice. They are in fact motorized closures. We have enough of them, 25% is more than enough. I pay my taxes and I vote, otherwise I wouldn't have much cause the dispute this with you, would I?

By closing lands to motorized access you are keeping people out. Since I happen to live near millions of acres of wilderness, I can tell you from experience that wilderness closures keep the vast majority of the public from gaining access. I agree that some wilderness is needed. We have at least 25% of forest service lands in this program, well over 100 million acres. That is more than enough. Are you honestly telling me that you review and advocate for/against wilderness proposals? Do you visit the lands in question before making a decision? This sounds like you have completely made it up. I snowmobile in an area of proposed wilderness. It is an existing use, can I expect your support to try and stop this expansion? Isn't it completely contrary to state that OHV use has grown so the lands open to them have shrunk? This is PUBLIC land we are talking about. If a user group grows, so should the lands open to them. It is so ridiculous now that I am fighting just to keep motorized and non motorized areas somewhat equal, which they are not. I cover 10 times the land of a skier, shouldn't I have 10 times the amount open to prevent user conflicts? So the people that want to USE the land are being told they can not because people who never use the land want to save it for posterity? You keep bringing up "open to development". We have a rule right now that states the USFS can not build a new road, unless they decommission the same amount of old road. As far as I know the USFS is not out selling off parcels for development, not where I am anyway. Our national forests are protected, well protected, wilderness designations once were helpful, today it is an outdated designation that is no longer the corect land management tool. Well, compromise is not what we have. What we have is 200 million acres of public lands closed to motorized use. We do not have any lands closed to non motorized users. Show me where the compromise exists? If you do not think it is the goal of environmental groups to stop all motorized access in the forests, you simply are not paying attention. It is all over this website, it is clearly stated on the websites of the groups pushing the adgenda. If most environmentalists do not want this, they need to start paying closer attention to the groups that claim them as supporters. If no motorized access in wilderness is the goal, then the compromise needs to be, no more new wilderness.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You came in on this discussion late and you are beating a dead horse, so to speak. \_\_\_ is a moderate person who has always said there is room for everyone. I, on the other hand, think OHVs should be given no access because OHV access costs taxpayers money. You want to cruise around and screw up the land for your entertainment and you want taxpayers to allow you to do that, even though your behavior causes erosion and gullying and degradation of water resources, and for what, just so \_\_\_ can get his ya yas in any manner that suits him. If you don't like the confines of that wilderness area next door, for Christ's sake, move. There's plenty of places to live where you won't have to ever look at a wilderness ever again.

I am tired of you thinking you have a free pass in these discussions to make false statements and intentionally try to steer topics off course so you can insert some touchy feely comments, or take a personal shot at other contributors. Expect me to show up and try keep you honest ;-). Beating a dead horse? Why because I agree with the idea as stated? Wildlife does not require anymore Wilderness designation. I will shout it from the mountaintops as long as there is breath in my lungs, better get used to it. OHV's pay their way, they always have. Please substantiate your claim that OHV use is a taxpayer burden. Even if it were, you do accept that a huge percentage of the population that pays taxes also use OHV's. When do we have our say? You also have no proof that OHV's "screw up the land", another hysterical unsubstantiated claim. I do not need to move, but you can rest assured that I will vehemently oppose all new Wilderness expansions. As mentioned elsewhere, the original Wilderness bill identified 20 million acres as suitable for the designation, today we have 6 times that amount. We simply do not need anymore. In that respect I fully support the "idea" as posted.

What I said is I advocate wilderness. That means I support it. I didn't say anything about reviewing and advocating for or against proposals. In my view, there too little wilderness land and I can't say I would be against any proposal. Although I would also say I advocate wilderness that is truly wilderness. I don't think the 2% we have now will be enough as the population grows. It may be enough now, since there are still areas that are wild and have not been protected. These areas will be fewer and fewer as we go forward. I did also say I advocate some existing uses remain in wilderness expansions. That seems reasonable to me. As the population grows and OHV use also expands, won't all areas eventually become crowded, even if every area is open to OHV use? When talking about national forests being open to development, it refers to things like mining, logging, drilling, etc. These areas are already covered with roads and have plenty of access.

The argument about areas being closed because it does not allow motorized access is still odd to me. When considering use, areas without roads are important to wildlife and clean air/clean water. These are issues to consider along with what recreation we are allowed to participate in on the land.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please explain to me what you think the merits of a Wilderness designation are? Do you realize that the land locked up as Wilderness is no longer actively managed by the forest service? Do you realize that if there is a fire the mandate is to let it run wild within the wilderness? Do you realize that the rule is supposed to be no motorized incursions including the for the rescue of human lives? Now that some of the new expansions are within less than 1 mile from towns, what will that wilderness look like when it burns to the ground? What happens to the watershed that was supposedly protected by the designation? You state that you do not think 2% is enough. Is it enough that 1/3 of the forests are already wilderness? The 2% number is thrown out there to make it sound like there really isn't much protected land. That is because very little land in this country fits the designation. Did you know that the original plan was for 20 million acres? Do you know that we are now at 6 times that amount? How much forest land do you want closed, 50%, 75%, 100%? When will you be satisfied that it is enough, and what to you base that desire on, facts or emotions? Maybe it is substantially different where you live. In the mountains the access is much more challenging. There are precious few with the stamina to access wilderness areas here on foot. You can preach all day long that it isn't closed because you can walk in but you miss the fact that a substantial portion of the population is not physically able to make good on their desire to see these lands. So if you are somehow physically not able, it is just tough luck? Is that how this country is supposed to work? The point is, the 2% figure is wildly misleading. That needs to be viewed in the context of land even somewhat worthy of the designation. So 33% of public forest lands are already Wilderness. So lets be honest, 1/3 of the forest is already protected as you desire, and that isn't enough? You also want to revisit "development". Those issues, logging, mining, and drilling are all limited, and already managed under the pervue of USFS and BLM land managers. Development isn't the rampant beast you want to portrait. We have plenty of Wilderness designations already. Additional closures do not meet the criteria of the law.

You talk about environmentalists making exaggerated claims to make points and spread propaganda, your posts are nothing but exaggerations and propaganda. What's this "do you realize" crap? Like I said before, why don't you move to a city and quit trying to make the wilderness into one.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well, the "do you realize" is meant to illustrate that I do not think most people understand what a Wilderness designation really means for the lands themselves. It is a dangerous, hand tying proposition with little merit to existing forest lands. If you could focus on facts rather than what feels good and sounds good, maybe we could have a productive discussion. Please dispell my propoganda with facts, I do not want to mislead. I have never advocated for more areas with roads, not once, so no argument there. It is my belief, and maybe this incorrect but, isn't there already a forest mandate that states no new roads will be built in the forests unless old roads of the same distance are decomissioned? I agree with that. What IS happeneing, is that areas not worthy of the Wilderness designation are now proposed Wilderness. THAT is a problem. I also have a problem with the notion that Wilderness is the only or best way to protect the lands and wildlife. That simply is not factual. My opinion is that it may be one of the poorest. We probably have to disagree on that point. T.Roosevelt was a progressive, much like todays crop in the administration. That is a scary bunch unless communism is your bag. I agree areas without roads should continue to exist. If we still have roadless areas, let us keep them that way. I support the idea of closing old roads to open new, that maintains the status quo. I think Wilderness is a bit too restrictive, I have seen many negatives in pratice with this policy. I like the over snow exemption, not everywhere, but it is an accepted fact that over snow impact is not an issue in the forests. I want the govt to stop closing areas I utilize for recreation for no viable reason other than envirokooks complaining. I think we actually are on the same page though most of this.

The simple fact of the matter is that the USFS is charged, by congress, with maintaining the forests for multiple uses. One of those uses is motorized recreation. The notion that OHV are on a rampage destroying nature is unfounded. Are there some bad eggs? Sure, just like there are hikers that leave trash in the forest, there are some bad ones. We as OHV users do not want all hikers banned though because their dogs poop on trails and they leave trash in the forest. We want those people to be held accountable, just like we want the OHV users held accountable. Locking everyone out based on a small minority of rule breakers is NOT how this is supposed to work. Unfortunately, that is how it was being done. I am glad to see so many OHV participants on this site making factual, reasonable arguments for our place in the forest. My kids will learn to snowmobile in the forest this season. I can't wait to share it with them, it is THE BEST way to see the mountains.

There should be areas for OHVs. With the huge amount of roads we have, I only advocate no new roads.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The reasoning you push is the protection of the environment. The fact is, green groups have OPENLY advocated closing lands to OHV users for decades. It is about some who think their chosen form of recreation is more valid than others. Green groups have petitioned the USFS and BLM land managers to close more land citing conflicts, which they can not substantiate, damage to the environment, which they can not substantiate, noise and pollution which they can avoid in the some 190 million acres of forests closed to motorized vehicles already. There is not a policy to punish, there is an effort to punish led by an opposing land use group. Get of YOUR lazy posteriors and go to the Wilderness designations you fools ahd to have so many of. You will not see ANY motorized vehicles there. Stop trying to close more lands, that is the idea. OHV users are a legitimate forest user group. They deserve more respct than you granola crunchers extend. Then ironically, you expect us to abide by closure you pushed?

I'm a fan of preparedness, but the best plans are useless unless talented folks are empowered to react to actual disasters. The best models and brainstorming won't be able to predict the exact consequences of a hurricane, or fire or beetle infestations killing millions of trees. In almost all cases, decisions need to be made with incomplete information -- and that comes down to judgement and willingness to take risks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Fortunately motorized recreation is a long way from "unmanaged". OHV users typically are very involved in trail maintenance and trail damage mitigation. OHV users are good land stewards, and getting better every year as the interest grows. OHV groups have participated in noise abatement and law enforcement issues to help police their sport. Unfortunately people like \_\_\_\_ appear to have enough time on their hands to go out and secure obscure photos from all over the country and present them as a problem. The fact is, there really isn't as large a problem as you suggest. Fact is the problem is much less prevalent in the last 5-10 years because forest users are being educated on protecting the lands. I have also hauled out more hiker trash from forest campsites than I have ever seen OHV users leave behind. OHV users are not the only group with "bad apples", but they are the only group owning those issues and working to correct them. Banning them from the land is not the answer. I would be curious to know who did the user group study. There sure are a lot more ATV and Jeep users in the forest where I live than hikers, though we have a lot of both in the summer. You might also start to consider that penning all the OHV users into small areas actually increases the likelihood of damage to the land. Giving them room to spread out reduces concentrated use. Clearly though, that is the tactic being employed. Close areas one after another concentrating OHV use. Then pinpoint those areas as being damaged and push to close them as well eventually attempting to lock out motorized use throughout the realm of public lands. Unfortunately for you, OHV users are a legitimate user group. They are recognized as such in travel management plans all over the country. They are rapidly growing in numbers, and they are wise to the land grabs taking place. Admittedly we are late to the party as you greenies have been stealing public lands for a couple decades but, you may see the tables start to turn soon. The general populace is tired of liberal policies and can now clearly see through the green initiatives as the hoax they really are. I suggest you get used to the idea of OHV's in the forests. I suggest that you start trying to work with OHV groups rather than demonize them. We have more than enough Wilderness designation in public holdings already. The idea presented here is one I fully support. Local land management by USFS and BLM managers, that is the answer. 120 million acres of Wilderness is more than you greenies can ever hope to hike or ski. It is also more than enough to "save" for future generations that will also likely never even see a minute percentage of it.

Irrelevant until you start telling the truth about the numbers. 97% is "dedicated" to what purposes? Do you know how much is just plain desolate land with little redeeming value? The fact is, if we consider government controlled forest lands, wilderness now covers 33% of them, that is one third of the forests closed because you think the sky is fallin?. Now you want to close more? I agree, the results of what is "recommended" is just a political scheme. The Wilderness designation is being badly abused. The original intent of the law was to protect about 20 million acres deemed suitable. Since then it has grow six times over to 120 million acres. There are far better management tools than Wilderness designation. Closing lands without the parties involved having proper representation is not how this is supposed to work. The Federal govt shouldn't be involved in it anyway.

So if it is "art" as defined by the few, it is then accpetable to upset the wild lands that offer more beauty than any "art" ever will? Can you environmentalists please try to be consistent?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wrong again, when will you learn? Just a little quick research indicates that around 93-94% of the land in the US is considered open land. Be it farmland or forests your contention that we are using up the land, and the cities are coming to you, is a completely false idea, what you are saying is not supported by facts at all, it is propoganda and hysteria. We already have over 100 million acres of Wilderness lands set aside. My guess is that most of you will never visit even 1% of those lands. This leads me to conclude that there is plenty for those who need such an area for mental health issues. Wilderness is extremely valuble. I think that most people do not distinguish between wild lands and Wilderness designations. I am not even exactly sure what the original poster was suggesting. Wild lands can be effectively managed in many ways. Wilderness designations are rarely the best management tool. We have plenty, we need to MANAGE the remaining lands. Wilderness designations stop land managers from doing their important work.

They already have flamethrower parties in the wilderness, it's called lack of management, due to draconian rules. Wildfire. It burnt yellowstone to the ground. Oh, did you know they cut hundreds of miles of fire lines, with bulldozers? There where 25,000 fire fighters on that fire, over 100 fire fighting aircraft dumped millions of gallons of fire retardant, chainsaws where used, hundreds of fire trucks, tent cities for the fire fighters all summer, and then someone tells me how nature took care of the park and it's so beautiful again. I find environmentalist have no perspective. As for the slavery quip, motorized users aren't the one's taking land away from other American's to enjoy how they see fit, while not damaging the environment. Your the one's implementing a king's forest, where only the healthy and strong, and advantaged can use. You don't own the forest, and if popular opinion can create wilderness, a swinging pendulum of popular opinion can take it away. Your probably one of those brain washed kids that believes the rivers are dirtier today, than 40 years ago. Let me give you guys some advise, get everyone as a stake holder in the National Forests, so we'll all be there to help protect it, when the socialist go looking for a way to pay off the national debt.

The Clean Water Act does support recreation -- but that doesn't mean that even good tools can't create mayhem. We need to prevent narrow interpretation of CWA provisions -- and also look at how we can mitigate the impacts of rand trails key to recreation on water quality.

Tribal partnership and participation in the recent Lewis & Clark Bicentennial (2003-2006) and Jamestown Colony Quadricentennial (2007) taught us many lessons that can directly apply to the goals of America's Great Outdoors. We learned that, locally and nationally, Americans are intensely interested in learning about American Indian lands, histories, cultures and tribal perspectives on America's public lands and our nation's history. They want to learn more about the histories of their own communities, national parks, forests, rivers and landscapes before European settlement. They want to know how Indians took care of the land before there were "public lands.: They are interested in learning from tribal members whose lands are now national parks, monuments, forests, byways and scenic rivers. They are interested in enjoying outdoors activities offered by tribal businesses, such as guided hiking, horseback riding, bird watching, river rafting, hunting and fishing trips. They're curious about sleeping in a tipi and hearing coyotes sing in the early morning darkness. They love the stories our elders tell. They call it the wilderness, and to us it is our home that creator provided with abundance and beauty.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Today, however, our country's remarkable conservation legacy hangs in the balance. A new wave of threats could well undo what has been accomplished. The cumulative impact of these trends, if we do not respond to them, will be an accelerated fragmentation of the American landscape—the separation of plants and animals from their essential habitats, of watersheds from downstream estuaries, of people from experiences in the outdoors, and of Americans from our common historic and natural heritage.

North America and the United States are blessed with a diversity and abundance of natural resources, natural systems and habitats that have been central to our growth and prosperity as a nation and a foundation for our way of life. Despite urbanization and the increasing use of technology, our health, welfare, economy, culture and identity still depend heavily on the quality and productivity of our land, water, oceans and coasts. While we rely on nature for our well being, no place in our country is immune from at least some human impacts. We depend on nature, and it now depends upon us for its survival.

Farmers, ranchers and forest land owners are finding it increasingly difficult to retain their lands in natural resource use in the face of increasing taxes, development pressures, competing land uses and changing markets.

Climate change is affecting the productivity of rural lands and the viability of wildlife habitat; it is altering traditional wildfire regimes, hastening the spread of forest pests and diseases, producing more erratic weather patterns—more floods, droughts, and major storms, and will affect our coastlines with rising sea levels.

Intensive use and development is stressing coastal areas, near-shore waters and estuaries.

Invasive aquatic species and other pests and pathogens are becoming particularly damaging to our freshwater and forest resources.

People, particularly young urban and suburban residents, are losing their connection to the land and to experiences in nature.

Providing the American people, working as individuals and through their governments, associations and institutions with the means to achieve these goals and attain this vision is a great challenge especially given the very real financial problems now faced by governments at every level. But we cannot turn away from the threats to the health of our land and water.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public and tribal agencies, NGOs, and local communities have come to realize that piecemeal conservation yields diminishing returns and that we should be working to conserve large natural landscapes that are defined by the needs of fish and wildlife and the way people live, work and play in these places. This category of places should also include estuaries and coastal land and seascapes. There is a groundswell of place-based, collaborative efforts to sustain large landscapes; federal funding and programs should be enhanced to empower these efforts. Large landscape efforts range from several hundred thousand acres to entire watersheds and large ecosystems. Some of many examples include: Northern Everglades, Alabama River/Mobile Delta Corridor, Central Appalachians, Hudson Valley, Penobscot River Watershed, Maumee Basin of the Great Lakes, Upper Peninsula (Michigan) Forests, Crown of the Continent, East Side Oregon Forests, the Pioneers (ID), Colorado Plateau (UT, CO, AZ, NM), Longleaf Pine Initiative, Keeping Maine's Forests Initiative, and the Northern Sierra Partnership.

Great Lakes, Chesapeake Bay, Puget Sound, Mississippi River, Gulf of Mexico/Louisiana Wetlands, California Bay Delta, Greater Everglades, Colorado River

These specific places are often talked about in the context of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. All of them, however, already have some level of multi-agency Federal and state involvement. Some, like the Chesapeake Bay and the Everglades, have been underway for many years, but they have proceeded slowly with considerable difficulty and with varying levels of funding. Others, like the Gulf of Mexico, have never been funded comprehensively and require accelerated investment and cooperative action. Large amounts of money, invested in targeted and strategic ways, over a long time period are required to accomplish restoration of these areas and in most cases there is also a significant regulatory component required to reduce water pollution and prevent further habitat degradation.

Build the Pipeline: Employ and Empower Youth on natural landscapes through volunteer and community service opportunities, employment and other means by building upon the Department of the Interior's 21st Century Conservation Corps program. Support passage of the Public Lands Service Corps Act (H.R. 1612 / S. 1442) and similar legislative initiatives that would expand the capacity for service work on federal, state, local, tribal and private lands, build and maintain the necessary infrastructure to connect youth with the great outdoors, engage and employ youth, especially youth from communities of color, and diversify our conservation constituency.

The rapid pace of climate change is itself a direct threat to the long term sustainability of natural systems in the United States as we know them and their associated benefits to human communities (ecosystem services). Fragmented and otherwise degraded ecosystems are less able to withstand and adapt to new climate impacts. Current science and policy suggest that watershed or ecosystem scale approaches are essential to help make natural habitats more resilient to the impacts of climate change and to ensure that those systems are optimally storing and retaining carbon.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our country faces many challenges and a good deal of uncertainty as we prepare to enter the second decade of the 21st Century. Americans are struggling, as well, to find the common ground required to solve those problems. For more than 100 years, however, most Americans have agreed on the importance of conserving our country's legacy of rich and productive land, water, and coastlines. While we have made substantial progress in protecting America's environment and conserving our natural and agricultural lands, there are, today, many threats to that progress.

In a time of soaring federal deficits, this renewed commitment to conservation will require increased funding. But much can be done by more effectively targeting existing resources and by making conservation and restoration spending more reliable, predictable and responsive to on-the-ground needs. The additional investment in things like full and dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is extremely small in relation to other Federal expenditures and in comparison to the immense permanent benefits derived from that investment.

Agencies do not currently have all the tools they need to target resources and facilitate partnerships necessary to efficiently and effectively achieve national goals in priority landscapes.

Current performance measures and budgeting processes do not reward, and may discourage, interagency coordination that could enhance effectiveness and efficiency.

Problem: Uncertain and unreliable funding hinder effective planning and efficient implementation of long-term projects.

A number of federal conservation programs are funded with "one year" money that must be obligated within the fiscal year for which appropriated, and related budget guidance requires agencies to submit annual funding requests and justifications for such programs. This leads to uneven, "stop and go" funding from year to year, especially where there are delays in annual appropriations legislation (a not unknown phenomenon). This creates difficulties in effective long-range interagency coordination and in the planning for and implementation of large, multi-faceted and multi-participant actions of the kind vital to an effective AGO landscape scale program. It also creates serious planning and funding problems for local, federal, tribal, and NGO partners in such programs. Evaluate programs currently funded with "one year" monies to determine those programs where the effectiveness of the program as an element of landscape-scale AGO programs would be enhanced with multi-year funding and take the appropriate administrative and legislative steps necessary to convert those programs to multi-year or "no year" funding.

Problem: Effective and efficient partnerships among agencies are hindered by the lack of authority to pool or transfer financial resources to achieve shared conservation objectives.

Problem: Each agency involved in a multi-agency or multi-unit project may be required to do a separate NEPA analysis, wasting time and resources.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Problem: The lack of sufficient funding for technical assistance to landowners prevents the most effective use of Farm Bill program funds to maximize conservation benefits.

Problem: There is currently no incentive for states to use formula-driven "stateside" LWCF grants to advance national priorities.

Climate change is already affecting our ecosystems and it would be futile to launch this initiative without discussing how you will incorporate the latest science and climate change models into your efforts to maintain and restore America's most important landscapes.

Given that we are likely to face tight budgets for the next few years, it is difficult for me to imagine how you can achieve your goals unless this effort identifies priority landscapes and relentlessly focuses staff and other resources to advance the conservation of those landscapes. I believe such a place-based approach is critical to your efforts.

#### Large Landscapes, Natural Splendor Threatened

While great strides have been made in preserving the Hudson Valley's unsurpassed beauty and history--federally recognized through the region's congressional designation as one of America's first National Heritage Areas--many of its iconic landscapes and prime agricultural lands remain under severe threat from poorly planned development.

Sprawling residential and commercial development already has dramatically eroded the region's ecological resources.

In the coming decade, the valley will contain four of New York's 10 fastest-growing counties, exerting additional pressure on open space critical to preserving the region's natural splendor and enhancing recreational opportunities. Developers' plans to meet the anticipated influx of 1.4 million new residents sit on drawing boards, awaiting economic recovery.

Scenic Hudson alone is investing approximately \$5 million annually and leveraging additional resources. But at the current pace, Saving the Land That Matters Most will take 60 years. With federal support, success can be accomplished in a decade. By making the protection of the Hudson Valley's breathtaking landscapes a pilot project of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative, the Obama administration can achieve early outcomes in connecting more people to the country's irreplaceable natural treasures.

Despite these enormous benefits, 50 acres of Hudson Valley farmland were disappearing each day prior to the recession, leading the American Farmland Trust to designate it one of the country's 10 most threatened agricultural regions. At the same time, New York's Farmland Protection Program has a \$70-million backlog of approved transactions.

Yet the estuary and its watershed face unprecedented challenges. Sprawling development is fast diminishing valley habitats; roads and subdivisions are separating wetlands and rivers from upland habitats, also polluting tributaries essential to the region's water quality. Climate change will exert tremendous additional pressure on productive tidal wetlands and signature Hudson Highlands forests.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

#### Engage Youth with the Great Outdoors

A direct correlation has been made between the declining amount of time children spend outdoors and the skyrocketing incidence of childhood obesity. In addition, studies show that children must develop a sense of respect and caring for their natural environment during their first years of life or be at risk for never developing such attitudes.

For the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission's (Commission's) eleven member tribes, located in east-central Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan (for more information on the Commission, see [www.glifwc.org](http://www.glifwc.org)), connecting to the outdoors provides a vital connection to culture. The exercise of the Commission's member tribes' treaty-reserved, off-reservation hunting, fishing and gathering rights depends on an abundance of healthy ecosystems that support natural resources that the tribes depend upon for cultural, subsistence, economic, and medicinal purposes. Federal courts have held that these rights cannot be exercised on most private lands, making the quality and accessibility of public land extremely important.

A number of challenges face tribes in reconnecting members, particularly youth, to the outdoors. Some of these challenges are shared by Americans of any race – the increased role of technology in our lives and the lure of cell phones, Facebook, chat rooms, video games, cable TV, and DVD movies, etc. Other challenges affect tribes disproportionately – 50% of American Indian children live in single-parent families. These parents often find themselves lacking either the skills, knowledge, financial resources, or time to participate in outdoor activities with their children.

In addition, federal government policies of the 1940's, '50's and '60's relocated tribal members to urban areas. As a result, when tribal members return home to their reservations, they often do not have the outdoor skills developed by participating in traditional Ojibwe hunting, fishing, and gathering activities.

The Commission has also developed and instructed outdoor skill workshops as part of the Intercultural Leadership Initiative, a program whose funding was recently eliminated despite the fact that it won a Harvard "Honoring Nations" award in 2008. These winter-based day camps bring together Indian and non-Indian fourth through eighth grade students before they are integrated in high school. Students from different cultural backgrounds participate in workshops such as snow-shoe making, fire-making and winter shelter building, exposing them to outdoor activities while at the same time encouraging exploration of issues related to self-image, conflict resolution, race, cultural diversity, and tolerance through experiential learning.

**Private Lands:** Most of Missouri's grasslands and forests are in private lands. A significant portion of the state is managed for agricultural production. Supporting good conservation practices on private lands is essential for protection of the great outdoors. Initiatives for conservation easements, for example, are a good tool. However, such conservation easements need to be enforced. In Missouri conservation easements have been granted along the Ozark National Scenic Riverway, but not always fully enforced by the National Park Service. Crop Reserve Programs are another way to encourage stewardship on agricultural lands.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Missouri's outdoors are perhaps best known for our Ozark rivers and streams. We are blessed with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which include stretches of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers and is managed by the National Park Service. That linear park is currently undergoing a revision of its management plan. The process has highlighted some glaring management problems which have been a growing concern for years. The NPS has failed to follow the mission of the Scenic and Recreational Riverways designation and has allowed numerous illegal river access points, unauthorized ATV traffic and excessive equestrian use to mar and pollute the rivers. Due to agency analysis and public input, a goal of the management review now is to focus on improving water quality and river habitat and to provide for appropriate, but not destructive, recreation. Carrying through will be a difficult task. The background message to this experience is that proper management of public lands needs to be both consistent and participatory, but always true to the mission and resource protection principles for the area. Backtracking is hard.

Developing access to our rivers and natural areas needs to take into account the circumstances of many urban residents. Travel opportunities even to areas within the state may be limited due to poverty, extended family responsibilities, and disability. Thus, providing linear parks with river access or views can help those citizens enjoy and appreciate the natural history of the area in which they live.

Recreational anglers will continue to act as good stewards of the waters they treasure, but progress must be made to maximize their buy-in when it comes to federal management actions by meeting the goals laid out below.

Goal: Give Recreational Anglers Better and More Consistent Opportunity for Input

It is critical that across the federal agencies that have a role in water and fishery resource management, the 60-million-strong recreational fishing constituency be given adequate opportunities for a formal voice in resource management decisions. Currently, this is not being addressed in marine resource management in particular and this needs to change.

The main challenge to this goal is inconsistency. There is too great a variety of current interfaces between federal resource managers and the sportfishing public. Some federal entities, such as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Sport Fishing and Boating Partnership Council (<http://www.fws.gov/sfbpc/>), give the recreational fishing community a voice in federal resource management decisions. Unfortunately, there are far too few of these opportunities, particularly when it comes to more local and regional decision-making. This is particularly true with respect to marine resource management and the current make-up of regional fisheries councils.

Goal: Collection and Use of Better, More Timely Fisheries Data

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

A fundamental challenge to gathering adequate, timely fisheries data is the reality that recreational anglers disperse across broad areas and sampling can be very difficult. Enforcement and monitoring on the freshwater side, achieved through the state fish and wildlife agencies, tends to be more easily accomplished. Inadequate gathering of recreational fishing data on the saltwater side, where the federal government has jurisdiction beyond three miles, has been hugely problematic. Over the years, NOAA has been largely focused on commercial fishing to the detriment of the recreational fishing public.

Apart from gathering and using higher quality data of recreational fishing effort, better data in general needs to be gathered regarding fish populations. Timeliness and frequency of marine fish stock assessments are far too inconsistent and a national standard for stock assessments should therefore be established.

Goal: Re-establish the Primacy of Science in Fisheries Management

Fishery management decisions, in the view of ASA, should always be made on the basis of timely and definitive scientific information. There have been trends in recent years toward protectionist management that has been based on assumptions that simply are not born out by up-to-date, adequate scientific information.

The challenge in this area has risen through the allowance of arbitrary, emotion-based management decisions made for fisheries in the absence of fully adequate scientific information. Standards have slipped in this regard and this slippage must be stopped.

Goal: Differentiate Between Public Uses and Commercial Uses

We have a goal of seeing the federal government manage our aquatic and fishery resources in a manner that much more definitively recognizes public use of resources versus private use of resources. Particularly in the area of marine management, there is an unacceptable lack of attention applied to the fact that public uses of our public ocean resources, such as fishing, boating, and diving, are very different than private uses, such as energy development, aquaculture, and commercial fishing.

The main challenge here is overcoming the mindset that commercial and industrial exploitation of our marine resources are comparable to sustainable, low-impact public uses. They are not. ASA certainly supports the extraction of resources in our public waters when such activity is managed properly and carried out in such as to not have significant, long-lasting negative impacts on the given resource. However, preferential treatment, consistent with the public trust doctrine, should be given to public, low impact uses of this same resource. The mindset at the Department of Commerce and, to some extent, the Department of Interior has not been to elevate public use of our public ocean resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Goal: Passage and Implementation of National Fish Habitat Action Plan

A tremendous amount of work has been undertaken to conserve, restore and enhance aquatic habitats because of their recreational, ecological and economic importance. While there are numerous efforts underway to address the health of aquatic habitat on local scales, there is a need for conservation action on a range-wide scale for these efforts to be successful. Given the diverse array of federal, state, tribal, local and private jurisdictions, the need never has been greater for increased action and improved coordination of fisheries conservation actions across boundaries and jurisdictions.

Goal: Full Funding for Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)

ASA has joined with its partners in the recreational fishing community to focus on disturbing trends in recreational fishing recruitment and retention. Despite the fact that Americans currently have the best access to quality fishing opportunities they have had in over a generation, fewer young people are going fishing and older Americans who have fished in the past are no longer participating. We have a major overarching goal of getting new anglers out and on the water and returning lapsed anglers to the sport.

Goal: Increase Federal Support for "Take Me Fishing" Program

Goal: Clearly Identifying Access as a Management Mandate

Over the 105 year history of the Forest Service, the predominant management activity has been the extraction of timber, particularly since the close of World War II. The emphasis on extraction has often come at the expense of the health of the natural resources the agency is mandated to protect and improve. Water provides the link between all resources on our national forests. Rural communities, fish, wildlife and forests will benefit most from focusing on the protection and improvement of water and watersheds. It's important to realize that managing water is one of the oft-overlooked components of the agency's mission as defined in the Organic Act: "to secure favorable conditions of water flows."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Importance of Water - Impacts of Climate Change on National Forests: Climate drives the hydrologic cycle. Variation in climate can play havoc with our nation's water supply<sup>1</sup>. Changes in the timing and intensity of snow and rain events can produce either regional flooding or droughts depending on the region.<sup>2</sup> Reservoirs may be swamped early in the season and dry at the end of the season. There is considerable concern about possible water shortages across portions of the nation due to hotter annual temperatures. Water supplies are affected by shrinking glaciers and decreases in snow pack as they serve as reservoirs that provide summer runoff. Furthermore, meeting the water supply needs for the ever-increasing populace also adds to the concern over water availability. The U.S. has among the highest rate of population growth of industrialized nations<sup>3</sup>.

Our national forests may soon be the most important natural system capable of capturing, retaining and releasing water. According to the Forest Service, more than 60 million Americans get their drinking water from national forest headwaters. The role of the Forest Service in protecting and managing drinking water supplies affects approximately one-fifth of United States communities, yet few Americans know or understand the important links between forest management, watershed and fisheries health, climate and change and community drinking water supplies. We believe the management of watershed and fisheries resources should be an important priority for the agency.

Forest Roads – A Great Threat to National Forest Watersheds: One of the most significant threats to forest watersheds and their biotic communities is failing forest roads. Road-caused sedimentation fouls drinking water and is one of the least publicized but most widespread of the human-caused impact on coldwater fish. At least 15 different direct negative effects from sedimentation have been demonstrated to impact trout and salmon, ranging from stress, to altered behavior, to reductions in growth and to direct mortality<sup>5</sup>. Muddy water from failing forest roads makes streams wider, shallower and more susceptible to warming, thus harming fish that thrive in clear, cold water. Silt harms the gills of salmon and trout and smothers fish eggs when it settles into the clean gravel bed.

The same sediment fouls drinking water and may result in the need for communities to build expensive water filtration systems. Unmaintained roads, especially in mountainous regions, are more likely to fail in severe storm events, contributing massive amounts of sediment to streams. In 2006 and 2007 alone severe storms in the Pacific Northwest led to massive road failures and road-triggered landslides, resulting in tens of millions of dollars of damage to public and private lands. Storms such as this are increasing in both severity and frequency, likely due to climate change, further bolstering the need for an immediate investment in restoration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Roads fragment wildlife habitat, spread non-native invasive plants, pests and pathogens, reduce wildlife security, increase the incidence of poaching and increase edge effects. They also lead to direct mortality through wildlife-vehicle collisions. Studies have found road densities of one mile of road per square mile of land as an average threshold above which roads will start to have negative impacts on wildlife. For example, elk habitat effectiveness decreases by 25% at 1 mi/mi<sup>2</sup> and 50% at 2mi/mi<sup>2</sup> 6. There is also a strong negative relationship between road density and population fitness of grizzly bears<sup>7</sup>. Roads act as complete barriers to movement for some small mammals, reptiles and amphibians<sup>8</sup>. When old jammer roads and motorized routes are added in to road density analyses, road densities exceed 20 m/m<sup>2</sup> in specific areas on numerous national forests, resulting in severe degradation of wildlife habitat.

State of Forest Roads: At best, only 21%<sup>9</sup> of national forest roads are currently maintained to "standard." The Forest Service never planned for nor assessed the impact of its extremely limited maintenance capacity on forest and water resources, and the impact becomes exponentially more significant each year. In 2001, the Forest Service estimated that it could remove nearly a third of its entire road system<sup>10</sup> (up to 186,000 miles out of the total 380,000 mile system), while still meeting the resource management and recreational needs of forest users. Many of these roads were built for obsolete logging systems and now are largely abandoned and prone to landslides from heavy rains or snowmelt. There is ample opportunity to put people to work restoring watersheds and remediating road problems.

To guarantee that Legacy Roads and Trails Remediation funds are spent effectively, it is essential that the Forest Service develops a strategy to rightsize its oversized, failing road system. The Forest Service estimated their road maintenance backlog at nearly \$8 billion in 2002<sup>11</sup> -- although when administrative and indirect costs are included the backlog may be closer to \$10.3billion<sup>12</sup>. Shrinking maintenance budgets have resulted in the downgrading of thousands of miles of passenger vehicle roads to high-clearance vehicle roads. At the end of 2006, the Forest Service estimated that the road maintenance backlog is now \$4.1 billion<sup>13</sup> but it is likely that this reduction comes not as a result of improved road management, but as a result of maintenance level reclassification (the agency budgets far less money per mile to maintain high-clearance vehicle roads as opposed to passenger vehicle roads). This creates the fiscal illusion that roads have been repaired but, in fact, the majority of the system is not being maintained (80% of the system is high-clearance or closed roads). It is this 80%, the vast majority of the Forest Service road system, that provides the least access and causes the greatest ecological harm.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

National Parks in and around Urban Areas - Especially in the "Shrinking Cities" of the Rust Belt. Create more National Parks in and around urban cores. An excellent example is the Golden Gate National Recreation Area around San Francisco which offers exceptional and accessible outdoor recreational opportunities to many urban dwellers. It has also helped to prevent urban sprawl, and attracted national and international companies that understand that quality of life in and around a city is important to attracting high quality employees, especially in a knowledge economy. Applying this proven strategy to the shrinking cities of the struggling rust belt states could be pivotal to their long term economic recovery. For example there is lots of coastal and riverside land around the Great Lakes has been abandoned due to industry shut downs and foreclosures. With the help of federal dollars and local conservation initiatives, these lands could be restored to become some of tomorrow's proudest new National Parks/Recreation Areas/Monuments. Allow the struggling economy and abandonment in these states to be an opportunity for large scale outdoor urban recreation and habitat conservation corridors. For this idea there is no better time to act than now.

Thanks so much for all the conversation on this point. I am intentionally avoiding a discussion of the technicalities of what liability issues should be surmounted, how a recreation easement should be written into law, etc. I can't take credit for this "recreation easement" idea. It was a unique point, generated in the homegrown listening session that NOLS co-sponsored. We felt it deserved inclusion in this ideas space, as did all the themes and presidential messages that came out of our session. Access to private lands, or across private lands to public lands, has been a significant issue in Wyoming for many years. Your access to a favored recreation destination often depends on your personal relationship with a landowner who owns the private land between you and that destination. It is appropriate to consider many of these public lands with know public access as de-facto private lands. Conservation easements are gaining in popularity in our state, as traditional ranching families, who anticipate selling the family ranch, seek solutions to preserve the unique and diverse nature of their home place. The success of conservation easements spurred a discussion of recreation easements, where access rights could actually be sold, and maintained by a separate entity. This is one of many thoughts regarding access that came up in our America's Great Outdoors - Central Wyoming Forum.

one problem with grazing is that cattle are an introduced species that compete for the same resources as native creatures upsetting the ecosystem. Another issue is BLM is holding in "trust" Indian land and not paying them for it and mismanaging the land in the process.

"Stewardship is often talked about, but not practiced much" How loosely some people refer to themselves as environmentalists. I once heard someone refer to themselves as "going green" by drinking bottled water.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Here we go with the welfare forest user again. Roads cost big bucks to maintain. If they are not being used to extract some resource that is worth way more than road construction and maintenance costs, then those roads are costing taxpayers all across the country, money that could be spent on schools, health care, police. Branden wants this welfare cost to be permanently locked in by making the government do an expensive, taxpayer funded EIS just to close a road. It's a ridiculous idea.

I noticed in the article you linked to that the county is taking responsibility for maintaining the rs2477 road. I assume that costs quite a bit. I hope the road goes somewhere worthy of the expenditure. In my area a load of gravel costs over \$200. The grader in the background must be a hundred bucks an hour. Sounds like Kane County is spending big taxpayers dollars, including the court battle. I bet not everyone in Kane County is happy with that!

I don't see anywhere any attempt to control your access to federal government land. You may not be allowed to bring your truck along though. Trucks have a different set of rules. They are called objects, not people and are not participants in our society, though people like you, who probably call their truck , have trouble differentiating between a babe and a truck.

Motorized use makes the land closed to hikers and quiet seekers by design. Hikers don't like the noise and pollution, so they go elsewhere. I wish that hikers could be offensive to OHVers, maybe by crapping in the OHV tracks, so OHVers would know what we mean when we say YOU'RE OFFENSIVE. But alas, hikers aren't offensive. We're nice. So motorized users will probably never understand.

I decided to see what the buzz was all about with OHVs being so wonderful, so I drove up in the woods with my honda civic and found a skinny, ratty dirt road with lots of potholes and rocks popping up. I got on it and for a half hour I wove in and out and barely kept the oil pan from getting crunched. I had to watch the road like a hawk so I didn't see any scenery, just the road bed. I found a place to turn around and then I had to do it all again, for another half hour. I had on my heart monitor and I didn't see any increase in beats per minute. And I was kind of bored with the whole experience because I didn't get anywhere I couldn't have walked to in half the time, and walking, I would have smelled the roses, so to speak.

I mostly told that story about my OHV experience today to point out that my heart rate never went up at any time during the ride. I think that when people claim that OHVing is healthy, they are lying. When they say it connects them with nature, they are exaggerating. I didn't mean to imply that, just because I don't enjoy bumping down a ratty road, you shouldn't enjoy it. But really, hiking is infinitely better for you and you'll see a lot more of nature.

Glad you got out for the weekend. Put some black carbon on an ice cube and set it in the sun next to a regular ice cube and tell me which one melts first. Now, once the black carbon ice cube melts, put the remainder of the regular ice cube in your margarita and notice that, though the carbon cube would not make it colder, the non- carbon cube still makes your drink refreshing. I like refreshing. I don't like tepid. And the economic cost of melting the ice cap is going to be astounding. There's no doubt about it. Your so called studies were done by the oil industry.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Jets that leave trails in the shape of tic tac toe games are insulting to nature. Jet trails all over the sky and the shapes they create are insulting to nature and those who look to nature for artistic and design ideas. Jet trails make national park visits less meaningful by destroying the sublime lines of the natural world. Tic tac toe game looking clouds in the sky can't have a positive impact on children's minds. Jets should not be allowed over or upwind from national parks.

You need to pay the full cost of your actions and quit sluffing off. Take responsibility for your actions. I don't want to pay for your actions. Don't ask me for welfare. If you are screwing up my national park by flying over it, you are stealing from me. Pay up.

I said the contrails are insulting to Nature. I don't think you likin em makes em um um good.

I never said anything about my vision of a contrail making it insulting to nature. That's your interpretation and it is an intentional twist to warp this conversation. \_\_\_\_\_, go drink your own bong water. I don't have any.

Natures lines are sublime and could teach you something about the world you live in, if you were receptive. Instead people like you try to superimpose your trite vision over the sublime lines of nature. I guess that makes you more comfortable with the world. But it's insulting to everything that is bigger than you, and to the people who are not afraid to look at the world the way it really is.

Well let's give \_\_\_\_\_ some peace of mind and do a full EIS on contrails affecting public land so s collins and all his family and his little dog wolfie can sleep good tonight and not have to worry about terrorists.

Weather modification destroys recreation. Here is a satellite photo taken yesterday that shows a wide area of manmade weather. These manmade clouds are over the northwest US and they decrease my interest in going outdoors and recreating. Now, if you keep your head down and never look up, you probably wouldn't notice that the sky had the look of a big tic tac toe game, but if you like a real wilderness experience, this crap has got to stop! { <a href="http://rapidfire.sci.gsfc.nasa.gov/subsets/?subset=USA1.2010285.terra.1km" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

There are many theories and I'm sure that they all are possible, especially in light of the recently exposed syphilis experiments. { <a href="http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6903RZ20101001" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } If you expanded on this idea or listed a new idea I would appreciate it. Aerial spraying of chemicals is a subject barely touched on in this forum and it definitely affects health and recreation and public lands wildlife and plants.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

The border of Glacier Park is the center of the river, so mining on the North Fork, which is crystal clear, will affect the water quality inside the national park. It's time for the US to add the whole North Fork Flathead River to Glacier NP. It's certainly scenic enough! And \_\_\_\_\_: you saying that, because the glaciers are going to be gone soon, it's OK for us to continue down fossil fuel road, just demonstrates how cynical humans really are. Here's how the human mind works: someone sees a beautiful place and they dump their garbage there. A bunch more people of the lowest common denominator see the garbage and they think it's a dump so they dump their garbage there. Pretty soon the county make's it into a bonafied dump site. Someone says clean it up, it should have always been a national park. But the majority say, it's a dump, it's always been a dump. We have to make the world better. It's easy to degrade everything, but it's hard to clean it up. Around Glacier Park, one of our oldest national parks, we can clean it up.

Control carbon at the source, geoengineering is not an option. Heres a link to a Washington post article: Threat of global warming sparks U.S. interest in geoengineering { <a href="http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/03/AR2010100303458.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } There is only one solution to climate altering carbon. We have to produce less of it. A lot less. And we have to do it right now. Making Earth and all of it's inhabitants part of a global geoengineering experiment is scandalous and downright evil and would be a heinous crime against humanity and nature that will cause the slow death of millions of people and the extinction of species on a massive scale. Allowing the heat to come on is the only way people will come to see the light about alternative energy. Here's another article from London's top newspaper. { <a href="http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/jan/28/iron-carbon-oceans" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Geoengineering in itself is a massive experiment. Any participation of anyone or government in any form of geoengineering that is meant to reduce the affects of carbon dioxide pollution and lower global temperatures is an experiment that, I assume, will be performed without the permission of the people of our country. That experiment, which will include stratospheric Welsbach cloud seeding from jet airliners as outlined in a 1991 patent by Hughes Aircraft { <a href="http://www.freepatentsonline.com/5003186.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }, and ocean fertilization with iron to induce plankton blooms, will have grave side effects that will reduce the diversity of lifeforms on Earth. It is likely that many people will also suffer from this geoengineering of our planet because people will be breathing airborne mining waste pm2.5 every single day, indefinitely, in doses that will definitely have health effects. Geoengineering will give mining companies incentives to create and disperse mining waste into the environment, into the upper atmosphere, where it will eventually fall to the ground, without environmental review or critique, as they will call this dispersal recycling. Because geoengineering will all be an experiment, as there are no set of results that will be widely understood, and all of humanity will be affected without their permission, and geoengineering will definitely have health effects that will cause death to some people, probably a large portion of Earths population, this will be a crime against humanity and any perpetrators will be criminals.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

\_\_\_\_\_ said "But if scientist don't have the ability or are not allowed (by ideas such as this one) we would never know what may work and what would not work." They don't have permission to do geoengineering. If they do it, it's a criminal act, like rape. It is a violation of someone's body without permission. It's that simple. And I'm not talking about whitewashing rooftops. I said stratospheric seeding and ocean fertilization.

When I post an idea here it is for the people who initiated this list. It doesn't really matter if any one individual gets my drift or not. When the Obama administration refers to geoengineering to combat climate change, they are talking about a drastic alternative to carbon dioxide emission cuts which are proving to be politically unlikely because oil and coal money gets politicians elected. They are not talking about small actions. They are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars of geoengineering. If you think that you are just going to skate by and ignore the results of that geoengineering, you are sadly mistaken. You will be a part of an experiment without your permission, just like I will. And that experiment may have deadly consequences for you and your family, or worse yet, it may ruin the great outdoors so no one can ever enjoy it ever again.

\_\_\_\_\_ has absolutely no proof regarding any of the statements he has made. All the geoengineering articles I have read, which is many, (and they are available by simply typing geoengineering into a search engine) state that there could be dire consequences with experiments of this kind.

For every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. If we do something massive ( I'm talking massive, not just changing the color of our buildings or replanting trees that we've cut down) here in the USA, it will change something in the opposite way somewhere else on the planet. Now, a well educated guy like you should know that!

Trails in environmentally sensitive areas have always been rerouted and the damaging trails are closed permanently. I've never seen any sign of a hiker trying to reopen a wet meadow trail that was closed. I have seen plenty of OHVers try to open paths that were closed to protect the environment, and when they get to the wet meadows, they usually spin brodies all over them. It's just an entirely different way of thinking.

I see you have made one comment and have, to this date, cast one vote. You are villifying government employees and making it seem like they are somehow less worthy of jobs than the private sector. The private sector doesn't do a lot of things that are important to your life, like educate your kids, surface your roads and give you access to hunting and fishing. You disagree with some of the ways the government spends your tax money but you agree with some of the expenses. Same with me, but I think they should spend a lot more on research and monitoring and a lot less on roads. The government is the only entity that has enough money to regulate big corporations to protect little people like yourself from becoming slaves. As for government overspending, the whole world is in an economic crisis that is far from solved. If we don't spend money to get out of it we'll all be eating rat. Maybe spending the money won't get us out of it anyway, but we have nothing to loose.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

\_\_\_\_\_ said "Keep all the land open and MANAGE IT. Thus the USDA has a job to do." A great deal of the world has been stripped of trees. For centuries the hills of Ireland have had nothing but grass growing on them. The soil on those hills was so bad that crops would not even grow. So in order to plant a garden, inhabitants had to drag seaweed up from the ocean to make soil that would grow potatoes. In other words, where humans occupy the land for many years, eventually the land will be totally destroyed. That is our history. That is what will happen here in the USA. We have swept from coast to coast pillaging all of this continents resources in just 2 centuries. This is what humans call "management". It will not be very long before we are all sitting on a rock in a desert hoping that a goat we own will feed our families one more day. The human direction in this world is like an arrow that is shot and it will not veer from its course until it hits the target.

I think your statements are correct but incomplete. There may be more trees but there is much less biomass. Many forest stands are unhealthy and overstocked and prone to fire, but land managers have proven over the years that they are incompetent and are slowly but surly aiming at completely stripping the ground of all the forests over the next century, for mines, cities, power plants, toxic spills, wood products, and most widely, air pollution.

\_\_\_\_\_ said "Next time you are on an airplane, look out the window. " Most people on aircraft are too scared to look out the window, so they miss an incredible opportunity to see an overview of what people are doing to the planet. 1) the sky is becoming permanently brown throughout the northern hemisphere. 2) almost all of the land is being used by people 3) the population density is increasing in all areas that are not owned by the government 4) most of the USA is deforested for farms, cities, roads. 5) wilderness areas look remarkably beautiful even from 30,000 feet

Arctic Ocean should be off limits to development!. Russia is expanding their boundaries into the arctic for oil and gas development. The USA should also extend it's boundaries to the north into arctic waters and then declare those waters as off limits to development of any kind. The reason the Arctic Ocean is on the front burner right now, and you can look at news stories about this on the BBC website, is that global warming is making the ice cap melt and that ocean is becoming accessible. Drilling for oil and gas there will make global warming worse, which is the opposite of what we need. It is absolutely counterproductive and counter intuitive to take advantage of the catastrophe of global warming and make it even worse.

Invisible Benzene and the Great Outdoors. Benzene flows invisible, like rivers, down the canyons from freeways and factories. People have heart palpitations and doctors say that is normal. It ain't normal. People swarm the shelves for herbal remedies looking for something to make themselves feel better. How are we supposed to get out and enjoy the wild if benzene has made the whole atmosphere poisonous? In my area, the government doesn't even monitor gasses you can't see. It's not good for the chamber of commerce, I guess. They don't want to know. The fed needs to toughen measuring standards for benzene and invisible atmospheric pollutants. Sick people don't get out and recreate.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Here is a link describing benzene from the epa website.

[www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/hlthef/benzene.html](http://www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/hlthef/benzene.html) This pollutant is widespread in cities and along freeways all over the world. Because it is invisible, most people can't imagine being poisoned by it. Sort of like carbon monoxide.

Thanks for reading the link. There's a mountain of info on Benzene and I don't want to get too technical as too much verbiage keeps people from reading. Here is another link [www.deq.state.or.us/news/prDisplay.asp?docID=2704](http://www.deq.state.or.us/news/prDisplay.asp?docID=2704) Keep in mind that this compound is common and widespread and that it has a high molecular weight so it lies close to the ground, displacing our normal, breathable atmosphere. It pools up and forms invisible rivers that flow away from transportation corridors and factories. Pools of benzene can be inches to many feet deep, usually in low spots in the landscape. Benzene is not affected by catalytic converters. Catalytic converters help out with about 95 percent of auto smog, leaving 5 percent untreated. Now there are twenty times more cars, so their polluting is back where it was before the catalytic converter was invented. Trouble is, now that pollution is invisible, so most people don't acknowledge the problem. Asthma in the USA is soaring.

Could you please provide me with a link to one of the enviro wacko lawsuit summaries. I really need to see what the reasoning is that defines an enviro wacko. Other than that \_\_\_\_\_, I personally believe you all should have a place to ride, and close to your homes. These riding places need to be well defined so I don't accidently end up hiking there. I have already suggested using highway corridors right of ways for this activity. That is government land and, for the most part, it is ignored by OHVs.

\_\_\_\_\_ said "46% of the Forest is Designated Wilderness" and "only 1% of all Flathead Forest visitors go there", I used to live in the Flathead. We are totally off subject now, but you brought it up. The Flathead is the most beautiful NF in the lower 48. It is also mostly rock and ice and for 6 months a year it is bone chilling cold. Trees grow extremely slowly there, about 25 percent as fast as they do in the Pacific NW, so, once a clearcut is always a clearcut, for all practical purposes. It is no wonder that most of the forest was set aside as wilderness. The part, though, that is not wilderness designated has not fared so well. Almost all of it is a solid, clearcut stumpland, with trees left along the main roads so visitors don't notice. The Flathead is not representative of any other National Forest in Montana. Most of Montana is wide open to logging, mining, cattle grazing and OHVs. You have chosen to highlight a very small area compared to the whole USA and you are suggesting that visitor usage should have something to do with the amount of wilderness set aside. Once again I have to say, wilderness is not for humans. Humans can benefit from it through clean air and clean water and a place to hike or hunt, but first and foremost it is set aside for nature.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"The reality is that thousands of loggers are out of work for lack of timber sales" Thousands of loggers are out of work because they cut trees fast and efficiently and the forests were liquidated. Most of the wilderness areas contain very little merchantable timber. That is a fact. It takes 70 years to grow a tree that is worth the cost to cut it. Most of the trees that were cut already were two to four hundred years old. Trees grow very slowly at Flathead NF elevations. Human visitation has nothing to do with the value of wilderness.

Sick people can NOT recreate!. People who can't breathe can't get out and enjoy nature. Asthma and heart disease caused directly by air pollution is running rampant. Everyone in the USA knows a few people who survive on inhalers, including young kids. Wake up! These people don't think about anything but breathing. Recreation is a luxury to be experienced by people who are somehow unaffected by the atmospheric sewer of air that people have made. Here's the worst of it. We "recycle" our garbage including plastic by sending it to China where it is burned and sent back to us as toxic air pollution. On the barge to China, the worst, most polluting kind of fuel is burned to propel the ships. This is greed running our world, on the most retarded level. Should there be a government push to end disgusting behavior? YES, there should. The DOI and USDA can participate by reducing use of plastic and packaging, converting to electric vehicles, turning off lights, building smaller buildings and using solar hot water.

I'm going to have to agree with \_\_\_\_ here. The human experience isn't a very important aspect of of the whole.

Conservation is conspicuously, absolutely missing from the national debate, which makes me wonder, did Obama lie about his commitment to environment just to get elected, or did the big boys from big coal, oil and toxic waste, behind the scenes take him in the back room, put a friendly arm around his shoulder and say something like, 'if you want your pretty daughters and wife to stay alive, don't say another word about parks, climate change, ending the war and crap like that'.

Conservation organizations have been great about helping people understand environmental problems. The government has to use the billy pulpit to help consumers understand the consequences of consumption that is beyond the carrying capacity of the planet. The consumer is the key. If an airline is only allowed to carry so many passengers on a certain size of plane, why should we ask the Earth to provide lifestyles of the rich and famous to everyone in the world? There are a lot of really stupid things consumers are doing that actually diminish the quality of life for all of us and our future. One example is shipping things like steel and drywall all the way from China, things that we could make right here, heavy things. We send China our garbage and they use it to power their electric plants and cargo ships and send us a polluted atmosphere and a bunch of crap made by slave labor. Consumers need to say no! Pay a little more, but have a little class. Don't enable the slimiest possible behavior.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Too little too late is a sure recipe for disaster . Too little too late is a catastrophe for billions of people, and all the animals, birds and plants of Earth. Money and precious stones are going to be worthless and you won't be giving an inheritance to your grandchildren either. Environmentalists are not the only ones who need air to breath, food to eat, water to drink. There are tons of ideas here to improve the quality of life on Earth. Start now and get it done!

\_\_\_\_\_, did I do that? I apologize. Actually, it is 10000 feet of hazy air and there's not as much lift as there would be if the air was clear. It's quite frustrating to know that all those people who hang out within a few feet of the ground all their lives never look up and see the problem. The whole climate is being altered by pollution. Learn how to hang glide. You'll learn a lot and your kids will respect you more.

\_\_\_\_\_ said "very early years of the sport. Several deaths in the family" I'm sorry to hear that. The danger factor is now vastly improved, perhaps thanks to your flight pioneers. About your comment on the air being better than in the 60s: catalytic converters improved 95 percent of emissions, but now there are many times more cars, so air pollution is rising again; but now it is invisible. Benzene and other invisible gasses are becoming a serious problem. Ambient pollution from China, India and ships is also a concern.

I can't believe there are people who promote this kind of crap. Talk about shooting yourself in the foot. If this land were private you would not be allowed on it anymore. If you like recreating on private land, go ask a land owner for permission and stay off my government land.

Close roads of no proven economic use that are degrading environment. Close all federal public land roads unless it can be proven through EIS process that those roads are necessary for long term economic benefit and are not causing environmental degradation.

What? Do all you people who demote think it's OK that forty years has gone by and not one thing has been done about this problem. Do you think you're going to somehow breeze through this problem. You're not. The political establishment is planning on doing something to 'fix' the greenhouse effect. It's called geoengineering. They figure a good percentage of us are going to die of breathing problems caused by seeding the atmosphere with aluminum iodide. Collateral damage is what they call it. THERE IS NO TIME FOR BEING NICE ANYMORE. Congress needs to get it's ass in high gear and radically cut greenhouse gasses. And this is not just my 'opinion'. Almost every scientist in the world agrees with this. And the few who don't work for big oil and coal.

Federal Public land belongs to all Americans, equally, and all Americans should have an equal say in its use.. Local people should not have any more right to say what use federal public land is put to than any other American, any place in the country. The Whitehouse belongs to all Americans, the National parks belong to all Americans, and every acre of public land belongs to every American, equally.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

\_\_\_\_\_ said "the locals should more say."... so... "land bills wouldn't be spearheaded by environmentalist groups any longer" BP buys a few congressmen and promotes an oily wasteland in a wildlife area and buys locals with short term but high paying jobs that wreck an area once and for all. But you don't want any outside interference in your local federal lands by environmentalists who don't want to see natural national treasures wrecked. Huh?

\_\_\_\_\_ said "What does BP have to do with this? " I was just using BP as an example of an interest group, British for that matter, that would have more leverage over US public lands if a few locals got to dictate what was going to be the land use pattern for all federal public land. If all they have to buy is a county full of votes in order to keep a wilderness area from being established it seems like that's how a huge mining corporation would want it. You talk about a couple of million bucks enviro groups are raising to promote a wilderness in Utah. A company like BP would spend that much every few seconds to prevent a wilderness from happening if there was oil under it. You say enviros won't allow a middle ground. Huge corporations are the entities that don't allow a middle ground. Proof of that is that almost the whole planet has been decimated for profit and there is almost no place in the world that has not been over run by people. If you don't like the wilderness proposal for Utah federal public lands, some of the most bone dry desert in the world, you really wouldn't like what's happening in the rest of the world.

Hogwash, Why should owners of the land who live closer to the area have any different rights than owners of the land who live further away?

\_\_\_\_\_ said "what recourse do I have for the expropriation of my property and violation of my beliefs while the hunters pass back by with carcasses slung on their shoulders or pagans parade around clothed only in leaves?" I think \_\_\_\_\_'s idea here needs a little work. \_\_\_\_\_, what are you going to do about the pagans?

There is nothing but truth in everything I post on this site. I said there are no OHV trails that have been closed in my area that prevent me from getting to the public lands I enjoy. That is the truth. In fact, if OHV trails were closed, I wouldn't have to walk as far to enjoy local public lands. I don't enjoy walking in ruts, seeing heavy equipment drive by, or listening to screaming motors when I walk. There are public lands where I don't go because they are already impacted by motor noise and gas fumes. Those are the public lands on highway rights of way. You will get no argument from me if you use those corridors for your activity.

I wish I could instill in your imagination what a national park would look like if the many visitors who now choose to see natural wonders on foot all decided to buzz around on obnoxious motor cycles. The only reason you enjoy your motorized sport is because many, many others are quietly making room for you, by walking.

Access to a fishing hole where parents can bring their kids is pretty basic. In my area, access is not really a problem. But if it had been when my son was growing up, I'd have been upset. Since we're on the subject: please parents, teach your kids to handle fish carefully and use barbless hooks so the fish you catch don't die. Kid access can be pretty hard on fish populations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As cities expand, recreation use is jammed into a smaller and smaller space. Then it does more damage to the land that is left. Fight to keep the cities corralled. Fight for open space. Don't blame things like this on environmentalists. It's about urban sprawl, which is driven by population growth.

\_\_\_\_\_, arctic sea ice. Take a look at it. Compare it to 40 years ago. Two ships are trying right no to circumnavigate the arctic ocean, a fete hitherto impossible because of the ice cap. It's melting. Let me guess. You were totally surprise when the financial markets fell apart. Pay attention. You're on the Titanic.

\_\_\_\_\_ said "The problem is... this money is getting high-jacked!" From your comment I gather that your money was used to restore a trail to its natural condition and that is what the money was supposed to be used for if there was no way to use that trail without damaging the environment. Face it, you don't see the damage you do. You need some training so you can identify the problems. But I don't think it is mandatory to have a degree in fish biology or environmental science in order to ride an OHV. Maybe it should be.

A freeway is like the great wall of china for wildlife. The environmental damage it causes is a catastrophe. People need to take responsibility and solve this very serious wildlife access problem.

\_\_\_\_\_ said "After living in Japan, Germany and Italy for a decade, I have finally returned to Montana. I don't hear the roaring of the traffic from dawn to dusk and dawn again" Most of the Earth is populated and cities are much bigger than they are here in the US. For all practical purposes, Europe and Japan have no wilderness. The old forests disappeared centuries ago along with native wildlife. You came back to the states to get away from the hustle and bustle of Europe and you had to go all the way to Montana, one of the least densely populated places in the US to find a lifestyle you enjoy. There are not many places on the whole globe as wild as Montana. And then you complain about setting aside a little bit of land for a National Monument. The key to having your lifestyle for the rest of your lifetime is to protect what you've got. If you don't, it will be developed and populated and the hustle and bustle will come to your back yard. That is a world wide proven truth. The human population is growing and spreading out. I grew up in Montana, and believe me, it used to be a much wilder, even less populate place. \_\_\_\_\_ also said: "but I have this terrible feeling that the way I live will be taken from me." Yes it will. The house I grew up in was bulldozed and replaced with a parking lot. The quiet residential neighborhood was replace with a bustling city of square brick buildings and noisy trucks speeding around on freeways. And the quiet lake-sides where my family used to go to enjoy mountain scenery great fishing have been lined with three story mansions and private property signs. I shake my head in wonderment: how could you come to say:"I will be forced to move back into the cities" The cities are coming to you. Why can't you see that?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Jets create contrails. Contrails, due to fuel additives, expand and create cirrus clouds. These clouds are not natural weather and they affect many aspects of the wilderness area, including solar radiation, precipitation and atmospheric chemistry. Wilderness areas are supposed to be untrammled, which means that they are free to function without human manipulation. Weather modification is most certainly changing the natural function of wilderness areas. This idea has nothing to do with my pristine outdoor experience. It has to do with living up to the wilderness act and keeping wilderness areas 'untrammled by man'.

Keep wild places for the wildlife. Whether it is Bristol Bay, the Arctic National Refuge, the wild mustangs or the wolf populations, we are letting various industries and corporate interests encroach upon our wildlife and their habitat until we will be lucky to have any left. Mining in the beautiful wild area of Bristol Bay which sustains both wildlife and people. Do we really need to dig for gold and have to produce huge dams to store the polluted water which results/ Do we need to drill for oil in the arctic off-shore or on land? Drilling everywhere we can in this nation will not produce more than 10% of the oil this country uses so it would seem we are drilling to make money for the oil companies, not for necessity. Rounding up wild mustangs and warehousing them so that there is more room for cattle to graze? This costs the taxpayer much more money than it makes on the ridiculously low 'range rent' that the cattle industry pays. With the small amount of mustangs left to graze we will be lucky if we have any mustangs left. What about making and keeping a better policy to keep the wolves alive? The wolf hunts aren't about the wolves eating cattle, they don't that much and the government and private organizations have long been willing to recompense the farmers. The wolf hunts are about wanting to kill a predator that competes with man as a hunter or in some cases just to kill for the sake of killing something. These are just a few examples. How about assuming of policy of protecting wildlife wherever and whenever possible and stop making excuses for eradicating it. Our ecosystems are all interlocking and ruining one part will eventually ruin all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Watersheds Work...Fund the CWMP. Landscape scale conservation work being conducted through a watershed approach is critical to the health and welfare of every American across the nation. Water connects us all. As a Headwater's State, Montana recognizes the importance of Building and Uniting Watershed Communities. Watershed groups emerge locally in response to local concerns and issues. Their success is often dependent on cooperative partnerships built on understanding, trust and respect. Because they reflect the needs of the community, on the ground projects encompass a wide variety of natural resource issues, but often include a strong education and outreach component. The Montana Watershed Coordination Council asks that the administration prioritize watersheds as part of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative and assist the efforts of local watershed groups, conservation districts and tribes across the nation by fully supporting the Cooperative Watershed Management Program (P.L.111-11). We believe that implementing the CWMP is an important first step in developing a comprehensive program that will provide the much needed financial, operational and technical support for the more than 1000 identified watershed groups across the nation. Montana is home to many success stories and is actively demonstrating the power and promise of local communities working collaboratively and collectively to address natural resource issues from the ground up. Conservation and education work that is accomplished through a watershed approach is enduring. It is enduring because it swells from the hearts and hands of regular folks in the local community, folks that care about the land and the legacy they are leaving for their children. As noted by Julie Cajune of the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe at the 2010 Watershed Symposium: Connecting Communities in Helena, Montana September 7th: "...we have a generational responsibility to introduce our children to the delights of the natural world and raise them with responsibility as stewards of the land...we live in a finite place with finite resources and we are losing the battle...now is the time to be radical and creative in our thinking and actions to connect to the spirit of the land and each other..."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Tread Lightly" doesn't work when the very purpose of an OHV is speed and thrills. The book "The consumer's guide to effective environmental choices: practical advice from the Union of Concerned Scientists" says that one of the most effective things you can do for the environment is, don't buy and ride an OHV. "Wilderness Quality" means an area of over 5000 acres without significant human impacts, so if people are riding ORVs on Wilderness Quality lands it means they are riding in places that have not yet been torn up by tires (or at least they weren't yet torn up 20 years ago when these pristine wild places were documented). In Utah elected officials (Mike Noel for one) have led groups to break the law and ride on closed trails in sensitive areas. OHV riders justify the destruction they cause either by saying "we have ridden here historically so it's OK to destroy this place" or by denying that there is any destruction. I have heard OHV riders say again and again that they believe riding in washes and rivers is benign because they believe (contrary to all scientific evidence) that the next rain washes away all traces. Areas that are heavily infested with OHVs become impossible for other users to use. The noise, speed and exhaust from the equipment makes the area dangerous for people on foot, especially those who don't want their children run over. Around Easter OHVs converge on Moab Utah and the resulting chaos is so vastly unpleasant that it is virtually impossible to visit the desert at that time of year without hiding out in a National Park or Wilderness Area where they are not allowed. In my strong opinion, public lands OHV use needs to be far more restricted, controlled, monitored and enforced than it is now, especially as the number of OHVs continues to grow with the population and the level of destruction rises. OHVs should not only be excluded from all identified wilderness quality lands, they be limited to designated trails. The most enforceable policy is that all public lands are closed to OHV use unless they are specifically marked as "open".

It is my understanding that this land provides water for thousands of homes west of I75, and that the development of this property would not only hurt native species, but would threaten the water supply of those thousands of people.

As someone who like OHV's and the outdoors I agree with this point of view that OHV trails dont need to be everywhere. Moreover I agree OHV trails should not be open to hiking. But all areas should be open to everyone. There is a balance. The extremes need to come to the middle and understand there needs to be comprise on both sides. Not black or white.

While you and I might be on opposite sides when it comes to wilderness and OHV issues, I have to agree with your comment above as there's not been much in terms of ideas on conservation. We should be doing what we can to conserve our resources in order to hopefully maintain our world. Why aren't we seeing a larger increase in fuel efficient cars? Or the reduction of the use of plastics, or electronic waste going overseas for processing? Why are we building more and more homes when people are loosing them at a record number? To me, something just doesn't add up.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Youth Outdoor Challenges for Tribes. For the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission's (Commission's) eleven member tribes, located in east-central Minnesota, northern Wisconsin, and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan (for more information on the Commission, see [www.glifwc.org](http://www.glifwc.org)), connecting to the outdoors provides a vital connection to culture. The exercise of the Commission's member tribes' treaty-reserved, off-reservation hunting, fishing and gathering rights depends on an abundance of healthy ecosystems that support natural resources that the tribes depend upon for cultural, subsistence, economic, and medicinal purposes. Federal courts have held that these rights cannot be exercised on most private lands, making the quality and accessibility of public land extremely important. Traditional diets have been shown to improve tribal members' health. "[T]here is a relationship between use of traditional Ojibwe food and the health and wellbeing of Band members." The holistic physical and mental health benefits of traditional food use include: the improvement of diet and nutrient intake; the prevention of chronic diseases (such as obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular diseases and hypertension, gallbladder disease, and dental disease) associated with the consumption of non-traditional foods; the opportunities for physical fitness and outdoor recreation associated with harvesting traditional foods; the opportunity to experience, learn, and promote cultural activities; and the "opportunity to develop personal qualities desired in Ojibwe culture such as sharing, self-respect, pride, self-confidence, patience, humility and spirituality." Harriet V. Kuhnlein, Ph.D., *Ojibwe Health and Traditional Food Use*, Centre for Nutrition and the Environment of Indigenous Peoples (1995), at 39. Staff of the Commission offer the following with respect to Challenges: What obstacles exist to achieving your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors? A number of challenges face tribes in reconnecting members, particularly youth, to the outdoors. Some of these challenges are shared by Americans of any race - the increased role of technology in our lives and the lure of cell phones, Facebook, chat rooms, video games, cable TV, and DVD movies, etc. Other challenges affect tribes disproportionately - 50% of American Indian children live in single-parent families. These parents often find themselves lacking either the skills, knowledge, financial resources, or time to participate in outdoor activities with their children. In addition, federal government policies of the 1940's, '50's and '60's relocated tribal members to urban areas. As a result, when tribal members return home to their reservations, they often do not have the outdoor skills developed by participating in traditional Ojibwe hunting, fishing, and gathering activities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What is Wilderness?. One of the greatest obstacles currently facing the conservation of wilderness is the lack of understanding of the term "wilderness." The Federal Government defines wilderness as "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." When most people think of wilderness, they think of national parks and reservations that have nice walking trails that conveniently end at clearings overlooking beautiful landscapes and scenery. These two concepts contradict each other in so many ways. Although it meets the requirement that humans do not permanently remain, it disregards the fact that walking trails, shelters, and the beautiful overlooks are creations of man that alter the wilderness, disrupting the "community of life" that is supposedly "untrammelled by man." There is no contrast to other "areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape," it is just masked by what we think wilderness should look like. Although, I believe people should have access to wilderness, there should be limits on the impact humans have on it. People who understand the importance of this distinction are willing to sacrifice the convenience of man-made structures to fully appreciate the beauty and grandeur of true wilderness. What is the point of entering the wilderness if you have to rely solely on human creations to enjoy it? When "googling" the term wilderness, the first suggestion that pops up when typing it is a link to a wilderness resort. This should not be the first thing we associate with wilderness. Rather than helping to conserve it, these associations ultimately hurt the whole concept of wilderness, catering to people who do not fully understand its importance. A compromise should be worked towards. Instead of the leveled, pristine walking trails that lead to convenient clearings overlooking beautiful landscape, a person should have to work for that reward. If that occurs naturally, then so be it, but if not, then man should not alter it to make it so. People who truly appreciate wilderness will either enter it knowing that they have to work for the reward of seeing it in its full beauty, or if they choose not or cannot enter, they will know it's because wilderness is being preserved the way it should be.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well this is the same self serving IMBA nonsense that Hasenauer has been pushing for years. His point 2 is an out and out lie. 1964 Wilderness Act did ban bicycles since they are mechanical transport. In the early years Hasenauer and IMBA were able to trick some land managers into believing that they were "human transport" not mechanical transport. This allowed mountain bikes into some wilderness areas. Finally the feds had to put the 1984 regulations in place to make it clear the original intent of the Wilderness Act - Mountain bikes are mechanical transport. They are not allowed and should not be allowed in wilderness areas. They should not be allowed on the PCT which is primarily a hiking trail. They already have access to miles and miles of trails, they just want to consume everything. Some jurisdictions have tried to allow Mountain biking on trails with hikers and equestrians but there is a long history of failure of this approach: History of Failure "Share the trails" is the cornerstone of the national mountain biking interest's public relations campaign to successfully promote opening public trails to mountain bike use. In the 1980's and early 1990's, this philosophy was used to convince many decision-makers that a "Sunday ride in the park" was precisely what mountain biking is all about and that no social nor environmental impacts would occur once trails were opened to use by bicycles. By the late 1990s however, mounting evidence of environmental damage, user conflicts and use displacement convinced many jurisdictions to return to earlier regulations and ban the use from public trails. The public agencies' actions amplify growing discontent among officials with the problematic sport. Of eight agencies interviewed on mountain bike use compliance with rules and regulations, all stated that the single biggest problem was the disproportionate amount of time that officers and staff spent on enforcement (See "Liabilities" this report). It is a costly sport in terms of enforcement, but also in terms of medical costs. 1. Bryant Creek Trail in Banff National Park, Canada, was closed in 1998 by officials due to disturbance to wildlife habitats. According to the Parks Superintendent, the distance a mountain bike can travel effectively shrinks the wild habitat from a human disturbance point of view. Predictably, mountain bike interests charged "discrimination" and said the trail should be closed at all. However, no credible evidence was presented that habitat disturbances ever occurred in the past, prior to mountain bike use introduction. The fact that the bike can travel so fast and far may in fact disturb grizzly habitat, a concern raised by nature personnel in Parks Canada when the trail was closed. 2. Boulder, Colorado—home of the International Mountain Biking Association—opened 6500 acres of parks in 1983 after discussion among agency staff and mountain bike interests, who committed to maintain and monitor trail use. Prior to that date, city parks prohibited mountain biking use. In 1987, after years of multiple efforts to educate, post signs, distribute brochures and offer a college course in proper mountain bike trail etiquette, Boulder officials barred the high impact sport from the parks systems because of off-trail damage, community complaints and staff-observed conflicts between mountain bike uses and other trail uses. 3. Alley Pond Park, Queens, in 1999, stepped up enforcement to include fines and seizures of mountain bikes after cribbing, logs and other maintenance devices, installed to impede erosion and bike traffic, were torn out and destroyed by mountain bikers unhappy with the trail closure and bike repair. The Parks Commissioner stated "They kill the vegetation, they cause erosion and they turn the thing into a motorcross track. It's a public park, not a racing ground." The Parks Forester stated that the footpath had been expanded from 12 inches to 5 feet due to aggressive bike riding; that further evidence was present of bikers straying off trails, creating new trails and damaging tree roots. 4.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Palos Verdes, Rolling Hills and Palos Verdes Estates, California, in 1990, banned mountain biking from their hiking and equestrian trails, citing unmanageable conflicts. Some bikers are "courteous, others are not," but the overall assessment concluded that the uses are in conflict. 5. Point Mugu, California, was the site of radar guns purchased by the State rangers in 1995 to clock and ticket speeding mountain bikers on "multi purpose" trails. As one ranger observed, "a lot of hikers are no longer coming" to the area because they no longer can enjoy the hiking experience. Radar guns are a clear indication of a chronic, not an occasional problem. When the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) planners limited mountain biking use in 1995, there were sued by biking interests, including IMBA. On appeal, the Ninth Circuit Federal Court of Appeals opined that testimony about mountain bike use speeding, causing erosion and scaring horses are valid indicators of use conflicts and the Court upheld the extensive ban on mountain biking imposed on Marin County Trails in the GGNRA. The mountain bike interests tirelessly demand "statistics or scientific studies" to prove conflicts exist, but the published Court opinion has clearly set aside that false argument and has provided that letters and verbal testimony about social conflicts are admissible and clear indicators of past, present and the likelihood of future conflict. 6. In 1990, the MidPeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD), California adopted extensive guidelines, policies and standards in order to permit mountain biking on multi-use trails. The mitigation measures included: • a published etiquette brochure • caution and speed limit signs • increased ranger patrols in hotspots with persistent problems In 2000, the MidPeninsula Regional Open Space District (MROSD), California voted to ban mountain biking in seven preserves, approximately 40 percent of the parks area, because of repeated problems with user conflicts and long-term damage to the parks ecosystems promoting erosion: The Agency launched a review of its trail policies after receiving a steady stream of letters from people who complained that their outdoor experience was marred by a run-in with bicyclists...Often the letters were from senior citizens and families with young children who said that they were afraid to hike the most popular trails. 7. A Commissioner admitted during the reconsideration that opportunities for tranquil nature study and observation had been lost and that the Agency had strayed from its directive to provide a peaceful outdoor experience. Reported as a threat to close trails, the district Commissioners subsequently voted to ban biking in seven preserves. This significant development occurred in an area that spent countless hours detailing policies, guidelines and standards to permit mountain biking on multi-use trails only to reverse its own policy when too many uncontrollable problems arose because of the use. 8. The Tantalus Trail, Hawaii, near the Hawaiian Nature Center, was closed by State officials in February to mountain bike use. The officials said that the halt was needed to allow recovery from rutted and eroded trails. Conditions on the 18-mile trail system were monitored for five years and mountain bike use damage was witnessed and documented; a lot of "near accidents" were also reported where hikers had to jump out of the way, said the program manager for the State Na Ala Hele trail program. 9. In North New Jersey, the Morris County Parks Commission, in 1999, banned mountain biking use from all but two parks. The Commission reconsidered after predictable pressure from bike interests who promised to "educate" bikers on trail etiquette. Mountain bike use is already prohibited on unpaved trails in Essex and Union counties due to repeated reports of conflicts, trail damage and loss of solitude among other trail users. 10. Orange County, California, a parks system touted by IMBA interests as a model, is experiencing significant

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

damage from environmentally and socially irresponsible mountain bike use. In Aliso and Woods Canyons Wilderness Parks, there is now a visible decrease in quality of habitat because bikers ride off of designated trails creating their own and poach hiker/equestrian trails when rangers are not present. The effects have been cumulative: "Rogue mountain bikers ride right over the vegetation – even prickly pear cactus – commonly replanted to block illegal trails. Signs identifying closed trails are taken down faster than I can put them up," (Ranger) Maloney said. And so on and so on.....

I am a Yup'ik artist and fisherman from Bristol Bay. I have traveled the world, and I cannot tell you how awesome my home is. It's economic cash value in gold is deceiving on paper, because it is worth so much more to not only the local people, but everyone around the world. It is a place that can heal an unhappy person with one boat trip upriver. It is a place that makes you feel accomplished and alive after catching your own dinner. It is a place that has a traditional way of life that is worth fighting for. Our people believe in thinking at least 7 generations ahead. Today, this is not only a local issue. We, as a nation, have the opportunity to protect diminishing and essential resources for all life; Water and wild food. You will not regret saving this land for our future generations.

To quote a hero of yours, "YOU LIE!!" Your assertions and pseudo-facts are pale falsehoods that have clearly never seen the light of truth. While a large percentage of lands in the Western US are indeed public lands (even up to the 80% you claim, in a few particularly waterless states), they are not 'open space'. They are dominated by roads, agriculture, mining, oil and gas drilling, logging, ski areas, and general human development. Most of the open space in the US is west of the Mississippi, perhaps even the 80% of it. But it only constitutes about 5% of the whole landmass of our country. Hardly a substantial amount. Ask the animals: Here in Colorado, elk and deer populations and reproductive rates are down on the order of 50%-90% over the last fifty years, due to habitat loss and the increasing pressures of motorized recreation. These are verifiable facts that come from the Division of Wildlife. You did make me laugh though, so thanks for your "idea" -- keep 'em coming. As a grumpy conservationist who sees the truth of what's happening on our Western public lands every week, I need to laugh more often.

It is helpful to remember that the best definition of wilderness is a region that isn't "about us", it's about the ecosystems and wildlife. Access, sidewalks, overlooks, restaurants, gift shops, roads etc. -- those have their place in our Parks, which emphasize the relationship between humans and landscape (mostly through inspiring scenery and the emotions it elicits). But Wilderness is different. It is for the other species. Not for us, even those who might want to work hard for some rewarding experience by entering it without mechanized/motorized means, as I do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You must not live anywhere near where you can see what these "private investors" of industry have done to our public lands. In Western Colorado, it is nothing short of a disaster zone throughout many counties where hard rock mining, logging, and oil and gas drilling have had their under-regulated ways with our environment. If we continue to externalize the costs of industry doing business (e.g. subsidizing them with public lands and resources), they will continue to exploit these opportunities for maximum short-term profit. Nothing surprising there; it is in the DNA of private capital interests to do so. Overall this is a terrible idea here, with perhaps the most insidiously undermining logic of any I've read so far. It would further sacrifice the public goods of our lands -- exactly the opposite of what is needed to protect wildlife, clean air, clean water, and quiet recreation opportunities.

Areas that are dominated by, or open to, "Human manipulation of the land" accounts for closer to 95% of the lands in the US, not 60% as stated here. Make no mistake, Kaitlyn, we're fighting over the scraps. More policy and financial support for 'alternative' (eg renewable, clean) energy is paramount, as you suggest. So is preserving the wilderness character of non-designated, and thereby unprotected, wilderness-quality lands, which speaks to your first point of 'changing how we dominate non-wilderness'.

Please help stop Mitsubishi's plans for an enormous, disasterous, toxic, open-pit gold and copper mine in the heart of Alaskan wilderness. Nothing less than an American natural treasure is at stake! Bristol Bay is home to orcas and beluga whales, wild moose and caribou, and one of only two populations of freshwater harbor seals in the world -- all intimately connected to the health of the bay and its world-class salmon runs. Those salmon runs also support thousands of sustainable jobs in fishing and tourism as well as Alaska Natives who depend on the salmon for food. The massive Pebble Mine would be dug right at the headwaters of the pristine watershed that feeds Bristol Bay. Anglo American (a British company) and Mitsubishi couldn't pick a much worse place on the planet to dig a 2,000-foot-deep open-pit mine. Sited in a known earthquake zone, the Pebble Mine's colossal earthen dams -- which are supposed to hold back some 10 billion tons of mining waste including toxic byproducts like arsenic and cyanide -- are a disaster waiting to happen. But it wouldn't even take an earthquake to irreparably contaminate this unspoiled corner of Alaska. Just constructing the Pebble Mine -- before it goes into full-scale operation -- will permanently destroy over 60 miles of salmon habitat. As all large mines do, it would leak, spilling copper -- which is toxic to salmon -- right into Alaska's biggest sockeye salmon fishery, on which wildlife, Native communities and commercial fishermen all depend for their survival. Will Mitsubishi back down when faced with worldwide opposition? It did 10 years ago. When Mitsubishi and the Mexican government planned a massive industrial salt plant in the planet's last untouched gray whale nursery at San Ignacio Lagoon in Baja, Mexico, millions of concerned people joined with leading Mexican environmental groups to oppose it. Working with an international coalition, public opinion was brought to bear on Mitsubishi -- deluging the company with more than one million petitions. In the end, the Mexican government called a halt to the project, and Mitsubishi abandoned its salt plant project! Today, Mitsubishi needs to know that proceeding with the disastrous Pebble Mine will give the company a black eye in the view of millions of American consumers.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Help stop Mitsubishi's plans for an enormous, disasterous, toxic, open-pit gold and copper mine in the heart of Alaskan wilderness. Please help stop Mitsubishi's plans for an enormous, disasterous, toxic, open-pit gold and copper mine in the heart of Alaskan wilderness. Nothing less than an American natural treasure is at stake! Bristol Bay is home to orcas and beluga whales, wild moose and caribou, and one of only two populations of freshwater harbor seals in the world -- all intimately connected to the health of the bay and its world-class salmon runs. Those salmon runs also support thousands of sustainable jobs in fishing and tourism as well as Alaska Natives who depend on the salmon for food. The massive Pebble Mine would be dug right at the headwaters of the pristine watershed that feeds Bristol Bay. Anglo American (a British company) and Mitsubishi couldn't pick a much worse place on the planet to dig a 2,000-foot-deep open-pit mine. Sited in a known earthquake zone, the Pebble Mine's colossal earthen dams -- which are supposed to hold back some 10 billion tons of mining waste including toxic byproducts like arsenic and cyanide -- are a disaster waiting to happen. But it wouldn't even take an earthquake to irreparably contaminate this unspoiled corner of Alaska. Just constructing the Pebble Mine -- before it goes into full-scale operation -- will permanently destroy over 60 miles of salmon habitat. As all large mines do, it would leak, spilling copper -- which is toxic to salmon -- right into Alaska's biggest sockeye salmon fishery, on which wildlife, Native communities and commercial fishermen all depend for their survival. Will Mitsubishi back down when faced with worldwide opposition? It did 10 years ago. When Mitsubishi and the Mexican government planned a massive industrial salt plant in the planet's last untouched gray whale nursery at San Ignacio Lagoon in Baja, Mexico, millions of concerned people joined with leading Mexican environmental groups to oppose it. Working with an international coalition, public opinion was brought to bear on Mitsubishi -- deluging the company with more than one million petitions. In the end, the Mexican government called a halt to the project, and Mitsubishi abandoned its salt plant project! Today, Mitsubishi needs to know that proceeding with the disastrous Pebble Mine will give the company a black eye in the view of millions of American consumers.

I know that the Upper Peninsula has large amount of public lands. There are some great destinations in all of these states, but few are in "rust belt" areas. Northern Indiana has Indiana Dunes National Seashore, but you look down the beach either way and there are smokestacks. Southwest Ohio has the Wayne National Forest, but it is highly fragmented. Detroit doesn't even have any National Historic Parks or Sites. The lakeshore dunes are a critically endangered habitat with high biodiversity, but at the moment, they are a stepchild of the more glamorous destinations. Cuyahoga National Park is a good example of carving a natural destination out of an old industrial area. These lands don't need to generate taxes if they can generate other revenue. Most parks generate a minimum of \$2 for the local economy for every \$1 spent by the government. With more popular destinations, that ratio is ten times higher. Also, most of the lands within the National Forest system or the National Wildlife Refuge system would generate much tax revenue because they are too mountainous or too swampy to be farmed or developed and therefore would not be valued highly. Either way, I'm mostly concerned about restoring ecosystems that have been destroyed by industrialization. Places succeed when the people there take pride in their surroundings and restore the health of their lands. You can't have a successful community in a place that neglects (or forgets they ever had) a beautiful landbase.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The wetlands are our only natural water filter. A Brita filter can not nearly do the job of the wetlands. Even if we had a giant carbon exchange column or a reverse osmosis filter system on all major street corners around town, the toxic load would just increase with each year and be more difficult to handle. More sophisticated public water treatment facilities would have to be built. QUESTION: Would we rather preserve our precious wetlands or build new water treatment plants ? The latter would require even more land to be developed. No manmade water filter can replace these lands. Once the wetlands are gone, they are gone FOREVER !

Respect volunteers. Other threads have talked about things like providing volunteers with a free pass if they work enough hours. Last year I officially volunteered almost 400 hours - 10-40 hour weeks - but was still well shy of the time required to get an \$80 interagency pass. Volunteering for an interagency pass is a full time job for nearly 3 months, far beyond the reach of most Americans. Sometimes volunteers are offered a free night at the campground where they volunteer. But that doesn't cut it either. I don't volunteer at a soup kitchen in order to get a bowl of soup for myself. Likewise, I volunteer on public lands to give to others who enjoy the land but don't have the free time to volunteer. For that reason, I find it entirely inappropriate for Government agencies like the Forest Service to take the fruits of my labor and charge a fee for what volunteers like myself have worked to create.

The point is that the funding comes from our tax dollars. The labor comes from our hands. And then the government takes over and charges a fee for what we've created. Seems inappropriate to me.

I like the idea of a voluntary donation, but considering I haven't been able to afford a visit to a National Park in decades, I not sure what I have to gain. How about making the Park entrance fee a voluntary donation?

\_\_\_\_\_ wrote: "kids have a right to play in clean waters and hike scenic trails, and more" Its interesting that we seem to lose this right as we age and are then forced to purchase access to hiking trails, scenic rivers, and the like.

Please see \_\_\_\_\_ (15 Sep 2010) entry; I'm with her. Please ban mtn bikes on PCT!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I've already cast my vote to demote, I'd like to add this little story: A few years back I almost fell off the edge of a cliff (this was in Griffith Park, Los Angeles, CA where mountain bikes are banned) when a mountain biker came careening down a deer trail; even he looked scared -- in the process tearing up the mountainside opening it up to erosion -- and came to a screaming stop at the feet of my horse. She jumped sideways to avoid the biker and almost lost her footing at the very edge of the trail. Needless to say, if we had gone over this very steep edge, neither of us would have survived. The mountain biker showed no concern over my safety instead, cussed me out for being in the way! I had to remind him that HE had been riding his bike in a restricted area and shouldn't have been there in the first place. He cussed even louder. So...please register and DEMOTE this measure. (Let me also add that equestrians are losing more and more trails while mountain bikers have increasingly more options open to them.) Not all mountain bikers are inconsiderate but, it's still dangerous to mix horse and mountain bike sports. Thanks for your concern and support.

This comment is poorly defined. I live in Utah and without the cooperation of ranchers and residents, waterholes become degraded and useless for any animal, including cattle as well as wildlife and non sustaining of botanical diversity. With the help of ranchers and local citizens the general range is preserved for wildlife and people. We have vast areas that few people in the eastern states can understand. What we do need is full access to our public lands and help with reclamation after fires. I would be heart broken if I could no longer visit many of these areas because I'm not as able as I used to be, or that my grandson would be limited from seeing these areas. Further, if these areas are designated wilderness, NO medical help would be available in an area already underserved by medical facilities. I don't mean to say that we throw these areas open for oil shale mining, which is a filthy, dangerous process.

I'd love to see more availability of National Forest recreation. As it is now it seems to be the domain of the big logging industry interests. The ugly clear cutting is merely convenience and the ragged roads are outright dangerous. Even when logging isn't an issue too often these lands are overgrazed, promoting undesirable plant species and the roads dubious. Not all of us can afford to stay with concessions in or near the national parks (especially seniors) or we'd like a peaceful place not overrun with people yet offering more than a downed log for an outhouse. We need to promote more jobs by hiring more staff and funding the projects fully. I'd be willing to pay a small fee to help. Our state parks have "campground hosts" who are often snooty and presuming and the fees are no longer in line with services received. There must be a happy medium here somewhere.

Sound science is not paid for by private, special interests. Funding must be made from neutral sources. Let's keep the private sectors/corporations out of this.

I would be careful of what Congressman Hinchey promotes. His treatment of western lands would lock them away from all but the vested interests with special interests. Also this sounds like the concept of gateway drugs, which is absurd.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In case nobody noticed, oil is past peak, in decline. I'm not saying that careful selective logging isn't a good idea, it is. But flight is polluting, expensive and in danger of going the way of the dinosaurs. "Flight" as in whatever you're promoting is odd.

Acquire Land. Take advantage of the decline in real estate values to acquire in-holders, adjacent properties, and in general expanding the public land base. Much of the original set asides are no longer used for their original purpose whether grazing, mining, rail roads, etc and some prime land is destined to become into accessible private property. Where ranchers, miners and railroads used to allow access the new developers of resort caliber property are prone to shut up miles of prime river and many square miles of land. In no case sell public land to satisfy the national debt. That is the equivalent of selling one's birthright. There may not be a better time for the next 15 years.

By definition, Wilderness Areas are to be sites of primitive use--where man is a visitor and not a part of the permanent landscape. Mechanical devices are not to be used in Wilderness Areas. For example, no chainsaws are allowed to clear trails, bridges are built by use of hand tools rather than electrical (generator driven) tools, etc. Mountain bikes do not meet the non-mechanical definition and should not be allowed access to Wilderness Areas.

yellowstones wild buffalo. I think these buffalo should be able to go onto our public lands freely. They need this land when there food souces are running low and they shouldn't have to compete with cattle when they get here. Who's idea was it to close this to the buffalo and allow cattle on them anyways it makes no sense. And no more hazing or costly shots for for the disease some carry that wouldn't help anyways.

I personally believe that some "wilderness" actually should be off limits to people and just left alone however idealistic or unrealistic as some think this notion to be... as far as going in naked, I'd at least have the Tarzan rule apply - loin cloth and blade allowed.

5) (29 Jun 2010) I love to hike and I agree that there should be areas set aside for hiking, but truly it is the hikers that are least compatible with other uses. OHVers are happy to share trails/areas with just about anybody - miners, ranchers, loggers, bicyclists, rock climbers, snow mobilers, horse back riders, etc. etc. I also agree that all motorized recreation should be as quiet as possible - loud pipes on vehicles are just plain annoying. I agree with ALL of your comments...well said! I especially agree that there is no doubt that hikers are some of the most hateful people I've encountered when riding my UTV. Taking a lesson from the training my children received when getting their license to drive an ATV, I move off the trail and shut off my engine to let most everyone pass by safely and respectfully. I have had very few hikers show any appreciation for this, rather I usually get snubbed with a dirty look and a grumbling. Others such as mountain bikers, people riding horses, etc. most always show their appreciation via a smile and a thanks. We need to learn to get along with one another. None of us have any more right to the lands of this nation than another. From what I've personally experienced many times, hikers could use the same training my kids got in how to respect others on the trail. My 8 year old is more respectful of people than many of you are!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

14)(16 Sep 2010) I think God gave us feet for a reason. If you want to see all that remote territory hike it! I believe you are not only disturbing the wild life but other human life as well with ORV's. Your rights only go as far as not interfere with other's rights! My intent is not to trash you Carol, but only a recognition of your ignorance. Do you not recognize that not everyone has the ability to hike these areas. You are right, 'your rights only go as far as not interfere with other's rights!' Your view suggests that people who are unable to hike them do not exist or are not as important as you and those that share in your ignorance. State and Federal lands are there for ALL of us to enjoy regardless of our ability to hike or not. I am a Utah native and I can personally attest that many of the negative comments posted here are absolute lies. I honestly cannot remember any area that has been trashed by an OHV. I am not ignorant enough to say it doesn't happen as I'm sure it does. However, I take every opportunity to visit all parts of Utah and it's surrounding States and have not seen this. Additionally, there are few new trails being produced that I've witnessed. Of those I have seen, the Forest Service seems to manage efficiently by posting as closed or other means. To accompany this, I feel that the OHV training our youth get has been very effective for kids and parents alike. As one of those parents, I now go out of my way to protect our environment and would be the first to turn someone in for making new trails, littering, etc. By my example, my children have learned to pay attention to what others are doing and would do the same. I love the opportunities we all have to enjoy the varied environments of the Western States. Thanks to roads and trail systems that have been around for decades, I've seen and enjoyed scenery that I never could have otherwise. While I believe that some trails that duplicate another trail to the same destination should selectively be closed, I feel the continued efforts to close off large tracts of land to those who choose to access them by OHV are absolutely unacceptable, thoughtless, and self-serving.

We the people includes everyone...not just the environmental activist that has become well known for having the attitude that EVERYTHING is being destroyed by OHVs and the sky is falling. Guys we need to find common ground here. Not everything can be YOUR way or the highway. Most of us who enjoy recreating with an OHV agree that we must protect the environment that we have. Guaranteed, NONE of you love the environment more than we do. We don't advocate new trails and roads. What we advocate is the right to use what already exists. A bunch of our roads and trails have already been closed...most without seeking our input. We're tired of being railroaded and we are now letting our voice be heard. We are part of the "We are the People" club of the United States too. We love the mountains, sand dunes and all the areas we recreate in. With a consideration to taking care of our environment, we demand the right to continue to access these areas and we demand that our voices are heard before any more lands are deemed National Parks or a Wilderness designation.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All the OHV (dirt bike in my world) users I know respect the land and other users, including hikers (I like to hike and mountain bike too). If a rut and a puddle is destruction then your definition is silly? A rut and puddle is a "drop in the ocean" of our world. I'm sorry, but your argument is nonsense and just not based on common sense. Proper trail building and maintenance techniques actually prevent erosion and protect the landscape. In addition, nature is not as delicate as you think. It can handle a few ruts and puddles. But, forest fires is another matter. Talk about destruction. However, eco-nuts prevent harvesting the good wood after a fire to let "nature take it course" - meaning "let the bugs have the good wood." This too is nonsense.

OHV use should be considered as any other recreational use in the forest. The impact (if any) is minimal and trails and roads help create fire break. A good trail system actually prevents erosion when proper trail building techniques are used. What is the point of creating more wilderness for the critters and bugs when we ALL (including humans) can play nice and enjoy the beauty of God's creation.

You are joking, right? Seriously, you are joking? What state do you live in? Not CO, not UT... I'll give you one easy example - BLM closures in the Moab, UT area. Lower Porcupine Rim Trail was closed to dirt bikes Oct 31, 2008 because it was not designated as a dirt bike trail in the TMP, regardless of the fact it was created by dirt bikes. That is one small section of Moab that has been closed, or limited to dirt bikes. When I pushed the BLM as to why it was closed, no other reason was given. That one peice of trail is maybe 10 miles of more than 500 miles (at least, probably more like 2 times that) that are now closed.

I am an engineer, I understand "contamination" in rivers/streams and how erosion carried into streambeds kill fish feeding bug larvea (among other problems). I have designed, installed and maintained erosion control measures. I have also seen natural streams (no mines, little or no nearby roads) turn brown with silt from natural erosion events (large storms, or cutting into natural hillside slumps, like in Southern CO). The question over whether a road will impact a stream is not cut and dry - it has more than a few "inputs" - how steep is the hillside, where is the nearest stream, what kind of soil exists, what kind of protection exists over the soil, etc... While you may brush off a quick reference to deer and elk (healthy fox and I even saw two moose a few months ago) still existing near my house, the fact is that my impacted land (by housing, OHV use, and historic mining) is still healthy. The big game is still here, the fish are actually increasing. Unmaintained roads and trails in my area do not adversely affect the land like it may in other areas. I can't say this enough, I want MY land (this is where I live, where I play) to stay wild. I also want access. We (well, the FS) is closing roads and trails right now quickly and with little reason. I want reason (I want the damage to be documented) for closure to be clear, otherwise, leave it as is. Where do you live? This is pertinent to the conversation now. It may explain why you feel that NF status is not enough protection.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Michigan, that explains A LOT. Please, do not confuse eastern land use policies with the west. We have loads of NF and WAY less people. I could see how you are concerned being the entire east coast is a wasteland of people and private land, but that IS NOT happening in the West. We have NF, which balances recreation, use and conservation in a mostly adequate (until recently) manner. Much of the concern about land use in the West is driven by people who may have never been here, and certainly have never lived here.

Your entire post is great, but I want to repeat this, because this part is important: "These actions are costing the forest service, as well as a large portion of the environmental community, in terms of creditability" Could not agree more.

I would say we pretty much agree with each other. I just want the FS and BLM to stop closing roads in areas we already ride, that's all. Leave the roadless areas roadless, leave the lightly impacted areas lightly impacted, close the few trails or roads out there that are causing problems that can't be easily mitigated or re-routed. That's all I want.

The rest is the truth (the FACT is that in the past 10 years tens of thousands of miles of roads and trails have been closed for little or no reason), you want to sit around with your fingers in your ears, fine with me... you can delude yourself all you want. It shows very much the true value of your character. You want legitimate documentation, how the heck am I going to find reports or reviews where a government agency actually admits to closing trails for no reason? Do you even realize how stupid you look by repeating that stupid question? Seriously, do you have any idea? Someone like yourself, who lives in the Midwest or East coast (I know it's guess, but I'll bet anything this guy is from the VA/NY-ish area) doesn't see it everyday. I'll tell you what, go to BLM's Moab office website and check out the TMP maps - I can tell you areas where the BLM has closed dozens of miles of singletrack that you have no idea ever even existed. Then call the BLM and ask why the Lower Porcupine Rim trail was closed to dirt bikes, after being created by dirt bikes; I have, they will not give you a reason other than it was designated to be closed by the TMP. DO you really want people to start listing trails that have been closed, I can go on all day...

Thanks for the reminder on the rules, \*facepalm\* I appreciate it... You seem to have no idea what a Travel Management Plan is, how the FS is implementing these plans, how non-identified trails are now closed, etc... I am done with you, you are just not worth it. This will be my last comment to you: You don't want to do the research (otherwise known as learning) on your own, there is nothing I can do. I gave you instruction on how to do it yourself, but you refuse. Short of actually taking you on a trip around to the various gates they have installed on Apex Rd, along Peak to Peak Hwy, Switzerland Trail, West and South Magnolia, Rollins Pass, Hessian, 4th of July... (all within 30 minutes of my home) or to Moab to see the closure signs for yourself, there is nothing I can do. You want to keep going with those fingers in your ears, fine by me, but stop messing with us in the West; you just don't have any idea what you are talking about.

I don't know who is reading this, and if they "matter" or don't, but I was surprised by the support for OHV use. I think "ignore" is most likely what will happen. OHV users have been trying for years to get these land managers (BLM, FS, state, etc) to simply include us in the process, let alone actually listen.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Not true. All OHV users create tracks in the dirt, 99.9% of which is in the middle of a trail or road. Some of this dirt may be transported as sediment in stormwater; if that water makes it to the nearest stream and settles, it is hard on the aquatic life. In the West, in areas of low relief, most of the sediment (both non-natural and natural, AKA erosion) never makes it to the nearest stream and drops out into the forest soon after being picked up. In areas of high relief a large amount of natural erosion loads the stormwater with sediment anyway, meaning the additional non-natural sediment load is small in proportion. Some roads and trails may not be in the best spots and do contribute to sediment loading, however, these roads and trails are disappearing as they are now being closed. My statement is true; your statement is anything but fact.

There is no process needed to close roads. FS does it all the time, no reason stated. In fact, following a decision a year or two ago, every road in NF land that is not signed open or included within a TMP is closed, effectively closing tens of thousands of miles of roads and trails no reason, with no EIS process. Your "idea" is already happening.

Turning Wilderness Trailheads into crowded Disneyland style parks is not what I have in mind for the West. Heavily impacted areas need to be properly managed, but to see tents, horse corrals, signs and pavement at every trailhead = the end of the wilderness experience

I couldn't disagree more. I think of the entrance to St. Vrain trailhead when I see posts like this: campers, RVs, giant parking lot, trailers, etc. It is Disney-fication of our lands, and it is happening everyday (Disney's CA Adventure themepark has a little mountain thing, I also just visited it). I see our outdoor experience eroded every year (I actually live in the mountains, surrounded by National Forest) by trail closures, signage, parking lots, etc. I want back to the days when I could go nearly anywhere I wanted, people were smart enough not to do too much damage, I didn't see signs everywhere....

Complaining about dislodged rocks and ruts on a trail is humorous (seriously, for every one foot of trail width 0.12 acres are disturbed in one mile - that means that one half of mile you hiked was about 0.06 acres, not much). Trash is something to complain about, but it is not only OHV users that contribute to trash, hikers do it too. I live in the mountains, my home borders National Forest, and I can tell you hikers are litterbugs too. And, to repeat what has already been said above, dirt biking is one of the most physically strenuous activities I have ever done - right up there with mountain biking, skiing, trail running, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your world seems to revolve around the false premis carousel. First, I seriously doubt you have the stamina it takes to operate a snowmobile in the fashion I enjoy. I am a long way from lazy pal. Your ideas on how snowmobiles destroy habitats and nature are completely unfounded. I have read quite a bit of your drivel on this site, impressive in the sense that it is so wildly misguided and mis-informed. Your hypocritical stance on land use doesn't surprise me. Since when is it "me,me,me" when you, you, you have NEVER lost land open to your chosen use. Just because the snowmobile is my chosen recreation does not mean that I am against conservation and preservation. Your side of the argument has been wildly successful in pushing that adgenda. As for your "novel" approach. Do you read the stuff you type? You start off by suggesting I am harrassing people and then finish your paragraph by suggesting people are harrassing me. Maybe if "coherent thought" was in your bag of tricks we could discuss the issue. If you clowns would stop these incessent land grabs we wouldn't break "the rules". Well, hate to be the bearer of bad news bud but your dogs crap on the trails all over the place. That is pretty offensive. Folks like you purposely block parking areas to try and keep motorized users out, and I have been bothered by skiers in the parking lot more times than I have done the same to them. You guys are INCREDIBLY OFFENSIVE, just so you know. Who knows, maybe it isn't dog crap, maybe it is yours. I spent many years purposely avoiding skiers. I did this by choosing to ride weekdays and stay off the snow during peak skier time on weekends. I purposely rode the opposite direction of the skiers when leaving parking areas to avoid contact. I don't want to see you, anymore than you want to see me. I tried respectful. Didn't work because your clan was not respectful of my recreation. Sorry guys but the hassle started on YOUR end, and it has nothing to do with fair. If we are going for fair, you owe us what, 150 million acres?

I would prefer to share. I am willing to be very accomodating if you are willing to show me a smidge of tolerance.

For some reason you assume I do not own snowshoes and use them? I do my exercise at over 10,000 feet of altitude on a semi weekly basis. You have no idea what you are talking about. Have you ridden in my shoes? Have you ridden at all? Thank you for your expert testimony though. Talk to your Forest Managers, this is Forest Service land you are talking about right? That is what I am talking about. Development of private land is a different issue. You want to paint me into a corner? I am anti this and that, stunning insight from a guy who has read a couple of internet posts by me. Thanks again for your expert testimony sir. Why is it whining when we feel the need to have our voices heard? This depends on your perspective, and is in no way a matter of fact. What do you have to whine about? How much USFS land has been closed to your use? I ride the same places I have for years never bothering anyone or anything until somebody moved in from somewhere else and tried to change how we live our lives. The land is as wild and desolate as it has been for centuries. You seriously over estimate my impact, but that is what I might expect from a self proclaimed expert with no credentials.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have very good friends that are die hard backcountry skiers. My friend met me on Molas Pass for a day of sledding. It was a deep snow day, 3-4 feet of fresh on 5 feet of base. His wife did some skiing, he joined me on a snow machine. He was flat whooped after 2 hours. I got him back out for the afternoon but in the end, he had figured this would be a good day of rest riding the machine but it turned out to be more strenuous than their ski adventures. So whatever guy, is this a measuring contest or a discussion of land use policy? Snow machines are proven to improve big game habitat making it easier for the animals to travel in deep snow. The argument that machines scare animals but people on foot somehow do not is absurd. I can drive by deer beside the road at 30,40,50,60 miles an hour in my big V8 SUV and they don't even blink. If you stop, open the door and walk towards them, they run. Wildlife doesn't recognize the machine as a predator, it sure recognizes a human on foot though. I can not honestly admit I support ATV, ie; four wheelers, as a good idea on trails designated for hiking. If you noticed this going downhill, you could have become involved for a solution right? Wouldn't it just be easier if we could show some mutual respect? There is zero compromise by the land grabbers. I reached out, got involved, went to meetings, wrote letters, ambassdored in a parking lot, posted no snowmobile signs, started a club, everything I could think of to try and reason with you people. One week ago I found out the group I had tried to work with was on a continuing quest against snowmobile use in the area I live in. It is time for motorized recreation enthusiasts to be heard. We are also outdoor enthusiasts. We are reasonable. We are also being stolen from, and I am tired of it. My solution is simple, split it up, you stay off of my half, I'll stay off of yours and I will bet anything, 10 years down the road, the motorized side will be in better nick. What we have been doing is, you folks have designated large portions of the forest off limits to me, but not yourselves, based on the type of winter travel we prefer. The argument seems to be conflicting user groups, sort of like irreconcilable differences. We are tired of being the user group that is groing in size being forced onto smaller and smaller tracts of land. This is directly opposite the directive of the USFS and BLM to support multiple use policies. I am all for working something out. Instead of poorly done insults, let us discuss the pros and cons of my idea, you know, the reason for the thread.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My use of larger, more durable, more capable vehicle than you choose is out of necessity, not choice. I would prefer a car, but that just isn't viable in my mountainous western venue. I never claimed I was a conservationist, I am concerned about the environment, but I do not hold the extreme and unfounded beliefs you are clinging to. I hold radical environmentalists like yourself more to blame for the oil spill than anyone driving a big vehicle. Your assumption that my snowmobile use is causing extinction is completely baseless unfounded and unsupportable. Your admission that you have not even tried my sport, and probably never skied either makes me wonder why you are commenting in this thread at all. You have no idea what you are talking about. You most likely haven't even seen the western mountains, nor the vast open expanses of untouched land I have access too. Closing it just creates land of no uses and that is foolish. Snowmobiles harrassing wildlife now? First it was me harrassing people, then it was people harrassing me, now snowmobiles are harrassing the wildlife? This wild accusations are just that, really wild. If people are doing that, find them and hold them accountable. You create this false scenario where snow machine riders are all crazed again. Truth is, ohv users are not harrassing anybody or anything. Steven, Midwestern snowmobile use and western snowmobile use is very different. We have very few trails, I ride cros country almost exclusively. We ride on USFS and BLM lands, rarely on private property or on trail networks. The skiers are mostly just PO'ed that we beat them to the fresh snow. I am not asking you to understand or enjoy the things I enjoy. That is a pointless comparison. Your way is not THE way no matter how much you may want to believe it is. I don't care that you didn't enjoy yourself. The difference is that even though my choices are different than yours, I am not trying to take your choice away.

You can think what you want, once again it is not all about you. You are correct though, when I take the truck on the 4wd trails I do not work up a sweat, or generally get any exercise. When I ride the snowmobile it is a much different story. Not everybody rides like we do in the west, so I do not expect people to fully understand. Wrestling a 500lb machine in deep snow is more physical exertion that you clearly can conceptualize. That is why I posted MY story, which you clearly ignored. Wade, Well stated. I think some of the forest managers are starting to see increased participation by snowmobile groups, and they are figuring out that they need to start considering more than just the non-motorized users input. To those that think we will continue to lose as they push their "fully closed" agenda, consider this...When negotiations were being help regarding skier/snowmobile areas near Wolf Creek Pass in SW Colorado, the snowmobile club proposed just what we are discussing here, if snowmobiles lose one area, we want another back open. Forest Managers agreed, skiers backed down and decided to be reasonable and share rather than be locked out of some land themselves. The results are interesting when the shoe is on the other foot.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am sorry if it was too difficult for you to actually read the idea, rather than judge the book by its cover or title. I know that is a lot to ask. Fact is, this is about the skier/snowmobile conflict that the skiers have created. Are snow machine users complicit in the problem, certainly, but they are the only one of the two user groups looking for solutions beyond a lock out of the public. It isn't about the poor animals that live in the forests. You have repeatedly displayed your lack of knowledge about wildlife, and blatantly ignored when someone has attempted to enlighten you. The simple fact is that wildlife is not fearful of machines. Wildlife is fearful of man on foot. Funny how they seem to be able to identify the real threat through generations of instinct. You also have no concept of the lands we are talking about. I am travelling over land on between 5 and 15 feet of snowpack. The animals are sleeping for the most part. It is a harmless activity. More scientific facts, not that I expect you to comprehend them... Molas Lake has been a source of contention between greenies and the snowmobile users. To illustrate the amount of concentrated use in the immediate area, there is a snowmobile tour business on the shore of the lake, there is a large trail groomer operated around the lake, and it is the most popular venue for local snow machine riders. There is a LOT of riding on the lake. For years the greenies have been screaming about the certain pollution of the lake that just MUST be taking place. They have been sampling the water now for close to a decade and have yet to find even traces of the pollution that these evil machines are so certainly causing. Your tirades about noise, pollution, and physical damage are all completely transparent and baseless. You greenies have been pushing these ideas for a long time without having any science to back them up. The science has been catching up and findings do not support your tirades. You want to emotionalize issues where there are no problems, and push your agenda based on emotions and not facts. We are pushing back using facts and a willingness to compromise. I believe that your cause is doomed if you do not start coming to the table with rational arguments.

Clarification using specific examples, sheeesh! Currently the situation is precarious. There is pending Wilderness legislation on land I ride, and has seen documented snowmobile use for over a decade. Another area is currently open to motorized use, also documented back 10 years to the USFS planners. The south half of the pass is one forest district, the north half is another. Currently we have 1/4 of the land designated non-motorized. They can keep that 1/4, but I want the same 1/4 already open to me, closed to them and I would politely share the other half. The third documented use area under siege is tightly bordered by Wilderness on one side, non motorized closures on another, and a refuge area for x-country skiers on a third. Cat skiing outfits have a permitted closure on the snowmobile trail system. I was riding up the adjacent, open to motorized use zone only to find Cat skiers at the top complaining about me riding the good powder. It is NEVER enough for them, they want it all and openly admit it on their own public websites. We are legit forest users. There is no evidence to suggest that snow machines in the area over the last decade, in increasing numbers even, have caused a problem for the ecosystem. I just want a fair shot at what is out there. Wilderness...NO NEW WILDERNESS, this is really for another post, of which there are plenty but suffice it to say that process is corrupt. We have enough already, the remaining public lands should be managed on a local level by qualified USFS and BLM land managers. Any questions about my intent?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Is it the case that snowmobiles do not have a registration sticker in California? In Colorado we have to register our snowmobiles and either display the sticker provided on the machine, or have the paperwork on our person. The fee's are used for trail grooming operations and back country rescue operation funding, so there is a strong motivation to register your machine, not to mention a fine if you are caught not doing so. Enforcement is another issue entirely. Bigger, more visible tags are simply not the answer. Law Enforcement must make personal contact with the operator in order to be effective. Posting large tags on riders backs so that enforcement can be done from a distance is probably not even a legal avenue. The police, on a public highway, can take a plate number, or gather a plate number from a call in but in order for a citation to be awarded, a face to face stop must take place. Just as there are those who abuse their priviligages on a snow machine, there are those on the other side of the argument that would love to falsify reports to advance their adgenda. Affixing large orange flags with registration numbers to snowmobiles in order to catch offenders doesn't sound like a viable solution to me.

Oh golly, now you want the emotionalists to come up with facts? The notion that OHV users are bad stewards of the land is unfounded. There are just as many, if not more, bad eggs in the hiker/skier crowd. As motorized users we generally do not like to throw stones but, the fact is, I have cleaned up more non-motorized user messes in the forest than from my bretheren on motorized vehicles. I also happen to despise those who get on an ATV just to go tear up some trails, or worse yet, off trail areas. Funny thing is, I spend lots of time in the forest all year round. I would certainly turn in an ATv rider who was damaging the land intentionally. In the last 15 years though, I have never had to turn in a single person. These incidents are the exception, not the rule as the opposition would like people to believe.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Since you do not seem to approve of OHV companies making profits, I wonder how you feel about a company like General Electric? You know, the big corporation making hundreds of millions in profits, far more than all the OHV manufacturers put together, then taking massive amounts of our tax dollars in the form of stimulus money only to lay off ten of thousands of workers. Our system is very corrupt on many levels. Your "green" administration is also very guilty of corporate profiteering. You need to understand that as individuals in this free country, we all have our own ideas about what getting away from it all means. You want us to get away from our vehicles. I happen to use my vehicle to get away from the people. The hiking trails in my area are VERY busy all summer long. Camping along them requires luck to find a spot, and taking the risk that you may be coming back down and starting over in another place. If I load the truck with the camping supplies, which in my case does not include tv or cell phone, I can access clean, quiet, pristine places you could not access on foot if you had a week to walk in. Most of us do not race to these places, just leisurely trips back into the forest to set up tents from where we may hike a trail, or just explore the area. The problem I see is that you want to change the way I live my life, the way I want to use the forest because somehow you think your way is better, more enlightened, less impactful, quieter, or whatever. What you need to know is that it isn't all about you. I live adjacent to the forest. I have made MAJOR lifestyle sacrifices to do so. I do not need someone hundreds or thousands of miles away from here dictating how I can use the forest. The USFS is charged by congress with maintaining the forest lands for multiple uses. One of those is motorized access. If you do not like this, I suggest you spend your time in the the 120 million acres of designated Wilderness. That is what it is for, and we definitely do not need anymore of it.

Does \_\_\_\_\_ realize how much he has polluted the planet by flying all over the world in a jet aircraft? This must be one of those cases where it is OK for him to participate in highly pollutive actions but it is taboo for the rest of us. I am offering tours myself \_\_\_\_! I think we need to realize that we are most likely dealing with people that live in large urban areas on the east coast. They THINK they have seen the west but in reality they haven't, they could not have based on their comments. I can think of at least one excellent example right off hand. Drive I-70 west from Grand Junction Colorado, tell me just exactly how overrun and tainted that land is. You can drive for literally hundreds of miles and see exactly no human influence other than the road across the landscape. When I snowmobile to the top of a mountain, I can see for many, many miles in every direction, pristine open lands, most of it completely untouched by man without the need for federal government intervention, and still open to be enjoyed by all.

The Asbestos hazard area of Clear Creek isn't the only portion closed. I've never been there, but do know people now in their 60s along with their children and others who recreated there for years with no ill effects. Some of the people who mined there long ago lived into their 80s and 90s.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It's been my experience on mixed trails that bicyclists try to be polite when they approach. The problem comes from their preferred rate of travel. They are going to fast to stop or yield to the other forms of use as they should. If they conducted a large campaign aimed at teaching manners and trail etiquette maybe this would help their image. I for one won't believe it has happened until I see them show up for maintenance days on the trails they are allowed to use now. Most I've met think they are being polite by singing out which side they are approaching from as they zoom by. I don't like the I'm bigger and faster so you should get out of my way style they employ while saying excuse me. It leaves me a little flat. I say keep them out of wilderness areas and off the major scenic trail systems that travel thru and link together wilderness areas for the safety of all. No where in any of their arguments do they bring up the idea that bicycles will add safety to the wilderness trail systems. In response #33 above the person says that equestrians don't maintain trails. I'm sure that either the Oregon equestrians or the Oregon back country horsemen would love to show him the lovely and intensive trail work they've done. Not to mention all the packing they do for the different trail crews on the PCT. I submit that near Corvallis Oregon is the Macdonald Experimental Forest it is a close in mixed use area great for staying in shape in the winter or for a quickly reached hike anytime of year. The bicyclists who use this area are noticeably absent on any organized trail maintenance scheduled by any of the hiking groups who use the area, They fail to regulate their own use and don't pay any attention to trail closures at wet and goopy times of year and yes they do tear the trail up more than pedestrians. The equestrians don't use the closed trails at this time of year. I fear this is the treatment we could expect in our wildernesses should we allow bikers to use them. We should keep the no wheel no machine rule in place. I've done a lot of maintenance with single and double buck saws and carried many buckets of dirt and gravel. Yes a chainsaw or wheelbarrow would come in handy but it is nice to leave them home and follow the rules. If the mountain bikers want trails let them use existing roads that are open or closed and build trails to share just like the already do. The wilderness is no place for a mtn. bike.

"NOTHING good comes of introducing humans to areas animals live." So, if you believe this, let me ask you something. Do you practice what you preach by staying out of the woods? Or does this only apply to others, "do as I say, not as I do"? "I have watched deer, moose, rabbits, etc. run from the noise and presence of motorbikes on trails." I have no doubt that this is true. I have also seen them (add elk and black bear to your list) run very regularly when I have been on foot. (as an exception, I rarely if ever have seen moose run from either OHV or foot traffic, they tend to stand their ground). Specifically during hunting season, when I make far less noise and disturbance than the average "hiker". So, again, given that any human presence is a source of "disturbance" for wildlife, do you propose keeping all humans out of the woods?

Your ignorance is showing. Your thread title is about Wilderness designation, then you rail about OHV use...which is banned in designated wilderness. Then you whine about wolf management plans, which were in turn blocked by an activist judge. "when we are going extinct we'll regret our stupidity"...I can only assume that you are speaking for yourself.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have the same issues here in Idaho and Montana. I've been working with the local forest service ranger district in regards to a planned closure in the Wallace area. It is one of the most popular trails because it allows a loop between 2 different riding areas, provides access to a rural town where we often stop for lunch, and offers some great views. The forest service's "justification" for the planned closure is due to the threat the trail poses to endangered Bull Trout. The trail does cross the creek over an area where the bottom is large rocks. I took pictures after 5 machines crossed the creek, there was NO turbidity in the water after this. I followed this up with a call to the US Fish and Wildlife service biologist in charge of Bull Trout recovery in this area. According to him: 1) There is no known Bull Trout population on this creek 2) There is no proposal that designates this stream as critical bull trout habitat 3) The stream in question isn't in an AREA even proposed for bull trout recovery. 4) Even on streams with endangered bull trout populations, motorized crossings pose no threat unless they are running across a reed (spawning bed), or across a really soft, muddy area that will contribute to sedimentation. These conditions are very uncommon on trout streams, which typically have rock bottoms. So, the entire excuse to shut down the trail is bull poo. Like most in the OHV community, I place the survival of an endangered trout above recreation on a particular trail. However, I don't appreciate being LIED TO with regards to the justification for a closure. These actions are costing the forest service, as well as a large portion of the environmental community, in terms of creditability. They are also driving the OHV community to be alot more resistive to closures in areas where there may be some actual justification for closures. On a brighter note, I have started a dialog with the biologist with regard to what we in the local ATV club can do to help him with a project on a local creek that does have an established bull trout population. We'll see what comes out of it.

It is unfortunate that it has come to this, but the OP makes sense. The non-motorized community is unrestricted with regards to wintertime travel, while over-the-snow vehicles are increasingly restricted to smaller areas. The non-motorized users should be focused on areas where motorized use is prohibited. This seems like a sensible way to reduce conflict between motorized users and those that want a quiet back-country experience. Snowmobilers pay some fairly significant fees for groomers to maintain their trails, there is no such fee program for the non-motorized community in most places. The non-motorized community would have to step up here, but the same time the trails wouldn't see the wear and tear of motorized use.

Which is why the OP makes so much sense. It provides seperation between motorized and non-motorized users, just like you ask for. This takes away the opportunity for a small handful of the non-motorized users to contrive "conflict". Please note that the OP doesn't even ask for any areas currently closed to motorized use to be opened. The non-motorized community has virtually unlimited areas to recreate in. Per your own statement "Motorized use makes the land closed to hikers and quiet seekers by design.", as such the impact of this should be minimal if motorized use is really "closed" to "quiet seakers" now. Lets make it official and avoid the whining. Vast areas where motorized recreation is currently banned would still be open to non-motorized use. I suspect that even such a modest compromise will be too much for some.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I fail to see why this is such a contentious idea. It's addressing the primary complaint of the non-motorized community, specifically motorized use on trails they currently share. All this idea does is provide the separation between the motorized and non-motorized recreationists that they have asked for. This should make it safer and more pleasant for both user groups. The only way this idea could be seen as a negative is if the real motivation behind a small portion of the non-motorized community is to create conflict, thereby providing justification for shutting others out of the woods all together.

What studies have been done comparing wildlife response to motorized and non-motorized winter recreation showed that wildlife were displaced further by non-motorized use (skiers). So if you are concerned about wildlife, you should be proposing keeping all human contact out of the woods. However, once again, you are trying to deflect the OP. The OP only suggested keeping non-motorized users off of motorized trails and out of areas currently designated as open for motorized recreation. The OP said nothing about granting "further access to vital wildlife habitat just to accommodate a greedy ohv user and to put entire species at risk of extinction is ridiculous and I will fight that every time." I know you have issues with making a comment without going off topic. How about trying for once. Why not keep non-motorized use off existing, designated motorized trails and access areas? This would address the conflict you are always complaining about. Or are you willing to admit that this is not your real motivation?

The OP seemed pretty clear in his post: "My suggestion to the skiers is to use what you have already closed to snowmobiles." No where has he said anything about adding access to new areas off limits to motorized recreation, nice try again at deflection. So back to the OP, would you support a ban non-motorized recreation on areas currently designated for motorized recreation? This would address conflict issues.

"So protecting the last 3 remaining animals of that species is not good enough reason to close an area?" IMO, the question isn't the value of those 3 animals...it's how much area is enough for them. Again, we're talking about approximately 500,000 acres, or 166,666 acres per animal. And with no evidence that snowmobiles are even an impact, let alone a negative one. I'd absolutely support closures in especially sensitive areas, say a breeding zone for example. I do feel that closure of half a million acres for 3 animals is excessive.

I wish them the best of luck. In this area, any time a comparable project is proposed a couple of the local "environmental" groups file a lawsuit and shut it down, or at least delay work until it's too late.

I'm voting to promote. State endowment lands are required by law to be managed for financial gain to support schools. It may make more sense to group state endowment land holdings, rather than have them scattered within federal lands. I disagree however that these lands are incompatible with conservation purposes. In my state, many of the forests on federal lands are in poor health due to overcrowding associated with a lack of harvest and fire suppression. Nearby state forests are generally healthier and provide more useful habitat for wildlife. The state has more of an incentive to ensure forest health than the federal government does.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In my area, we have lost probably 2/3 of the trails in the area. The introduction of the travel management plan has eliminated all off-trail travel (which was previously legal). Many areas have been set aside as designated wildlife habitat. Trails on approximately 300,000 acres have been eliminated to "protect grizzly bears". Another area of approximately 500,000 acres, larger than some states, has been restricted due to woodland caribou, even most cross-country snowmobile traffic is banned. Closing the vast majority of these areas, and limiting access to designated trails isn't what's bothering the OHV community. It's the closure of ALL trails through specific areas, that in turn takes out some possible loops that connect other trail system is a big issue. Adding to our problems is the whole "roadless" scam. Many areas currently restricted vis roadless designation used to be roaded...the foresst service simply removed the existing roads from the map. Trust in our federal employees is being lost. We have another trail system near Wallace, Idaho that has been one of the most popular in the country. They are implementing their travel management plans at this time. Several of the most popular trails in this area appear doomed, for no obvious reason. One of the trails that is popular because it connects a trail system to town was recently blocked. Hey, miles are open...just 50 feet are all thats closed...you know the part you need to access the entire system? Our most recent challange is the proposed expansion of a ski resort. They want to triple in size, clearcut upwards of 2000 acres and add additional runs. The property they currently have is adjacent to some of the most popular OHV trails, which may be absorbed in the expansion. OHV enthusiasts don't want ask for access to everything...but how about some small portion? OHV users have always been willing to share the trails they paid to construct...yet now are being locked out. Yet very very few hikers visit the areas in question.

"This is one of many such occurences that I can find where OHVer's have voluntarily vacated an area for various reasons under the promises of "We will find you another area." Yet it rarely happens. Once the greenies get what they want any and all deals are quickly forgotten." It isn't just the OHV community that the "greenies" renig on promises to. The same thing happened with the wolf issue. Defenders of Wildlife committed to reimbursing ranchers for losses caused by wolves. Yet now they often refuse to pay, even when wolf tracks are present and damage consistant with wolves are found on the bodies of dead sheep and cattle. "Something else killed them and the wolves were just scavanging" is the common theme. Especially true when an entire flock is killed...no other predator participates in "sport killing" to this extent. There were also only supposed to be a limited number, I believe 300 animals in the population before management would be turned over to the states. Now, with 2000+ wolves in my state alone (by many estimates more) there still "aren't enough" and the same orginazitions have sued and won to have them re-listed. The word of many environmental organizations isn't worth much. The public is slowly and painfully learning that lesson.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"\_\_\_\_\_, you guys are amazing, claiming that enviros words aren't worth much. How many times have environmentalists sat at the good faith table and made deals and have been screwed. That is why enviros are constantly in court. That is why enviros consistently win in court."

\_\_\_\_\_, several issues here. First, it is typically the extreme environmental groups that give the entire "movement" a bad name. We have a couple in my area. Many times the forest service has attempted to have timber sales. Logging in many areas is an important step to reducing fuels and enhancing forest health by thinning stands and planting site-appropriate species. These are generally highly supported by residents and recreationalists in the area. Public meetings are held, with the "greenies" in attendance. A plan is worked out to satisfy as many stakeholders as possible. Yet when the "greenies" don't get 100% their way, they file a lawsuit over the sale. This puts forest health, property and lives in jeopardy, and costs the taxpayers money. Of course, that's the least of their concern. Lawsuits are an income stream for these groups, who's costs are reimbursed by the taxpayers through the EIIA. \_\_\_\_\_, where is it you live again? I'm trying to relate what you observe, vs what is happening here in Idaho.

"\_\_\_\_\_, just in response to a comment you made about the roadless rule. The roadless rule is a policy limiting road construction and re-construction. A lot of areas aren't really "roadless". It's not wilderness designation. Most of the areas in Idaho that are covered by the roadless rule allow road construction or re-construction. There is even a "back country" designation that I believe even allows OHVs. I noticed you keep referring to this rule as a scam. Aren't you the one who posted an idea about a "back country" designation for land?" The reason I refer to the "roadless rule" as a scam is that it was implied that it was for areas without roads, that never had been roaded and were in a near natural state. In practice this has not been the case. Areas that are roaded have been classified as "roadless" by erasing the roads from the maps, yet in practice many still exist but have been closed. The environmental movement attempts to portray these areas as just a few of the remaining "wild" areas in the country. Yet in my state, nearly 10 million acres, half the forest service land in the state, falls into this category. IMO people have been deceived with regards to roadless rule.

The wilderness areas I visited most recently already have horse corrals, camping and horse loading "docks" cut into berms every few miles. This was along the McGruder Corridor between the Frank Church and Selway-Bitterroot wilderness. The only people I saw using them along this entire trail were outfitting services preparing for the start of archery season. I see no reason to use public funds to provide services for private businesses who use (exploit?) designated wilderness areas for profit. Horse camping is particularly unsuited for camping at public access points for Wilderness areas. Horses trample the ground, turning it into a muddy mess for other users. Their leavings stink and attract flies and other insects. Allowing horses in or adjacent to public camp grounds leaves those places unsuitable for every other user group. I don't have much of an issue with horses in wilderness areas, but allowing them in campgrounds used by many different user groups outside of wilderness areas is a bad idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree there is a need for protection (I generally oppose the term "preservation" since it's undefined) of our public lands. However, protection doesn't mean keeping everyone off those lands, or even banning reasonable resource extraction, particularly well managed logging. There is a need to make the US less dependant on overseas sources of oil. If that means drilling on a small fraction of 1 percent of public lands, I say do it. With regard to the wolf issue, there are other threads going on it. I would support the presence of wolves as long as methods are in place to allow control and management of the population to a reasonable number. Unfortunately, that was taken away recently. If this dealt with specific areas and issue with regard to protection, there are a number I'd support. But with this blanket statement I choose to demote.

Idaho already has some 4 million acres of designated wilderness, the most of any state other than Alaska. There are other management themes within the roadless initiative that provides protection to this area without being as extreme as Wilderness designation. Among other issues, Wilderness designation bars the use of chain saws for clearing hiking trails. This area is also popular with snowmibilers, a major contributor to the local economy. They would be banned with Wilderness designation. Lets share the wealth. We can afford to allow some of the other states catch up with regard to Wilderness.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for the education on wilderness acreage, you made me do some digging. In addition to CA and AZ, Washington actually has more designated wilderness than Idaho does, I stand corrected. As far as snowmobiling is concerned, the Scotchman Peak area is utilized by members in the local snowmobile club. It is adjacent to the trail system accessed by Trestle Creek and from Clark Fork. Wilderness designation would of course preclude their enjoyment of this wonderful area during winter months. And at what benefit? Is there significant utilization of this area by non-motorized users during the winter months, who would be disturbed by snowmobilers? It is my understanding that it is a several mile trek from the nearest trailhead accessible via car to even the edge of the proposed wilderness area. If so, I can't foresee significant non-motorized recreation going on there during the winter. I am an active proponent of ATV recreation and enhancement of the trail system. However, I agree that the core Scotchman Peak area is not a suitable place for this use, and agree that we need to keep some areas free of constructed trails. That has been carried to extremes in areas outside the Scotchman area, to the best of my knowledge there is ONE ATV trail (Porcupine Lake) off the entire Lightning Creek/Trestle Creek road. One area that we would like to explore is a bypass around the washed out Rattle Creek connector that ran from Lightning Creek road to Montana's road system. My understanding from a recent (2 week ago) conversation with people that have recently hiked the Scotchman trail system is that many trails are in poor shape due to deadfall. I can not base this on my own observations. I would like to hike this next year, and would plan on bringing my chainsaw to do some trail clearing. I believe that this is currently allowed under the existing management theme. I'm a firm believer in leaving an area better than I found it. Doing the same amount of work with hand tools is MUCH slower...and apparently has not been happening. Wilderness designation wouldn't help with this. While I support protection of this area, I readily question if Wilderness designation is the best way. Within the existing roadless management options there are means of protecting an area from logging, mining, road building and development, without the restrictions imposed by Wilderness. Can you explain what Wilderness would gain over these other methods? I'm willing to be educated.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for the information, I'm enjoying the education. I'd like to hike this area and will sign up for your newsletter. I'll also withdraw my "demote" vote. To address one of your comments "There are approximately 12,000 miles of forest service maintained trails on the Idaho Panhandle National forest and the majority of trails maintained by the forest service are open to motorized use. " I would really like to see a map of these trails. This flies in the face of my experiences. According to the district ranger, the Kaniksu National Forest has 35 miles of designated ATV trails. The bulk of these 35 miles of trails are unfortunately dead end trails that do not provide connectors to more of the existing road system. Porcupine is a perfect example, it's perhaps 2 miles and dead-ends at the lake. Strong Creek is another, it dead-ends in Hope and does not tie into any other area or road where riding is legal. The entire Trestle Creek/Lightning Creek road system is "bound", there are no connector trails that connect to other systems, and no ways to do a loop ride. Of course riding on hwy 200 is prohibited. In the entire Kanksu forest, I can think of less than 10 trails. The 222 by Pack River, another abandoned road by Pack River, Strong Creek, Porcupine, Silverleaf, parts of the old 278 road by Lakeview (not sure it has a trail number) and one trail east of Clark Fork. The 111 trail is designated on the map, but in practice has been signed prohibiting ATV use. The "trail system at the north end of the drainage"-are you referring to the Moose Lake area? If so, I believe these trails are closed to ATV use. At least they were signed that way the last time I was there, about a year ago. If you look at the Kaniksu National Forest map and check the trail designators, you will find only a very few trails open to ATV use, believe me, I have looked. Contrast this with the hundreds of miles of designated hiking and horse trails in this area, plus the fact that cross country travel is of course legal for all non-motorized recreation. I have run a large percentage of the legal trails in the CDA, St. Joe and Kaniksu forests. The CDA forest has issued their motor vehicle use maps. The number of actual ATV permitted trails is very limited. I doubt the entire trail system consists of over 200 miles of trails, but I really do need to research this with the Forest Service and find out the exact number. The St. Joe is in the process of developing their MVUM. The situation is a bit better than the CDA or Kaniksu, but not much. Several of the most popular trails in the area are slated for closure, including the Champion Creek trail. I discovered just last weekend that the Forest Service, in their infinite wisdom, closed another half mile of trail. Unfortunately, it was in the middle of an approximately 16 mile "connector" trail. So they now have made two "dead end" trails, rather than one through one. It's stupid decisions like this that raise the ire of the riding community. Quite honestly, the discrepancy between motorized trails and non-motorized is a primary reason that motorized recreationalists are hesitant to support Wilderness designation. Which is unfortunate, in that there are areas where it makes sense. Wilderness supporters are seeing a backlash from recreationalists on non-Wilderness areas that have suffered some bad decisions at the hands of the Forest Service and other land management agencies.

My comment #26 wasn't directed at you. The OP was a reasonable suggestion and merited honest discussion. Unfortunately, we have a few posters on here that try to turn every thread into an anti-OHV one, even ones completely unrelated to OHV activity, such as this. It succeeded in this case, we never did even come up with any user-based funding ideas for non-motorized trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I voted to promote this. In my area we have virtually unlimited access for hiking and horseback riding, there are many trails and cross country travel is permitted. Single track (dirt bike) has a significant trail system. 50" and under UTVs and ATVs have a limited system. For 50" and over UTVs and mid sized 4x4s (Jeeps, Samaris) the system is nearly non-existent on the motor vehicle use maps (MVUMs), they are mostly limited to roads. This does need to be expanded to avoid discrimination against a growing user group. UTVs are one of the fastest growing user groups around here, but get very little support.

Close and Convert Zoos. Elephants do not belong in St. Louis. Tigers do not belong in San Diego. Giraffes do not belong in London. Convert zoos to urban open and park space, commercial venues and human housing. Use resources garnered from selling off zoos to create large nature preserves based on bio-regional science and populate those preserves with indigenous animals only.

let us ride or maybe will use your front yard as a track

The Klamath / Siskiyou bioregion has the most biologically diverse conifer forests in the world and contains a lot of endemic plants (especially in the areas with serpentine soil), it is largely federal land (with some wilderness areas that need better linking) where some forest carnivores such as Pacific fisher, marten, and wolverine still survive. Looking at a topographical map of California, the Central Valley is like an oblong salad bowl. At the southern end, the east-west link connects the southern Sierras & Angeles & San Bernardino Nat'l Forests to the Coast Range and its LPNF. The obvious high-elevation major biological corridor (and core habitat in places) for the east-west link along the Calif./Oregon border is the Siskiyou Crest. It would help water flows to support native salmon so vital yet threatened in these watersheds.

Non Native illegal wolves are not endangered either. Almost zero is far cry from the hundreds. Nope the problem is the wolves are wiping out the moose the Mt Goat and Big horn sheep but you people don't go out in the woods and just live in fairy tale land. Those of us that live out in nature saw the game herds get wipe out first hand. In the links I gave plenty of proof. But you don't care about the truth. The wolves are not benefiting anyone but DOW who makes Multi millions of dollars crying about them. It is high time you people that are supporting the wolves pay for the destruction they cause out of your own pocket.

FY 2011 USF&WS Funding. The US Fish & Wildlife Service and the many NWRs under their care and management, deserve full funding in FY 2011. The Gulf Oil Release disaster would have killed many more animals if not for the proactive and selfless action of hundreds of USF&WS Rangers, Biologists, L E Agents, managers and others. In addition to the great personnel assets, facilities and equipment, both on hand and leveraged from other sources, are what saved the region from a potentially devastating wildlife disaster. To reduce funding now is like selling the Firetruck after the fire is put out.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

These conversations are always tough because strong emotions overtake logic and reason - which is a shame because at the end of the day we all want the same thing, access to our beautiful lands in whatever way we prefer to enjoy them. I know for many mountain bikers - access to the trails is simply a way to see more and experience more of the beauty than is possible in a day solely on foot or hoof. But lets start with some facts as a good basis for the discussion: 1. Trail Work - it's an absolute fallacy for anyone to believe that MtnBikers don't work and car for the trails they ride - there are numerous organizations across the nation that spend almost every weekend of the calendar working trails... the issue is that you probably don't see them on trails where their bikes are not allowed - please open your minds to this fact - we are more alike than we are different. 2. MtnBikers - some are very nice and respectful of other trail users; some are not - this by the way is no different than hikers or equestrians or campers. There are nice people in the world and some not so nice people in the world. It is impossible and improper to stereotype any of these class of trail users as wholly being one or the other. Again - protect your mind from making these simplistic conclusions. 3. Biking and Horses do not mix - this is a challenge because it can be true for inexperienced users (of the bikes and the horses). I've also seen many cases where hikers have spooked some horses and caused some pretty sketchy situations. But there are all kinds of very simple solutions - that are practiced in many parts of US and Canada to alleviate the risks (particularly in the Rockies Regions). Two very simple and easily applied examples: One: Separate access times for horses and bikes - can be even/odd days; or alternating weekends; or whatever - i'm sure the bikers would take mid-week if that worked best - as the timing plans becomes known trail users of all kinds learn how to plan around it and each group enjoys the trails without the danger/annoyance of the others. (this is actually less enforcement burden as rangers only need to be concerned half as much as closing a trail full time, etc.) Two: Separate Trails in similar areas: one for hike/horse - one for bikes... more trails can be concerning for ecological issues but it does solve the safety issues and if trails are built correctly won't harm the ecosystem really at all... Where there are existing network of trails - simply divide and designate. These simple tactics provide equal access to all US citizens and keep safety at the forefront. There are many land spaces in the US that have done exactly this with raging success for all users. Again - open your mind to innovative ways to get what you want - but also share the trails with others.. it can and has been done. 4. Trail Damage - this is flat out misguidance. There have been numerous studies that show that horse hoofs cause significantly more long term trail and erosion damage vs. bikes - particularly in softer/wet steeper terrain as horses stomp hard for traction. Proper trail construction/maintenance and closure for both horses/bikes in extreme weather generally preserves the trails the best. Again free your mind of the mis-perceptions related to bikes vs. horses in this regard. 5. Plenty of trails exist for bikes - unfortunately this is not valid except in a few select regions of the country like maybe the Rockies and the Appalachians where the communities have embraced the bike culture much stronger. And in particularly when we refer to 'trails' as the sweet singletrack, narrow trails that all trail users prefer and crave. I live here in the supposed Mecca of Mountain Biking, Northern California - but in reality in the greater Bay Area - there really aren't that many great single track places to ride --- maybe 5-7 tops. if we ride 1-2x per week, we've exhausted these trails within a month or so... multiply by years and things get pretty stale pretty fast. I know this to be true in many other major metropolitan areas - and in some cases even more true in remote wilderness

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

areas... so again - while it may seem like there are plenty of places to go ride our bikes - we crave the same serene deep scenery and remoteness that you do - and for the same reasons of beauty, wonder, and adventure. In the end there really is no valid reason other than safety not to make the same trails and/or spaces available to bikers - other than safety. All other reasons are really false and simply propaganda based on wrong facts and pure emotions. If the safety concerns can truly be solved via simple division tactics through time or routes - then all of us can enjoy these beautiful places together, in harmony - and we can join forces to protect and nurture these trails together. It can be done - put down your emotions, open your minds, and think creatively about how to divide but share the trails amongst us all. If you can't see this and see the other sides POV - then I wouldn't want you on the trails in any form - check yourself and your motives.

The problem with OHV use is that the minority of OHV-ers who are badly behaved can destroy vastly more territory than the same number of badly behaved hikers or equestrians. If a hiker or equestrian gets crazy and heads out cross-country, the impact is gone within hours. If an OHV does it, the scars from tire tracks can last years. Three or four of them can destroy a stream crossing or sensitive site in minutes. I appreciate that most OHV-ers are law-abiding, family oriented folks who want to enjoy their activity in the great outdoors but the fact is that the few bad apples in their bunch are incredibly destructive and, sadly for the others, that's why their vehicles deserve to be locked out of wild lands.

Only a civilization in decline will allow the loss of its major commerce and population centers. We are not talking about a few houses poorly located on a bluff here... Regardless of why it is happening, what is at stake is as \_\_\_ stated, "Billions of dollars" in the form of our major coastal cities and ports. You may say it is "Chicken Little", but like it or not this "Little Chicken's" prophecies are backed by mountains of data and hard science, the only debate is as to the reasons why. Maybe it is a natural cycle... so what! Does that mean that we should do nothing? In a world almost entirely shaped by man, would we really be expected to just watch as it all falls apart? From where I stand, anybody who refuses to act because of a political dogma, simply has their head in the sand. Good luck with that.

You are absolutely correct. I am well aware of the well documented human causes of global warming, I was simply trying to make the point that regardless of your politics, action is imperative. The rock hard science about the causes and effects of global warming is generally ignored by people on the political right wing, and is therefore considered a "vast political / scientific conspiracy of global proportions". The fact that this is utter nonsense has no effect on these people, so I tried to simply focus my comment on the fact of the problem we face, and leave the causes aside for the moment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I AGREE, since we can't quantify the specific damage an individual causes... lets figure out the total damage and charge a use fee that is appropriate to cover the damages for each type of use of our common natural resources and allows us to keep environments in a sustainable condition that would be considered usefull to all. This would be fair-er to all concerned including future generations. This could be a nationwide or state wide fees dedicated to conservation of public lands. Lacking the funds necessary to conserve our public lands it would make sense to close damaged areas to overly destructive uses to allow nature to regenerate itself so future generations can enjoy their inheritance. Let's not rob our children and our children's children for our self indulgences.

STOP PEBBLE MINE-SAVE OUR SALMON!. Bristol Bay Gold mine is another corporate rip-off of the American people that will destroy one of the last untouched salmon runs left in our country. Seen the price of wild Alaskan Salmon lately? Bristol Bay Gold mine will rob us all of our natural heritage and source of good food.

A Federal Surplus Land UnUsed (Make a Public Park). This message is in reference to the Federal Lands to Parks Program. The BONUS Plant ([lm.doe.gov/bonus/Sites.aspx](http://lm.doe.gov/bonus/Sites.aspx)) administered in part by the Department of Energy (DOE) and The Office of Legacy Management is a good candidate to be considered for a public park. This property and land was expropriated for an energy research purpose. At this moment is not been using for energy research. Currently, there are many organizations interested in preserved this land in its natural state for its great value in helping many environmental causes. Currently, there is a movement in the community to preserve this land.

I think God gave us feet for a reason. If you want to see all that remote territory hike it! I believe you are not only diturbing the wild life but other human life as well with ORV's. Your rights only go as far as not interfere with other's rights!

Saving Our Natural Resources. I really have just 2 comments. The first being that Brisol Bay Alaska should nt be ruined by the pebble mining. The second is that all our National Parks beauty needs to be preserved and that includes the peace and quiet. Off road vehicles should not be allowed. They are distracting and disturb the wild life that we need to protect.

Unfortunately even if you are right the "cycle" is going to cause massive destruction to our shorelines.

Actually, OHV are a big deal! They create noise and erode the land. They also destroy the complicated relationships in the soil which are vital to the health of ecosystems. (Any Pro OHV people who really want to protect the environment should please take the time to study these matters.) In other words, OHVs are not sustainable.

All private businesses on public land should be severely limited. Why not just let this land remain wild?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I appreciate your idea. More recycling is always good. But, actual research shows that there is no relation of an area's recycling rate and the area's litter. And, in urban areas, about half or more of all litter is accidental, such as papers blown from a bench, paper cups flying out of the back of pickups, etc. I and others have studied what does work on reducing litter: Cities requiring use of non-styrofoam cups/take-out boxes, as do Seattle and San Fran. (recyclable/biodegradable ones are available) ; plenty of litter receptacles (but servicing these is expensive to cities); and threats of significant fines on litterers. The best approach is simple...pick it up! In Seattle many businesses keep their sidewalks and street gutters spotless. What does NOT work: education just against littering (but early-age proenvironment ed may work), "setting a good example" .. (Litterers do NOT learn.) and one-day "clean street" pickup campaigns ( the litter is back within 2 weeks, and people who participated in the campaign feel that they have done their share.)

Should wilderness areas become more handicap friendly even if it means changing the land? Should wilderness areas become more handicap friendly even if it means changing the land? As of today, people with disabilities may use wheelchairs in the wilderness. Is this enough to ensure that these people are able to enjoy the wilderness? And if it is not enough then how should the government change the land in order to accommodate more handicap visitors? I believe that the use of a wheelchair is sufficient enough for the handicap to enjoy wilderness without having to change the land. The majority of people visiting the national wilderness areas are not going to be handicapped. By changing the land for a minority of the visitors, the government would in turn be ruining the serenity of the land for the majority. As a country built on the principles of democracy, the government of the United States should follow the desires of the majority over the needs of the minority. Although I do not find that the land needs to be altered for the handicapped, I do see the importance for people with disabilities to enjoy the wilderness if that is their wish. I also do not believe that these handicapped persons would want the wilderness to be changed for their benefit. People visit wilderness areas to enjoy the beauty of untouched nature and this is no different for people with disabilities. They visit these areas of wilderness for the same reason any human would visit the areas. Whether it is to escape civilization or enjoy the view, people of disabilities have this opportunity with a wheelchair. A wheelchair is sufficient for people of disabilities to visit and enjoy a trip to a designated wilderness area. Many handicapped people are accustomed to traveling in a wheelchair so it is not as if the government is punishing them. It is very important for all humans to enjoy wilderness if that is their desire. I believe that disabled people have this same opportunity with the use of the wheelchair, but I am not handicapped and have no idea the needs of all disabled humans.

All ORV vehicles should have the right to use the open trails be it Federal or State owned.. There are many people that own side by side rec vehicles that appreciate the outdoors and gladly accept the responsibility of keeping it clean and natural. Their tax dollars are paying for the trails also, and therefore they should have the right to ride on these trails also. Here in the state of Michigan they are closing trails both state and federal owned land which should be open to all tax payers.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If you think "sitting on a machine" is any less grueling than WALKING ON TWO LEGS it shows you are uninformed and ignorant. Have you ever tried to operate a snowmobile, 4 wheeler, dirt bike? If not then your opinion of the amount of effort required to do so is invalid. If you think a snowmobile is any more damaging to the environment than a skier, think again. Once again you are showing your ignorance. Because they travel over snow, a snowmobile has very, very little impact on the landscape underneath it. Go take a look at an area open to snowmobiling in the summer months and SHOW me the damage. Oh wait, you won't find any because its not there. How has an area being opened to OHV use "taken" some of your favorite trails? You are still welcome to recreate there I'm sure. People like you need to learn to show respect for those of us who prefer to recreate with motorized vehicles. There is a considerable amount of work put in by all kinds of motorized rec users (snowmobile clubs, dirt bike clubs, etc) into trail work and restoration work. Yes, we do give back. When was the last time YOU contributed something to trail maintenance?

Based on past experience, the "development" of this pristine area will negatively impact that watershed, wildlife and native people.

I am a mountain biker that says NO WAY!

I think you need to get outdoors. The US has more trees today than it did when the pilgrims landed. It is true that most of our forests were cut down in the 1800's to build homes, railroad tracks, support beams for mine shafts and to fuel steam locomotives. There is an excellent book that shows then and now pictures and in each case the areas that were in many cases totally denuded are now heavily forested. Most would say so heavily forested they cannot tolerate a natural wildfire. When John Muir roamed the forest he was able to stroll through the open forest landscape. When a fire came he climbed up a tree and waited it out. If one did that today you would be incinerated due to the overgrown forests. So there is plenty of forest, but it needs to be managed and thinned to be healthy. Our overgrown forests are also poor habitat for wildlife who cannot survive massive stand replacing wildfires. Wildlife also need wider spacing between trees to be able to travel in the forest.

Equal Use Rights for OHV. Please consider equal rights to all parties in the OHV use matter as this is the American way. Systematically off-road use is being taken away from OHV enthusiasts little bits at a time over decades. This is being accomplished by a non compromise policy by one party and a compromise policy by the other party. The other side has no intention of relenting until all trails are closed to motorcycles and ATVs. This is not a fair compromise this is a total block. I am a hiker and mountain biker as well and empathize and respect these concerns and desires within reason. Please be respectful of all rights of all taxpayers and I ask you to be considerate of the off road community. Most of us love our country and love to enjoy it's wilderness in our way so please always be sympathetic or empathetic of OHV rights.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I was hiking up a small mountain in Maine a couple of years ago. The hiking trail, which had been there for decades, took switchbacks so as not to cause erosion. But there was a newer OHV trail that went straight up the mountainside. All the soil was washed off of that trail, leaving only bare rock. Bare rock is not as much fun to ride on as dirt, so new trails get made. How can anyone be out there all the time making sure riders stay where they belong?

People sit on their butts watching TV, then sit on their butts in a truck, then sit on their butts on snowmobile or an ATV or a jet ski. This isn't exactly getting off your butt.

Old growth forests that have never been logged or have not been logged for 200 years or more have a mixture of old and young trees at a density that is sustainable. They are adapted to the fire regimes of their area. On the other hand, forests that have been clearcut grow up in even-age stands that become extremely dense. If unmanaged, the young trees will eventually crowd each other out and the strongest will survive - but it takes decades and leaves a lot of dead wood. These forests should be thinned near habitable areas to reduce fire danger. Old growth forests should be left alone. When forests have been clearcut in the past, fires have ensued. This happened in the early 1900s all over the upper Midwest. It happened in ancient Rome. It's a well-known phenomenon. Clearcutting increases fire hazard.

As a biologist, I believe that the only way to promote conservation of multiple species is to protect large connected habitats, while it's still possible. Climate change is happening, whether politicians want to believe it or not and now is the time to act.

I find the link to family recreation to be interesting but a non-sequitor. It would be just as logical to promote family spray painting of graffiti in the National Gallery of Art. I'm sure a family that enjoyed vandalism could bond together and have a good time. But that doesn't mean that cans of spray paint should be allowed in art museums. ORV recreation is a consumptive use of the public lands. The vehicles damage (at a minimum) and frequently destroy the ecosystem where they are used. That said, motorized recreation is a popular pass time and there ought to be 'sacrifice areas' where it is allowed. But given the consumptive and destructive nature of that 'multiple use'; those areas should be limited and carefully selected to minimize the impact.

As long as there is money available for real grass roots groups, who would otherwise find it impossible to get legal assistance on public land access issues, I'm OK with EAJA-type programs. Our local OHV groups, who depend on volunteer elbow grease for nearly everything, will be depending on these funds in our battles with the Forest Service over Travel Management plans, as will local governments and other aggrieved parties who have standing but lack the paid legal staff of the environmental groups.

This past week I heard a conversation on NPR by two experts on the plight of earth's oceans. I came away so depressed and felt that there is nothing that can be done at this point in time to redeem such valuable resources as the oceans provide. I don't know if that is really true, if there is no point to protesting and advocating and just plain raising HELL about the situation but I think that's what we, in all good conscience, must do. There are so few true treasures left, we must protect them.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This isn't a case of Weyerhaeuser exploiting resources on public land. Their private land blocks access to public land, including existing USFS trails. It's simply a matter of location: to get to public land the public must first pass through private land. There is no easement, and Weyerhaeuser is balking at giving up CONTROL. This is a case where the USFS should gain a public use easement to the public's trails and lands, willing seller or not.

While I agree that better access to fishing is essential, a five mile hike with kids to fish is completely ok. Our family does it all the time. My biggest concern is public fishing areas blocked by private landowners. Most large rivers are "navigable" and in some states that means the "beds and shores" are owned by the people of the state, or at least the people should have the right to float the river. Where public and private land co-mingle, it is difficult to know legal access areas, so defined parking with defined access would help. Private landowners are also guilty of hoarding public waterways, and posting no trespassing signs on publicly owned beds and shores of waterways. I even know a case where the Forest Service refuses to allow any access for fishing, although the state (which legally must manages fish) wants to open the lake.

This situation isn't just about hunting. I know where public trailheads are also blocked. Weyerhaeuser (hardly what I would call a small private rancher) has complete control of access to a chunk of nearly 50,000 acres of public land near me. Nearby, private landowners have four USFS trailheads landlocked. Big timber pays lower property taxes because of the public benefits to forestland. One of those benefits is recreational access. If these companies insist on blocking access through their land to public land, their tax breaks should be reduced. Also, Federal agencies and local jurisdictions should be able to use all means necessary to acquire public use easements to significant blocks of landlocked public lands via roads or trails. The public should have rights to public land, just like if a private landowner was landlocked by public, they should have the right to access their land.

Berries, too. Wilderness areas do not allow berry or mushroom picking, even for personal use (unless eaten in the Wilderness Area).

There's a budget crunch here folks. The parks need to share all these "Ologists"--each park doesn't need it's own! Imagine the maintenance that could get done with the extra money.

This is a naive world view. In reality, people are in charge of everything, everywhere. When we leave an area alone completely, is not really for "wildlife", but to make US feel good about ourselves. And it is impossible to remove people from the equation anyway (global warming, pollution, etc.) When animal populations get too high in the preserve, what happens?--animals migrate to backyards. These off-limits areas would need big fences to let the animals "take care of themselves". I believe we need the opposite approach, get more people INTO the woods. Get more folks to touch the land, feel, experience, understand. The more folks really experience the land, the more support conservation has in the future. Remember, people control everything. They vote, pay taxes, donate, volunteer, CARE. We need to create a new generation of People who Care.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Nature is not a museum for kids to look but never touch. If children associate nature with getting in trouble, feeling guilty for being alive, thinking they must never step on the sacred ground, or pick a flower, rock, or other simple kid's stuff, we will lose them to TV's and computers. We must touch to survive. "Human entertainment" is touching, feeling, hiking, swimming, fishing, camping, driving, hunting, biking, and yes sometimes even ATV. These entertainments are creating the next generation of PEOPLE WHO CARE. The old school environmentalist view of "not even footprints" has got to go. Everyone must recognize that regulation and restriction has a real environmental cost. That cost is the loss of the next generation.

HELLO! There is a real budget crunch in this country people. As a former Park Service and Forest Service volunteer and employee, I can say that the Park Service needs to be more efficient and redirect their funding. More money for them doesn't necessarily more "services" for you. Do we need a ranger behind every rock? Do we really need \$250,000 pit toilets? Do we need to sponsor international scientists to come to our parks to study everything? Do we need every single park to have on its payroll a whole string of "ologists"? The park I worked at spent fire mitigation funds on a HORSE PASTURE where fire camp was set up! The Parks need to get efficient, direct money to repairs and services, and less study, litigation, planning, and visitor micro-managing. The USFS does much more with much, much less. The USFS even has to subsidise park visitors, since many roads leading to parks are USFS roads, and since Parks are very restricted on camping, USFS campgrounds outside their boundaries are "overflow".

I love a fast machine as much as anybody, and it's just my opinion, but it seems that there are enough areas for ORVs already - they don't need access to all wilderness quality lands or to all areas. ORV users are concerned about their rights, but giving them unfettered access to these lands takes away the rights of other user groups by ruining their quiet enjoyment of the land. I can see the joy of flying across the desert on an ORV. Can the ORV users see the enjoyment of walking through the natural quiet of wilderness areas and wilderness study areas? Seems to me there is enough land to go around for all of us if we are willing to give some consideration to the rights of others.

So many of these beautiful places are quite remote. If you are young and fit and have a lot of time on your hands, you can see them. But many people aren't up to a 4 day 60 mile backpacking event. Many of these people benefit from OHVs. Our government needs to think about them as well, and not just assume that a few paved roads and scenic overlooks is sufficient.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thanks, everyone, for the comments and questions on this idea. Yes, the land is preserved. A permanent conservation easement would be a required component of using this financing tool. Yes, a conservation easement and management plan are both required to qualify. Duane: the timber industry is supportive of the concept, as is the conservation community (the list of supporters includes Plum Creek, Weyerhaeuser, and the National Alliance of Forest Owners, as well as Trust for Public Land, The Nature Conservancy, Sierra Club, and Land Trust Alliance). The reason that the conservation community is supportive is that it will bring new, private money to conservation deals. There are several differences between the current Community Forestry Bonds proposal and what happened in Montana, but the most important is this: the Plum Creek Montana deal was essentially public dollars to expand public land ownership while the bill now in congress will enable private dollars to put a conservation easement on private lands and maintain those lands in sustainable working forestry. This bill would actually not use public funds - that's one of the cool parts about it. Instead, it would authorize the use of private, tax-exempt financing for acquiring forestland, in just the same way a non-profit hospital would access this capital to build a new facility. So, it can add to the overall conservation funding pie by bringing in new money from the private marketplace. Thanks again, everyone, for the great comments and questions. Feel free to contact me directly with other thoughts:

None of the commenters on this idea seem to have any real knowledge of what the environmental impacts of the Bristol Bay mine might be nor of the economic benefits of the mine. I would suggest that this is an issue to be resolved by the citizens of the State of Alaska who are more knowledgeable on the subject and are more directly impacted by the decision.

I respectfully disagree with your characterization of the Flathead National Forest and with your statement that "Most of Montana is wide open to logging, mining, cattle grazing and OHVs." But the point is that the Flathead is not unique in the western states. For example, the Bitterroot National Forest is 47% Designated Wilderness with a 5% visitation rate. Indeed, Region 1 is about 25% Designated Wilderness with a 4% visitation rate. The reality is that thousands of loggers are out of work for lack of timber sales, we haven't had a new significant mine development for decades, and hard working ranchers are systematically being squeezed out of grazing permits on public land.

\_\_\_\_\_, you hit the nail on the head!! If we want to reconnect America with the Great Outdoors, we have to provide access to the Great Outdoors. Simple.

There should be more trails made specifically for bicycles, not on the PCT or through designated wilderness. There are many old, unmaintained dirt roads that could be made into bicycle trails. Bicycles need wider trails because of trail damage and erosion issues that their use causes. Old forest service roads that are no longer being used would be perfect bike trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Love it - my city has streetlights and also lights in the alleyways! Someone broke into a garage in my neighborhood, and now everyone is asking everyone to have lights on in their backyard, their garage, their front yard, and on and on. Very worried about thieves and so forth. I really really wish most lights could be replaced with high tech motion sensors, instead of being "always on." (Imagine a thief running down an alley way, and the police could see the motion detector lights all along his escape path!) Related, I understand lightning bugs/fireflies are on the decline. Their magical flashing lights are used to signal to potential mates. They don't like areas with lots of lights, because it upstages their bio-luminescence when they're trying to show off to their mates.

increase gov't solvency. The Federal Gov't has an enormous wealth in land. If the Fed's was more solvent it could be more credible when it made suggestions for land management. If the Fed began selling the land to private citizens it could use the money to pay off it's huge debt. This would be a form of voluntary tax collection that would help everyone.

There are better ways of getting your point across. The point is not whether someone follows the law or not. The point is do the laws and practices in place address the issue of protecting the outdoors while giving reasonable access to enjoy those areas. First, I agree that it only takes one OHV to ruin the experience of a wilderness area for everyone except others who are also on OHVs. This goes for the wildlife that lives there as well as all non-OHV users like hikers, fly fisherman, hunters, backpackers, horseback riders, mountain bikers, etc. The smell and sound of a single OHV can impact other users more than 2 miles away. That same area can be used by hundreds of lower impact users without detracting from the experience. It is wrong to assume OHV users are not following the laws any more than any other group of users just as it is wrong to assume that hikers and backpackers are careless and cause forest fires. There are no statistics to identify which groups of users are more likely to cause wildfires, but you can be sure there are careless users of all kinds that do so. Apparently it is not just "tree huggers" who are likely to "ignore facts and stick to lies and rhetoric (rhetoric) to stir up emotions." Clearly the OHV users have a challenge to be able to share the wilderness with other users and still enjoy their sport. It is possibly similar to smokers vs non-smokers in many respects. Some things that might go a long way to smooth things between users would be to improve noise and exhaust controls on those vehicles. A bit off topic, but if you have a dirt bike, you should check out where they are going with electrics. SERIOUS torque, kick-butt 0-60, and so quiet you sneak up on bears (that may NOT be such a good thing).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness should be Wild. I think the Wilderness areas should be Wild. There should be no maintained trails. No trail heads. No trail head parking lots. No GPS, Cellphone, rescue beacons. If somebody tries to use an electronic device to summon help, it should be ignored. There should be no wilderness rescues provided by the government. Marked and maintained trails, and their associated trail heads and parking lots encourage concentrated use. This detracts from the wilderness experience. Of course there will still be a demand for more developed areas, with marked trails, and parking areas, and the possibility of rescue. These areas would have to be removed from Wilderness designation. Perhaps call them "backcountry" areas as a means of distinguishing them from areas that have paved roads. In the interest of fairness I think some of these areas should be designated multiple use. Not all the trails should be restricted to pedestrian use. Horses should be allowed on some. Bicycles, motorcycles, OHV, Jeeps, SUVs should all get areas their owners can use. The division of the available land could be based on the number of users in each group. This could perhaps be determined by trail registers at trail heads. Or perhaps each user would pay a fee based on which type of areas they intend to use.

My understanding is a US wilderness is defined as "A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain." If we are going to have wilderness areas (and I think we should) we need to be honest about it. In my mind, a maintained trail, with trail register and parking lot, is a permanent sign of the trammeling by man. They should be eradicated, just like other signs of previous human activity (roads, cabins, etc) are sometimes eradicated.

Look in a mirror. Every post you make is about the way YOU want it, and it's always against motorized use. You're a strange, simplistic creature with a tad bit to much anger harvested. Perhaps you should exercise a bit. The author has a good point. \_\_\_\_\_ attempts to paint a picture that by its very nature, accessible land is 'closed'. He's lying of course, but it makes a great bullet point for propaganda. I just can't imagine such a sheltered, closed minded, and twisted view of life as the the self pro-claimed 'anti-everything' live. Tell me, you don't plug your coffee pot into an outlet in your apartment. You hypocrite. Your very actions are "ruining my salmon runs", etc, etc, etc. The author's point is, if you can't get along with they way others like to do things, how would it feel to be on the receiving end? Be careful what you wish for and demand, for you might be next. Personally, I think sharing is a great idea. Currently, when I go cross country skiing, I have the choice of using their groomed trails and gaining better access to areas I would not otherwise be able to reach; or, not being around 'them' and going somewhere they are not allowed. In all fairness, I seriously doubt the guy on the sled appreciates me on a trail they are riding on knowing dang well that he is only allowed to access some small percentage of land because of groups that I'm associated with (skiers). And for all the complaints I hear about them, it's always amazing at how well they treat me. I have spoken often to dog mushers who share the same parking lot as we do (along with snowmachines). If any group of people would seemingly not like the noise of an engine, I would suspect it would be them. Let them seem to always have nice things to say. Again, look in the mirror. You are a selfish, insecure person. All I see when I read your posts is "me, me, me, I, I, I, give, give, give, take, take, take".

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'll get a crayon.... write in big block letters so you can understand. Will that help? Sorry, that was mean. Naw, I could repeat myself, but your mind is seemingly so set, its likely closed to anything other than the way 'you' want it. Which, to put it bluntly (this should be simple, even for you), would make it selfish. Just because you 'think' that your way is the only way to protect wildlife, does not make it so. I think that's the hardest thing for many to grasp, yourself included. Your 'moronic' comment only announced to the readers your weak grasp of the issue. Most folks can probably see your attempt at lashing out and attribute it to the source. Your comments "I still find it laughable though that you people think sitting on a machine is strenuous exercise." only weakens your argument. It shows you as ignorant and blind to widely known facts, which in turn shows you (again...) as simple and closed minded. I quit donating to groups that support this closed minded thinking a long time ago. We're going to have to get along with groups that do things other than what we enjoy, whether we understand the attraction or not. I've never been to the dunes, can't understand the attraction to sand in the shorts nor blasting through hot air at high speed. Yet, who am I (or you) to say it's wrong, it's not exercise (that is a really lame statement and makes one look like a keyboard jockey) or should be shut down. Or is this where the 'holier than thou' and 'my way or the highway' attitude and beliefs come in? I don't apologize for mocking you and pointing out your short comings. You should have left the 'moronic' comment out. You earned it. Would you like to try again?

I live in Big Bear Lake, CA. There is an Adventure Pass fee to "park a vehicle and recreate" in the San Bernardino National Forest here. This is in areas that are unimproved and should be free to we Americans. As a Marine veteran I have to bite my tongue and use a restrained vocabulary to express my disgust and outrage at our govt. and politicians on this issue. The San Bernardino forest here has even gone so far as to offer "one free day" a year to veterans. You have to be kidding - what a cos. How much more disrespectful can our govt. get? You can't nickel and dime everyone to death. Everyone needs money, but our forests should be free for all citizens and families to enjoy, especially when on a tight budget. \_\_\_\_\_, you say emotionalism? We have a lake here and it costs \$90 a season to put a boat on the water - has nothing to do with an Adventure Pass. As for the San Bernardino National Forest here, the "improved areas" you mention require an additional fee. So if you don't understand our "emotionalism," then do further study.

I am a Utah native, and have seen the the damage done by OHV's on Forest Service land, BLM land, and private land. The use of OHV's has exploded exponentially over the last several years, which means the "small minority" of irresponsible riders has exploded exponentially as well. Places I have gone with my family, from the time I was a child with my parents, to now taking my own children have been damaged beyond recognition. Dirt roads that took us into the back country along the Wasatch Front mountains, my back yard, are now impassable. Streams and hillsides ruined and meadows turned into dirt racetracks (I have photographs). We MUST protect the last wild places and OHV use controlled and strict laws enforced or there will be nothing left for anyone.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think it is time to tell the federal agencies that earning an America the Beautiful Pass should be doable during a week's vacation and two weekends -- say 50 hours. That would value our time at about \$160 an hour! Make sure that the volunteer effort is subject to documentation, but for goodness sake, make the volunteer recognition achievable by folks other than the unemployed and the retired!!!! Heck -- I get two free baseball tickets for donating blood -- a \$30 value for literally 30 minutes of my time.

Controlling the viewshed above national parks just seems way, way too big a challenge. You would be talking about buffers of 50+ miles around parks.

Do we alter fees according to how many people see the contrails? Over do we let flights go free if there is a cloud cover and no one's view is impaired? Reminds me of the classic philosophy question: if a tree falls in the woods and there is no one around to hear it, does the tree make a sound? Look, I'm sensitive to impacting the enjoyment of parks. But there are so many other more pressing issues for me -- acid and toxic rainfall, climate change and more -- that I'll just have to pass on believing this issue merits action.

We have some sympathy for both your message and the problems being faced at the grassroots level by the Forest Service. But first -- your descriptions of the federal pay scales is a bit off. There is no GS 25. For details, go to: { <a href="http://www.opm.gov/oca/10tables/pdf/gs.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } We have found that adding funds to the Forest Service budget nationally is not a good way to get funds to the ground. The charges assessed against line items like recreation are exorbitant -- there are deductions for everything from EOE to new computer systems and overall administration. Lucky if \$1 in \$3 hits the ground. That is a big reason for our advocacy of retained fees -- which are generally exempted from these deductions.

The "we" refers to the dozens of recreation enthusiast and advocacy groups that have worked to increase resources for FS recreation programs for more than three decades -- through budget increases, fees, overcoming obstacles to volunteerism (including liability issues) and through federal funding for trails, boating and fishing access and more available for investments in national forests through state agencies, usually in cooperation with local trail/fishing/boating/hunting organizations.

Even worse, the AVERAGE American youth spends 7.5 hours daily watching a screen (and even higher for urban and minority youth) and 30 minutes outdoors. Source: Kaiser Family Foundation report in January 2010. This represents an hour a day increase since 2000. Researchers were amazed -- reported that they hadn't imagined that the hours reported in 2000 could increase because of other time demands like sleeping, eating .....

\_\_\_\_\_ is right. Simply calling for more funding are likely to fall on deaf ears during the next several years. We need to either suggest where other programs can be cut back or suggest ways to raise funds for our suggested new and expanded programs. The Congress and the Administration are forced to do that under PAYGO budget rules -- and to be effective in our advocacy, we need to help them with the rules they must play under.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Forest Service Planning Rule Needs to Facilitate, Manage Recreation. The Forest Service is going through an elaborate process to development a planning rule to guide planning efforts by national forests covering 190 million acres and hosting hundreds of millions of recreation visits each year. The process has included Federal register notices, a science forum, public roundtables and more. Recreation community leaders recently met with the Chief to praise the process but underscore that major change is needed to keep national forests relevant to Americans in the 21st Century. While we agree that the planning rule can't go into great detail about treating recreation in the forests, we do believe that the rule needs to signal a change in managing recreation, including strong direction to utilize state programs, volunteers, concessioners and permittees to head off the all-too-frequent clashes that occur between a dn among recreationists in the forests, and to be more forward-looking in planning efforts.

The data is clear -- recreation and wildlife economic benefits of national forests and most other public lands exceed the economic benefits of commodity uses. Has been true for years. And the recreaiton/wildlife benefits are sustainable. Yet getting recreation its deserved place in forest and public land planning is very tough and not appropriately supported by the agencies. Trying to change that in the new FS Planning Rule.

Sorry, but it is not clear to me -- are you proposing to buy private lands and make them into school trust lands or are you proposiong to buy school trust lands from willing states for placement in other conservation systems? School trust lands were designed to generate income for state educational programs, and is resticted to well under half of all states -- seems to me that this mixes too many concepts for a clear initiative.

Park Partnerships are Drowning in Red Tape and Process. There are wonderful partnerships at work protecting America's national parks and helping to create life-long memories. Many of the partners are non-profits like NatureBridge and the Golden Gate Parks Conservancy. Other partners are businesses operating in or near the parks. But across the board, these partners are finding the red tape and process to be growing dramatically and challenging even long-standing relationships. Fear of GAO and IG investigations is prompting NPS to shorten the terms of the agreements -- even as they are asking more of these partners -- and putting each agreement through hoop after hoop of local, regional and national clearance. The House Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands held a hearing on Parks and Partnerships on 9/23 and got an earful. The Congress needs to take action soon to overcome the surge in barriers to partnerships and to send a clear signal that creativity in "doing the right thing" by park superintendents will not only be tolerated but applauded. For copies fo the testimony detailing the problems facing park partners, go to: { <a href="http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/index.php?option=com\_jcalpro&Itemid=32&extmode=view&extid=388" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

FLREA fee options never implemented. When Congress passed the Federal Recreation Lands Enhancement Act in 2004, providing 5 federal agencies with fee retention authority and more, it also provided authority for some important additional fee programs -- like the ability of volunteers to earn a nationwide pass and an option to make fees simple for us -- with regional passes that would cover federal, state and even local entrance fees with the same pass. Lots of models to follow on the latter -- the fast pass systems now used for tolls on highways. or the addition of a stamp on the America the Beautiful pass, as is now done for hunting and fishing passes in various states. The FLREA fee authority expires in 2014, and no action by the federal interagency fee task force on this yet. Looks like it will not happen.

While I generally support this comment, I do not believe that management of our lands should be looked upon as a "majority vote" issue. Our federal land managers need to be trained and rewarded for developing consensus on land use decisions, as well as helping the public understand the science issues involved. And there needs to be consideration of the variations in public values within the one-third of the US managed by federal agencies. In short, national park system lands and wildlife refuges deserve more "national" consideration in use decisions than much of the multiple use lands systems.

We have made significant progress in water quality, almost all in the point source arena. Public and private investments have been large -- and regrettably, we have not acquired some of the real estate which could allow public access to these waters -- real estate which was made much, much more valuable by the clean up. Perhaps we have no choice but to pay the price now. but let's learn the lesson and as we turn to non-point sources, let's make certain that key access points near urban surface waters are not made still more unaffordable!

Permits are required for commercial uses of Wilderness -- or any FS or BLM area. The problem is that the permit process is hugely burdensome, very slow and works only with well-intentioned outfitters and guides. There is virtually no monitoring or enforcement, meaning that there are renegade operators ignoring the permit process -- and others who operate under the pretense of being educational/charitable operations when they are not. This is definitely an area needing major change.

I'm all for "spending on conservation" -- also on education, and medical research, and transportation infrastructure and defense and ... the point is, I also care about the total tax burden on me, too. This is an era when we need to grow park and conservation resources in areas other than straight appropriations. And there are lots of ways to do this.

The issue here is that we have ignored the inholding issue too long. Once the Congress designates a park/refuge/other special area, we need to proceed to either buy private inholdings at a reasonable price or impose development restrictions -- and pay fair value for the restrictions imposed. I do agree that Tom Chapman is engaged largely in a gaming process that needs to be discouraged -- but not at the cost of legitimate private property rights.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hard to understand why you "can't afford to visit the parks," since well over half of all NPS areas have no fees and since in 2009 and again in 2010, fees were waived during many key periods. Switch your medical insurance to SeeChange insurance -- they will reimburse you for park entrance fees!

I think we ALL agree that sustainable, alternative energy needs to be advanced, but that we need to be mindful of unintended consequences. Our highways of the '60's and urban redevelopment efforts of the '60's and '70's proved that good intentions don't deliver good results. I'm reminded of a favorite saying: "There is always a well-known solution to every human problem--neat, plausible, and wrong." H. L. Mencken Wind turbines are good -- but not in the wrong places. Geothermal is good -- but not if it "kills" Old Faithful. Solar is good -- but not if the water demand exacerbates problems with groundwater mining.

Bad idea. Mountain bikes should NOT be allowed in the wilderness or on the National Scenic Trails like the Pacific Crest Trail. Mountain biking is an activity supported by a powerful industry (including auto and motorcycle manufacturers.) We as a society need a place we can go that has not been sold out to industry. A place where quiet, passive recreation is the most that can be done. Mountain bicyclists can enjoy the wilderness on foot like the rest of us, and ride their bikes elsewhere like they already have plenty of opportunity to do. Nobody wants to be run over while gazing in quiet contemplation at the view on the John Muir Trail.

Animals that require solitude (no humans) to thrive don't care what condition the road is in.

Quality family time does not include risking your child's life on an OHV in tough terrain. The results are clear to intelligent people. A single man trashes the land commensurate to a single OHV. A family of 4 trashes 4 times as much public land. There are 306 million owners of our national forests. Why should someone feel that they can harm the land that belongs to 305,999,999 people without permission?

No, this should be reworded to read: preserve OHV use to assure massive profit for corporations that manufacture OHVs. This statement originated with a lobbyist.

Every timber sale, every road constructed and every noisy OHV either destroys the wildlife habitat and/or drives our wildlife from their habitat. Currently 96% of the undeveloped land in America is developed and no longer functions as habitat. There is a time when there will be more than enough habitat ... after corporate development has forced the wildlife into extinction. Extinct wildlife species can get by with no habitat at all.

Fact: OHVs tear up the ground and create sediment that hammers the aquatic environment. It makes no difference who is riding them ... whether they are members of a family or unrelated.

When an ORV uses a trail they demolish the solitude enjoyment of hikers and scare horses.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No! Ban children under the age of 85 from using OHVs on public land.

When OHV users expand to the point that they bump elbows, why not buy 100,000 acres of private land that has already been trashed and plundered?

The vast majority of Americans enjoy viewing wild animals interacting in their habitat ... not draped over the hood of a car.

National Wildlife Refuges are no place for motorized recreation.

More local open spaces!. Sidewalks are NOT nature trails! Newer developments seem to be about maximizing the profit by squeezing people into smaller and smaller lots , and the developers and the city officials run the show. Its like minimum requirements in some city's where one percent of there business has to be beautification. It is not enough. Open spaces should be a requirement! Not just baseball fields and golf courses that you and your dog are not allowed on. We should not have to drive 20 or 30 miles to an open swath of land. There needs to be a better balance for people to actually live and play.

You can stop beating the drum... Global Warming is over. We just got through one of the coldest summers in history. This winter promises to be the same. Al Gore made a 100 million dollars from a lie and scare tactics. Ha. Let's learn to share our Public Lands with ALL Americans.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

12): Many people don't trust federal politicians...so what's your point? I'll take a crooked local politician over a crooked federal politician ANY DAY! Which is why I feel land bills should start at the county level. As for the wilderness bills not passing without local congressional support, that is essentially how it is now anyway (so though people disagree with it, it's the way it is...with few exceptions), I just want to make it official. And the fact that historically congress hasn't passed wilderness bills without congressional support from the state the land is in, is for good reason! Right now, in Utah, there is a MASSIVE (and even "massive" is an understatement---the thing is larger than the entire state of Maryland) wilderness area trying to be FORCED down Utah's throat, by a radical environmental group. This group tried 20 years ago to get a Utah congressman to support the bill-and he was promptly voted out of office...so they realized they had to get politicians out of reach of Utah voters to progress their agenda. So here we in Utah sit, looking down the barrel of a HUGE wilderness bill that we don't want, that will hurt our economy, that includes non-wilderness act compliant land, is really unnecessary (the reasons stated for the bill are exaggerated or outright lies), and that we HATE, and there is NOTHING we can do about it. The politicians progressing it are out of reach of our votes (many of them won't even accept emails from people outside their district-Maurice Hinchey 22nd district in NY for example). We are helpless! That is why this is wrong! Utahns know what is best the federal land we live on, make our livings from, of which our livelihoods depend. And we're helpless to stop this BAD wilderness bill. In Washington County here, there was a very successful land bill that passed, it included nearly 300,000 acres of wilderness. Similar bills are in the works in Emery County, San Juan County, and Piute County...All will include wilderness...but this radical environmental group has promised to "kill the bills" if the amount of wilderness in each county is less than in their proposed wilderness bill. So for people to say that our local politicians don't care about the land, or won't designate wilderness, or will sell it to the highest bidder is just plain misinformed and WRONG. \_\_\_\_\_ 13) What does BP have to do with this? And in my experience, the REASON environmentalists are so against "local" (county and state) politicians is because they have MORE control over the feds (just like corporations do). Environmentalist groups are "big business" these days...they have MILLIONS AND MILLIONS of dollars (The one we deal with here in Utah has MAYBE 20 full time staff, and they have well over \$5Million in assets with nearly \$2Million a year in "donations"...and that's a small one!). They are just as eager, just as capable, and just as willing to "buy" congressmen, and their agenda is just as damaging and just as crooked as a corporation is. Environmentalists constantly try and dumb the discussion down into absolutes and exaggerations. They try and make it an "either/or" proposition. It's "either" wilderness, or its "wrecked once and for all". Which isn't even remotely true! There are many different, and sometimes more effective ways to manage public land than wilderness....but the environmentalists-the radicals that they are-only see to want wilderness. Why is that?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

...those county commissioners are wrong in that desire. If San Juan and Emery and Kane and Piute could spearhead the land use proposals without fear of a radical environmentalist groups threatening to "kill the bill" if it doesn't reflect what they-radically-believe it should, those county commissioners would feel they needed those drastic measures. The problem is that the environmentalist groups won't allow a "middle ground" (unless it's a forced last resort--Tavaputs Plateau), their radicalism and extremism breeds extremism and radicalism from the opposition. The opposition to these bills can't give an inch, because the environmentalists will take a mile. So they have to maintain these extreme-be it, unrealistic-positions to counter the extreme-and equally unrealistic-positions of the environmentalists. All I'm saying is that the county residents should have the MOST say (they should do the inventory, they should set the wilderness and other potential designation boundaries, etc...this gives them the most say), they should welcome input from everyone in the country, and at the end of the day ALL Americans would get a say via the vote of their congressional representatives when the bill is brought to the floor in congress (just like they do now on every land bill and every other bill on every other topic). That's all I'm saying.

As a point of clarification, OHV access to public land in UTAH is shrinking! Every year, OHV's lose access to more and more public land in this state. For example: When the BLM revised it's travel plan for the San Rafael Swell in 2003, OHV's lost 40% of their access to the Swell. 40% of the OHV trails/roads in the Swell were CLOSED!!!! (And, as a point of interest, Bush was president in 2003) More recently: When the BLM changed from an "Open unless designated closed" model to a "closed unless designated open" model, again OHV's lost access to their public land! I've been riding on public land in Utah my entire life, and I can tell you with 100% certainty that there are less places to ride TODAY, than there was last year, the year before that, 5 years ago, 10 years ago, 20 years ago. Certain groups and individuals would have America believe that OHV's are literally canvassing the entire landscape in Utah and destroying everything in sight. This isn't even remotely true! Don't let certain agenda's fool you, OHV's aren't proliferating into new areas they haven't already been. They are being shut out of more and more areas every single year. Quite honestly, OHV access to public land in this state, at least, is at a critical mass! More and more OHV's are being crowded into ever shrinking open areas. This trend can't continue.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I take issue with the claim that ohv's "destroy" (as in "ruin forever") the land. A track or a trail through a landscape doesn't "destroy" the land scape. Stating such is an emotional exaggeration and misleading. I don't even see a track or trail (or even multiple tracks or trails) as "ugly" or "unsightly" (just my opinion, just like it's someone else's opinion if they feel otherwise). And the failure of the environmentalist community to acknowledge that the land will heal, is a huge hole in their argument! They will provide pictures of OHV tracks across the wet sand, and site it as evidence of the "destruction" of OHVs...yet fail to acknowledge that if they were to come back tomorrow, the tracks wouldn't even be visible. (Just one example) And for your information, OHV access to Utah public land is DECREASING every year! In 2003 when the BLM revised its Travel Management Plan, it closed 40% of the OHV trails in the swell. And more recently than that, when the BLM switched from an "open unless designated closed" to a "closed unless designated open" model for OHV trails and roads, MORE OHV access to public land in Utah was lost. This is important to point out, because it is an underlying factor as to why you are seeing more OHV damage in the areas they are allowed to go. As OHV increases in popularity, the places they are legally allowed to ride continue to shrink. So more and more OHV's are being crowded into smaller and smaller riding areas. OF COURSE the areas they are allowed to ride on will see more damage. (The environmental community lobbies to get areas closed, and are thus responsible for the over crowding, and increased damage, in certain areas....then the dishonest environmentalists use these open areas as evidence to close MORE riding areas. They can't have it both ways!) And if you have evidence of people illegally riding in areas they aren't allowed, we need to deal with those people via enforcement of existing laws, not by stereotypically banning all OHV's. OHV's don't destroy public land. People destroy public land. Do pencils misspell words? No. The people controlling the pencils do. Do OHV's ride irresponsibly on public land? No. The people controlling the OHV's do. We need to focus on the people! Not on their mode of transportation (be it a Honda or Nike's). Punishing ALL OHV riders because of the actions of a few, is wrong. Because some members of Islam are radical extremist set on destroying America, is it right to punish all members of Islam? Because some African Americans are gang members and damage society, is it right to punish all African Americans? Of course not! And it's wrong to punish all OHV riders for the actions of a few. Enforce existing laws to deal with the bad apples (just like is being done with gang members and radical Islam). Come on people...this broad brush that the environmental extremists in this country use in their dishonest attempts at gaining control of public lands needs to stop (and by "gaining control" I mean getting it designated in such a way that only the activities that they SELFISHLY approve of are allowed). Stereotyping all OHV riders, is wrong. Wilderness Advocates don't have any more right to the land than OHV advocates do. And it's incredibly selfish for them to attempt to have the land designated in such a way that only activities in which they approve of are allowed. It's PUBLIC, it has to be shared! If you don't like sharing land because it ruins your pictures, or you don't like seeing trails or the noise...go buy some land and do what you want with it. But you can't have your exclusive way with public land. If you can't afford your own land, tough cookies! Life isn't fair...so you are going to have to deal with other people while you use public land. I just do not comprehend the selfishness of the wilderness advocates. "I don't like OHV's, so I want them banned" "I only like to hike and paddle, so I only want hiking and paddling allowed"....come on!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

All public land bills should start at the county level!. When it comes to public land bills, they need to start at the county level-with input from local citizens and businesses-spearheaded by the resident county commissioners, and supervised by the state congressmen. Once a land bill is finalized at the county level, the state congressmen then take that bill to D.C. for a vote. This is public land, and as such all Americans deserve a say. And this way the AMERICANS that will be most significantly affected by the how the land-those that live on/near the land-is managed get the most say. The Americans that live close to the land in question-residents of the state-get slightly less say than the specific residents of the county, and all other AMERICANS get a say by how their elected congressional representatives vote of the proposed bill. This way those that will be affected the most, get the most say. Yet all Americans still get a say-as they should. The current way of special interest groups (environmental groups)-who represent a small minority of the population-spearheading the movement and going over and around local politicians, and getting support for whatever bill they come up with from congressmen from the otherside of the country and then forcing the bill down the local residents throats, is broken and wrong!

From what I've seen Locals don't have hardly any say at all. The Red Rock Wilderness Act (which has proposed to designate 9.4million acres of BLM land as wilderness---an area larger than the entire state of Maryland, and which would be 40% of the total available public land in the state of Utah) is completely ignoring the will of the locals. There is no support for the bill from the Utah congressional delegation, virtually every county commission which has land included in the bill is against it, and there is very very very little general public support for the bill. So the environmentalist organizations got a Congressmen from New York (out of reach of Utah voters) to sponsor the bill (and he's been re-introducing it every year for the past 20...and there is nothing Utah voters can do about it). The environmentalists are 100% intent on forcing this bill down the throats of Utahns against our will. This is wrong on so many levels. As a Utahn, I expect to have very little say in what New York, or Montana, or Oregon or California do with their Federal land...and I wish they'd afford Utahns the same. We in Utah are very capable of taking care of the public land in Utah, and are intent on doing so on a county by county basis. It is proving very effective at representing the will of all stake holders. And if you aren't an extreme environmentalist that I'm not talking about you. So don't take offense.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm not opposed to wilderness. But 40% of the public land in one state as the very most restrictive of all possible land designations is WAY too much. The problem with this bill is that it's too large, it is being sold to America on false pretenses, doesn't represent the will of the majority, will hurt local/rural economies by limiting their access to fossil fuels which their economies so badly depend, not to mention the tourist dollars OHV's bring to these rural communities. The Moab Jeep safari is WORLD famous! There world famous Dirt Bike riding areas here, which attract visitors to otherwise irrelevant towns and keep them alive. Mountain biking in south eastern Utah is also world famous and the rural Utah towns depend on the tourism dollars these non-wilderness compliant activities provide. I don't think anyone is opposed to small amounts of wilderness (archeological sites, the very most pristine and sacred parts of public land, etc) as evidenced by the amount of wilderness included in the successful Washington county land bills, but when a vocal minority is trying to take a land mass larger than the entire state of Maryland and designate it as wilderness against the local state's wishes is just wrong. As I said, I don't expect to have a huge amount of input on how Americans in other states manage the federal land that they live next to and on, and I wish they afford Utahns the same privilege.

This is something that NEEDS to change. And suggesting it as an idea for better managing public land, to the Obama administration is relevant. I'm not saying that it shouldn't take an act of congress to designate wilderness areas, I'm just saying that federal land should be looked at on a county by county basis, and the local residents should spearhead any public land bills for the federal land in their county. All Americans get a say in how the land is designated via their elected congressional representatives vote on the land bill the county comes up with-just as they do now. Should congress change this law, the only difference would be that county commissioners and local residents-who know and understand the land better than anyone-would be spearheading the movement, rather than environmental groups with screwed views of reality-in that they believe "wilderness" is more important than lives and livelihoods. There is now way a person from Maine, who never has-nor never will-set foot on public land in California....should have more say over how that public land in California is managed, than a person that has been dependent on that land-sometimes for generations-for his livelihood. I don't want a huge say in how the federal land is managed outside of my state-above and beyond the vote of my elected congressional representatives-and I wish other Americans would stop being so selfish, and allow the people in my state to manage the land.

The OP says there is 6 million acres of "wilderness quality" BLM land in Utah. If that's all there is why is the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, along with about 160 members of congress asking to designate 9.4 million acres of land IN UTAH ALONE as wilderness? Does that mean they are asking to designate 3.4 million acres of land, in Utah, as wilderness that aren't wilderness quality? (Doing so via the Red Rock Wilderness Act)



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many Americans see the Great Outdoors as more than a recreation venue. It is where they connect with their spiritual side and experience re-creation. For these people, the Great Outdoors is church and nature religion. \_\_\_\_\_, you are a man of Christ and so I share with you something recently found on-line and directly relevant. Can you appreciate that it is a blaspheme to demand payment for walking in nature or seeking communion with values greater than Mammon? Or, as a lobbyist, can you appreciate only the values you are paid to represent? \*\*\* Jesus Christ announces new \$75/month Pay-for-Pray Subscription fee by \_\_\_\_\_ 10/7/2010 | BOISE - Lord and Savior Jesus H. Christ today announced new plans for Heaven's prayer service, as, starting Nov. 1, each Christian must pay a \$75 per month "Listen to Your Prayers" Subscription fee. "For too long now, we've allowed non-tithers to piggyback on true tithers," said Christ, 30-ish. "Now, you can still pray, but if you don't pay, we won't listen." The controversial Pay-for-Pray plan comes just days after a Tennessee man saw his house burn down, and have four of his pets burn to death as firefighters watched on, unwilling to help because the man had not paid his "subscription fee." Christ said that such things are to be expected. "If you don't pay your \$75 then that hurts Heaven," said Christ, sporting a new grill. "We can't use those resources and you would be sponging off your neighbor's \$75 if they answer your neighbor's prayers and you didn't pay for it." Christ went on to say that Heaven's finances have been in turmoil since the economic crisis hit, and that a "lot" of money was invested with convicted fraudster Bernie Madoff. "You'd think we'd have seen that coming," said Christ. The new subscription Listening Fee plan will start at \$75, and go up 10 percent every year to keep up with inflation. Jesus said that it was a bargain at twice the price. "Hearing your prayers matters. We're talking your eternal soul, here people," said Christ, noshing on a hot dog. "Just remember this - You shall enter God's glorious kingdom if you accept Me as your one true savior. And pay the \$75/month Prayer Subscription Fee. That's all we ask."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have gotten ourselves into this unsustainable and disastrous predicament by pursuing exactly the policies \_\_\_\_\_ recommends! We need to learn from our mistakes and start doing things differently, in a way that is not only sustainable (which has become a buzz word, these days), but regenerative. By observing and understanding nature, we can learn to live in a way that renews the earth instead of always degrading and destroying it. This is not a pipe dream, we can do this now. We know how to do it. Organic agriculture and permaculture good examples of how to live this way in terms of food production. Solar and geothermal energy, among others, are good examples of how to do this in terms of energy production. There are many other examples and we are just beginning to see the countless possibilities as we explore other options besides the traditional Western notions of exploit, degrade, rape and move on to the next resource area. Eventually, you run out of new areas and resources to exploit and use up and you destroy the life-sustaining systems we rely on for survival. We are now approaching the limits of oil extraction and exploitation, referred to as "Peak Oil", where the only substantial, new reserves left are those that are increasingly difficult and dangerous to get at, and are much more costly to extract. A new regenerative model is clearly needed, one that allows us to live within the capacity of the Earth to sustain us by incorporating the principle of renewability as fundamental to the system. We will either adapt to this reality, or we will perish. The Earth does not care, it will still be here after we are gone. We still have a "frontier" mentality in America, but we no longer have a frontier to exploit. This is now the case on a global level and we must adapt to this reality.

Excuse, me! I meant to say "the policies that \_\_\_\_\_ recommends", not you. My apologies!! I agree with everything you said. I especially liked your comment "global warming is making the ice cap melt and that ocean is becoming accessible. Drilling for oil and gas there will make global warming worse, which is the opposite of what we need. It is absolutely counterproductive and counter intuitive to take advantage of the catastrophe of global warming and make it even worse". The oil and gas companies who will profit most from the exploitation of the Arctic as the ice caps continue to melt, must be literally giddy over the fact that global warming is making them melt and I believe they are doing everything they can to encourage it. They have a tremendous amount to gain. It is well know to anyone who cares to inform themselves that the biggest funders of global warming/climate change denial are Big Oil, such as Exxon Mobil and Koch industries, the latter is also the primary funder of the co-opted and now largely astroturf, "Tea Party" movement. People need to wake up and smell the coffee and see who is behind these campaigns that are hurting us all, yet massively increasing the profits of a select few.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with everything you said. I especially liked your comment "global warming is making the ice cap melt and that ocean is becoming accessible. Drilling for oil and gas there will make global warming worse, which is the opposite of what we need. It is absolutely counterproductive and counter intuitive to take advantage of the catastrophe of global warming and make it even worse". The oil and gas companies who will profit most from the exploitation of the Arctic as the ice caps continue to melt, must be literally giddy over the fact that global warming is making them melt and I believe they are doing everything they can to encourage it. They have a tremendous amount to gain. It is well know to anyone who cares to inform themselves that the biggest funders of global warming/climate change denial are Big Oil, such as Exxon Mobil and Koch industries, the latter is also the primary funder of the co-opted and now largely astroturf, "Tea Party" movement. People need to wake up and smell the coffee and see who is behind these campaigns that are hurting us all, yet massively increasing the profits of a select few. \_\_\_\_\_ seems to have a "frontier" mentality, thinking that resources are infinite and inexhaustible. News flash, we no longer have a frontier, \_\_\_\_\_, and haven't for some time now. What's more, there are no more frontiers left anywhere in the world. We have reached and are pushing up against the limits of all of our resources, whether they be oil and gas, fresh water, and soon, arable land and food supplies. This is the reality that we must adapt to or perish. Unless we adopt a sustainable way of living upon the Earth, one that is regenerative and allows us to renew our critical resources, we will perish. We now number 6.8 billion people on this planet. There is no more margin for error or foolish wastefulness, selfishness and greed and a grand scale. We must leave our childish ways behind, grow up and face reality. The laws of nature are pretty simple and straight forward: adapt and evolve, or perish. The earth does not care, it will still be here after we are gone.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with the previous comments. I think \_\_\_\_\_ needs to stop taking his cues from fictional novels, like "John McPhee's novel Encounters with the Archdruid" and get out and see the devastation of real places, parks, wilderness areas and other public lands, to appreciate what Aron has aptly described as the many disaster zones that have resulted from doing just what \_\_\_\_\_ recommends. I live in Pennsylvania where our rich state forests are now being auctioned off for cheap to Marcellus Shale Gas drilling companies that are polluting our ground water, using millions of gallons (free!) from the Delaware River for their hydrofracking operations and causing lethal explosions and degradation of ecosystems by the introduction of roads and spillage of fracking fluid and other drilling wastes. Our government officials have sold us out on the cheap and are not even taxing the gas drillers! Oh, and they send much of their waste water to water treatment plants to be "cleaned up". Many plants are overwhelmed and some will not accept the waste water because they do not have the ability to deal with some of the highly toxic chemicals, which the drilling companies refuse even to disclose. From my experience, this is typical behavior from "private investors". Face it, they care about one thing and one thing, ONLY: MAXIMIZING PROFITS and the expense of everyone and everything else! This should not be a mystery, it is the very nature of unbridled capitalism. Welcome to our nightmare...when will this insanity be stopped?? The Allegheny Forest in PA is the largest expanse of forest left east of the Mississippi River. It has taken it over 150 years to recover from the first disastrous episode of unrestricted, unregulated logging and now they are back to rape our forests again. Don't we ever learn?

Horses and History. On the East coast National Parks use birth control (PZP) to manage wild horse herds on barrier islands as opposed to the roundups of the BLM. This idea needs to be extended to the west where wild horses also have a legitimate historic as well as prehistoric place. The National Park Service could lead the nation in treating these animals as the native species they are. Americans are fascinated by them. Think of the history, the Native American cultures, the movement West, the Spanish. Climate change - how have things changed since horses originated here? How do they fit into the ecology as opposed to causing environmental problems since horses had long been in most of the west before the westward movement began?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

govern nature as nature governs itself. What works for conservation and allowing nature to live in harmony with plastic. First lets define plastic.. plastic is a cover all word for something that is man made. I have found that anything man made can be traced to chemicals many of whom are by products of fossil fuel extracted as oil. Other posts of mine tell of my creating polarfleece and point out that corporations now deeply rooted to plastic man made products also called synthetics have organized into coalitions to try to improve recreation experiences and participation on public lands. Years ago in 1992 I was quoted in a feature story about polyester plastic underwear in the Wall Street Journal. quote: "layering irony upon irony Mr. Hoschek explained who was responsible for this winter wear revolution: hippies. The outdoor winter wear revolution of moving on from natural fibers to plastic fibers was indeed part of the strong hippie culture in Berkeley Calif. One name Sierra Designs rooted in name only to the more famous Sierra Club began the revolution. Contrast this hippie thing to today and a recent award winning documentary film about one of the founders of Jan Sport also acknowledged to be at one time a hippie. Are we going to connect the dots of Michael Moore and Bill Mahler todays voices that can swear on tv and make it okay as hippies swore at the gov't in the 60's and 70's. What kind of movement can deploy itself against the war on terror in todays world. The term grass roots comes to mind. Grass is a root of the land itself in real terms not just a tag line that might be linked to hippies. Every idea and post for the Great Outdoors I believe carries with it a real claim to preserving and protecting what we have set aside through time honored work and education from those before us like John Muir and Aldo Leopold and others. Every comment should be read by the federal employees who manage the lands of America that are NOT privately owned. That is why I offer up the goal of seeing a separate Department from the Department of Interior and Department of Agriculture when the word recreation is associated with conservation and the ethics created from thinkers and scholars like Aldo Leopold and John Muir. I learned from ten years of being asked by the DOI and trying to present things to DOA that these agencies have their plates full trying to administer what is before them and that recreation should find its own seat at the table. Plastic is simply my way of saying its man made and its purpose is to serve a corporate entity to make a profit. Nature is something humans have yet to control and certainly are not paying enough attention to in how it governs itself through all the lives and deaths and births it accepts in the evolution of its union with land air and water. The is a survival of the fittest in Nature but that also directly brings forth another species and the chain is not broken by plastic manmade intrusions less we begin that trail and do not have the right governing ways and means to sustain both our plastic and natures natural. I have always viewed recreation as a means to be upon nature and to employ our powers as human in conservation to its higher power and calling. Words today are not enough. Actions are needed and after ten years of following the conservation alliances of recreation coalitions I truly believe our government should create a new Department for Recreation to allow it the freedom to become what our public lands are asking from us as we continue in our world of plastic and design our way back to nature.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The whole state of Utah is amazing and should not have any more wilderness to prevent anyone from enjoying it. You say you have seen streams ruined by ORV's which is a made up story. Sure it happens but not the way you extremists make it out to be. There is more area to hike in Eastern UT then to ride a jeep, bike, or ATV so go enjoy that part of UT and leave the rest alone.

I am surprised anyone would demote this. In Sardine Canyon every winter there is a huge transitional range where the mule deer head down to there wintering grounds and there needs to be an underpass for the deer to go under the road and head to the wintering grounds. I bet I seen over 50 deer killed in one winter on less then 4 miles or road. There is 1 underpass for them already but it is placed to high. They need to place it lower by the town of Mantua.

OHV vehicles may have some impact on the areas we ride. No matter how much we dispute that there is evidence that some greenie finds. These facts are simply a smokescreen, the destruction of the forest from responsible ohv users is almost unachievable. at prarie city ohv area, there is a certain type of bush growing in this arid wasteland, and in this bush lives a certain type of beetle. The state has constructed wood fencing around these bushes to protect these beetles. these fences are concreted into the ground. was there an impact report on the bulding of the fence? Its a political battle. If your son or daughter runs into one of these barriers while riding, the result could be serious injuries. so the livelihood of a beetle takes precedence over our safety. PC ohv has existed for years. before ohv had gained the popularity and political attention that it has now. And guess what beetle was living there coexisting with ohv users. Or the big argument with the rubicon trail is sediment run off into tahoe. this is funny to me, that the couple hundred rigs that are out there on the bussiest weekend can cause more sediment deposits than the 5 million dollar homes that are built on the shore of lake tahoe. or the freeway that wraps around the lake, driven by thousands of cars a day. Lets not forget the hundreds of boats in the lake, and uncountable amounts of tourism that leaves behind litter, and excess waste. Some EPA investigator has a goal and its not related to the environment. Ive heard everything from beetles to eagles, and its sad that so much time and money is spent trying to scrape for any shred of evidence to blow out of proportion and destroy something that we love. why not look at the impact caused from the building of a new shopping mall or freeway in a public forum. Why is ohv, and public constantly under attack in a public arena. Has anyone seen the photos from the Arizona border south of Tuscon. Well I lived there for a while, and the amount of disgusting filth left by people coming into America illegally is heartbreaking. It looks like an interstate highway made of nothing but trash, cut right through the middle of a beautiful landscape. One would assume that the federal greenies would be all over stopping this destruction, but thats not in their political agenda. They need the filthy illegals in this country so they can have more votes. So they deny any knowledge of the trash trails and support amnesty. my point being, if we look hard enough we can find a beetle in any situation. Its just a matter of how much money your willing to pay a prius driving communist to find it.

We don't need to use birth-control on horses, and instead should drastically limit the number of privately owned cattle now ravaging our Western public lands. There are only a few thousand wild horses left and there are multi-millions of cattle on BLM/ Forest Service lands. With less cattle, horses could again increase to their optimum numbers.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To use the CCC to lower the cost of managing our forests, a few changes in management would have to take place first. 1 Lay off their army of Botanists and Biologists that do nothing but wander thru the forests looking for some form of plant or bug that they can declare as endangered, and spend the rest of their time doing paper work to apply for a grant that they can use to justify their job. 2 next the agency will have to hire some credentialed Foresters to manage our forests instead of political appointees that know zip about managing our forests, the last 40 years of the existing management have only given us overgrown forests that burn at the drop of a hat. only then can the CCC program become successful. eddie

The CDB & THE Earth Justice are basically one in the same separated so as one group CDB files the complaint and earth justice does the legal work. if you want to really see if either of these groups really care about the environment or the critters that live on our lands call your BLM agent or USFS agent and ask them How much of the billions of dollars in legal fees have these groups donated back to any of these agencies to help protect the lands and critters on them. the last time I talked to the managers of the Barstow BLM and asked this question after a long pause the answer was They could not think of a single instance where any money was returned to the agencies after their suits were settled. their interests seem to be closing public lands & collecting money and having power over public lands and the agencies that manage them. eddie

The individuals above are only attempting to give the cattle ranchers a black eye. The ranchers that graze on public lands are far better stewards of our public lands than the agencies ( USFS BLM NATIONAL PARK SERVICE etc.) that our gov. created to care for the public lands, all you have to do is check with the agencies and you will find that thousands of grazing allotments have been withdrawn from use by their respective agencies at the request of environmental organizations, these environmental groups have outbid ranchers for allotments just to take them off the list of active grazing allotments, When these allotments are not grazed they become overgrown with flammable fuels (Grass and Brush) and when this flammable fuel catches fire it usually causes catastrophic fires that we have seen over the past several years.

proclamation. I suggest a presidential proclamation to reaffirm that the federal government's role of protecting and maintaining the National Parks System as a national patrimony for the whole people, present and future. The National Park Service should encourage and welcome the cooperation of citizens and communities, but it should never fall under the sway of commercial interests or groups seeking to promote activities that are harmful to the environment.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Save the Chesapeake Bay by saving the tributaries. President Obama issued an executive order for Federal agencies to take all action to support the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay. Everyone agrees the Chesapeake Bay must be saved to preserve the way of life in Maryland and Virginia. All the scientists agree that the best way to save the Bay is by means of the Tributary Strategy; protect the tributaries and you will save the Bay. However, despite the pious pronouncements of the local politicians in favor of saving the Bay, they continually advocate projects that will destroy the tributaries and thereby destroy the Bay. The only source of the pollution that is destroying the Bay that is growing is urban runoff. Yet local politicians continually support projects that will increase runoff into the tributaries and thereby into the Bay. Case in point is the Cross County Connector in Charles County, MD. This road is not receiving any funding from state as it is considered unnecessary and extraneous. Yet it is proposed to be built through what the county describes as "the most pristine area" of the watershed of the what the state calls "the best most productive tributary of the Chesapeake Bay", Mattawoman Creek. This roadway was revealed in inadvertant statements by the Commissioners who are pushing it to be for the purpose of development. The current commissioner said "the entire deferred development district [the pristine areas referred to above] WILL be developed." This kind of attitude will end up turning the Bay into a sewer. The Federal government must do its duty and enforce the Clean Water act and protect the Bay from the local politicians who would destroy it.

Obviously you know nothing of the issue. In fact at the hearing on the Cross County Connector hundreds of people were in attendance the proposed 2 hour hearing lasted until well after midnight. Thousands of letters were submitted to the County Commissioners, the Governor, the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Army Corps of Engineers. Large protest meetings were held. Dozens of letters to the editor were published in the local paper, and who knows how many were not published. In fact in the election all the Republic Candidates for County Commissioner as well as the insurgent Democrats have come out publicly and strongly against the CCC being pushed by the developer supported good ole boy network of incumbents. The only ones who supported the granting of the permit were the developers who want to lay waste vast tracks of forest on either side of the road to convert them to large developments of unsellable or soon to be foreclosed houses. Their puppets in the local government though have had their come uppance. Only one of the incumbent commissioners survived the primaries. Only one of the 6 candidates for state delegate that survived the primaries favors this project. The planned mitigation for this project would trade off protection of the most pristine areas of "the best, most productive tributary in the Chesapeake Bay watershed" for a River that is already severely degraded by centuries of agricultural and urban runoff. How is this going to save the Shad and Herring runs that each spring are so much a part of life in Charles County, the best Bass fishing on the East Coast, and the crabs and oysters that make up so much of Maryland's heritage and culture?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hogwash. The Clean Water Act of 1970 was passed by the Federal government because we citizens got tired of the state and local governments controlled by the good ole boy network ignoring the issue. In 1970, the Cuyahoga River in Cleveland would catch fire several times a year. Boy Scout Canoe trips on the Potomac River, the river that runs through our nation's capital, had to get off the river by 4:30 because the all the towns in West Virginia would dump their raw sewage into the River at that time. What a lovely view from the Jefferrson Memorial, and George Washington Home at Mount Vernon; turds on the Potomac. If the Federal government had not got involved the the Potomac River would now be one large sewer. Even so the Potomac is still pouring tons of urban runoff into the Cheasapeake Bay, creating vast dead zones and killing off the crabs and oysters that are the livelihood of so many in Virginia and Maryland. If it were left to the state and local governments, the Mississippi would be a concrete lined ditch, Niagara Falls would be dammed for hydro-electric power, the Bison would be extinct, Yellowstone would be converted to a geoelectric power plant and the Grand Canyon would no longer have a River in it. As it is now the Colorado River is an empty ditch when it flows into the Gulf of California thanks to the state and local governments that suck all of the water from it on the way.

Mountain bicycles are not compatible with horses and hikers on single track trails, including the Pacific Crest Trail. Mountain bicycles have no business in the wilderness areas of the United States. Mountain bicycles are free to use scenic Rail Trails, dirt roads-(many miles of scenic dirt roads are located within the forestry) and then there are streets, and bicycle paths. The wilderness and historic trails should be protected from mountain bicycles. The back-country wilderness should remain as it was originally designed to be experienced. Hooves and boots... No Wheels!

What about the native population? This mine proposal threatens their way of life, the safety of the water and the food supply. And for what? More computers and cell phones? Profits for a few? This mine would cause such an upheaval and such destruction on so many levels in a place that today is still pristine, still a miracle to behold. So few places like that left and so important to preserve them.

Protect Bristol Bay: Stop Pebble Mine. The projected Pebble Mine promises environmental damage on a large scale in a rich ecosystem that needs protection. Bristol Bay's unspoiled waters and wildlife are threatened - and so are traditional subsistence ways of life. Enough is enough. We can no longer buy the arguments of 'minimal disturbances' and 'environmentally-conscious mining' (or drilling, or whatever). It just doesn't work: accidents happen. Even construction activity is too much of a disturbance for the very ecosystems on which we rely. Please, let not be swayed by huge corporate interests. Our commons are at stake, we must protect them now more than ever. No mining in Bristol Bay. Thank you.

We in Fla have always supported everyone sharing OHV trails (hikers, campers etc.). After pondering this idea I see how seperation could be a viable strategy to possibly reduce extremists attacks upon the ORV community. If they don't have the chance legally to stumble in an ORV rut maybe they won't litigate so much. Probably just wishful thinking on my part.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

During our current depression all of the governmental (borrowed) money we spend on roads should be for road construction and maintenance rather than wildlife related issues. To support this ideas issues another agency should be created by Congress if the general public so desires. Well intentioned but not appropriate at this time in our Nations history.

Playing with weather I would agree is a dangerous game. It can destroy a lot more than recreation. Florida experienced extra bad hurricanes many years ago due to cloud seeding in attempte to make a hurricane run out of rain out at sea. It did not work and the storms wound up deluging land masses instead. Right on!

From what I've experienced in Florida, heritage, culture, traditional trades (fishing)and local economies suffer tremendously from draconian regulations that accompany Federal control of property. A recent prime example of Federal callousness is the refusal of Nat Park Service (NPS) to mention in the draft Addition Plan two local cultures the plan could devastate. (Independent Seminoles and Gladesman) . NPS may think this intentional oversight will provide a legal foundation to run over these cultural communities with their steamroller of a plan but it will not work this time. In an idealistic sense this idea has merit but due to reality I will vote to demote.

In order for folks to bond with and support protecting Americas Great Outdoors they need jobs and money. In order to do that for the next 100 years or so they will need gas and oil products for many reasons. According to the climate change theories which abound lately the glaciers are due to be extinct soon. So my question is - Are we supposed to further enslave ourselves to foreign oil product producers to save glaciers that are due to be extinct soon just because canada does? Possibly this idea would be better suited for a web site titled- "Let's destroy America".

I just think ideas that include balance of all of Americas needs are more appropriate. Ideas leading to polarization are not too productive in my opinion.

Once again you attempt deflection of the topic at hand by trying to divert this to an OHV issue, it's not. The topic here is entirely different. The proposal includes LOGGING of a specific area in order to reduce the risk of catastrophic wildfire. In my area, (presumably) well meaning, but often ignorant, environmental organizations attempt to stop nearly every project that involves logging. The term is scary to them, they would rather leave an area at high risk of wildfire than allow any logging, no matter how well managed. They have been successful in preventing or delaying many similar projects here. People that actually spend time in the woods around here have seen the damage done by a century of fire suppression, the resulting bug and insect damage and yes, poorly managed logging. Entire mountain sides are covered with dead and dying timber. To some of us, it makes sense to harvest that timber, though most is too far gone to have any commercial value. There may be opportunities to use these trees for biomass energy projects. Replanting with species appropriate to the site, followed with careful management, including controlled burns, can enhance forest health. Our local environmental groups oppose even this activity...and when the catastrophhc fires do hit, they attempt to deflect the blame. If you took the time to read the OP, you would see that part of the proposal involves destroying roads, which is something the OHV community generally opposes. Just the same, there are places where it's appropriate.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Coming back to the OP, his idea is to have a sticker or sign with a characters large enough to allow identification of machines violating rules in that area. I'm not opposed to this, but I don't know that it has to be via a site-specific permit. Many states require snowmobilers to display registration numbers in some minimum size on their machine. This would accomplish what the OP stated he desired without creating another bureaucratic maze of permits. "A snowmobile does not automatically 'tread lightly' - operator discretion is crucial. The snowmobile will not keep itself out of unsuitable conditions, nor can it prevent its driver from pursuing clandestine bushwhack routes through breakable tree tops, etc. A snowmobile does not automatically 'tread lightly' - operator discretion is crucial. The snowmobile will not keep itself out of unsuitable conditions, nor can it prevent its driver from pursuing clandestine bushwhack routes through breakable tree tops, etc. Even though thoughtless pedestrians may adopt unsuitable routes on vulnerable terrain, they quickly tire of post-holing into brush, and soon turn around whereas a snowmobile just keeps going and going - even when it trenches foot-deep through unresponsive snow into underlying material. Like any remotely operated vehicle, a snowmobile must be driven with discretion to minimize its impact on the resource and on other forest visitors. Like any remotely operated vehicle, a snowmobile must be driven with discretion to minimize its impact on the resource and on other forest visitors." I agree with the first sentence. Responsible operation is important rather we're talking an over the snow vehicle, OHV or non-motorized recreation. And yes, there are irresponsible operators of all types. I do have to debate this statement: "Even though thoughtless pedestrians may adopt unsuitable routes on vulnerable terrain, they quickly tire of post-holing into brush, and soon turn around whereas a snowmobile just keeps going and going - even when it trenches foot-deep through unresponsive snow into underlying material." I believe what \_\_\_\_\_ is describing is a circumstance where a brush field, new growth seedlings or small trees exist, and are covered with a layer of snow. The vegetation creates air pockets where the snow is not fully supported, allowing the snowmobile or skier to break through into the void. In my experience, these are conditions that snowmobilers actively try to avoid. This unsupported snowpack may give way at any time, resulting in the machine getting stuck. "Unsticking" a 500 lb machine is far more unpleasant than it is for a skier to extricate himself from a "post hole" scenario (I believe by this \_\_\_\_\_ means where a skier sinks up to his knees or deeper when the snow gives way). This is a circumstance most riders try to avoid. In general, there are two types of snowmobile "configurations". The first are designed for operation on maintained trails or hard-packed snow conditions. These machines typically have (relatively) short tracks, and a wide ski stance for stability on twisty trails. Designated trails don't seem to be the issue the OP is discussing. Mountain sleds typically have much longer tracks to provide flotation and allow them to operate in many feet (10 or more) of snow. They typically are operated on deep snow off of groomed trails. They don't perform well on trails or hardpack conditions. The snowpack in preferred locations for these machines would tend to put seedlings and brush out of reach most of the time. That of course assumes that riding areas in higher elevations where these machines truly have no impact has not been closed to the snowmobiler. The specific conditions that these machines excel at are typically devoid of vegetation (above tree line and buried under snow) and have no wildlife during the winter season. This is not to say that there can't be issues at certain times of the season, and when operated in sensitive locations. Perhaps some snowmobile riders familiar with the area in

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

question will chime in.

Prediction-The USDA and the Obama administration will bury the results of this forum. This is purely speculation on my part, but I predict that the Obama administration and the USDA will ignore and do their best to eliminate any record of the results of this forum. My opinion is that this forum was intended to provide justification for expansion of designated Wilderness areas, and for additional restriction to access on Forest Service and BLM property. I don't believe that they expected (or wanted) a large variety of actual users of our public lands to actually get on here and comment or vote, nor did they anticipate that ideas favoring multiple use would become prominent among the top 10 ideas. Opinions?

I, and I believe most other OHV users, agree that there is a need and benefit to Designated Wilderness areas, off limits to motorized recreation and management. They should exist in as near an untouched condition as possible. I'd go so far as elimination of manmade hiking trails, but that's for another thread. We also are a country that needs natural resources, including mined materials, timber and energy products. We need to be able to utilize some portion of our public lands for these purposes as well. In between are what some are proposing for "backcountry" designation. These areas could be utilized for ORV use on designated trails, a limited road system to allow access for camping, hunters, fishermen, etc. In addition, some logging, when done in areas where thinning and fuels reduction promotes forest health and recovery, makes sense. This type of compromise is opposed by at least a portion of the environmental community. A great many people, and I believe this includes both of us, recognize that there is need to achieve a balance between these uses. However, the perception is that there are extremists on both sides. The perception is that some in the "environmental" community want to eliminate all resource extraction and motorize recreation on public lands, and would restrict nearly all areas without a paved highway as wilderness. The opposite perception is that some that ride an OHV or supports some logging wants to see every inch of public land developed and cares nothing about nature, wildlife or our scenic backcountry. Like most issues, the truth, at least among rational people, is somewhere in the middle.

With regard to the OP, it is my opinion that this forum was really indented to solicit responses from the "Environmental" community. I put that in quotes, not as derision, but to separate the more extreme people I describe above from the rest of us that recreate in and enjoy our backcountry, and are every bit as much environmentalists as those in the first group. I may well be wrong with my supposition, and hope that this forum was intended to solicit a variety of inputs, not just those that supported a pre-conceived agenda.

Challenge to those opposing Bristol Bay mine. I have generally not voted to support or demote the multitude of Bristol Bay threads. Quite honestly, I am not sufficiently informed about the area to make an informed decision. Based upon some of what has been posted, I lean towards opposition to the mine. We do require natural resources, particularly ores and minerals (are metallic ores minerals?), I don't think anyone with any common sense will argue that. It requires mining to extract those materials. Bristol Bay may well be particularly unsuited for this activity. My challenge is, for those that oppose mining at Bristol Bay, what area with similar deposits would you recommend or propose for mining?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"I promote this idea. But, OHV use is just one of many user groups. Its my observation that the OHV users are the most vocal and therefore, OHV users are not in danger of losing their rights to existing, designated trails on public lands. OHV riders' appetite for new trails appears insatiable. There should be some land preserved as wilderness for its intrinsic value. Future generations of families will be thankful for that, just as we are thankful to our predecessors for preserving our national parks." Wilderness designation precludes OHV use, all motorized and mechanized use is already banned from wilderness areas. To the best of my knowledge, ATV and dirt bike use is not allowed in any National Parks either. If someone can demonstrate otherwise, please correct me. What I do KNOW is that you are incorrect in your statement "OHV users are not in danger of losing their rights to existing, designated trails on public lands". In my area I discovered another closure just this past weekend. There is, or rather was, a nice, maybe 16 mile trail that connected between two existing forest service roads, and provided a popular access into a local community for a lunch break. The forest service, in their infinite wisdom, closed about a 1/2 mile stretch of this trail, about 12 miles from one end and 4 from the other. It is malicious decisions like this that raise the ire of the OHV community. While closing "dead end" trails into sensitive areas makes sense, closing the middle of a connecting loop does not. And this was done with no public input. That's just the start of it. Many, if not most, forest service roads have been closed and are now "off limits" to motorized recreation. This is just in my area, in Washington state, even forest service roads are off limits to ATVs in most places. In most places in my area, the only places you can take a quad I can drive in my Pontiac. Perhaps hikers need to be limited to the road system as well.

Where will the funding for this program come from? It should be via the user groups that utilize these spaces. Hunters and fishermen already contribute vis license fees and tags, OHV users by registration and permits. We need a means of collecting from other users to make this happen. To the OP, please define what you mean by "fully fund", and explain how you propose to do so. With this, I could promote the idea.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Yep, I vote against all biggoted "ideas" that arbitrarily limit the ability of a large portion of outdoor recreationalists to utilize their public lands. I wont bother to try to educate the OP this time though. Looks like another one that got his "talking points" from the Sierra Club. Should have a nice ride tomorrow, I have to scout a trail system for our club ride in a few weeks. It should be about a 60 mile loop, with some great views. I'll let you know how many hikers I see out there. With all the posts about how OHV use "disturbs" hikers I keep thinking I might see one on the trail some year. Though this time it's possible, hunting season is coming up in a couple of weeks, I may find someone out scouting. Oh heck, I can't pass up the opportunity for a little education after all. "Clearly the OHV users have a challenge to be able to share the wilderness with other users and still enjoy their sport." I suppose you're right, it is a challenge for OHV users...since they are banned by law from designated wilderness areas. You appear to have the mistaken idea that they are allowed to share these areas. As far as "ruining the expeerience" for other user groups, I hiked, fished and hunted far longer than I have ATVed, and I can't say that the presence of an ATV ever "ruined" my experience. When a ATV passed me, the sound of it disappeared in less than a minute. In wooded areas you can only hear them for a couple hundred yards. Passing a group of hikers that were talking was worse, voices carry at nearly as far and since they were going slower than the quad the noise lasted longer. My only grumble with the Quad riders was that they were having a lot more fun than I was. Some friendly riders offered me a chance to try one of their machines...and I was hooked. ATVs give me an opportunity to see country that very very few people do. They have also allowed me to meet some great people and have some great times.

The OP doesn't adequately explain the idea. A decommissioned nuclear plant doesn't on the face of it seem like the best place for a public park... Without knowing more about it, I'd wonder if there wouldn't be some value as an interpretive center?

Please no cyclists on PCT because: 1) There would be increased traffic on the PCT. They do outnumber equestrians. 2) Due to increased useage there would be more damage to the eco-systems from sewage, erosion, and garbage. There are not fasilities for increased use. 3) There are rules banning mechanical devices. If they can use bikes on the PCT, then perhaps wheel barrows, chainsaws and other mechanical methods could be used. 4) There would be an increased need for managing the trail due to access by greater numbers of people. Therefore there would be an increased need for paid personnel to keep order, to help in crisis situations, and to maintain the trail, etc. Currently with the economic situation this is not feasible through the USFS. 5) Equestrians do need to have some areas to ride that are in the wilderness. I prefer not to ride where there are cyclists even though my horse and mules tolerate them. Thanks, The Starrs

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I can only surmise that anyone who would suggest that horses and bicycles could share a trail has never spent any time on a horseback, nor been injured or know someone injured/killed after being thrown from a horse. Any animal with a high flight reflex can put life in danger when mixed with unfamiliar fast moving vehicles. This is only compounded by adding variable of uneven terrain, speed, blind curves, cliffs, etc, etc. Many of our trails are not intended for vehicle use and can put those the use and enjoy them at risk. Being married to a avid cyclist, I mentioned this quote to my husband, "Pure hiking trails like the AT may not be suitable, but any trail that accommodates equestrians can certainly accommodate bicycles." His response was this, "The last thing we need are bikes and horses startling and subsequently trampling one another. There are plenty of places to ride your bike, not too many places to ride your horse." I would hope that any reasonable cyclist would agree with this statement. The equestrian & hiking community isn't vying to clog up the american bike lanes and knowing the threat to my safety I do not use mixed use trails. While I respect mountain bikers rights in many varied areas where they are allowed, I would hope that intelligent decision making will prevail and vehicles will continue to be banned on hiking / equestrian only trails.

Our Greatest Challenge: Ourselves. One of the main challenges wilderness faces, is the inability of Americans to describe what wilderness is. It's hard to preserve it if we don't have a general consensus on what it truly is. Some people think it's just that land that the government tells us is wilderness, but since when does the average American believe what the government tells them? Others say that wilderness is an area where no humans inhabit the land, and only wild animals make that area their home. However, how would we describe wild animals? Aren't we all in a sense wild animals? I seem to agree with \_\_\_ when she said, "Wilderness is not a single region, but a condition of being of the natural world." She also brings up the idea that much of our wilderness is used for other purposes by the government. In the western states, vast areas that could be wilderness are used for nuclear weapons testing. So our modern country's obsession with war impacts our use of wilderness. Another challenge facing wilderness preservation in this country is companies that deal with natural resources. These companies don't want the natural resources to be protected and unaccessible by them. So they spend their money on lobbying to get their way. Some even go as far as political corruption and pay off legislators to support processes such as mining even though they destroy the wilderness. Designating large areas as wilderness and restricting the use of these areas would help the environment and endangered species as well. Not everyone has to be an advocate for wilderness areas, but everyone should appreciate the wilderness. Just like history, you don't have to love it, but everyone should know where we came from. As American citizens, it's our duty to preserve what the human race is slowly destroying. If we fight so hard to win a war to be proud of our nation and patriotism, why can't we fight just as hard to preserve the wilderness to be proud of our country and it's beauty? As \_\_\_ said, "Humankind has no enemy but itself."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Answering people that don't travel at all if difficult indeed as they can't see the effects of Global Warming for themselves. If you travelled, you would indeed see the results of GW in just the last five years or so. Try Glacier National Park for starters. The glaciers? They are gone as in melted, no more. Let's visit Canada to the east and wonder why all the gorgeous trees are dead. No frozen temps equals hordes of bugs that have eaten them. Blistering coral reefs the world over. Bleached out by warming seas, dead, never to return. Don't take my word for it. Do some research on your own. Icebergs melting, no habitat left for the fabulous polar bears. For the animals, marine and land, it's habitat loss. For the mountains and Arctic, it's the warming of our Earth. Just wait. If you live near the coast, you may see the seas rising and wiping out coastlines in your lifetime.

It's a shame that you don't travel around a bit, for if you did, you would have your own view of how swiftly our earth is changing. According to leading scientists, temps have warmed 4 degrees in the last ten years and that is way too warm for the glaciers. Visit Glacier National Park why don't you? No glaciers anymore. Visit the upper East coast to see the turning of the trees and witness the death of many species from a bug that no longer dies in winter as the temps warm. Millions of beautiful trees have died. If you think I am making any of this up, just Google any of it and go and take a look at what is happening in our world. Take coral reefs. Warming seas cause bleaching and death to them. It is tragic enough that the earth is dying, but then to find people who won't open their eyes and see it happening is even more tragic. In the beginning, man depended on nature for his survival. Now that nature depends on man for hers, she is out of luck.

I can understand why so many national or state parks feel the need to resort to money making activities like golf courses, boating, camping, etc., but it seems an oxymoron to set aside land to "protect" natural resources and wildlife and then interfere with it by over use and excessive human activity. Do we really need to subsidize an 18 hole golf course with taxpayers money? I would like to see state and national parks protected in every sense of the word: limit human activity to the enjoyment of the available resources, not man made, and limit the number of people visiting places like Yellowstone. The excessive amount of visitors has created some serious problems that is costing animals lives. Just like the NYC marathon has a lottery system, parks like Yellowstone should establish a system by which to limit excessive human interference. WE all need to be on board and willing to sacrifice if programs of conservation stand a chance for success. I am willing, are you? Set limits on how much land "developers" are allowed to destroy and demolish in order to build human habitats. Limit how much open space can be destroyed. Set restrictions on how far into wildlife habitats we can extend our cities. We buy homes in the canyons off LA county and then complain when coyotes visit, or build in the mountains and demand the extermination of raccoons and bears. Set limits. No more unrestricted "development". "Real Estate" is a growing venture to the detriment of our open spaces and wildlife. A Separation of agencies (National Wildlife Refuge System} and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), this union reeks conflict of interest.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have similar problems with a trail here in my area. There is also a problem with homeless camps along the trail area. The answer to both is enforcement, but we all know law enforcement agencies are stretched to the max. There are numerous examples from all fields of recreation for using volunteer rangers to maintain order. That would fit right in with user fees.

If you'd stopped at the first paragraph I could totally support this idea. Like \_\_\_\_\_, I think there should be places for all kinds of recreation. Including OHVs. The problem is that all forms of recreation are growing, right along with the population. You may not understand why the sound of a distant motor ruins a day of quiet, just as I don't understand how a mudbogger can rip through a sensitive wetland. But that doesn't mean either activity is not viewed as o.k. by the user; it's just the inherent differences of human nature. The goal here should be to recognize that we all view the outdoor experience in different and unique ways. That means we should tolerate those activities we don't enjoy, provided they are in the appropriate place. Unfortunately, intolerance is too often seen in the emotional arguments on this site.

\_\_\_\_\_ will continue to turn any idea toward an OHV argument. Check his profile. He sounds like a mouthpiece for the Blue Ribbon Coalition. He will also continue to post if you respond to him. Please check my latest response under "Volunteer Management Program for OHV." The theme that has emerged here is clear from the first ideas posted. The off-roaders have had free rein for a couple of decades and now think the trails they created belong to them. What's happening is that the government is finally, if belatedly, addressing the issue. Reasonable people like us believe there should be appropriate places for off-road recreation, but they just want to ride wherever they want to ride. Read "Off Road to Ruin." There's a great quote: "Because they can go wherever they want, they do." Reasonable controls on all forms of recreation are necessary. Hikers, horse riders, bicyclists, hunters, fishermen, boaters, etc. etc. have accepted this for years. So don't bother to respond to \_\_\_\_\_. He'll just keep blathering on with the same old same old. Let's focus our energy on the discussions that are civil.

5th Amendment: "...nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation" Unless and until there is justice and equity in the definition of "public use," we should all be skeptical of eminent domain.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The arrogance of this "idea" is amazing! (#13) said it best. All we hear from the off-road enthusiasts is how much they love the land, how healthful their activities are, how they are losing trails, and how much volunteer time they put in. Here's my view....and before the two-wheelers start screaming for proof, it is based entirely on a mere forty years in the backcountry, dealings with BLM, interaction with the local off-road enthusiasts club, and more than a few confrontational encounters with off-roaders acting illegally. Only recently have public lands been restricted to "Closed unless marked open," and this only by Forest Service and many National Forests have yet to complete their transportation plans. BLM lands are still "Open unless marked closed." Most of the trails created over the past 30 years have been created by riders without regard to whether or not they are appropriate. Trails that are being closed are trails where there has been documented environmental damage. In my experience, the clubs talk about controlling it through education, but fail to do so. The local club advocates for management, but the enthusiasts outnumber them considerably in disagreeing when BLM says management will mean closing trails. Volunteer activities in my region by the off-road club are mostly self-serving, cleaning up areas around their riding terrain. Local bicycle clubs, equestrian clubs, hikers, hunters, fisherfolk, . etc., etc. not only clean up their areas, but they donate both time and money to other organizations, such as Boys & Girls Clubs, Food Banks, etc. etc. One thing that is constant among local off-roaders is the continual lobbying for more and more land dedicated to off-road recreation. In my area hunters, mushroom gatherers, hikers, photographers and others avoid miles of terrain because it echoes constantly with the thrum of off-road machines. Taking \_\_\_\_'s comment a step further, off-roaders should be honest with themselves about how much their sport is incompatible with other outdoor activities. "We the people" means all of us, not a selective slice of society advocating for a particular special interest.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is NO confusion on my part (and I doubt \_\_\_\_\_'s part) about the program in your state. One of these days I hope maybe, just maybe, you will be able to understand what the ATV funds are all about, how they are funded and allocated in your state. There are two funds within the category we have been speaking of and both come through the Oregon's Department of Parks and Recreation. Neither of which you seem to have a grasp of - you are making progress, so there is some hope for you. But your lack of knowledge continues to discredit what you say. There is the state ATV fund that has an advisory committee which you were, and probably still are, very incorrect on and I have already explained to you in previous post. There is the "Oregon RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM" which is the Federal RPT program. It must be represented by a committee that is both motorized and non-motorized recreational trail users. In Oregon the committee provides advice to the State Trails Coordinator and the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department Director regarding program policy and procedures. The committee is represented by Federal Lands Representative, David Lewis Cyclist (Oregon Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee), Terry A. Wheeler Equestrian, Bill Law OHV, Dave Eaton OHV, C. John MarÃ Hiker, John Vogel Snowmobile. States must use 30 percent of their funds for motorized trail uses, 30 percent for nonmotorized trail uses, and 40 percent for diverse trail uses. Other than OHV (motorized) uses (30%) the majority of the funds go towards trail uses including hiking, bicycling, inline skating, equestrian use, cross-country skiing - are these the special interest you are making reference to? Is this what is being "...administered to the detriment of citizens" you make reference to? Or maybe it's the handicap access that the funds often go towards that you find so objectionable! You still - just don't understand. There is only one person confused, that is - \_\_\_\_\_.

So is that your excuse for refusing to admit that you are consistently wrong, confused and DON'T UNDERSTAND! You really expect me to believe what you are now saying with every false thing that you have already said! Nice try - just reading your posts here and the article you wrote for the newspaper website are all filled with lies about the subject at hand. You may indeed have all the problems that you have just stated - but that does not make it right to misrepresent and flat out lie about successful programs as you consistently do! Its called lying! It is very apparent that you are consistently incorrect and like most when in your situation you grab for whatever straw you can in desperation to change subject from "Volunteer Management Program for OHV", reaching to archaic mining laws, and now to "... local club shold be indicted for fraud, based on the record of their grant requests to the State." Can you back up the fraud like you are stating? You have yet to be able to substantiate ANYTHING that we have disagreed on! You are one thing and that is being consistently WRONG.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In your web article you and I both know that the statement about funds taking away money from schools and roads are outright lies! Those funds were never allocated for the purposes you lied about. So they never could have taken the money away. Nice try but I seriously doubt that the proof was required and if it was, then you are as guilty as your accusations of the club you are now making reference towards. In fact you also know that so many of your statements here on these post have been filled with "false and misleading statements" and those have been proven! If as you have said, no law enforcement agencies are willing to undertake an investigation, it is as I figured - just nothing more than your outright lies! The program you and I have been talking about is not a success for me (as you stated) - it is a success for the State of Oregon and its citizens. It works and you just can't understand that!

Sorry for the redundancy but in your way of putting your own twist on the facts with Rebates, Refunds, Special Tax, special fund, etc, etc - you have shown time and time again your failure to understand and misrepresent the program and the value it has. The redundancy is only for the point of trying to help you realize the fact that you don't understand it. The program(s) we have talked about give valuable benefits for more than the OHV community. You write a newspaper articles and deliberately place misrepresentations in it. It is easy to make the allegations of fraud, but you lack credibility and have presented no proof. I would never have expected to change your mind of the OHV fund - it was very easy to continually point out that you don't understand and are incorrect for the purpose to counter the misrepresentations you continuously post. I think the public has decided - by allowing the fund to continue in the successful way that it has.

Nice link - I would have never thought that it was that bad! Thanks for the education on the subject. \_\_\_\_\_ posted a similar thought - "Stop Using our Taxes to Sue Ourselves". Maybe you should post an idea based upon the article if it is factual - its an eye opener! Makes you wonder if this might partially be why our National Parks and Forrest are under funded!

At least in San Diego County, California, \_\_\_\_\_s comment (#3) that mountain bikers do not contribute to trail work is wholly erroneous. Around here, it's the mountain bikers who do the lion's share of trail maintenance and construction, and any of our many land managers will attest to that since they depend on knowledgeable volunteers like us to get much of the needed work done. There are multi-use trails here today that would not exist without our efforts. Our volunteer hours now run into the thousands per year and are still increasing. Why? Because there are lot of concerned mountain bikers committed to making things better for all trail users. This is good for all since it means more trails. As for all the horror stories about careening mountain bikers, this is indicative of inexperienced users on too little available trail. Concentrating use by limiting where biking is allowed only leads to these sorts of incidents. I have been riding mountain bikes for twenty years and I have never spooked a horse. Perhaps it's because I rode horses before that. We strongly discourage idiot behavior and do not tolerate it on our sanctioned rides. Every group has its bad apples and we do our best to cull such behavior. It's all about education.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

I must respectfully bring to your attention that motor vehicle use is heavily subsidized. Our roadways are paid for by everyone, whether they drive or not. How much of an impact on roadway maintenance does the average bicycle create versus the average car? On top of that, you can park 12 to 20 bikes in one typical vehicle parking space. Space for parking is not cheap and it eats up our urban landscape. Everyone you see on a bike is saving a parking space for you. \_\_\_\_\_ is absolutely correct in his additional costs, which just pile on the justification for better bike facilities. Incidentally, like the original proposer, I also live in San Diego and I own two cars, but only drive when I have to, which I have been doing for over 11 years.

I live in the San Bernardino National Forest. The Adventure Pass up here is a disaster. I'm a criminal if I pull to the side of the road on the way home from work to enjoy the view. I don't think anybody minds paying a fee for using a developed facility like a campground or picnic area, but to threaten fines and jail for visiting raw undeveloped space is pathetic. The Adventure Pass certainly has "bleached" the visiting demographic. Minorities just don't like being buttonholed by gun-toting rangers asking for ID and proof of admission.

The "advisory committees" you said were supposed to approve fees were a joke, at least here in Southern California. The so-called public meetings were never public. I called the FS numerous times, was given the runaround about when and where and was astonished when the local paper published a press release that described a "public meeting" that supposedly happened.

as an OHV user i used to have this much area to recreate -----  
even back then the area to which we could not recreate was  
still -----  
----- some 20 years later we only have this much  
area ----- and the area to which we cannot recreate is even  
larger -----  
-----  
----- and  
now we are looking at losing even more area to which we would only have this much - really?  
seriously? when the radical environmentalists complain about noise or beatin trails. well. look at  
all that area they have to use where OHV's are prohibited already.. duuuuhhh.. go there! and let  
us use OUR land and take care of is as we have for generations. i just don't see the debate. its so  
far fetched in mine and so many peoples minds that there closing more and more PUBLIC land to  
us and our families..

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

How about donating some of your Manhattan address lands to the Wilderness Preservation Project and leave ours alone. Has it occurred to all of you east coasters that you are the ones who have destroyed what were once beautiful lands in the East? We, out here, preserve our lands well on the state level in Utah. The lands that we always find are managed poorly are the ones you have taken from our state without our permission. In Utah we need less federal regulation and bad advice from people who already messed up all their lands. Demote.

The medicine man may have known the wilderness better than I do, but he could not even save his people from progress brought to the land by common sense (progress minded) people. Medicine men seem to be almost as lost as the dinosaurs. The medicine men were good at rain dancing and dancing with the wolves, but did not dance to reality. Did the rain come and did not the wolves go extinct? Also Mr. Rohde needs to show and tell us where is the houses and flying helicopters in the wilderness areas. Don't spread lies to try to prove a point. It shows just how uninformed (or ignorant) you are. Also everyone should remember the movies (even documentaries) are mostly make believe, not reality or real life.

Multi-use trails don't work in the sandy soils of northwestern lower Michigan. I am a long time bicyclist and hiker, and I am not even sure if bikes & peds can enjoy the same trail unless the numbers are low, and the individuals courteous. And horses do not blend with either group. Our Michigan DNR has tried valiantly to have shared use trails, but ideally, each user group is different with their own needs.

Michigan has Sleeping Bear National Seashore, Pictured Rocks National Seashore, Isle Royale National Park, quantities of state forest lands and national forests. We are already a state with great outdoors trails and lands for all kinds of activities. A problem with state or federal land is that local governments have a funding problem, since those lands don't provide taxing revenue. I agree with \_\_\_\_ about the CCC -- their work is still a pleasure and inspiration that I wish our current politicians would replicate.

The people don't want Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay, Alaska. Anglo American and Dynasty Minerals are planning a 2000 ft deep mine in the Bristol Bay watershed, with 60 miles of salmon habitat slated for destruction. "CEO Cynthia Carroll and former board chairman Sir Mark Moody [said to Alaskans that] Anglo American [British Mining giant] would not develop Pebble Mine if local people did not want it." --Bobby Andrew, spokesperson for Nunamta Aulukestai, a coalition of eight village corporations that then commissioned a survey. The Craciun Research poll (published September 22) found 79% of Bristol Bay residents against the mine. Fisherman and Native Communities have asked Anglo American to honor its promise and not go ahead with the mine. "We will not go where communities are against us," Cynthia Carroll has said. Despite this community opposition, to all appearances the company is still moving ahead with their plans. Some links: { <a href="http://ithinkmining.com/2010/04/16/pebble-mine-a-test-of-anglo-americans-integrity/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } { <a href="http://ourbristolbay.com/blog/?p=489" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Strong oversight of the permitting process, analysis of cumulative impacts, strengthen relationships between federal and tribal governments..... .....good principles in themselves and they should always be implemented and should already have been implemented but they are easily abused. In this case protection of unique habitat, subsistence and recreation resources will be served by no mining. A very large number of jewelers, including some very large jewelers, have pledged not to use gold from the Pebble mine if it goes ahead.

Although I wish we could all get along, bicyclists, hikers, and equestrians are a poor mix on the same trail. While most animals avoid hikers on the trail, I find it enjoyable to meet a horse on the trail, it enhances a natural experience of seeing various wildlife scamper away, additionally, if I had a physical emergency on the trail, an approaching horse and rider would be a blessing. Although most bicyclists are very considerate on the trail and a pleasure to meet, many speed recklessly, and present a serious physical hazard to themselves and others. The bicycle we knew has evolved into a full suspension vehicle like a motorcycle which can approach freeway speed on a downhill trail and is not a safe mix.

How long will your area stay wild with a growing population. I would say the west faces alot of the same issues that are in the east, maybe on a different scale. Michigan is in the midwest, not east coast.

Access is important. Areas without roads are also important. Here is something I read recently that I agree with. While roads are important for providing sportsmen with access to the lands they use to hunt and fish, too many roads are associated with increased big-game vulnerability and fewer mature bucks and bulls. Too many roads also can decrease the quality of important spawning habitat for fish. Because you saw wildlife does not mean we should not preserve some areas for the good of people and animals. I think there is room for both, motorized access is some areas, and areas without roads, for all the benefits that provides. Some people in past generations saw the benefit of preserving wildlife and wild areas. I think most understand that if we want to ensure that enough habitat will be around for future generations, we must plan carefully today.

I snowmobile. In Michigan, we have far more snowmobile trails than cross country ski trails. I don't cross country ski, but I can tell you I would not want to try it on a snowmobile trail the way some snowmobilers ride. There should be areas for snowmobiles and areas they are not allowed. Just like any other activity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You know this is a Chinese company that wants to mine this area. The appetite the Chinese have for natural resources is insatiable. I believe what they want to mine for is gold and copper. They can go to Africa to mine for gold as far as I'm concerned. If your looking for an area in the lower 48, they have mined for copper in Michigan for years. The boom and bust industry of mining hasn't made the area they mine for copper here very prosperous. Some things are more important than the money to be made by developing every concentration of minerals they find. With 50% of our national forests open to mining, I'm sure there must be a better alternative. There will probably be opposition from environmental groups no matter where they mine. I don't think mining has a good environmental track record. I would rather see them find an area where they could buy and own the land to be mined, especially if there are already roads and development present. They can lay on the ground and f\*ck the land then for all I care. Here's my question for you. In the past you have said you are against areas being designated as wilderness that are not truly wilderness. Here we have an area that is wilderness. Do we let this go, other areas go, like the Peel Watershed in the Yukon (not U.S.), and then every other wild area that people want to develop. What area should we save?

Most people don't consider farms as wildlife habitat.

I guess anything is wildlife habitat then. I live a suburb about 10 miles from a major city. I've seen most of the animals you listed near my house in the few areas awaiting more development or next to railroad tracks where there is a small clump of trees. I suppose that means we don't need to preserve ANY wild lands. Farms are fine, but I think it is reasonable to preserve some true wild areas that don't necessarily have people occupying or using ever acre. A farm is home to a person and family. Although there are animals present, most would not consider this the staple of wildlife's home range. This also raises a question of animals that require more solitude and are not always welcome by farmers and their families. If a wolf were to kill livestock, I would think some farmers would want them gone. At least that's the idea of some of the comments that I've read on this forum. Not to mention grizzly bears. They may not be in Minnesota, but I'm sure there would be some action taken against the bear if it frequented somebody's farm. Sorry, farms are fine and it is a respectable profession, but there needs to be true wildlife habitat, also. We can't expect animals to survive on the fringe of what we leave behind and don't consume. I also would not like to pass on to the next generation a country that only had farm land and urban habitat.

I agree, there is room for all types of recreation and room for things like wilderness as well. What I find ignorant and disappointing is people who fail to see the value of preserving things like wilderness and only see land for what they are able to get out of it. Land is more than that. Wildlife and people depend on wild areas, for numerous reasons. Living in the midwest, I have seen areas change from having a wild character to development. That is not what most want for all of our public land.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I don't think anyone could argue that there is more wildlife habitat now than when pilgrims landed. It seems odd to me that after all the development and habitat people have used, and continue to use, that there is still a segment of the population that will argue there is plenty of wildlife habitat and we shouldn't be concerned about or preserve the environment. I guess we should just continue the status quo and keep using everything up until it's all gone.

You can try to "spread out" as much as you want, but with the population growing, eventually everything will be congested. That's why it's important to preserve some areas. I don't think anyone stated all wildlife is nearing extinction, but should we wait until it is. Because you looked out the airplane window and saw more dirt and trees does not really change the issue.

Guys we have and continue to reduce oil consumption or at minimum the rate of increase in consumption. Increased gas mileage is one way in which oil consumption is reduced and there are other ways such as solar, wind etc. The problem is that when alternatives are proposed on a large scale many begin bitching immediately about enviro impact. It seems that some will never be pleased with anything. I just believe domestic oil production is a good strategy to keep America as strong and secure as possible economically. Domestic oil production could help in my opinion. We will need oil from SOMEWHERE for many years no matter what happens. That is REALITY! Let's don't be comparing apples and oranges folks - necessary oil products aren't trash. Try never adding or changing oil in your vehicle and see what happens. Eventually the vehicle won't function and that will cause the production of a replacement vehicle producing more pollution. I guess one can take their pick - I don't know which would be less environmentally negative. Maybe someone here does.

\_\_\_\_\_ broad policy idea is no different than many other existing policies that put large areas of land off limits to the a group of visitors due to a few bad apples of that particular group of visitors or citing the "precautionary principle" when the so called science we use today doesn't support a closure, restriction etc. We see this routinely in So Fla and elsewhere.

This is nothing more than more of the propoganda campaign for The Wildlands Project. LAND off limits to Humans. Boo-Boo - Boo. Reed Noss and his accomplices hopefully will never accomplish their subversive goals regarding Americas Great Outdoors. They need to go to some 3rd world country that isn't on to their feindish concept and accomplish it their. Leave Americas Great Outdoors alone you subversives.

I haven't become accustomed to the new name yet but am aware names change as folks catch on. I must differ that it is mainstream due to the fact that the likes of David Foreman, Reed Noss et al developed it. I cannot consider Earth First/David Foreman/Reed Noss mainstream. The anti-human bias expressed publicly by these folks is what prevents me from considering them or this concept mainstream. After the Cenezoic Society/Earth First distributed 70,000 copies of the Wildlands Project land management strategy, according to them for free, they went on to facilitate its infusion into the brains of many if not all biological, ecology etc. students heads for the next many years up to and including today. Some might think my attitude is somewhat paranoid but there is an old saying " Just because you think the SOB's are after you doesn't mean they aren't". I would take you up on the offer to have a beer some day.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I feel the SOB's are after us due to the fact that most land acquired in Florida recently does not allow much ORV access if any. They come to us hunters for support of acquisition of land for "conservation purposes or Multiple use". The trouble is that hunting is one of the multiple uses and many acres of acquired land winds up not allowing hunting to be supported by ORV's even to haul out animals taken during hunting. ORV use as associated with hunting is totally traditional for nearly a century in Florida and recent management philosophies are not acceptable and often parallel TWP ideas. This is very bothersome to me. I do not believe it is justifiable considering other much more horrific mis-management going on in Florida regarding fishing, hunting and endangered Species. If folks knew the truth they would NOT believe it.

Excluding the accomodation of human desires to visit public lands that they are as natural in as a cougar along with the fact humans vote and pay for the lands protection only breeds animosity and negative attitudes towards conservation and land preservation.

Teddy did not live in todays modern times. We need what we need and we need to go get it here rather than importing. Sane conservation is one thing but a total hands off policy is National suicide.

The author should explain the down side of this idea for all of the not so financially secure folks living around these parks on fixed incomes or just poor. The "Repayment would be through a tax-increment process based on redevelopment around new or refurbished parks." This idea sounds like a plan to help cities duplicate more redevelopment as discussed in the Kilo Supreme Court case minus the condemning of poor folks properties. What a gift.

Maybe this idea could also include a committment that the non-motorized boating community would cease and desist their consistent attempts to gain exclusive use of Americas Great Waterways Waterways for themselves by their organized lobbying of State and Federal agencies to prohibit traditional motorboating that predates the recent canoe trend by decades. It seems to me that some canoe folks could start a business scouting streams and producing a guide book for paddlers not competent to do their own scouting. I do not believe any level of government should have to do that for them except if a stream somewhere is very dangerous for some reason. In that case the land manager could post a notice of danger. What happened to the Great American Spirit of ADVENTURE and RISK TAKING.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Minimum of 22,000 miles closed to ORV access at Big Cypress National Preserve (BCNP) in the year 2000 due to an ORV plan developed due to an out of court settlement(back room deal) of litigation between Extreme enviros and NPS. The ORV plan only allowed 400 miles of primary trails within the 582,000 acres (909 square miles)of BCNP. It is quite a coincidence that the 400 miles + a few trails to inholding property equals 1/2 mile of trail per each square mile of land which basically is a perfect match to The Wildlands Project trail limiting criteria. I know 22,000 miles sounds outrageous but when I did the math using NPS demographics for ORV types (indicating tire widths) used there, the total amount of land that a rubber tire had ever touched was only 1 1/8 percent of the 909 square miles of BCNP. Believe it or not there is enough space in 582,000 acres to have put a whopping 2,401,411 miles of ORV trails in BCNP if folks had chose to because it was technically legal prior to the draconian ORV plan being implemented currently. Folks never chose to use all of the BCNP with ORV's since the main purpose for their use has been to get to inholder camps, hunting areas, governmental land management and law enforcement. The terrain itself there physically limits where anything even animals can go to. Now the ORV plan reduced the access to 2/100th of 1 percent of what was technically legal all along. We are now in a process of recommending and having secondary trails approved for future use 10 years after the ROD was signed. It is a very time consuming and arduous process that doesn't seem like it will help regain the reasonable access people thought it would. We may not have actually needed the 22,000 miles of trails we had but we do need a trail system with trails within a mile of one another to facilitate access to the treacherous and sometimes impenetrable terrain of BCNP. Walking long distances with large Alligators underfoot is a pretty hairy experience forced upon all visitors by NPS. Even a few miles of trails that folks worked with NPS for 14 months to have re-opened were attacked with litigation by enviros. That litigation is unsettled so far. How's that for a loss. I know some will cheer over our loss but folks need to be sensitive to our Gladesmen Culture and other cultures being destroyed by government actions.

As one seeks to promote tourism and folks getting into America's Great Outdoors one should be ready to accept all who come including off road motorized enthusiasts. Apparently according to this idea even the NPS was accepting of all who came. My compliments to NPS for their planning actions. I will to vote to demote this idea due to its bias and discriminatory attitude against selected visitors. Some local businesses may be very appreciative of motorized visitation. I doubt this idea is supported by all locals in the area.

Question - Does our Nation or States or local communities really have the money to do this these days without the beneficiaries of this idea kicking in some of the money for amenities they will be using. All of us need to begin thinking about living within our means including folks here and all of our governmental entities. We need to get back to the basics at least until our financial houses are back in order. Can anyone take a guess at when that will be?

Please be honest with the kids and explain how dangerous some animals are plus the fact that people are eaten by some species. An example of what I mean here is to tell kids that Alligators do not really ever smile and they eat dogs and kids on occasion.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To \_\_\_\_\_ and other mountain bikers, To address the point regarding the fault of improperly trained horses being the issue with regard to trail safety, may I tell my story: A few years ago circa 1998 I was riding on what used to be the mecca of hiking/riding trails before the invention of mountain bikes, The Sunset Trail in Altadena, and was making my way alone carefully along the narrow winding ledge trail on my steady, calm, well-trained horse when from around a blind turn a mountain bike came at us at a high rate of speed and was unable to stop in time before ending up coming to a sliding rock-spraying stop UNDERNEATH my horse. Thankfully neither my horse nor I were injured, but we could've easily ended up being PUSHED off the ledge by the cyclist. So, my advice to bikers: TRAIN YOURSELVES. As for equestrians being lardos who let the horses do all the muscle work...How many bikers will be riding the same trails at 100 years of age? I ride with many quite elderly equestrians, including a centegenarian--Are you saying they don't deserve to enjoy the outdoors on their horses because they can't WALK or BIKE the trails themselves? All of the elderly people I used to ride with in Altadena refuse to ride there, and Malibu SP, any longer because they are afraid of the speeding cyclists. They have been, de facto, removed from the same trails they have ridden since the 1930s, the same trails THEY BUILT in some cases over 50 years ago. For Shame! How selfish of mountain bikers to suggest that slower, older equestrians don't deserve to be there because we can't train our horses to GET OUT OF YOUR WAY. Cool your jets...we'll all be dead within a couple of decades, then you can turn the PCT into a highway and no one will be around to stop you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Conservation in a Progressive Society. Conservation in a Progressive Society It is hard to deny that most of us feel some sort of awe or reverence to wilderness. Whether it is scenic mountains, raging rivers, or wild dunes, wilderness seems to have some strong hold on us. Perhaps it is the grandeur of such images that makes us feel small and insignificant. Perhaps we realize how little we matter in the large scheme of the world. Nevertheless, it is in these places that many people experience some sort of spiritual revival or self-discovery. Away from the hustle and bustle of life, in the tranquil, raw wilderness, we find ourselves reflecting on our lives, and often, we walk away changed. How then could we destroy something so mystical and mighty? Ironically, in a matter of hours, we can destroy something that took thousands of years to form. It is clear we should take steps to prevent such destruction, but obviously this proves to be complicated in a progressive society. I recognize that the standard of living must be maintained. It is simply unreasonable to suddenly force people to live like Native Americans, for a dramatic example. Regardless, America is obsessed with expansion and competition. We are not maintaining the standard of living but constantly searching for untapped resources so we can become richer and more powerful. There is a constant race to have the most advanced technology or to be the most powerful nation. Such expansion requires a continual supply of resources. We destroy whole mountains to obtain a small amount of copper. We strip the land of nutrients to acquire the resources we need to progress in this competitive world market we have created. This is the challenge we face. Where do we draw the line? When are we going too far and taking more from the land than we actually need? We cannot expect to continually take from the earth without repercussions. There will come a point when we have destroyed the very places that always provided for us. Therefore, in the process of our extraction, we must be environmentally aware. We must give back to the land that so amply gives to us. Conservation needs to play a key role in the system of removing resources. These are the points that need to be considered. The challenge: find a balance in conserving the wilderness while maintaining our place in this fast-paced world.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wilderness Lost in Tourism. It is my personal opinion that "wilderness" is losing its allure to vacation spots, gift shops, and casinos. It is becoming far too commercialized, even with modern advantages. Often times these are located immediately outside of the designated wilderness areas. The Carlsbad Caverns, for example, has a giant gift shop in the bottom of the cavern equipped with electricity, elevators, and restrooms. While you're walking through this natural underground world, you notice signs everywhere reminding visitors not to touch the walls, yet those signs are illuminated by bright lights that are found all throughout the caverns. I loved walking through Carlsbad, but these modern advantages took away from the natural elements. I may even go as far as to say that I would rather miss that experience than have the caverns turned into my own personal tourist attraction. A similar experience occurs along the rim of the Grand Canyon. Once a visitor steps foot inside the Grand Canyon, they are in wilderness and enjoy it as thus. However, once your voyage through one of the most beautiful spots in the world is finished, you instantly find yourself surrounded by gift shops and hotels. These are wonderful amenities, but I believe that they should be spread out. There was a wonderful glass skywalk built over the Grand Canyon. How amazing it would be to look down on the Grand Canyon! That is, if it didn't cost from thirty to seventy dollars a person to walk around the overlook. This money does not go towards the Grand Canyon. I'm sure it goes towards the huge lounge that sits right on the edge of the skywalk. I would like to remind the Nation that wilderness is not our personal property. It was not created for profit, and thus should not be dominated by investors with buildings. I like the way the Yellowstone and Yosemite National Park's handle their tourism. Yosemite's gift shops blend in with the nature around them. They are not huge and are not located every three feet. If we could make our wilderness follow this model, the entire experience of a wilderness trip would be much more enjoyable.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Overall there are many aspects of your proposal that I agree with, but there are a few that I would like clarified, revised, or removed. I do think there should be some trails left natural for the more experienced and patient hiker, as well as areas that should be maintained for more accessible use. To an extent, I would even agree with distinguishing the two areas. I concur that the wilderness should be wild, left for man to fight through for himself, and that parking lots are a large distraction to the wilderness aesthetics. However, I have always been told that no more than ten people can be allowed in a group in a wilderness setting. So this concentrated use that you're speaking of cannot have an extreme impact, unless every trail and park that I have ever visited made up that rule coincidentally. I also prefer to hike in a more solitary state. That is why, when I know it is going to be a beautiful hiking day, I choose a trail less known and less accessible to all people. If I cannot find one of those, I enjoy the beauty around me and the comradeship of meeting new people on a trail, and maybe that is something that you could look into. As for technology goes, I agree that cell phones take away much of the experience and a GPS ruins the excitement of blundering through the wilderness alone, and yet I cannot agree that signals for rescue should be ignored. That is not only irresponsible to our fellow citizens, but also far too dangerous. I'm sure that the many people who have died in the wilderness would highly disagree with that idea. If help had been available, I have a feeling even the most rugged wilderness man would have accepted it. Since you disagree with GPS systems, do you also disagree with maps of the wilderness? Do you wish that we all had to make the deathly trek through the Sierra Nevada's for the first time, or even through the Appalachians? As much as I love the wilderness, I am appreciative of the work that volunteers do to keep up trails. Your last paragraph is very interesting to me. By "these areas" I'm assuming that you mean the designated areas that you were speaking of. I'm sure that you know that Section 4 C of the Wilderness Act of 1964 bans any permanent or temporary road systems and use of the vehicles you mentioned. "Except as specifically provided for in this Act, and subject to existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise and no permanent road within any wilderness area designated by this Act and, except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area" (Wilderness Act of 1964). I am just slightly confused by the fact that you want wilderness to remain wild and that overcrowding is a problem, but you would be okay with OHV's going through the wild? Or with trails being cut down and maintained so that a jeep can fit through? Does this make your quest for absolute wilderness a selfish act, since it seems like you only want the areas you will be in to be kept as close to their natural state as possible?

Multiple use trails work for MTBs, ATVs, and even hikers, but not for horses. Horses really tear up trails and leave their "exhaust" behind.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No environmental impact statement has ever been written for the Pebble Mine. The mine will need a permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers, so it's definitely a federal issue. It has been opposed by many Alaskans, including the late Senator Ted Stevens, who was seldom a friend of the environment. They will need the help of people from across the United States to stop this project.

Too many OHV groups insist that every mile of trail is sacred. I'm for negotiation and compromise, based on the principle that every user of federal lands has an obligation to keep the lands and waters in good condition. OHV routes that abuse the land need to be closed and restored to nature. The same goes for hiking and horse trails.

Some of the southern Utah county commissioners would like to dictate how federal lands are managed. I don't think commissioners representing 6,600 people (the population of Kane County) or 15,000 (San Juan County) should be calling the shots on lands that belong to all of us from coast to coast. They will have their input on any wilderness bills, but the final decision is not theirs to make.

Wilderness bills are normally written, negotiated and enacted with the support of the affected state delegation. The only exception I can recall is the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980, which designated wilderness, national parks and national wildlife refuges. I don't support the author's idea as a requirement, because the Alaska law demonstrates that there are cases where the national interest must come first.

The Bureau of Land Management found 6.6 million acres to qualify under the Wilderness Act criteria, but BLM is allowing ORVs to run all over them on a network of routes. The vehicles should be kept out of these areas until Congress decides for or against wilderness status. That would still leave more than 15,000 miles of routes open in southern Utah. My wife and I have visited most of the areas by walking in, as they are readily accessible from public roads. It's America's greatest unprotected wilderness.

I can't agree that the industry has "no interest in land with no reserves." When I worked at BLM we heard from the oil and gas industry regularly, and they argued that estimates of oil/gas reserves or potential were fallible and temporary. They wanted the freedom to lease and drill everywhere. By the way, the industry wasn't starting at the county level, so I don't believe conservation measures have to start there either.

Blockage by private lands is a genuine problem in some national forests and in some BLM public lands. This is worth more effort by both agencies to acquire rights-of-way. If the private landowners hold federal grazing permits or buy federal timber, they should be required to grant a free public right-of-way.

Some people would oppose anything with the name "conservation" or "environment," not to mention "nature" or "ecosystem." Environmental education has made great progress, but there is still work to do. I'm thankful that high school students today have a better understanding of ecology than many adults.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The same concern has been expressed by a pro-OHV group, the National OHV Conservation Council, in their "Management Guidelines for Off-Highway Vehicle Recreation" (2006): "Stream crossings should be located where the stream bottom is solid, stable or modified to support the expected uses. Stream banks should be hardened or stabilized, if necessary, to prevent unacceptable erosion or sediment delivery into the stream. When local regulations require and when crossings cannot be stabilized, streams should be bridged." That guidance is widely ignored.

At this very moment millions of mountain pine beetles are hard at work to counterbalance the unnatural density of pine trees in western states. This is the very same unnatural density that is a result of groups like this. If you want to preserve the forests, and the accompanying landscape that they produce, we have to stop trying to put everything in a bottle. Nature was never intended to remain in one state of being at any one time. In fact it is the exact opposite, nature is constantly changing and evolving. Yes that is right, has anyone here ever heard of evolution? Change is the most natural process of all processes and should be welcomed instead of feared. Our insistence of trying to control nature will only lead to a quicker destruction thereof.

I am inclined to agree with you. The government should stay out of the green movement. I have seen so many examples of bad supposed environmental legislation. Something that is lost on so many people is that for every action there are consequences. We had better start looking at the consequences to the environment of the actions proposed in the "Green" movement. Two examples are the additive MTBE in fuels and the compact florescent light bulb. Since 1992, MTBE has been used at higher concentrations in gasoline to fulfill the oxygenate requirements set by the United States Congress in the Clean Air Act. Because of the high water solubility of MTBE, it led to the contamination of ground water wells all over the United States, which finally resulted in a reduced use of MTBE. Great, we got cleaner air and contaminated water. There is also a push to outlaw incandescent light bulbs and push Compact florescent light (CFL) bulbs on everyone. Here the goal is to reduce power consumption. Indeed a noble goal, and all of the politicians jumped on board to say that they were on top of the green movement. The problem is that every CFL bulb is manufactured with mercury. Not only is the manufacturing process dangerous for the employee, but now every household in the US will have Mercury in it. Wow we are using less power but contaminating every household with poisonous Mercury. And if we are lucky enough not to break a bulb in our house and expose our family to this toxin, they go to the local landfill and potentially contaminate our soil and water sources. These are only two examples out a countless number of examples of how the "Green" movement is only a commercialized means of selling more products to the gullible guilty conscience of the public. Again I try and remind everyone that every action has consequences. Before we fall victim to the commercial entities trying to push the sale of new products through lobbyist introduced "Green" legislation, lets think about the consequences. Pushing this or that in the name of saving the environment is no different than declaring war in the name of Christianity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Trouble is, as always, if the government closes all of the access down to the natural areas I'll have to watch it on TV anyways. I'd rather share it all with my fellow brothers and sisters and actively use and maintain it, as you have recommended in other posts. Oh and by the way I'm not destroying the "natural" environment anymore than those who choose to walk in it, Or in your case clear cut forests for take off and landing zones.

I don't think there are enough words in the English language that would satisfy your request for recognition. No matter what the OHV community does or says, your preconceived notions are likely too entrained to ever convince you otherwise. The fact that we love this land and want to share it with our friends and family so that all can grow to appreciate it, is lost on people like you. The more we try and exclude "we the people" from public lands the less "we the people" will have a connection to the land and the more the land will suffer from a lack of interest from "we the people" and fall victim to the likes of developers and rapers of our natural lands.

I couldn't agree with you more. I was just at Mount Rushmore National Monument. In the visitors center they had a two pictures of a valley taken from the same point. The first picture was taken by a member of then Lieutenant Colonel Custer's expedition into the Black Hills in 1874. The second picture was taken in the present day. It really opened my eyes to the effect that fire suppression has had on the environment. In 1874, the landscape was much more thinned out with a greater variety. The current photo showed a dense forest with no variety. This has led to the current situation with the pine beetles devastating the forests. I guess it goes to show that Mother Nature will have her way one way or another. The goal to preserve everything in some artificial state of suspension, will only lead to us losing everything.

That is where you are wrong , that is the goal of every Environmental group out there. Preserve everything as it is in this second, or some second in time in the past. They constantly ignorantly and arrogantly proclaim that this area or this population of something shall be protected against all threats, even natural ones. Mother Nature does not stand still. She is ever changing everything. Climates and habitats have changed constantly from the beginning of time and the species that inhabit them either adapt, move, or die off. It is a natural process; in fact it is the force that causes evolution that the left is always proclaiming, except when it doesn't suit their agenda. No one here wants to "build into every last region" and no one here has suggested that. I think what we are after here is a little bit of truth in advertising. If an area is designated as a roadless area, it ought to be without roads. Just because there are limited roads in an area doesn't mean those roads that exist should be abolished. In fact those areas with less roads is appealing just for that reason. That is what we strive to find and experience. But if all of those areas are closed down then all we have left to enjoy are the areas crisscrossed with roads, which doesn't provide the same enjoyment. We don't want more roads, we just want to keep access to those places that we currently have access to so that we can enjoy them.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Okay I will give you that, I generalized the Environmental groups (not the people). Maybe what I should have stated was that the governmental policies that come from the agenda the environmental groups push results in policies that don't jive with the natural changes mother nature is constantly enforcing. As far as my limited knowledge of the roadless designation goes, is that they are to be preserved until congress can decide if they will act to make them designated wilderness or not. That is my fear that all of these places that I enjoy to visit will be shut down in the future. What we need is a new designation that protects our public lands from development, but leaves it open for all kinds of recreation, for all to enjoy.

Yes some people choose to abuse our public lands instead of use our public lands. What would you suggest though, should we not allow anyone into our public lands in the fear that they might be abused. Just like you I don't want to have to get my fix for nature by watching the discovery channel. I want to go out into nature and enjoy it, instead of becoming a big fat pig by sitting in front of the discovery channel.

Debate is what this forum is all about. People from different viewpoints have the opportunity to express their opinion and others have the opportunity to comment on those opinions. I agree with you that "Land of Many Uses" means "Use" and in people using and enjoying the land they develop a desire to "conserve" said land. Thereby giving credence to the motto and what it achieves. If you had never been in any natural setting and experienced something grand from it before in your life, would you have been on this forum taking an active role in conservation? I highly doubt it. I think everyone on this forum has developed a connection to the land in different ways and through different medias and thus they are here debating how it should be addressed in the future. So again I rally behind the motto of the National Forests and encourage all to enjoy our "Land of Many Uses" through a broad spectrum of activities, so we all may develop that connection to the land.

You are welcome, and I believe we have preserved *\*some\** undisturbed natural environments. I am very happy that we have too, so yes we are in agreement here. I am not against Wilderness designated areas and I believe most OHVer's think likewise. What I and others are against is designating Wilderness areas that don't meet the definition. Places that are disturbed and do have roads through them are being declared wilderness and roadless areas. There are plenty of wild areas that currently have access to and though them that are providing great habitat and that is a great thing too. Why do we need to change that? I think that wildlife and recreating humans can share most wild places. Resource extraction has a far greater impact than recreation and maybe more protection is needed from those activities in certain places. By the way I take a little offense to the implication that I am an anti-environmentalist, as I am not anti-myself. Maybe a more appropriate term of endearment would be anti-exclusionist.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My biggest problem with your last statement is that you are assuming that a "bushwaked trail" is going to cause harm to some critical habitat. It has been my experience that most of the "bushwaked trails" are much less intrusive on the environment than the actively "maintained trails" by the forest service. The forest service comes in with a trail dozer and widens the trails and cause unnatural surfaces like cuts and fills that are subject to increased erosion and sediment transportation. Natural trails that follow the landscape and are crisscrossed with roots and rocks hold the soil in place and cause minimal erosion. Your assumption that trails and roads in "less roaded areas" cause damage to critical habitat is just wrong. The mistake made in the past is to assume that every footprint that man makes is detrimental to life on this planet. In fact, the environment of these so called roadless areas have no bearing on their boundaries since a description of what kind of habitat is there or what species may live in them is irrelevant. They are only defined by whether they have roads in them or not, and then they don't even follow that definition. This is where my frustrations stem from.

So be it. How do you think the beaches and bluffs were formed in the first place. From the destruction of what was there before the beaches and the bluffs. If you build your house on a bluff overlooking the ocean, you should expect to loose your house overtime. It is called the power of mother nature and we have no one but our own ingnorance to blame.

Yes I am "finding it harder to have a genuine outdoor experience and not feel crowded" and I have wondered why. I have also come to a conclusion. It is because the government keeps closing access to public land and converging everyone into smaller and smaller areas. They are hearing us down into insanity.

I'll tell you why I demoted this idea. It doesn't work! How many rangers are you going to hire to direct the wildlife to use the crossings? What is the penalty for not using the designated crossing? Oh that's right death to all animals who would circumvent these crossings. If you really want to protect wildlife from road kill, sell your car to the junk yard and have it smashed. Instead of paying millions of dollars for bridges, Maybe we could have a new taxpayer funded initiative: Wildlife for Clunkers

It has been my experience that the legislation that comes from the government under the pretense of helping the environment ussally does more harm than good. What we need is education of our piers and to get them out into the outdoors to experience what we have so that they develop and attachment to it. If they develop that attachment then they will want to perserve it. More legislation will just make things worse.

The discovery channel is nice and all, however, when the next program comes on the previous program is quickly forgotten. It takes more than knowing that something is out there. It takes that personal connection. A multiday trip in our National Forests with a vista from the top of a mountain or a view from the shore of lake, river or mountain stream is something that stays with you throught ones life. The same thing on TV has on comparison. We have to get out there and experience it for ourselves to fully comprehend and let it affect us personally. Restricting access only hinders that endeavor. Just knowing something is there gives me absolutely no comfort what so ever.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Wolves should be treated as any other predator. Why should wolves have any right over any other predator? Wolves are one of the most wasteful of predators. For instance in August 2009, outside of Dillion, Montana, 120 sheep were killed in one night by wolves and only a handful were actually eaten. Luckily our tax dollars reimbursed the rancher for about half of them, since those were all that were "Confirmed". Now tell me why we shouldn't have at least a wolf season? Why they can't be shot at any time like a coyote is beyond me? Anyone wonder why our ancestors almost eradicated them in continental US? They obviously are having no trouble growing in numbers and need to be controlled.

Some of the comments here are very entertaining. Glad I brought this subject up. Last I looked we were at the top of the food chain and we should be able to effectively manage game. My main point is that wolves damage livestock. Then we pay for part of it and the rest comes out of a rancher's bottom line. If anyone doubts my story, here is a link { <a href="http://missoulian.com/news/local/article\_5ff01772-938f-11de-9aca-001cc4c03286.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I would like to see them treated as Coyote and stop having everyone pay for their damages. Let people shoot them when they bother livestock. Also, as a hunter they definitely move the elk around and effect their populations. Bottom line that wolves kill anything they can and are just about the only thing that do except for people.

Differentiate Between Public Uses and Commercial Uses. The American Sportfishing Association (ASA) has a goal of seeing the federal government manage aquatic and fishery resources in a manner that much more definitively recognizes public use of resources versus private use of resources. Particularly in the area of marine management, there is an unacceptable lack of attention applied to the fact that public uses of our public ocean resources, such as fishing, boating, and diving, are very different than private uses, such as energy development, aquaculture, and commercial fishing. The main challenge here is overcoming the mindset that commercial and industrial exploitation of our marine resources are comparable to sustainable, low-impact public uses. They are not. ASA certainly supports the extraction of resources in our public waters when such activity is managed properly and carried out in such as to not have significant, long-lasting negative impacts on the given resource. However, preferential treatment, consistent with the public trust doctrine, should be given to public, low impact uses of this same resource. The mindset at the Department of Commerce and, to some extent, the Department of Interior has not been to elevate public use of our public ocean resources. To see what works when it comes to this goal and its challenge, one need look no further than the management of our public lands. For over 100 years, we have managed our public land, for the most part, in a manner that balances public use with private commercial uses such as grazing and energy development. Our marine fishery resources should be managed more like our public land resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Collection and Use of Better, More Timely Fisheries Data. Federal resource managers have a decidedly mixed record when it comes to gathering adequate data on fish populations, habitat quality, etc. necessary for effective fishery management and conservation. The federal government should establish a standard that is applied across agencies, which will ensure that there is consistency when gathering fisheries data and a high national standard in terms of the quality of that data. A fundamental challenge to gathering adequate, timely fisheries data is the reality that recreational anglers disperse across broad areas and sampling can be very difficult. Enforcement and monitoring on the freshwater side, achieved through the state fish and wildlife agencies, tends to be more easily accomplished. Inadequate gathering of recreational fishing data on the saltwater side, where the federal government has jurisdiction beyond three miles, has been hugely problematic. Over the years, NOAA has been largely focused on commercial fishing to the detriment of the recreational fishing public. Apart from gathering and using higher quality data of recreational fishing effort, better data in general needs to be gathered regarding fish populations. Timeliness and frequency of marine fish stock assessments are far too inconsistent and a national standard for stock assessments should therefore be established. In terms of what works when it comes fisheries data gathering and use, new technology and techniques have been identified and are currently under discussion between our community and NOAA. The recommendations we are considering should be reviewed with an eye toward broad adoption. The federal government's role in meeting this need is fairly simple: a commitment must be made to achieve a much higher and consistent standard when it comes to gathering fisheries related data across the country. That requires making it a priority across the federal government and, as a result, dedicating adequate resources to this incredibly important and fundamental need. -Gordon Robertson, Vice President, American Sportfishing Association

Re-establish the Primacy of Science in Fisheries Management. Fishery management decisions should always be made on the basis of timely and definitive scientific information. There have been trends in recent years toward protectionist management that has been based on assumptions that simply are not born out by up-to-date, adequate scientific information. The challenge in this area has risen through the allowance of arbitrary, emotion-based management decisions made for fisheries in the absence of fully adequate scientific information. Standards have slipped in this regard and this slippage must be stopped. We know that it is possible to conserve and sustain our natural resources, but only when we manage them with the best scientific information in hand. Again, a review should be carried out across the federal agencies with fisheries management responsibilities to determine current standards for the use of science in fisheries management decisions. The results of this review should lead to the establishment of a clear fisheries science standard with obvious thresholds for what managers must have in hand, in terms of scientific information, before making a significant management decision. -Gordon Robertson, Vice President, American Sportfishing Association

I'm a road biker - done 3 cross country rides (2 x-usa, 1 x-canada), raced road and track in the 70's; likewise a backcountry/wilderness hiker... but sorry: bikes have no business in the back country. At the very best they destroy the wilderness experience for many, for the benefit of one (if that). Why the mtn bikers can't understand this I don't know - are they really that self-centered/conceited??

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Like \_\_\_\_, you keep getting hung up on a specific word. Two people go to a gas station and each fills a five-gallon can with gasoline. One uses it to work on a fuel-reduction project, the other uses it to put in his play machine. The worker gets no special fund from the government for the gas tax he spends, but the playboy does. That is fundamentally unfair. I never cried about hiking trails. I maintain that you get a much better outdoor experience on foot than you ever will on a machine. I'm not trying to destroy a program that creates trails....I'm opposed to a program that favors one special interest group, particularly a special interest group that exists for the optional purpose of recreation. Maybe what Uncle Sam's minions taught me about survival, plus what I learned in forestry school, plus my forty years on the land, would make for a great outdoor survival competition. But from your posts it appears you'll need more than the pocketknife I'll start with. AND it really doesn't matter why you call names. It's still immature.

I feel for your confusion. In Oregon the ATV Fund is exclusive to off-road recreation and administered to the detriment of citizens such as myself. You keep confusing it with a federal program. You want to maintain your special fund. I understand that. There are thousands of laws and funds in this country that benefit special interest groups. The 1872 Mining Law comes to mind. Many of them should be changed or eliminated because they do not benefit society at large. Yours just happens to be one of them. You folks say you pay your own way, but in Oregon I end up paying gas tax to enrich your sport. (And I don't think government should buy stadiums for sport teams, either.)

Here's what you don't understand: I have more than a hundred photos, and access to hundreds more, showing the destruction of public and private lands by unregulated off-road recreation. My home has been invaded by the species. Regulation on neighboring BLM lands was non-existent until a few years ago and now is minimal. The local club should be indicted for fraud, based on the record of their grant requests to the State. I have been threatened, shot at and nearly run over by dirt bike riders. And you tell me I shouldn't oppose the fact that part of the gas tax I pay goes to a fund to support an optional recreational activity that creates all of these problems? Clearly, you do not understand.

Before they ran that newspaper article the local editor required I document the issue. The proof is in the record. The local club used false and misleading statements to obtain grant money. Under Oregon law that is Public Investment Fraud. Neither local nor state law enforcement are (so far) willing to undertake an investigation. It is exactly because I have all the problems that I stated, and more, many of them exacerbated by the funding obtained through the State, that I can say the program is not successful. As I stated earlier, successful for you does not mean successful for all of us.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This will be my last response to you, regardless of how you may respond. In reviewing your comments on this site your narrow views and redundancy are sophomoric at best. You have helmet visor vision and repeat the same phrases I hear time and time again, as though you'd memorized the Blue Ribbon Coalition's talking points. (Just as you claim people echo Sierra Club language.) I post this response only to clarify for the larger audience that there is a systemic corruption in the program you defend so ignorantly. My attempts to secure an investigation into this situation did not produce results because of a lack of evidence, but rather because none of the agencies chose to investigate. There has been a lot of buck-passing, which I suspect has more to do with protecting the image of the State Parks than anything else. Here's the 4-1-1 on the grant application for a land purchase that I believe constitutes public investment fraud under Oregon Revised Statute 162.117. The land is a 140-acre parcel, formerly in private hands, purchased by a local motorsports dealer when the applicant's first application was denied. The land is an isolated parcel. The grant application: references a "BLM trail system" that did not then and does not now exist. alleges an "environmental study" that does not exist references a "Staging Area" that does not exist alleges the applicant has agreements with BLM that have never existed alleges meetings with members of the public that never took place provided a letter of support from a man who had been dead for ten months, alleging he was the "only neighbor," though his surviving brother actually lives closer to the subject property. The entire neighborhood association of more than thirty families are on record as opposed to the grant. alleges applicant has provided "law enforcement" when they are not a law enforcement agency alleges agreements and potential agreements with industrial forestland owners that do not exist The application was tabled at the first hearing, pending BLM's completion of a Record of Decision for the area in which the land was located. The applicant then secured an attorney, who appeared non-agenda and implied litigation. A subsequent hearing was held with invitee-only testimony. Neither the County nor the nearest adjacent city chose to attend. Only BLM testified, representing falsely that the land purchase would solve all the problems with local landowners. The grant was approved with the sole condition that the land be immediately turned over to the BLM. BTW, the motorports company, now out of business, made a tidy profit on the deal. These facts are available through the Oregon Parks and Recreation Department, but the record is not easy to obtain. They do not keep verbatim minutes, so you would have to request a recording of the meetings and copies of all written testimony. Nothing that you have said or will say can change my mind that the ATV Fund program in Oregon is inequitable, corrupt and not in the best interests of Oregon taxpayers. Therefore, post what you will, I'm not going to trade barbs with you any longer. Let the public decide.

I have watched as private, non-industrial forestland is cut into ever smaller chunks. This idea offers some protection for some of the best-managed timberland in our country.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Forty years of living in and studying northwest forests shows me something different than "overgrown forests that burn at the drop of a hat." I agree that the forests have been mis-managed. They have been overcut and the resulting unmanaged mix of saplings, brush and grasses are what fuel the fires. Our forests are overstocked, but not with mature timber. On federal lands and industrial lands the timber is too often cut and the landscape left untended. Fire management has created similar problems. If you want to see well-managed timberland, look to the private, non-industrial forestland owners.

ORVs Are Inappropriate for Wilderness-Quality Public Lands. In eastern Utah alone, there are over 20,000 miles of designated ORV routes and a few cross-country ORV "play areas." Some of these routes cross through ancient Native American cultural sites, scarce desert streams, and proposed wilderness areas. Many of these are trails that don't actually go anywhere, or there is no compelling reason for their existence; many duplicate another route. By eliminating only 15% of these trails - which would leave about 17,000 miles of ORV routes in eastern Utah available for use - some of Utah's most spectacular redrock country would be protected from off-road vehicle damage. A similar idea would help protect wilderness-quality lands in other states as well.

Even if some of the designated off-road vehicle trails are closed (and many miles would remain open), there still would be many ways to access these areas - hiking, horseback riding, paddling, etc. 80% of the lands that are proposed for wilderness would be within 2 miles of a road. Here is an example of the area near Moab (all of the routes in green would remain open to off-road vehicles if all proposed wilderness was designated): { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/DocServer/moab\_ORV\_plan\_wilderness\_map.pdf?docID=2183" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

In this "idea" I am referring to the lands which have wilderness character but currently ARE NOT being protected by the BLM as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs). Wilderness Study Areas in Utah are also included in the about 9.4 million acres of America's Red Rock Wilderness Act.

Proposed wilderness areas are places that are wilderness-quality. In this "idea" I am referring to those wilderness-quality lands that are currently not designated as wilderness or as wilderness study areas. The BLM is part of the Obama administration.

I am a frequent visitor to southern Utah, particularly the area surrounding Lake Powell and the Glen Canyon Dam. Each year I go there, damage from ORV use has been increasing by leaps and bounds. It astounds me that Utah residents and visitors from out of state seem to think of this beautiful 'moonscape' as a playground for ORVs. It's gotten so bad that it is next to impossible to photograph nature's grand design without hundreds, even thousands, of ORV tracks marring the landscape. There are already enough places where ORVs can be used legally, yet many on this and other boards insist on having more. Are these places becoming "boring" to ORV users? Is it not enough to destroy what God gave us where you're already allowed to do that? We NEED to protect the areas around Glen Canyon Dam and Grand Staircase/Escalante, Factory Butte, and others from this scar of human recklessness. I fully support ANY effort to restrict ORV use to certain areas until this scourge is brought to a decline, not the rapid increase I've been seeing since the early 2000's.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I volunteered at B.L.M. for Public lands day and recieved a day pass to any facility. I had no Idea I would receive a pass. I volunteered for the experience. On that same note the purpose of volunteering should not be a prize. Yeah it sucks that the government is screwing you over on an annual pass. If the only reason for service is the pass pay the \$80 (which would be much cheaper that 400 hour ) and quit volunteering.

No Bikes on the Pacific Crest Trail, or in wilderness areas. Please leave us to our peaceful SLOW way to enjoy nature. Every other trail we have to fear, that a thrill seeking usually young man will knock our horses legs out from under them. Or our horses will spook and fall off of a narrow trail in to a canyon. This has happened to me from a BIKE. Bikes and Horses should not share the same trails. There are too many blind curves and bikes are going to fast. My motive for writing this is I am 65 years old and I need a safe place to ride my horse, I do not want or need to be hurt by some thrill seeking junkie that doesn't care about me or my mount. People that ride Bikes are doing so for the thrill, because when they are moving they cannot look at nature, they must look at the trail. So why would anyone vote for them to ride the Pacific Crest Trail or in our wilderness areas, we are there for peace and quiet and to view nature as its should be. Slowly and Greatfully. We have lost many trails to bikes. PLEASE, let us enjoy what nature is left, without fear and worry of being hurt.

Control the wolf population. Acceptable numbers should be defined and wolf populations should be managed accordingly. Wild animals should not be given priority over domestic animals. Ranchers should have legal authority to shoot wolves if they are killing livestock. The special interest groups that instigated the re population of wolves should reimburse ranchers when livestock is slaughtered, not the taxpayers. Human society does not mix well with certain predatory animals. Human's are more important than animals. Manage accordingly.

\_\_\_\_\_ in comment 1 You are the epitome of the problem with environmentalism. You obviously place higher importance on animal life than human life. Stewardship of our environment does not preclude human life. \_\_\_\_\_ in comment 2 HUMANS are a part of our "natural ecosystem" not an "invasion / disruption" as you seem to think.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Watch how a minority (equestrians are maybe 3-4% of all trail users) will say just about anything to protect their privileged access. Some on the nonsense read above: - Bicyclists don't show up for trail maintenance day: what a lie. I've yet to see an equestrian at a trail work day. On the other hand, I've seen plenty of trails pulverized by their animals hooves, not to mention the feces left over wherever they go. - Wilderness bans wheels: that is the current interpretation of the act since 1984, not the intention of the 1964 Act. - Bicycles are power forms of transportation: muscle powered, unlike the equestrians who simply sit on their animal. - Cyclists are rude: wow, that's interesting. Apparently, the mere fact of riding a fact makes millions of people rude all of a sudden. Truth: most people I meet on the trails are nice. A minority is rude, and somehow it does not correlate with any singular activity. - Those trails are MINE: another lie. Trails are funded by taxpayers for the enjoyment of all as long as we do not impact them. Bicycles have the same impact as hikers and much less than horses. - Bicyclists and OHV have nothing in common. One is muscle powered like hiking (or maybe riding a horse, although the poor horse is doing all the work), and the other is motorized. - Cyclists spend much more time going up hill at 3-4 miles per hour than they spend going downhill. - Horses are spooked easily: that is true. Horses are prey animals that are spooked by just about anything including but not limited to: a dog, a snake, hikers, cyclists, etc. Frankly, if those animals are so easily spooked, and therefore so dangerous to other users (anybody seen a galloping horse coming at you on a narrow trail?), why are they allowed on public trails? Equestrians should train their horses to get along with other users. If they can't, then they should stick to private trails. Cycling a healthy activity enjoyed by millions of americans who want to be in the great outdoors. I support this idea.

In the US, there are approx. 30 mountain bikers for every equestrian, yet equestrians have access to many times more trails than cyclists (including 53M acres of wilderness in the lower 48). Reading G.S., it's pretty clear that their intent is to maintain this discriminatory practice for as long as they can so that they don't have to share. Again, if your horse is that dangerous, you should not be riding it on public trails. As for cyclists being adrenaline junkies, most of my riding buddies are well into their 40s and 50s, hardly the young punk people are trying to paint here. As for trail work, in Northern California, you won't see too many equestrians wielding a pulaski. Truth is that the scare tactics are not supported by statistics. Documented dangerous encounters between user groups barely if ever occur. Perception might be different, but fact is that 99.9% of all encounters go just fine. Cycling is a healthy human powered activity that needs to be restored in wilderness and other public trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

More lies from the usual hiker/equestrian lobby. Par for the course. The 64 Act does not ban bicycles from Wilderness. The 84 creative interpretation of the Act did. It's been proven that Congress intended to have bikes enjoy wilderness. BTW, pedal powered kayaks are legal in Wilderness despite being mechanical forms of transportation. Then, hikers call bikers conceited for breaking hikers' tranquil enjoyment of nature. Wow, the nerve! it's a public good, not your own private backyard. Learn to share. It's an especially galling claim when we know that the backcountry is pretty much empty. As for the PCT, we've been riding it for years. You might as well make it legal. Here are the facts: hiking and horse riding are on the decline while mountain biking has been progressing for decades. What we have is a bunch of old timers that are trying to cling on to an undeserved privilege with the hope that the wheels of change turn slowly enough so that they don't have to experience it during their lifetime. Sad state of affairs.

So funny. Trekking poles are not green enough for wilderness. I say: no trekking poles, no GPS (not close enough to the near religious wilderness ideal), no horses (because of their impact on the trail). Heck, no human!! (FYI, the above is all sarcasm)

I hike a lot of trails that are open to bicycles. It is not fun and bike cause a lot of damage to trails. However, I do see the value in mountain biking as a form of outdoor recreation, but national scenic trails such as the PCT would be the last place that I would want to encounter a biker.

Mountain bikes should have trails dedicated for their usage. Mountain bikes should not be sharing the trails with hikers and equestrians. High downhill speeds, blind curves, trail erosion, lack of safe passing areas, and steep drop offs endanger lives. It is hard to imagine a worse setting for horse and bicyclist than the Pacific Crest Trail. It is far too narrow and steep for safe passage for any but hiker and horse. My greastest fear is a tragic accident in such proportion that trails will be closed to EVERYONE. This is a case where I support the concept of separate, but, equal.

I'm not sure I'd support logging increases unless there were some supervision. And DEFINITELY no clear-cutting. Thinning out diesased trees sounds good on paper, but would it stop there? This has to have some supervision. No cutting of Old Growth healthy trees for profit!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As someone who is involved in putting on volunteer trail work parties on state and federal public lands throughout the year and on any given week, I will say that most consider the ATB 500 hour recognition insulting, and we generally choose not to mention it. Sure, the hours are accumulative, but to be honest, it is a hassle to track by volunteer organizations for each of so many different people, and it just reminds them of what an insult it is to have to do 500 hours of volunteering for a pass good for one year only. Better not to have it at all. As Derrick pointed out, volunteers start to boil it into a net worth agenda (like \$1.60 per hour). Just.....don't go there, or make it more functional like the USFS. As to the attitude that we should just be happy to volunteer and be happy to pay the fee or not volunteer.....well, that may work for some highminded, but has little value in the trenches. Trail volunteerism needs a lot of willing folks coming from a number of different political viewpoints and economic strata. We need these folks desperately to build trail and to run equipment, from tractors to chainsaws, particularly on the poorer funded USFS recreation sites. Frankly, any "pass" is a hassle for volunteers. I may visit sites multiple times over a couple of weeks, and so I have to carry a pass in any vehicle I may drive depending upon whether I am doing light work where a car will do or heavy work transporting tools and supplies where a truck is needed. Sure as shooting, my volunteer pass is in the vehicle I left at home. You have no idea how depressing it is to get a ticket for no pass when you just spent \$50 in fuel and a day's worth of labor and maybe \$200 worth of equipment time. Sure, you can usually get it removed later once you explain what you were doing, but the point is that pass management for volunteers is a pain in the rearend. Typically I have one volunteer USFS pass and an ATB pass that I buy, and even then, both may be left at home!! Anyway, if you care about volunteers, offer them a cheap credit system. It inspires them to come back even if they don't use it (since they feel appreciated), and I'm talking about the folks who swing pulaskis, dig with shovels, operate crosscuts and chainsaws, and pack heavy loads and materials into the backcountry. The USFS relies heavily on volunteers since they don't have in many places paid trail crews. The USFS gives a pass for 16 hours. The NPS is much better funded with many paid trail crews. So they want 500 hours. Fortunately, where local NPS parks must rely on volunteers, they have their own volunteer recognition system that is far more practical since they must deal with reality. So give me a meaningful credit system or don't waste the time.

I support this idea whole-heartedly. Two comments though. I find the staff in the USFS very hard working and dedicated. The problem that has occurred is with limited staff and resources they have to deal with more paperwork, more studies, and more litigation. They sometimes can't pursue worthwhile projects or provide on-the-ground support for what seems obvious improvements since they know they can't get all of the required pre-work done. So they start operating from a defensive custodial position not a proactive one. I can't say I blame them but I do wish the situation could improve. The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is no longer funded at all after this year. Expansion isn't so much an issue right now as reauthorization. Some legislators are trying to make this happen. Please support their efforts.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Under the topic of reducing irresponsible snowmobile activity, for what purpose do you suggest 'compromise'? I am assuming that you do not seek to ratify unsustainable snowmobile off-road practices like marginal snow driving and bushwhacking exposed vegetation. Snowmobiles, skis & snowshoes are all designed with enough 'footprint' to 'float' (or not sink far into) most snow surfaces; all three, when laden as intended, will have very similar ratios of surface area-to-weight; overloaded, any of these conveyances will cease to 'float'. I can report that, on fresh snow, when a climbing snowmobile crosses over my fresh ski uptrack, the snowmobile typically penetrates about 1" to 3" deeper (but sometimes MUCH deeper) than my uptrack. I attribute this not to difference in flotation so much as to the dynamics of motion: the greater forward thrust of the snowmobile and the widely shifting weight distribution of its (body-steering) driver. (It could also be that I'm using skis that are too big for me) . In any event, the ability to 'float' on snow is, at best, incidental to the topic at hand because ordinary snowmobile practice is not at issue here: I'm talking about curbing IRRESPONSIBLE snowmobile activity. A snowmobile does not automatically 'tread lightly' - operator discretion is crucial. The snowmobile will not keep itself out of unsuitable conditions, nor can it prevent its driver from pursuing clandestine bushwhack routes through breakable tree tops, etc. Even though thoughtless pedestrians may adopt unsuitable routes on vulnerable terrain, they quickly tire of post-holing into brush, and soon turn around whereas a snowmobile just keeps going and going - even when it trenches foot-deep through unsupportive snow into underlying material. Like any remotely operated vehicle, a snowmobile must be driven with discretion to minimize its impact on the resource and on other forest visitors. Your suggestion to steer motorists away from pedestrians is a popular paradigm, prim on paper, but such arrangements fall short wherever motorist compliance is unreliable. As I've noted, at least locally, snowmobiles routinely travel out-of-bounds (on mapped and posted wilderness) in places where pedestrians seek to distance themselves from impacts of vehicular activity. Repeat violations and unsustainable practices need not dog the wake of snowmobiling. Hence, my suggestion for prominent display of a permit/ID tag to introduce operator accountability and thereby reduce occurrence of irresponsible snowmobile activity.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

According to \_\_\_\_\_, the use permits that make campers, hikers, hunters and fishers accountable for their conduct will be unlikely to improve snowmobile compliance because the ID # on the snowmobile permit will probably be obscured by snow. And since those paper tags surely cost money, he suggests that we should spend even more public funds on futile and ineffective efforts to police specialty craft that remain exempt from license plates! But take heart: we're told that the irresponsible, unidentifiable snowmobile off-road motorists who are willing to break the law need little more than the guidance of a few more signs and, of course, some 'education'. \_\_\_\_\_ is quick to follow with the first installment of instruction: while finally acknowledging that snowmobile motorists are indeed indisposed by occasional encounters with unsupportive snow, voids and discontinuities mid-mountain, we are told that the motorist need only throttle FARTHER UP the mountainside into the rarified alpine life zone where, he declares, snowmobile off-road specialty craft "truly have no impact." If we're to rely on education to address problems of snowmobile misuse, we better make darned sure that off-road specialty motorists come away with more than empty slogans like 'our tracks don't last'. Following is a list of snowmobile impacts that accrue in high alpine environments of the Sierra Nevada. I have personally observed, experienced, and recorded every one of the impacts listed here. As you might guess if you've read this far, I will be happy to elaborate in detail on any of the following points as the discussion proceeds: Snowmobile off-road impacts which occur at treeline and above: 1) sonic pollution of rarefied atmosphere (sound waves travel farther above treeline than in the forest) 2) chemical pollution (carbon monoxide, hydrocarbon, etc.) of rarified atmosphere (aesthetic and physical impacts on forest visitors) 3) chemical (sooty hydrocarbon) pollution of remote snow and riparian headwaters with long-lasting contaminants like PAH 4) trampling (breakage) of slow-growing timberline elfinwood exposed above the snow (300 year-old whitebark pines, not seedlings) 5) contact damage to alpine vegetation BELOW the snow surface (during soft snow conditions) 6) trampling of (unseen) scarce wildlife and riparian habitat (e.g. Yosemite Toads overwintering in snow burrows ABOVE 9000' - yes, some animals actually live high up in the mountains year-round) 7) snowmobile driving on high terrain unprotected by snow (overdriving exposed soil & tundra on high wind-scoured ridges to link patches of discontinuous snow) 8) debris stripped or lost from moving snowmobiles (such as busted windscreens, torn belts, red shards of shattered reflectors, torn rubber track lugs, etc.) 9) violations of law (out-of-bounds motoring) and attendant public costs 10) conflicts among snowmobile motorists (who aggressively compete for, and rapidly chop up, trackless natural snow scapes) 11) degradation of bipedal access and opportunity (fall-line vehicular snow ruts impede or foreclose knee-reliant travel) 12) unsafe practices - reckless driving endangering others in the alpine environment (high-speed passing, avalanche triggering) Recall again: these are snowmobile impacts which Brian claims don't even exist at high elevation. That said, I should mention that nearly all of the above-listed snowmobile off-road impacts can indeed be minimized and possibly even reduced to insignificance. It will take awhile, sure, and will certainly take improved enforcement efforts, improved (honest) education, improved snowmobiles... and, above all, operator accountability. There's no doubt in my mind that snowmobile recreation is dear to many persons and is one of the few outlets that bring satisfaction for some souls in the cold season. As well, I know that snowmobiling has responsible and respectful sportsmen who are now beholden to, and constrained by, the least respectful of the anonymous operators. This

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

state of affairs is unnecessary, unreasonable and should no longer be tolerated.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Snowmobiles, by their design, don't do anything without an operator. Nothing at all. By design! But at least someone here appears to recognize that, in careless or inexperienced hands, a snowmobile can make a costly mess... A snowmobile will run over whatever the operator drives it over (or through), or whatever he fails to avoid; snowmobiles can and do come into contact with stuff other than snow, both accidentally and deliberately. While snow tracks of course vanish with spring thaw, snowmobile contact-damage to unprotected soils and trampled vegetation does not disappear and thus may accumulate over multiple seasons. Sometimes impacts of a single misused snowmobile can be pronounced: fall-line snowmobile ruts which are cut directly into sodden soil or through thin, unsupportive snow can channel snow melt, fostering erosion, stream pollution and stream turbidity. Vegetation exposed above the snow can be overrun, damaged or destroyed. Slow-growing timberline vegetation is particularly vulnerable, and alpine forage suffers too. Rare wildlife (like the Yosemite Toad) overwintering in snow burrows can be suffocated or crushed, especially in late season. Such snowmobile impacts can be acute since a snowmobile travels much farther per visit than a self-powered user, affecting perhaps ten times more terrain per hour. It's no surprise that the range and impact of a negligent forest visitor (the inevitable 'bad apple') is greater when he throttles a snowmobile in lieu of a pair of snowshoes. A snowmobile does not automatically 'tread lightly' - operator discretion is crucial. The snowmobile will not keep itself out of unsuitable conditions, nor can it prevent its driver from pursuing clandestine bushwhack routes through breakable tree tops and other forest life. Even though thoughtless pedestrians may adopt unsuitable routes on vulnerable terrain, they quickly tire of post-holing into brush and soon turn around whereas a snowmobile just keeps going and going - even when it trenches foot-deep through unsupportive snow into underlying material. Like any remotely operated vehicle, a snowmobile must be driven with discretion to minimize its impact on the resource and on other forest visitors. This is true on private property and equally true on public estate. Yet, a pernicious disparity continues to grow between what is preached and what is practiced - a duplicity sadly corrosive of sport. It is disturbing to see this 'snowmobiles are magic carpets' fiction so ardently hawked when bare truth is plain to see - in the mountains, sadly enough, and much closer at hand for the cognoscenti here, a link to [verit@e...](#) Following is a brief but plain exchange which appeared on the popular Snowest.com snowmobile talk forum just three days ago (an ordinary, fairly common discussion). The conversants are referring to specialty snowmobiling in the region surrounding Lake Tahoe. Responding to a prospective visitor, the local motorist describes the expressly typical practice of local snowmobile off-road motorists: his warning (or is it a challenge?) makes it crystal clear that snowmobiles routinely - and indeed violently - contact stuff other than snow. I have added CAPS to TWO of the words to emphasize extraordinary additional concerns, which should be self-evident to every honest defender of sport. Note that the term 'sled carnage', as used below, most probably refers to significant damage received by the snowmobile as a result of contact with one or more terrestrial features that failed to yield when they were overrun or otherwise impacted: 10/4/10, 1:19 pm TWOSTROKE - ...where's are best bet for early season riding near tahoe? 1-2 hour drive okay. where gets the best coverage first or does it vary year to year? 10/4/10, 2:13 pm ZRIDER - It all depends when the 'white' starts flying... ...Early season riding down here is usually road/trail riding till the meadows and bowls fill in, unless we get a big dumper right out of the hole. Early sled carnage is NORMAL. To[o] many guys can't wait and go find

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

rocks, tree stumps and whatever else might be lurking BELOW the surface. A-arm and trailing arm [impact-absorbing snowmobile suspension parts] sales are usually good early in the season. Here's the link for fans of frankness: { <a href="http://snowest.com/forum/showthread.php?t=227338" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I vote to demote Tom Lund's 'snowmobiles don't touch the ground' sloganeering because the habits of too many (though not all) snowmobile specialty motorists in my neighborhood, and elsewhere, betray this myth openly and often. It's especially disappointing to find the even more flippant 'our tracks don't last' mantra hawked here under 'what works' because this simplistic feel-goodism works, above all, to deceive; an unabashed con - now even a 'motto' it seems - designed to dismiss, if not to deny, the potential for snowmobile misuse. Here we even see the slogan used as a pretext for officially excusing snowmobile motorists from common standards of conduct. 100 horsepower personal off-road chariots of any kind come with tank-fulls of responsibility - but snowmobiles don't even have license plates! (See the 'Reduce irresponsible snowmobile use' topic situated - justifiably - in the 'Challenges' idea space.) Snowmobile specialty motorists will have to offer more than repetitious 'we ride magic carpets' plainchant if they expect to be excused from all accountability, much less if they expect any sport to emerge from this wink-wink, nudge-nudge doublespeak.

I spent the Labor Day weekend, on foot, sharing the trail with mountain bikers on a segment of the Tahoe Rim Trail that is open to bikes. Most with whom I spoke were nice enough, but NONE offered to stop and give me right of way (as is the rule of the trail - Bicycles yield to pedestrians, pedestrians and bicycles yield to horses). IMBA rule #4 "Always Yield Trail. ... Yielding means slow down, establish communication, be prepared to stop if necessary, and pass safely" Some of those I met even came on with an attitude that suggested I was "on their trail". Due to the bicycles (and their riders' attitudes), I would not choose to ride this segment with a horse if I had the option to walk instead. I think it is best to keep mechanized vehicles separate from foot/hoof traffic.

All trail users are not compatible on the same trails. Wilderness and National Scenic Trails with restrictions were created for the reasons stated in the law. Nothing has changed. I support the bikers having a place to recreate. Create these places through your support groups. Don't try to usurp existing areas said aside for other uses.

It is easier for the Forest Rangers to maintain the forest by excluding the people, closing areas, locking gates, exclusions of every sort. This gives the Forest Service personnel time to sit around their offices and figure out how to close and exclude more public use from the forest. It is easier to designate wilderness study areas to keep human activity out, especially the handicapped. Do Federal lands really belong to the PUBLIC.....I think not...they are owned and controlled by the government and you have to have a permit to do any activity. Give these Federal lands back to the states and let them manage them according to their historic and cultural use.

You are so correct. I see closures all of the time, and am getting very tired of it. I think we should close off hiking trails, let's have no one in the wilderness. That should make the activists happy. I have been riding my bike since I was 8 years old, respect the trail and others on it. These narrow minded activists only want their way and don't care about anyone else.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You are so right. Earth goes through changes on it's own, NOT man-made. I think it is pretty big-headed to think that man has caused all of these changes. First it was global warming, then when that did not work, they changed it to climate change. What will it be called when that does not work? These activists have too much free time, you can prove anything if you throw enough b.s. at it.

Where do you come up with this b.s.? Obviously you are just saying this without actually witnessing this happening. I have been riding my dirt bike since I was 8 years old. I respect the trail, others on it and pick up after the hikers. If there are horses on the trail, I shut my bike off until they pass. I think that you are self-centered to only want things your way and yes your comments are rubbish!

1 for 1 is not a great idea. If the roads get much worse downtown streets in many american citys will be OHV roads. WE have more virgin forest than we did 150 years ago here in the states. We really don't need any more.

this is the greatest challenge but to be free to enjoy the wide open spaces some time we must give a little. I will put up with the loud ATV blasting by my slow moving Jeep if it keeps the roads open.

I am the person who recently got his ticket for not paying a recreation fee in the Sedona area dismissed by a federal judge. I would like to address some of the issues raised here. Forest Service policy is that anyone who parks on Forest Service land anywhere within the 160,000 acre Red Rock Pass Area near Sedona without displaying a Red Rock Pass can be ticketed. This is true whether or not there is a trail of any kind. Parking and hiking cross-country can get you ticketed. The closest "paved area" to the trailhead where I received my ticket is miles away. The closest picnic table, trash receptacle, and public toilet--all amenities required by law for a fee to be charged--are 7 to 10 miles away. The Forest Service violated the law. The judge wrote:"...the Forest Service is not authorized by the FLREA and indeed is prohibited by the FLREA from citing Mr. Smith for failing to pay the subject fee." Forest Service officials need not worry about fines or prison time, however. While citizens face punishment when they break the law, government agencies apparently do not.

I think the main issue here is the rule of law. The right to have fees and taxes imposed only by our elected representatives was an issue that founded our nation. Many of the founding fathers paid dearly for that right. We should not surrender it so easily. Perhaps some of those who argue against me have not read the FLREA. The pertinent provisions are only a few pages long, and plainly written. The Forest Service is authorized to charge an amenity fee where specified amenities--including picnic tables, a trash receptacle and a public toilet--are present. There are specific prohibitions against charging fees only for parking or for hiking across National Forest land. I encourage those who have not read the FLREA to do so. As for whether someone who drives on a forest road should pay a fee, that is a different issue. There are many considerations about fees for driving on forest roads that I don't have space to go into here. I will simply point out that Congress has already made that decision.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"the FS fee program is largely legitimate". The court record show that 18 recreation sites in the Red Rock Pass area qualify for fees. These are mostly campgrounds and day-use sites along Oak Creek. They comprise a minuscule amount of the 160,000 acres of land in the Red Rock Pass area. At least for the Red Rocks area, the fee program is not "largely legitimate". He then says "There are ways to curtail attempts to charge where no services are sought or provided." The only way is to refuse to pay, get ticketed, and go to court.

The FLREA is deeply flawed legislation. Land management agencies like the Forest Service are allowed to keep fees they collect in their own budgets, rather than forward the fees to the U.S. Treasury. The legislative history of the statute shows this arrangement alarmed those who no longer trust the agencies with recreation fee authority. In 2004 Rep. Richard Pombo sponsored an amendment that contained, among other provisions, prohibitions on the Forest Service and BLM to charge fees solely for parking and hiking across undeveloped land. On August 14, 2010 a federal judge in Flagstaff, Arizona dismissed a citation issued by the Forest Service in the Red Rocks area near Sedona. The Forest Service was attempting to charge a standard amenity fee 7 miles from the closest toilet facility and 10 miles from the closest trash receptacle, both amenities required for that fee. The agency ignored, through the designation of a HIRA, the prohibitions on charging fees solely for parking and hiking. The judge found this use of a HIRA to be "contrary to the clear statutory language of the FLREA". The Forest Service is breaking the law in the Red Rocks and in many other areas of the country by charging fees that are not authorized, and indeed, are prohibited by statute. The solution is revised legislation with fees going to the U.S. Treasury, and appropriations from Congress directed to the National Forest districts with greater Congressional oversight.

The use of Mountain bikes on a trail is an accident waiting to happen. When a bike is zipping around a trail with no regard for anything but there "Need for Speed" hits a family and takes them out will the restrictions be placed on everyone. When I use a trail I expect that I can enjoy the sights without the fear of getting hit. Mountain bikes belong on a single track that is for bikes not people. It may limit bikes but public safety must come first. We do not allow people to target practice on trails, why should we introduce a new hazard on a trail. Also, the damage from erosion or worse yet, modification of the trail to attain more speed or a better angle for the bikes.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I participate in all forms of outdoor recreation, mountain biking being one of them. Mtn bikers are already allowed on plenty of trails. Our wilderness should NOT be open to mtn bikers. As stated already, mtn bikers can often be rude, they do not help with trail maintenance in many cases and in many cases they break the rules by riding where they are not allowed or building structures that are not allowed or both. The wilderness is set aside for historic uses, mtn biking is not a historic use. The poster admits mtn biking was in it's infancy in the 19980's and then later tries to imply mtn biking is a historic use?? Huh?? The poster stated any trail open to horses should be open to mtn bikes, absolutely not! Wilderness and other historic horse use trails should remain free of mtn bikes. Mtn bikes tear up the terrain on some soil types and steep areas. To a mtn biker this is great fun and too much of a temptation to miss even when it is not allowed. Dealing with the speeding bikers and ruined trails left behind is no fun for the other trail users or those of us who maintain them. Some of the trails I maintain are so trenched from mtn bike use on steep soft soils if myself and others did not volunteer and build water bars and rework the tread every year we would soon have the Grand Canyon out there. In all the years I have volunteered to maintain trails I have only worked alongside one mtn biker. The rest were all equestrians and hikers. There are plenty of trails out there open to mtn bikers already. You can even open more WITH PERMISSION and labor from the mtn bike community. But they should never be allowed in wilderness or on all trails. Some trails can not safely support mtn bike use and others like wilderness should remain free of all mechanical use! I support multi use trails where it is safe, I also support wilderness staying wild and trails designated for only those uses that are safe and sustainable. Sometimes one or more of the recreation community needs to be excluded from a trail and those rules should be respected and followed.

For many years, people have promoted and worked on a foot and bicycle trail linking several communities in our county. One obstacle to completion of the trail is residential property owners who fear intrusion by loud motorized vehicles, that is dirt bikes, ohvs, atvs. The property owners, who are used to seeing dirt bike tracks through the tank traps and vandalized "no motorized vehicles" signs, assume that motorized riders will use the trail, whatever the law says.

The people of Washington need schools and jobs more than we need green lawns and pavement. In a vacation there, I found the Mall an exciting environment, with thousands of people milling about among museums, the botanical garden, and lasting reminders of great men and military adventures. Better to spend more on the Smithsonian, for example, by replacing the polluter-funded climate change doubt promoting exhibits forced through by the last administration.

For the children, we need reliable security and sanitary services. We need rangers patrolling. We need cleaners. Our parks provide those services. The senators and representatives who subsidize billionaires through regressive taxes are not interested in spending more on health, let alone recreation, services for children.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Recreation is play. Management of play areas requires security and sanitary services, which require money to build infrastructure and pay staff. Do you think we have money to spend to expand opportunities for play when we are cutting food stamp benefits and refusing to support healthcare for our children, handicapped, and chronically ill?

Preservation of land FROM WHAT? From development into cemetery-like towns with chemical-dependent lawns, impervious surfaces, vehicles leaking oil, heavy metals, etc. that replace wetlands and forests that filter run-off before it reaches our drinking water.

To provide recreation services responsibly you must also provide reliable security and sanitary services. You must patrol. You must empty the trash, clean the outhouses, and evict squatters. There is more to it than putting up signs and cutting brush.

I have pictures of bike damage to both Pacific Crest Trail and Continental Divide Trail. The trails in places were designed for foot traffic. They've allowed horses, which also degrade the more delicate trail.

I am not trying to reopen a can of worms -- just make a point. You made a comment to \_\_\_\_\_ -- "The answer to both is enforcement, but we all know law enforcement agencies are stretched to the max." -- And no question I think (as most would) you are correct. My point is only to show a small part of your states Oregon's Parks and Recreation ATV Grant Program does to help resolve this problem you see. Year 2009 grants towards law enforcement programs -- 15 for \$1,725,505.00. Year 2010 grants towards law enforcement programs -- 14 for \$561,394.00. This is the program (ATV) that you are so adamantly against! It is a major factor in attempt to correct illegal OHV (camping, homeless and others) violations.

Personally I am not sure on the overall subject matter, there seems to be consistent differing opinions and studies all the time. \_\_\_ points to an older study by NASA on black carbon soot. Newer studies on glacier ice loss have come out pointing out results of "...find that the amount of ice lost to the seas is smaller than scientists previously thought." NASA studies in combination with other studies are now talking about "...shift of water mass" and "shifting Earth's surface around the globe..." rather than arctic ice cap melt. One finding in the latest study I looked at -- "The motion is only less than one millimeter a year, so it won't have any impact on life..." Black carbon soot may well be a problem and may need to be addressed. But newer studies may show be showing different results and make the \_\_\_\_\_'s statement of "The economic cost of melting the ice cap is going to be astounding..." incorrect.

\_\_\_\_\_ try starting with \_\_\_\_\_'s statement of "I keep saying that replanting trees that are logged is not geoengineering. Neither is painting rooftops. Those are local actions and I have never heard them be classified as geoengineering except by the completely uninformed." This came from his statement in his idea -- "ontrol carbon at the source, geoengineering is not an option" Scientist say different! But he is \_\_\_\_\_ and he is informed where scientists doing the work must not be!

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Re comment #5 Public Imposition tax (fee)! - Now there is a new one that everyone who wants to raise taxes and tax everything they can should be able to sink their teeth in too! Let's tax every airplane that is flown, every car that is driven, every person that walks -- OH Wait! We already do in some form or the other! Well - just throw more taxes on an overly taxed nation.

When \_\_\_\_\_ referred to jet trails in his idea I was under the assumption that it was in reference to what is commonly known as contrails. Contrails are basically water vapor. But in his last comment posted he now states that it is - "The tic tac toe is the acid rain is the climate change." There is a BIG difference from jet trails that are water vapor to now acid rain! When in fact the contrails are really beneficial in helping to reduce global warming and climate change. I know this only from another post where \_\_\_\_\_ listed a link for explanation on jet trails (contrails) - { [Link](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Contrail) } Under the section titled -- "Vapour trails or contrails and climate" it clearly states that -- "Therefore, the overall net effect of contrails is positive..." (they reflect incoming solar radiation (negative radiative forcing). If I understand this correctly now, jet trails are beneficial to nature in the long run and are not "... insulting to nature"!

\_\_\_\_\_ may like the sight of contrails and you feel the sights of them are insulting to nature. Just two difference of opinions on the visual aspects only. Look at the articles you have post to the beneficial aspects of the contrails for the facts not opinions. Just because you feel they are insulting -- "I don't think you (not) likin em makes em um um (not) good"!

You right that is my interpretation! But your statement in the idea is -- "Jet trails all over the sky and the SHAPES they create are insulting to nature" -- an interesting statement. Could you explain how the "shapes they create are insulting to nature". I am under the impression that shapes are determined by vision! Without vision how could someone (or nature) determine they are insulting?

The article you posted with your idea clearly states "vapour trails or contrails". If you read the start of the article you posted -- "Contrails (short for "condensation trails") or vapour trails are artificial clouds that are the visible trails of condensed water vapour made by the exhaust of aircraft engines. As the hot exhaust gases cool in the surrounding air they may precipitate a cloud of microscopic water droplets. If the air is cold enough, this trail will comprise tiny ice crystals.[1]" Your idea, as posted, is based on water vapour not chemical spraying. The "Contrails have a lasting effect on public lands." Statement you made is a positive effect not negative as stated by what you posted in the idea -- "Therefore, the overall net effect of contrails is positive" Your statement -- "You say they're harmless, but you have absolutely nothing to back that assumption up." Maybe you should read what you post prior to making a statement like that, as what you post and what you say in your comment are contradicting!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am sure every meteorologist does know about contrails -- never said they did not! The reason I posted the first part of the article you listed, that you may have obviously left out, was for those that may not have know what contrails were composed of. You stated "To the people voting this down..." they were making "...assumptions about contrails." You also stated that "You say they're harmless, but you have absolutely nothing to back that assumption up." Contrails are water vapor! The article you quoted basically states they are harmless and are "...overall net effect of contrails is positive...". But you have once again decided to (your statement) - "...belittling thousands of scientists worldwide who have facts that differ from your childlike observations." I seriously doubt anyone with knowledge would consider water vapor as harmful in this application. Your comment -- "You said "chemical spraying". That is not in any of my arguments." - yes the word "spraying" is not used within the text. In your comment # 5 you state "...chemicals dispersed along with jet fuel..." -- if they are not sprayed how are they dispersed with the jet fuel? Do they just magically combine! Spraying and dispersed -- either word I think would be synonymous for the explanation of how they would added for weather modification application -- which is not what this idea is about. This idea is about jet contrails -- water vapor. The problem you are having with so many of your thoughts, ideas, and comments is that the vast majority here are informed and don't buy into your rhetoric. You contradict yourself many times and I think you might consider trying to get more informed on your own subject matter.

Much of the threat of Global warming is caused by mankind's technical advancements. It would be narrow minded to think that mankind's technical advancement in the future may not ALSO PLAY A PART in correcting this same situation. Who has the ability to see what may developed in 10, 20, 30 years from now? But if scientist don't have the ability or are not allowed (by ideas such as this one) we would never know what may work and what would not work. Personal opinion I would agree that carbon reduction and total elimination would be best - but elimination is not going to happen any time soon. And perhaps even with elimination it might not be enough. Geoengineering techniques can range from painting roof tops white to who knows. Wouldn't it be simply amazing if all that was needed to be done is as simple as your best impression of Tom Sawyer and whitewashing your roof? But without the ability for scientist to properly research the various ideas we would never know! The author of this idea most always posts his ideas as this one - with fear mongering and deception. Using associations with Hitler, genocide, scandalous, downright evil and heinous crime is preposterous for this forum. I suggest you read the article and not \_\_\_'s personal opinion and make a decision prior to voting. If you don't wish to take the time to read, keep in mind just theses three statements from the article: "At this point, many scientists argue that it is worth scrutinizing different geoengineering techniques to see what could work and what will not." "If solar radiation management is a bad idea, the sooner we discover that the better," "Those who have been most skeptical about dire warming forecasts, however, are unlikely to embrace climate engineering."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your statement -- "I post an idea here it is for the people who initiated this list." So then the purpose of your post is to dish out rhetoric like Hitler, genocide, scandalous, downright evil and heinous crime to the people who initiated this list! Why! When your title of an Idea is "Control carbon at the source, GEOENGINEERING IS NOT AN OPTION" -- that pretty much says "NO" - no matter what, nothing would be allowed -- no matter if geoengineering is good or bad. White paint on the roofs or otherwise. If you really think that I would believe you on "You will be a part of an experiment without your permission..." with your lack of credibility and, as usual, no facts to back up your claims, then you are sadly mistaken. You have not displayed any facts about your statement of it being illegal and a rape either. Your statement of "They are talking about hundreds of billions of dollars of geoengineering." is directly disputed by the article you have linked -- it states "In fact, starting to investigate the feasibility of deliberately changing the climate won't require a massive allocation of federal dollars...". That's where this program is at -- the feasibility stage -- what will work -- what will not work. If ideas like yours were widely accepted we would never know what might have made the planet a better place, what might have been useful in turning global warming around. There is no "experiment without your permission", there is no "deadly consequences for you and your family", there is no "ruin the great outdoors so no one can ever enjoy it ever again.", there is no "slow death of millions of people" and there is no "extinction of species on a massive scale" going on -- AT ALL. Seems like there is just \_\_\_\_\_ over reacting for votes!

By definition Geoengineering : The modern concept of geoengineering (or climate engineering) is usually taken to mean proposals to deliberately manipulate the Earth's climate to counteract the effects of global warming from greenhouse gas emissions. That could mean proposals as simple as painting roof tops white, or that the facts of an article posted by you that jet contrails have a positive effect of combating global warming. Geoengineering is not doom and gloom. One article states --"To date, no large-scale geoengineering projects have been undertaken. Some limited tree planting and cool roof projects are already underway..." Yea! Tree planting and cool roof project will lead directly to your point of "...heinous crime against humanity and nature that will cause the slow death of millions of people and the extinction of species on a massive scale." Get a grip!

A well educated man I think would say -- we just don't know! Without studies and the ability to look at all possibilities how could we very know! That does not mean to go forward with just any hair brained idea. Studies and EIS are needed and not the idea that no geoengineering should be looked at all. Unless you have a crystal ball that can look into the future you can't even have a clue as to what might and might not work. The simplest study such as reforestation of the Amazon area to counter the over logging might help -- that is geoengineering! Are you saying we should not look at the aspects of reforestation and the positive and maybe negative effects it might have? You made a statement to me in another post "...quit belittling thousands of scientists worldwide who have facts that differ from your childlike observations." That statement sounds more and more like it should be direct towards yourself.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is a hard call for me. On one hand I feel strongly that the Forest, parks and all belong to everyone and we subsidize them with our tax dollars. Yet I see the need for more localized funding to support the local effort with improvements and maintenance. I have paid for years the "Adventure Pass" that the Forest Service sell to access several areas in many of the Southern California Forest areas. This pass has also often been controversial. But it allows for those of us that use and access these areas, and the forest in general, more often the opportunity support what we use. I personally access the areas way more often than the average person and don't mind paying the additional fees -- but that does not make it correct for everyone or for that matter legal if it is not.

As usual you Sky Is Falling! 1) "the sky is becoming permanently brown throughout the northern hemisphere." That is, as usual, very inclusive and not correct. I am looking at perfect blue sky right now. Permanent its not! 2) "almost all of the land is being used by people" -- You are kidding right? Again to inclusive and not correct. 3) "the population density is increasing in all areas that are not owned by the government." Yup! too inclusive -- when was the last time you drove by a farm or a ranch? Density of zero is not increasing. 4) "most of the USA is deforested for farms, cities, roads." Then we have no forest at all is what you are saying? Think again. 5) "wilderness areas look remarkably beautiful even from 30,000 feet." -- Yes they do along with all of the non Designated Wilderness areas! Wait I thought you said the sky is PERMANENTLY brown -- so which is it -- brown is beautiful -- wilderness is beautiful and you can see it because it is not all brown?

Ah, there you go - just reading into what I say without even a clue as to what I said. Even in my last comment I stated - "It does not take a satellite photo to realize we have air pollution, the overcrowding of areas, high demands on our natural resources, etc. etc.". I am not a "doom and gloom" kind of a person. Your own little world must be very sad - try opening your eyes and realize that it is not all doom and gloom. Realize that there are A LOT of environmental, habitat, etc. etc problems out there that need to corrected. But some progress has been made and a lot more needs to be done. Be constructive and don't insult peoples intelligent by telling them things like THE SKY IS PERMANITLY BROWN. If you have facts that it is permanent that's one thing and if you don't - statements like that just reinforces Chicken Little - The Sky Is Falling. Your little "hunky-dory" story just displays your lack of facts and reality.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

It is so nice to see that I am judged by someone as pompous as yourself! I am a frontier type personality and there is nothing wrong with that. Just because I may feel an idea is too inclusive does not mean I think "...resources are infinite and inexhaustible." And nowhere did I even come close to infer we should "...error or foolish wastefulness, selfishness and greed and a grand scale." Don't read into something that you obviously don't have a clue of on my intention, it only makes you look like an idiot! There is nothing wrong to put tight restrictions in areas to prevent development that could be environmentally disastrous. But unless you are psychic and have a crystal ball there is no way to know what developments, new technology, resources that may totally unknown to mankind now that will be developed in the future. If you think we are all knowing now (well - by your comments of me you must think you are) you are a fool. Your "...foolish wastefulness, selfishness and greed and a grand scale..." fits you to tee in that you want it all locked up with no hope to the future. If \_\_\_\_\_ had his way he would eliminate certain types of people (overweight) and it looks like you fit the same mold as well - just write off the 6.8 billion people by taking away opportunities to correct what is wrong now. Narrow minded and short sided is what that is. Mankind is always moving forward and we are starting to move more on the right track to improve this planet and there should be responsible, environmental sound ways developed to keep going forward. Both you and \_\_\_\_\_ demonstrate best your comment of "leave our childish ways behind, grow up and face reality"

The only person hung up on specific words is you! And specifically using words that are incorrect and flat out wrong only to suit your misleading and incorrect statements. The only reason you do this is to misrepresent and flat out lie! The program is no more special (not at all) than any other fuel taxes that are collected and used for other specified uses. You know in the past they were eligible for return back to the person that paid the taxes - now they are put to better uses for ALL of the public. In the case of the RTP program is "... to help the States provide and maintain recreational trails for both motorized and nonmotorized recreational trail use. The program provides funds for all kinds of recreational trail uses, such as pedestrian uses (hiking, running, wheelchair use), bicycling, in-line skating, equestrian use, cross-country skiing, snowmobiling, off-road motorcycling, all-terrain vehicle riding, four-wheel driving, or using other off-road motorized vehicles." - Federal Highway Administration. Your statement - "The worker gets no special fund from the government for the gas tax he spends..." he gets the exact same fund with a different allocation. THERE IS NO SPECIAL FUND!!!! Motorfuel tax is motorfuel tax with different allocations - it is all the same and put to uses from maintenance, bridges, highways, walking, skating, equestrian, OHV ect, ect.! No difference than the government funding other projects in National Parks, forest, ect. ect with other tax revenues! Everyone benefits!

Bristol Bay. Bristol Bay has to be protected from the Pebble Mine being planned to be built there. The mine would create huge amounts of toxic waste, to be held back by earthen dams, but the area is frequented by earthquakes, so the dams are likely to fail, killing the area's salmon, bears, wolves and forests. Its native people should also be protected. The region should also be carefully managed, so that it is protected from poachers and loggers.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Being productive does not include making accusations and being nasty to one another. While folks are speaking from their own experiences and or beliefs, it does no good in this forum to venture from the point. History has shown that NO ONE is supported and trails don't happen when the name calling and fighting are louder than the reality of each given situation. We all have our own perception of course but this forum did not ask you to attack one another. Here is what is has asked.

- Challenges - What obstacles exist to achieving your goals for conservation, recreation, or reconnecting people to the outdoors? Time, money and other resources are the biggest challenges. We have space and trails but getting access to most is costly in so many ways.
- What Works - Please share your thoughts and ideas on effective strategies for conservation, recreation and reconnecting people to the outdoors. Working together for the common goal and taking into consideration every appropriate user group for each area and trail.
- Federal Government Role - How can the federal government be a more effective partner in helping to achieve conservation, recreation or reconnecting people to the outdoors? Cut the chit and move on appropriate access.
- Tools - What additional tools and resources would help your efforts be even more successful? This is an ever work in progress! We'll never make progress unless we get to work and stop the fighting.

I thought this was for comments on Cattle grazing and ranching. I am a livestock owner and I completely oppose cattle grazing on public lands. I own cattle--they are hard on the land--on public lands they compete with native species. Also, livestock owners fence property and fence off water from other species. If any cattle are allowed at all (this applies to sheep too) it should be numbers based on solid research AFTER taking into account the needs of native animals, including mustangs and burros. There should be NO fencing and no private ownership of water on public lands. The exception for fencing could be to keep all animals off busy roads.

As a rancher using public lands instead of your own privately owned land, you need to take a complete back seat to all other species on the land, including mustangs and burros. You should not be allowed to graze any higher number of animals than that which would have NO impact on existing species and you should not be fencing off water from those native animals or fencing off available range. Many ranchers acknowledge their "guest" status and comply with these goal. Many don't. As a public land owner, your cattle are not my responsibility. The native species are. I have cattle myself and graze them on my privately owned land. Even there, I am subject to endangered species law. On public land, you should be even more so. My personal preference would be for all domestic animals to be removed from public land except for short term recreational use.

I strongly agree with this idea. Besides the destruction of riparian habitat from dewatering the springs, thousands of birds drown each year as they try to drink from the cattle troughs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

re "America's National Wildlife Refuge System is our only federal conservation land system devoted primarily to wildlife, plants and their habitats. Its status remains an unfortunate artifact of history ... Any such land conservation system, created today and containing as it does 150 million acres with astounding reach and diversity, would automatically be established as a separate, stand-alone federal agency"..." it needs to be at the peak of its capabilities" The Gov mis manages too much land that fails to maximize public access to OUR living natural resources in the public trust, including free roaming wild horses and burros. They are aboriginal by fossil evidence, re introduce in the 1500s, and a historic wild life heritage by Congressional Act of 1971. There are between 16-27,000 left on the western ranges which constitutes less than one percent of all grazing/browsing wild life and livestock . Habitat critical and necessary for genetic health herd has been diminished to the point that distinct population segments are extinct on Our historic landscapes. Herd areas that remain contain small herds that are threatened and endangered by loss of critical habitat. Unfortunately these icons of Western Settlement, supposedly protected under the Public Trust Doctrine, are non gratis on public lands in the wild life and multiple use communities. Americans that experience their living resources now are most likely to conserve them for every generation.

After many years of riding in California parks, I can say from experience, that bikes on the trails are not safe. I ride, and used to hike, and cannot count the number of times bikes have come out of nowhere and collided with hikers and horses. A friend of mine was riding one horse and leading another, when a mountain biker ran right into the horse being led. It spooked and the rider fell off the horse she was riding and landed on her back on the trail. The bike rider looked at the scene, and then continued riding down the trail. After yelling at the biker, he finally came back to the woman who had fallen. She had to tell him to call 911, which he reluctantly did. She had broken bones and was rescued from the scene and hospitalized. The level of awareness of their own impact, seems to evade those on bikes. Once in a while, I encounter a courteous bike rider. All of them either ride horses, or have family members that do. The vast majority of bike riders are there for the thrill of going down hill as fast as possible, because it is exciting. Taking in nature does not seem to be part of the agenda. Parks are no place for thrill seeking bicycle riders. Possibly ski trails could be opened to them in the off season. There is better visibility on them, and no hikers or horses. Alternatively, bikers could have their own designated trails. This would be suitable as a private enterprise, than a burden on the parks.

Mountain bikers travel much faster then hikers & horses on trails like the PCT. I do not feel it would be safe to have them on trails that are so popular with hikers, and horseback riders. They can come up very fast, and tend to spook horses and could cause serious injuries to riders.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My biggest issues is that some bike enthusiasts can be out of control and don't realize that a horse or person just might be right around the bend. This can lead to deadly conditions for both of the parties involved. Bicyclists need to remember that horses don't see right in front of them only to the side so, when a horse sees one thing from one eye the other object from the other side of there face the horse may not realize what the object is coming towards them and may run off or spook. Since horses have their own brain humans cannot always control what they are thinking or perceiving since they do have a brain. Not all bike people are bad and most are curious but it's the few that don't respect other people and their animals that spoil it for everyone else.

Throughout America there are areas of great beauty, as well as areas that were once legendary for beauty which are now degraded by humans--humans searching for wealth and comfort, humans not thinking any generations ahead, but only of our own selves. When we have a place of such pristine beauty as Bristol Bay we must deflect disastrous encroachments such as Pebble Mine. The Mine will have a deleterious impact on the Bay's clear waters and wildlife, as well as tribal ways of life. And it is not just Bristol Bay that is in danger; the federal government should require more stringent control of all use of large-scale metallic sulfide mining, working with local government to strengthen regulation of development and impacts on wildlife and wetlands wherever such national treasures occur. This is beauty that will never, once sullied, return. We must stop robbing future generations of their rightful heritage.

As I read the comments posted here, I think it's fairly obvious that the criticisms posted by the equestrians are generally nothing more than anecdotal assertions and opinions with no evidentiary back-up (for example that bicyclists ride too fast, "one slid under my horse", or that bicyclists don't participate in trail maintenance - where is your survey evidence or study results in support of any of this?). By contrast, the points made by bicyclists are true by definition or simply incontrovertible (for example, that bicycles are propelled by human muscle power and can't go more than 3-4 mph in soft dirt or uphill; and equestrian use of trails leaves tremendous amounts of excrement on the trails, attracting biting flies which all seriously interfere with trail use by those on foot). It is simply undeniable that equestrian use places tremendous demands upon trails - many times more demand and wear than hiking, running and biking \*combined\*, and leaves behind "externalities" that equestrians don't carry "pooper scoopers" to clean up. The non-equestrians have \*a lot\* more to complain about concerning equestrian use of these trails than the converse. The fact is that bicyclists greatly outnumber equestrians, and therefore statistically they greatly outnumber equestrians both in (1) promoting the existence and expansion of \*any\* shared use trails, and (2) their efforts to clean and maintain them. Majority rules in this country. But most of us who have worked very hard to promote the existence of these trails have been \*inclusive\* in our efforts and have worked in support of "shared use" trails for hikers, runners, bicyclists and equestrians. To our way of thinking, the more constituencies in support of non-motorized use trails, the stronger our coalition. For equestrians to "turn" on the rest of the users and argue that bicyclists (or hikers or runners) should be barred from using these trails makes about as much sense as taking a pick-ax and digging a hole in the center of your own wooden lifeboat 1,500 miles out to sea. In short, it makes no sense at all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Gee, I had not previously been an advocate for banning equestrian use of trails, but the intolerant, selfish comments I've read here posted by those favoring only equestrian and foot use of these trails makes me want to oppose and protest equestrian use at every chance I ever get in the future. The horse poop on these trails and the noxious insects that attracts ought to be sufficient reason alone. There are some pretty obnoxious and rude postings here by those favoring equestrian use and opposing bicyclists. My touring bike won't go on these dirt trails, so I've got no dog in this hunt. But I will certainly remember the rude and arrogant comments I've read here. I guess equestrians don't care about anyone perceiving them negatively. They don't care about their PR image; well, they'll reap what they sow.

I am a volunteer "C" certified buckler and faller with chainsaws and crosscut saws, and am welcomed in anyplace in California, park or forest. The sawyer is the final decision-maker in what is cut, and are trained to do so. The decision to cut is for safety, not for aesthetics. Too much work to bother with that! It should be said that all the agencies, just in the last year, have all agreed upon a single saw course and curriculum, taught across all agencies, for certification, employee or volunteer. This is now implemented, and should make things easier. In my experience, VERY few volunteers are experienced in working with saws IN THE FOREST ENVIRONMENT, which is markedly different than your backyard! The log you are working on is probably not the one that is going to kill you.

I have grave concerns with this proposal. I am a volunteer "C" certified buckler and faller, with both crosscut and chainsaws. When I'm out on a crew with other volunteers, I am often astonished and horrified by what I see. Astonishingly unsafe acts, that put a lot of people at risk. Most common, people go to work under a tree that is about to drop a ton of limb right on top of them. No situational awareness. It AIN'T your backyard! Particularly with chainsaws, things happen.....FAST. You better have it all thought out ahead of time, because you won't have time to figure it out when the log starts to roll towards you! The FIRST priority HAS to be safety. Once accident can shut a volunteer saw program down, can deplete the Ranger District's budget (the payment for medical injuries is not paid by some insurance, but by the budget of the agency. If you have a \$100k medical expense, and the district's budget is \$300k, you've used up 1/3 of the budget, and they'll be laying people off) There are some that may be willing to work without insurance coverage, but I'm not one of them! Some insurance policies will not cover volunteer work of this type (often consider worker's comp)---you might want to check your own.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Wilderness Act states: PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN USES (c) Except as specifically provided for in this Act, and subject to existing private rights, there shall be no commercial enterprise and no permanent road within any wilderness area designated by this Act and, except as necessary to meet minimum requirements for the administration of the area for the purpose of this Act (including measures required in emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the area), there shall be no temporary road, no use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment or motorboats, no landing of aircraft, no other form of mechanical transport, and no structure or installation within any such area. There is nothing prohibiting explosives in the provisions, or anything that would imply explosives. I fear when people start citing unstated "spirits" of something. I could see someone trying to bend the provision having to do with no permanent structures or presence of humans being morphed into "no humans". One of the big uses of explosives is the removal of extremely dangerous hazzard trees, that cannot be safely removed by sawing. This saves lives, being a MUCH safer technique of removal.

I do suppose this was meant to be funny and I took it that way. But this idea is far from ridiculous. Let us look at some of the issues commenter s have brought up such as trail degradation and erosion. You have to be really ignorant to believe a 200 pound bike and rider with rubber tires will do more damage to trails than a rider and a 1200 pound horse wearing steel shoes. Think about it - Would you rather have that horse step on your foot or would you rather have a bicycle roll over it? What is truly ridiculous is that they (whoever they is) actually entertained the idea of not allowing wheelbarrows for trail maintenance. These hikers who want to exclude everyone else from the trails are just selfish.

In my opinion bicycle and hiking trails are already getting way too high a percentage of the funding of the Recreational Trails Program. The money that funds this program is taxes paid on gasoline. Taxes were placed on gasoline to fund the building and upkeep of public roads. Dirt bikes, atvs, boats, and snowmobiles have to pay those taxes even though they aren't allowed on public roads. The Recreational Trails Program was set up as a way to give back something to those who were paying for something they couldn't use. Hikers and most bicyclists do not use any gasoline for their sport hence they do not pay anything into the fund. I'm not against bike or hiking trails but you can legally bike or hike almost anywhere. Here in the county where I live there is thousands of miles of public access for bicycles and hikers but not one mile for motorized recreation. In fact I have to travel 75 miles to get to the nearest public cite that allows (for a usage fee) motorized recreation. Doesn't seem fair does it?

I have always found the Fee Demo program to be offensive. Many generations have contributed to the creation and preservation of our national lands. Access to these lands should be freely available to all Americans. This land is our land.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am surprised that at my old age I am still surprised at all. What I mean is how narrow minded can people be? The conservationist community, the OHV community, the "XYZ" community can all have what they want if we all band together and build our requirements list of how we can all access OUR SOVERIGN RIGHT TO BE ON OUR COUNTRY'S LAND and preserve the interests of all. How hard is this? We can all have access and preserve the interests of the land, wildlife and the citizens. Anyone who feels there is only one absolute option is simply not using that space between the ears. Don't count on the Government people. If you like what you see with public housing, balanced budget, jet setting officials living in one state and commuting via private jet (on our nickel) to DC to work, then let's let the Gov. give more of what we already have.

I will be happy to respond to #2 above on \_\_\_\_\_'s behalf. The case he refers to is U.S vs Smith. It was recently decided in favor of Mr. Smith and against the U.S. Forest Service in federal court in Flagstaff Arizona. You can find a summary of the case and a link to all of the legal filings and the court's decision under Court Cases at the website of the Western Slope No Fee Coalition, [www.WesternSlopeNoFee.org](http://westernslopenofee.org). Here is a direct link to the relevant web page { <a href="http://westernslopenofee.org/index2.php?display=yes&pageid=33" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } The Forest Service has a terrible and longstanding problem with fiscal mismanagement, and they can be very creative about how they interpret the law. In fact "absurd" is the adjective the Flagstaff judge used. To save you the trouble of asking, you can find documentation about the fiscal mismanagement statement I just made at the GAO's website, [www.gao.gov](http://www.gao.gov). Type GAO-09-443t into the search box for the GAO's latest report on the topic, of many.

(#11) Had I supplied a "summary" of US vs Smith, you would no doubt have accused me of injecting my own bias into it. Hence I provided a link to the source documents so you could draw your own conclusions. Yes, there is a haystack of them, which goes to show how much time and effort Mr. Smith had to put into his defense, and how much taxpayer money was spent by the Dept of Justice trying to convict him. I salute you for wading through it all. The sentence you quote is an important one. \_\_\_\_\_ never claimed that there are no locations within the Red Rock HIRA where it would be illegal to charge a fee. Indeed, he supplied the court with a map showing all the sites that meet the legal requirements. Had he been ticketed at one of those sites, he would have paid the fine. However, he would not have ever received such a ticket, because he is a law-abiding citizen. All he asked is that the Forest Service be a law-abiding federal agency. Seems reasonable to me. Since the decision was rendered, the Coconino National Forest has announced that they will continue business as usual in the Red Rock Pass HIRA. I find that highly disrespectful of the judicial system. If they want to fight this battle one at a time, that is going to be very costly. But of course they don't pay their legal bills. You do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In many cases, it's not even as straightforward as "get ticketed, go to court." The Forest Service frequently uses a device called a Notice of Noncompliance (NNC), which was recently renamed a Notice of Required Fee (NRF). The renaming came about because the NNC looked too much like a ticket - never mind that the new NRF still looks just like a ticket. A NNC/NRF is not a ticket, and you can't challenge it in court. It's sort of a warning, but unlike a warning for speeding for example, you are still expected to pay the "fine," i.e. mail in your fee after the fact. In southern California the Forest Service contracts with a private company (Kinsail Corporation) that operates a website where you can "resolve" NNC/NRFs online. Whether Kinsail's contract is a percentage of the gross or fixed price is unknown, but you can bet they are not providing the service for free. You cannot plead Not Guilty to Kinsail, and whatever they are charging for the service, none of that gets to the ground on a National Forest. { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r5/sanbernardino/ap/nnc.shtml" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } And that brings up yet another example of Forest Service numbers that just don't make sense. According to a Forest Service memo filed with the Colorado District Court, the collection rate on NNC/NRFs is 72%. In FY2008, according to the memo, that amounted to \$120,000. If an average fee is (conservatively) \$5, then about 24,000 people "resolved" their NNC, and there were about 33,000 total NNC/NRFs issued. Yet the same memo says that southern California forests write 40,000 NNC/NRFs a year. If 72% of those 40,000 sent in their \$5 Adventure Pass fee after receiving a NNC/NRF, then there should have been about \$144,000 just in southern California alone. Yet the Forest Service took in only \$120,000 nationwide? The memo says, "NNCs are a non-enforcement compliance tool that provides visitors who have neglected to pay a required recreation fee the opportunity to pay without law enforcement action" and describes them as "a tool that is neither a Warning Notice nor a Violation Notice to encourage recreation fee compliance." Tony Soprano would certainly recognize this system, including the missing dough.

Here's an idea to make paying fees really really simple: collect them on April 15 as part of our taxes! Oh wait, we used to do it that way and then \_\_\_\_\_ led the effort to start nickel and diming us to pay a la carte for every forest trail and picnic table. The idea was that the fees would stay at the site where you paid them. Oh, but that became complicated so we got regional and then national passes, and then interagency passes, and then regional interagency passes, and now you have to navigate some pretty complicated websites just to figure out who and where to pay for the privilege of taking a walk in the woods without getting a federal ticket. And none of those pass vendors have any idea what specific sites you visit so there is no way to tie what you paid to the facilities you used. Thanks \_\_\_\_\_ you took a system that was fair and equitable to all and worked well for over 30 years and gave us the cluster we're dealing with now. You have a lot of nerve to presume to tell us how to fix what you broke.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Whoa \_\_\_\_\_ you need to get out of the office more. In southern California, Washington, Oregon, New Hampshire it's not possible to park your car at a trailhead and take a hike without risking a federal misdemeanor if there's no pass displayed on your dashboard. Can't drive to the top of Mt Lemmon or Mt Evans without paying - or at least you can't stop, get out, and take a walk or enjoy the view. Mirror Lake Scenic Byway, American Fork Canyon, Sandia Crest - pay up or stay out. Tonto National Forest? \$95 bucks for an annual pass. Wilderness areas with by law no developed amenities? You'd think at least those would be free. But try Aravaipa Canyon, Paria Canyon, Desolation Wilderness, Gunnison Gorge, many others, and they are making a play for Cloud Peak and Sangre de Cristo. I suggest you stop reading what the law says and go out and see how it's being implemented on the ground. A federal judge in Flagstaff just found the Coconino National Forest in gross violation for charging a fee in the entire 160,000 acre Red Rock Pass area around Sedona - developed facilities and backcountry alike. The decision is a glimmer of hope that we might finally regain access to our own land without being double taxed, but your friends at the Forest Service are probably going to appeal it. Why? Because fee retention, which you love so much, has made them greedy. They have lost sight of their role as public servants and now think of themselves as entrepreneurs, using our public lands as their working capital. It was the worst idea you ever had. If it's facts you want you'll find plenty more at our website.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

\_\_\_\_\_, in congressional testimony you gave on February 26, 1998 you said: "Recreation fees on public lands were one of the issues which prompted the creation of the American Recreation Coalition [your organization] in 1979." Can you explain that? Why should a lobbyist for commercial recreation interests find it so important that legislation be enacted to require the Forest Service and BLM to charge people simply for hiking, biking and horseback riding upon their public lands? At the same hearing, you said, "And we are proud to say the American Recreation Coalition and the Recreation Roundtable - a related group of recreation-industry CEO's - have invested heavily in staff and member time in helping the federal agencies covered by the fee demonstration program with project-level and national support and advice on sound fee programs. We have arranged for top marketing and communications executives from Disney, REI and other companies to work with the Enterprise Forest fee team in the design and implementation of that project; we have assisted more than a dozen additional Forest Service fee sites with specific communications efforts, enabling them to reach the general public and likely visitors with fee program information prior to arrival." \_\_\_\_\_, can you explain why you think it's a good idea for public land management to be designed by Disney and REI? Under Fee Demo, the Enterprise Forest (Adventure Pass) program imposed entrance fees to four entire National Forests in southern California. Fee Demo also brought us the Northwest Forest Pass, which locks up almost every trailhead in Washington and Oregon behind tollgates, and the White Mountain Recreation Pass, required for all parking on National Forest land in New Hampshire. I guess back in 1998 when these were still "demo" programs, you thought that by now the public would be skipping happily up to the tollgates, thrilled to have their automated pass electronically scanned so that they can get access to a little fresh air and scenery. You mentioned then that the Adventure Pass was resulting in 10,000 notices of non-compliance a year. Today, the Adventure Pass forests write 40,000 notices of non-compliance a year and the Tonto National Forest writes 9,000. The US Attorney for eastern Washington is refusing to prosecute Northwest Forest Pass violation notices because that program is so far out of compliance with federal law, and a federal judge in Arizona has thrown the Red Rock Pass out the window. The fee programs at Mt Lemmon and Mt Evans are headed for the 9th and 10th Circuit Courts of Appeal. I believe you have underestimated the extent to which Americans will fight for access to their public lands. In 1998 you asked Congress for "a prohibition on use of the [fee] authority to replace, disrupt or jeopardize the provision of public recreation services on federal lands by permittees and concessioners." Earlier this year, when the constituency for which you lobby - private concessionaires - tried to cancel the lifetime benefits that Congress has promised senior and disabled campers since 1965, you backed the concessionaires. Your agenda is to facilitate making private profit from our public lands, not getting more Americans outdoors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For most Americans, our public lands ARE an emotional issue. Labeling other people's emotions "ridiculous" confirms my opinion, Derrick, that your approach to public lands is solely based on a cool analytical assessment of their profit potential. That is the heart of where you and I disconnect. Glad to hear that you only support fees for use of developed sites. If the FLREA were being followed according to its plain language that would be the case. Instead, Forest Service and BLM are charging for backcountry access, including designated Wilderness, parking, entrance, and just "walking in the woods." To get an idea how widespread backcountry access fees are, check out the interactive map at [www.WesternSlopeNoFee.org](http://www.WesternSlopeNoFee.org). ARC was created to promote the idea that the Forest Service should be marketing outdoor recreation as a consumer product. Francis Pandolfi, former Chairman of your Recreation Roundtable who moved to the Forest Service as Chief Operating Officer, wrote: "For example, a product or brand could be defined as 'Hiking,' 'Fishing,' 'Camping,' 'Skiing,' and other activities. Thinking of outdoor recreation activities as products or brands, of course, suggests applying the principles of sound, private-sector marketing as an approach for meeting recreation demands and providing satisfying outdoor recreation products and services." Americans are surrounded day in and day out by marketing, advertising, and "branding." We go to the outdoors to escape that, not for more of the same. As far as fee retention by the public lands agencies without congressional oversight, that is just another tax. Why should we have to open our wallets, again, when we already support the public lands agencies through our taxes? Do you think that we should have to make up in direct cash what the agencies squander in tax revenue? That's the definition of "double tax." In 1998 you testified to Congress regarding the Forest Service, "It appears that 50 percent or less of the funds appropriated by Congress actually reach the forest district level," and, "We find that a substantially higher portion of congressional appropriations for recreation appear to be vanishing before hitting the ground today than ever before. Our attempts to investigate don't give us a clear picture as to where that money is going." Elsewhere in this online forum you said "Lucky if \$1 in \$3 hits the ground." The GAO agrees. They testified in 2009, "the agency has not always been able to provide Congress and the public with a clear understanding of what its 30,000 employees accomplish with the approximately \$5 billion the agency receives every year" and noted that the Forest Service's lack of fiscal accountability is a longstanding problem that has never been effectively addressed. (GAO-09-443t) Derrick, this is one thing that you, the GAO, and I do agree on. In fact I would put the administrative overhead at more like 80%. Yet you want Americans to throw good money after bad. What makes you think that an agency that cannot account for its appropriated funding can do any better job of accounting for a direct stream of cash revenue?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I know that you have great influence in Washington. You have lobbied in support of recreation fees since the earliest days of the Reagan administration. In 1998 you wrote the Secretary of Agriculture that Fee Demo was "the direct result of our [ARC's] efforts." The fees we now pay for recreational access to our National Forests and BLM public lands are your handiwork. You are also the man who can bring much-needed reform to these recreation fee programs. Wouldn't you agree that what we have now is a mess, both legally and from a public relations standpoint? If we can find some common ground, would you and your cohorts use your influence to make things better? In this forum you have said that you do not advocate recreation fees for use of public lands without significant services, but that a fee for a developed campsite or other developed or specialized facility is appropriate. I agree with that. Do you agree with me that it's equally important that the authority to charge fees for developed facilities must not be used as the justification for putting such facilities in places where dispersed facilities, rustic facilities - or no facilities at all - are working fine? The deeply flawed language in the FLREA is not doing the job of limiting fees to use of developed sites. Even if you haven't been out on the ground personally, from the posts on this forum it should be clear to you that people resent being charged for basic access, and that they are in fact being so charged. What are you and your industry colleagues telling the congressionals with whom you have influence today? What new ideas are you and the interest groups for whom you speak presenting to them for the next, new and improved, version of recreation fees? Is there a solution that will stop the war between the agencies and the public?

Defend our national resources for Americans, shut down Pebble Mine!. Pebble Mine must be shut down and blocked at any cost! Destruction of US lands, environment, wildlife, and natural resources cannot be given over to greedy foreign interests that will stop at nothing. BP, Shell, and the list goes on are all foreign business that have made false promises, created massive environmental disasters such as the Gulf, destroyed livelihoods for American citizens, caused billions in economic damages and continue to promote their own self serving interests. Now the Anglo American company wants to do the same with the Pebble mine. They cannot ever protect lands, waters, and wildlife that do not belong to them, nor will they! Generations of families have depended on that area for food, shelter, businesses and economic support. Now Anglo wants to erase all of that permanently with a massive destructive mine. Our government has an obligation to protect our citizens, our lands, our waters, and our wildlife from foreign invasion and that is what the Pebble mine represents. Invasion by British interests! The time is now to fight this problem before we have another "Gulf disaster" on our hands!

The whole Spotted Owl panic, and all the loggers who were hurt, some maimed for life-by radical, extreme enviros spiking trees--and it was another species of owl killing off the Spotted owl all along. In many cases, the locals do know what is best for the area THEY LIVE IN--someone who is a couple thousand miles away, and is getting all of their information from a few sources, and not taking ALL who use the lands into consideration is NOT always the best qualified person to make decisions on how to use an area of federal land. More control of federal lands needs to be given to the states.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Lack of access for hunters and fishermen. Provide better access for hunters and fishermen- there are places where groups buy up all the land that surrounds the forest service, or state forest, or BLM lands to prevent people from gaining access. Some states are working to solve this issue, but it needs to be done at the federal level in cases of forest service, or BLM lands where private property blocks access- due to group purchases of land. In W.Va. my relatives have some property that is surrounded by the Monongahela National forest- and they have to allow people to access the trails, and the National forest land, they can not block off access. There have never been any problems- it's a narrow trail on the edge of the property that we built so others could get through to the National forest lands, it is marked, and keeps people from wandering around the property. This costs the government no money, the forest service no money- it just allows people to get to the forest service land.

The Monongahela river has been a dumping ground for the coal industry for years, not just the mining, the "coke" that is made from coal and used in blast furnaces is made along the river too, and along the Tygart Valley river, and the West Fork river, which join near Fairmont W.Va. to form the Monongahela.

I agree 100% with the fact that the Bristol Bay area needs to be protected, and the Pebble Mine plan should be stopped. Several groups of people have been opposed to this plan for quite some time now, and more people need to get involved with the issue, or the mine may be allowed to proceed! This is one of, if not the most important spawning grounds for salmon in the entire world- the mine could destroy it forever. Off road vehicles are NOT allowed in National Parks. They are allowed on some BLM, and Forest Service lands, also on some state run recreation areas, No off road vehicles are permitted in the National Parks. I am voting your idea as promote, but please understand that off road vehicles, while not allowed in our National Parks, should continue to be allowed on BLM, Forest Service, and state recreation lands, the parks don't allow them, go there for quiet, otherwise, please respect the people who do use off road vehicles right to enjoy recreation as they see fit. Most Off road groups maintain their own trails, and help maintain BLM, and Forest Service trails too. They are not damaging the environment any more so than people who ride horses, or hike in backcountry areas that normally would get no foot traffic.

Access for Fishing. There is a need for more, and better access for those who want to fish the rivers and streams in our parks, on Forest Service lands, and in wilderness areas. Many places are surrounded by private land, and no one can get to the rivers and streams to fish, unless by water. There are many places, in many states, all across the country, where more streamside access is needed. How can we get children to enjoy the outdoors, and learn about aquatic life, if we don't have any way of getting them to the rivers and streams? This would not require a lot of money, or a lot of land, just a simple gravel road, and a parking area, so people can park their cars, and not have a 5 mile hike carrying fishing equipment with them, which is next to impossible to do when you are taking children fishing. This has nothing to do with people being too out of shape to hike, or any other health issues, just make it so we can get to the rivers and streams to fish, not everyone can afford a boat, or canoe. We just need a way to get somewhat close to the rivers and streams.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm not talking about a paved road, in most areas there are already dirt/gravel roads that could be used, with permission, and minor disruption to the land, how much would it hurt to dump some river gravel, or recycled concrete gravel on an existing dirt road, or driveway to an abandoned campsite? The state of W.Va. added some gravel parking areas along the roads to give fishermen better access to some of the rivers, and it did not create any problems. There are many areas in the Rockies where a simple parking area along a road would give access, no new major roads-just short, side of the road areas, so people can park somewhere while they fish.

You gave a typical extreme enviro view-this is about fishing access for CHILDREN-and you turn it into no roads-a gravel driveway length access road and a parking area is not going to hurt an eco system-PEOPLE live on the planet too. Not everything is an enviro issue-there will be new roads built-there will be new parking areas built-why not let people have access to the rivers and streams? Only those who hike in should get to use a resource? The resources are for ALL people-not some unspecified subset.

Access for Hunters. Many areas of Forest Service, National Forest lands, BLM, and state lands-where hunting is legal- have access blocked by the surrounding private landowners. There is a lot of public land that hunters can not get to because there is no nearby access. To get to some of these areas would take a multi day hike, or horseback ride, when there could be access points much, much closer. Our land in MT borders National Forest land where hunting is legal, and we let people park on our property, as long as they ask permission, and do not leave trash laying around. We have never has any problems with the people we allow to use our land as an access point. We still hear about the lack of access every year though. How hard can it be for the state game agencies, or the USFWS to get permission from a few landowners to let some people park on their property? Maybe charge a small fee? The little money collected could pay for some gravel and a trash can for a small parking area.

This idea has been brought up multiple times, at least 15 times-and has always been promoted, as it should be. Bristol Bay is the largest spawning area in the world for the salmon that return there each year. The gold extracted is not worth risking the future of the best salmon fishery in the world.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No, you need to use facts-wolves kill FAR more than 1% of livestock that is killed by predation, wolves have just about wiped out several elk herds, and are working on moose and other species-wolves are not endangered-if you want to use judge Molloys logic-there are tens of thousands in Alaska, which is part of the US, so they are not endangered-there are wolves in Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Carolina, and a few other states-so they are not endangered. The endless lawsuits brought by groups like "Defenders" (should say destroyers) of Wildlife, The Center for Biologic Diversity, The Nature Conservancy, and all the other extreme enviros do nothing for the wolves-they just keep a lot of lawyers employed, and spend the money donated to them by people who live in the cities, and have no real clue as to what goes on in the Northern Rockies. My family has had land in NW Montana since the 1800's, we hunt, we fish, we trap, some of us are guides/outfitters-soon to be were outfitters and guides-the wolves are wiping out the elk, they are killing cattle and sheep, they have killed two of my families horses, a mare and a foal, they are killing dogs, cats, and next it will be someones child who is attacked by wolves. Hunters have done, and still do far more for wildlife conservation than any enviro group ever has-we pay an extra 11% tax on firearms and ammunition, which goes to USFWS, and the state fish and game agencies, we pay for licenses, tags, and land use permits, all of which go to the state fish and game depts, all the enviros do is file an endless stream of lawsuits, or do like the Center for Biologic Diversity, and try to ban hunting by banning lead ammunition- Lead shot is already banned for waterfowl hunting, and not one study has shown lead from high power rifle ammunition to have an ill effect on humans, or wildlife-just the opposite-the studies showed zero effects. We hunt, our children hunt, it is legal to hunt, and we will not be stopped by a bunch of enviro nutcases who use false and misleading data, outright lies, half truths, and obfuscation to make us out to be bad people. Several states are now putting hunting rights amendments to their constitutions, due to the actions of the extreme enviros.

This mine is getting opposition from just about every group that has anything to do with the outdoors-the fishing and hunting groups have been fighting this mine since it was first proposed. Bristol Bay, and the drainage the salmon swim up to spawn could be destroyed for salmon if the mine is allowed to proceed.

"What do you not understand about the word "vote"? This is America" Is this forum how voting works in America? NO! This forum is dominated by extreme enviros, NOT a cross section of voters. They vote "promote" on only ideas which go along with their agenda, and "demote" on all other ideas. What gives one group of people the right to tell others how to live? How to spend their time in the outdoors? What gives one group the right to call for bans on OHV use? To try to close off even more areas to OHV use? I rarely even ride my dirt bike anymore-or use the 4-wheeler I own, I use the 4-wheeler sometimes to haul out an elk, or a big deer, that is a rare occurrence-I usually travel to the areas I hunt by horseback, then hike on foot from there to actually hunt. I just see all the hostility to ohv use on this site-and it is not fair to those who use ohv's.

More government land grabbing-NO thanks!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have experience in Parks and forests. Please do not let bikes in. They destroy wilderness.

This mine makes absolutely no sense. Bristol Bay is home to the LARGEST SALMON RUN IN THE WORLD! You can't live on gold (or other metals), as King Midas learned to his chagrin. People need food to eat, clean water to drink and clean air to breathe. People also need beautiful open spaces in order to thrive. I don't know how this mine even came under consideration. We need to take a really close look at how the federal government approves mines - what are the criteria? It sounds like important criteria like 'source of food', 'wilderness', 'native population', 'clean air and water', 'species diversity' were ignored or downplayed in this case. These criteria are not just some 'soft' treehugging concerns - they are the foundation of LIFE ITSELF (We NEED clean air, clean water, food, wilderness, diversity and respect for others). We literally will not survive if we keep ignoring these basics. I think our country has lost sight of the fundamentals as we kowtow to corporations and put money above all.

I agree as well. After living in Japan, Germany and Italy for a decade, I have finally returned to Montana. I don't hear the roaring of the traffic from dawn to dusk and dawn again. The stench of city living is far behind me, I wake up every morning with a smile on my face and my children are happy, but I have this terrible feeling that the way I live will be taken from me. They want to turn where I live into a National Monument. I will be forced to move back into the cities which I despise. I don't want my property rights taken from me for the benefit of wildlife. Wildlife IS existing right now... Humans are more important than wildlife. Can't we co-exist.

Bikes are destructive to trails. I have been hiking some trails for years and have noticed a lot of erosions to these trails because of the bikes. V-shaped grooves down the middle of the trail and increased water erosion because of it. Let the hiker only trails remain, there are not that many of them that are this way. I have run into bikers on the PCT, they know they are not supposed to be there and have been incredibly rude almost running over myself and dogs as they came blasting by. Mt Laguna section.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While I praise \_\_\_\_\_ for volunteering (and I've volunteered thousands of hours for a state park), I will point out that the point of it is to give of your time and talent to helping the agency, learn new skills, meet new people, and enjoy being out in the wildlands, typically without having to pay. The pass is a mere token of gratitude and not meant to be a quid pro quo. The spirit of helping out is the real reward. Volunteering is also supposed to enhance the amenities offered to the visitor (which could include better trails, less litter, someone to answer visitor questions, repair of facilities, etc.). If you insist that there should be fewer fees because you volunteer, then there could be a net loss in what the agency can actually provide. If you feel strongly about that, you should only volunteer in places that do not charge a fee. Effective volunteering for most tasks requires a significant amount of oversight and training, so requiring fewer hours could result in less effective volunteers. Having worked in a large volunteer program, I know it is not easy to find things to do for everyone who just shows up and wants to work a day or two. Litter picking will only employ so many volunteers, and even with such a seemingly simple task, there are potential problems which you may need to train for, e.g. disposal of hazardous waste (such as used condoms, hypodermic needles, and batteries), care around broken glass, steep terrain, potential for trampling rare plants while searching for litter, and in general, keeping the volunteer and the environment safe. Many projects that a staff member might be quite willing to delegate to a volunteer require a significant amount of time to complete, and may not be something that can be just left half done. So, while I have no problem with the agencies re-examining the minimum number of hours required for a pass to see if it can be lowered without impacting the effectiveness of volunteer programs, lowering it to a weekend or a week of work is way too little. Parks do have special volunteer days when they have projects lined up when they can supervise a large number of volunteers of varying abilities, and on such days, entrance fees for them are typically waived.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is sad to impugn an entire large agency full of many talented and conscientious people based on the actions of a few administrators one disagrees with. "Out of control, rogue agency"? Hardly. The Forest Service is a multiple use agency and as such has a lot of balls to juggle. One of the benefits of having recreational user fees which are retained in the area they are collected, is that this counterbalances other economic interests, such as logging, mining, and, to a lesser extent, hunting, that are not always compatible with hiking and backpacking. I support the basic concept of Forest Service fee collection in high use areas, while recognizing that any organization, public or private, is subject to administrative errors made by fallible humans. If you think they have misinterpreted the law, by all means, challenge them. But judges are fallible, too, and other judges may or may not agree with what was decided in \_\_\_\_\_'s case. Meanwhile, hyperbole does not help your cause, \_\_\_\_\_. The fee program was meant to address the highly variable and usually inadequate congressional appropriations that were allocated for National Forests in the past. The only realistic alternative I see that would help keep them properly funded but which would place the greater revenue burden on the actual users, would be to have a special federal tax on recreational equipment. This could be even more problematic than the system of collecting fees on site, because of the difficulty of defining what constitutes recreational equipment. When is a shoe a trail boot, for example? What kind of backpack is primarily recreational, versus used to carry books to school? How would you readily define tents used for camping, versus those used only in a backyard to screen a picnic table from bugs?

The Anti-wolf folks don't have any scientific legs to stand on. There is simply no way that a species that has lived in a region for millions of years can harm the natural ecosystem. If wolves were a problem for deer or elk herds there would be no deer or elk herd on the continent. There were a lot more deer and elk throughout the united states back when wolves present. Hunting, development, and other forms of environmental degradation are the biggest dangers to all of our wild species. I understand that people suffer some economic losses from wolf reintroduction and that should be addressed, but the idea that wolves are a problem for deer and elk herds is beyond foolish.

Standards for Non-point Source Pollution. Our public waters will not be clean until there are standards for non-point source pollution like there are for point source pollution. Voluntary-only practices for non-point sources like agriculture and urban lawns will not be sufficient to restore our public waters to swimmable and fishable conditions. Some practices, like appropriate fertilizer management could be required for Farm Bill commodity subsidy participation as well as through setting of enforceable standards.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I was born in Moab, Utah in 1965 and have remained here to watch some pretty amazing changes. No more. I'm against any more wilderness. I have many reasons to argue this but since most people on the other side think that \_\_\_\_\_ and his motel are better for the environment than \_\_\_\_\_ and his cows were, I don't see the point in trying to talk sense to them. 1000's of cars and showers and dinners cooked and dishes washed are better for the environment than \_\_\_\_\_ and the cows? FUCK ME!!! He's rich and he gives money to your groups which \_\_\_\_\_ didn't. That's the difference. Arguing anything that makes sense to someone like that is pointless. As I said I've seen a lot of amazing stuff over the years. I know what i'm talking about. NO MORE WILDERNESS. Enough is enough. Don't drive in and tell me I shouldn't have drove in. If we all got what we wanted, you people would go home.

Thanks to the personal efforts of President Roosevelt and other forward-thinking Americans over one-hundred years ago, today we're able to enjoy pieces of our national heritage in the vastly individual and highly unique National Parks sprinkled all across this blessed and beautiful nation. All Americans are, indeed, forever indebted to those other Americans who have helped to preserve precious pieces of this gorgeous nation for all -- American and visitor -- to enjoy. This imperative work must continue... However, the American Great Outdoors video states that now fully 80% of our U.S. population live in urban areas. That incredibly alarming statistic only makes it only more imperative that in this century present President Obama and other forward-thinking Americans continue this very vital work to ensure that National -- and indeed, even City, County and State -- Parks are available to all, as essential and vital components of the fabric of our every day lives... This means that every American, regardless of race, color, class or creed has an inalienable right -- and, yes, need -- to (and for) the full access of every available breath of fresh air, opportunity for physical exercise and every hint of beautiful nature needed for mental refreshment that's absent from the communities in which so very many of us presently live. As in the song, "America the Beautiful", the bounty of our beautiful spacious skies, amber waves of grain, purple mountain majesties and fruited plains belongs to each and every one of us, from sea to shining sea. One generation was blessed with the grace and foresight to have established the National Parks. Let this generation be the one blessed with the wisdom and determination to ensure that they are fully available to every one of us. { <a href="http://www.cyberhymnal.org/htm/o/b/obfsskis.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Mountain bikers should have places to go, but not in the wildernesses or the PCT. These trails were created for (and are built & maintained by) hikers and stock people, both historic users, so that they can enjoy the quiet & solitude of the areas. One can not have a relaxing and scenic hike or ride when worried about bikes screaming around corners and confronting us as we already have to deal with in non-wilderness areas. (#53) did a great job on the 'why nots' of bike use in some areas. They need their own designed, designated and maintained areas to ride or share the ORV trails and abandoned roads. They can help that user group get more trails and facilities that they desperately need. Unfortunately the bike user #'s are growing so fast that the good guys of the sport can't keep up with the education needs of the newbies. I either meet extremely gracious & helpful bikers or extremely rude ones, very few in between. This is a big problem that needs to be dealt with soon.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Establishing wildlife corridors is essential at all levels. At the community level wildlife corridors that are agreed upon and established would provide important educational opportunities and clarify smart growth boundaries. The same would be true at the national level, particularly with respect to how these overlap with utility corridors, transportation routes and the infrastructure network of human settlements.

I find it interesting that there is an underlying assumption that the land we live on is still considered only in the name of what it can provide for us now. As if we are masters of these complex ecosystems of which we do not fully understand. Perhaps there is benefit to having land that is not easily accessible by the convenience of modern ATVs. Perhaps there is benefit in having land preserved even if it will NEVER be seen by our grandchildren's children. I am thankful for this forum and know that this will bring us closer to a compromise. One of my largest concerns is about the protection and growth of "wilderness" areas. Why is there nearly as much concrete as there is designated wilderness area (approx. 2.5%) in this country? Should wilderness be protected from our use even if we can not objectify exactly what the short term benefit is, and is it possible to increase the percentage of wilderness areas or is that number inevitably going to decrease as it is slowly chiseled away at over the years? If we do see benefit in increasing our wilderness areas and giving back areas which have already been impacted, where will that land come from, and will it be accepted, as is a part of the wilderness policy, that motorized vehicle will no longer enter into them?

No doubt our nations natural resources are critical to not only protect but to use as well. It is also no doubt that our nations success is in large part due to the fact that we landed upon a continent of vast resources and that we were able to sanction them off for ourselves. Without the use of our resources we would not prosper as a people, and never would have. In fact many of us would not be here. However, where I believe your comments are perhaps short sighted is in the question of what it means to prosper as a people. As a nation we use, use, and use, and without a sustainable infrastructure that use creates waste. If we used less, or used efficiently, and invested in a more efficient infrastructure we would not need to worry about severely limiting our use of virgin resources. I wonder too if having a strong concern for "running out of wilderness" is perhaps the most rational path. Can privatization protect our nations "wild" resources? I have not yet seen a large corporation make a decision that in some way did not make them money. It is quickly becoming profitable for companies to invest in protecting natural resources, or at least appearing as if they are doing so, but in the end the for-profit companies will function in the best interest of the company, not the people as a whole. And who's to say what that interest will be. At this point it seems that the federal government, with all of its imperfections, has the means to protect our wilderness lands and natural resources for their long term use. The Feds also have the added benefit of answering, at least on the surface, to tax payers and voters. We have a great chance to let nature stay intact, without the destructive actions of people, as it continues to make this world the hospitable place it has been before our irresponsible use of its resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

SAFETY, SAFETY, SAFETY! Yes lets be safe on the trails. Most of the equestrians I know personally are embarrassed by those who cannot control their animal in public. If you cannot control your animal, keep it on private property. That is SAFETY! Just because you enjoy John Wayne movies does not give you the right to endanger others. Your horse is not some sacred exemption from personal responsibility! If a bike rider, hiker or equestrian endangers your "experience" then report them. Do not paint all others with the same brush or you may find yourself "painted into a corner of your own." Co-operation is the answer! You can slow a bike down by trail design or retrofit without disrupting other users.

Bicyclist can ride anywhere - horses can't ride on the roads or sidewalks and the two don't mix. There needs to be a place where people can quietly ride or hike without anything speeding by them. There are plenty of bike paths around the Los Angeles area. I can't ride my horse on the beach and I don't expect to see bicyclist on the hiking and riding trails. If the bicyclist want to enjoy the mountains they can do it on foot.

"As for the PCT, we've been riding it for years. You might as well make it legal." "I am pedaling along on a so called 'illegal' trail' ... 'aside from my supposedly not supposed to be here, what have I done to offend you?'" I will paraphrase \_\_\_\_ and ask you, Who is really the belligerent and unruly person in these stories? With this kind of obnoxious, self-righteous and illegal behavior, what makes anyone think that these mountain bikers, and others like them, will follow any restrictions on use (days, speeds, etc,) that may be put in place if the currently off limits trails and wilderness areas are opened to them? As it is now, if mountain bikers are on the PCT or in wilderness areas, they are illegal--no diversionary arguments about whether or not they were following any speed limits, staying on the trail, etc.

Mountain bikers want to see the forests and mountains where we ride protected in their natural state, with clean air and clean water. Bicycling draws young people to outdoor activities and improves their stewardship of public lands as adults. Bicycling is a sustainable, low-impact activity and a viable economic redevelopment option for many communities. Public lands do not belong to a small group of equestrians, but to all of us. The idea that horse on the trail are environmentally benign, while bikes "rip up the trail" is laughable. Almost every study done on soil lose from recreation shows that hiking and biking create pretty much the same effect and much less than equestrians.

I am sorry that you are so hateful. It must be difficult to live in such a state (I only glean this info by reading your angry comments all over this forum.) I was just speaking out of frustration. It seems as though this forum is getting so sidetracked by these OHV issues when there are so many other important and immediate issues to address. I have relatives that own OHV's and use them on their private property and they have a great time. I am all for that. Really, I am. But what I don't want is to have a solitary afternoon walk or a peaceful camp out with my kids disturbed by loud, and frankly, smelly OHV's encroaching on my peace and quiet. If you have private property to ride around in, God bless.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree and furthermore, all of the mountain climbers, hikers, etc. who require being "saved" at the taxpayers expense should have to reimburse the government. It costs a lot of money to go mountain climbing. People who are fool hardy and can afford it but can't do it should be made to pay. If you can't afford the rescue fees then know your limits!

I don't know . I teach high school in an affluent suburb and I was shocked that (at least 2 wks. after the BP spill) the majority of my students had no idea about the fact that it had happened! Some even went on to say that it wasn't going to effect them because we don't live anywhere near the Gulf! There is a lot of work to be done in educating today's youth and there is no time to lose! I guess you have more faith in our educational system than I do. I see so much apathy about this subject with the kids, but especially the educators I work with. It is really sad!

What idiots would want to vote against this!?! Children should be taught as much as they can about conservation and being good stewards to the land. It is imperative to the survival of future generations and certainly more necessary than a lot of the curriculum that is forced down the throats of students whether they want it or not!!

Wow! I didn't even know that that was the case! That is so wrong. As you said, it's a REFUGE! I want to expose my child to nature-- not firearms! It is so counter-intuitive?! The gun lobby is certainly well-funded.

Conservation. I think the Endangered Species Act is a wonderful tool enabling the conservation of species. The problem is that it doesn't protect the ECOSYSTEMS that these individual animals live in. It is impossible to save a specific animal if it doesn't have it's particular ecosystem to survive in. Also, I think all government entities need to work in conjunction with the species on the list. For example, the government has spent millions of dollars raising Black-Footed ferrets in captivity, preconditioning them for release, and then releasing them in the few remaining prairie dog colonies. On the other hand, another government entity is paying millions of dollars to poison prairie dog colonies. In fact, even persons who own private land are forced to poison any prairie dogs living on their property. This just doesn't make sense. They contradict one another and once again, this brings up the whole ecosystem that prairie dogs create. Not only are Black-Footed ferrets on the Endangered Species list, but so are Swift Foxes and Burrowing owls, which both also depend on these prairie dog colonies. The obvious solution is to stop poisoning Prairie Dog colonies and the animals that depend on them will no longer need to be on the Endangered Species list saving the government and people millions of dollars. I think the governments needs to create a new bureau dedicated solely to animal and ecosystem conservation. They need to hire more biologists and environmentalists who understand these complex systems to help manage our wildlife and public lands.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to start by stating that I am an avid trail runner and mountain biker. I have also been a park representative for a few local and state wilderness parks. This being said I have dealt with all of these issues many times. One thing that everyone has to understand is that these trails are here for all of us to use responsibly, no matter what your mode of transportation. Each group has rude people and very friendly, respectful people, that is just human nature. Both horses and bikes are controlled by humans. It's our responsibility to operate them with control and consideration of all trail users. There is no doubt that horses can be startled by bikes, runners, hikers, snakes etc. With this in mind we all need to be considerate when using trails in multi use areas. One of the main issues I have seen over the years is trail users not understanding or not knowing the trail rules or etiquette. As the economy has gone south and healthy living has become more popular, we have many more trail users than ever before. Rather than arguing about who can use what trail, maybe we should focus on educating people on responsible trail use. We all love the outdoors and there is no reason we shouldn't be able to work together to satisfy all users.

Complete Park and Trail Maps. Maps and Trail system maps and databases are not updated, ie. USDA's National Forest and Park maps do not include all trails in their publications which are distributed to the public. In a publically distributed, Mount Rogers National Recreation Area Trail Location Map. 18 trails are listed, and an additional four trails illustrated. Four trails and an access road are omitted. Sawmill Trail (4556), Buzzard Den Trail (4582), Wright Hollow Trail (4548) Feathercamp Ridge Trail (4550) and Forest Service Road FS287. Recommended Edit: The insertion of SR 731 and SR 605 roads on the map and showing more four trails, the Income Generating Consumers realizes there is more national park located on the north side of Iron Mtn. I'm sure there are 100's of similar maps out there which direct the consuming public away from private businesses which have been encouraged to start with the many economic development programs across rural America.

The name needs to be changed. When I heard the original name I pictured a gardner installing lawn and planting decorative shrubs...not natural landscapes...more as in landscaping a property after new construction. The name isn't self explanatory. 'National Conservation Lands' sounds like natural landscapes and doesn't bring to mind urban landscaping.

Wilderness trails should NOT be open to bicyclists...I have personally witness a mountain bike coming up behind a horse and rider on a blind corner and the result of the horse going off an edge and the rider seriously hurt. Horses hear the bicyclist, but the bicyclist are zooming along NOT seeing or hearing the horses around blind corners and on cliffs. HORSES AND BIKES ARE NOT A GOOD COMBINATION... There do need to be places for bicycle riders to ride, but not in the wilderness or on shared trails with equine!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Wilderness Act of 1964 defines wilderness as "an area where... man is a visitor and does not remain." Your idea concerning Wildlife Refuges and National Parks therefore goes hand in hand with the government's legal definition of what constitutes "wilderness." Many pass through the states that you and Mr. Harris mention, but do not pause to take in the land around them. A National Park with a well maintained camp ground would then afford visitors a place to appreciate the natural beauty of those states. And as you noted this would also stimulate the economy of those states. Most of these states' economies are solely based in agriculture (whether corn, potatoes, or otherwise) and many of the residents are living loan to loan. Since most of these states also have low population densities it would then not be hard to find areas that could be transformed into either Wildlife Refuges or National Parks. History has shown us time and again that the overgrazing of grass lands can lead to devastating consequences. The most extreme being the dust bowl of course, but that had a number of factors only one of which was the excessive grazing by sheep. Although it is unlikely that we will have a repetition of this tragic natural disaster, there are many other valid reasons for conserving, preserving, and revitalizing the lands in question. Sigurd Olson, writer of the essay "Why Wilderness," would argue that such parks and wilderness areas provide a necessary relief for many people from their everyday lives. But there are more persuasive arguments than that. For those who argue against wilderness conservation due to what geologist \_\_\_ might term "the cost" of "(a decreased) the quality of life" (Encounters with the Arch druid by John McPhee) for "present generations," simply look at the benefits hard working men and women of the Midwest would receive: greater tourism, greater economical diversity, and healthier land to name a few. One of the above alone would be enough to make it worthwhile for the government to look into the Great Plains States as locations for National Parks, Reserves, or Wildlife Refuges.

I am an avid hiker and an equestrian. Although most cyclists are polite and respectful the few that are NOT make it extremely dangerous for both foot and hoof traffic. I have been nearly knocked off my own feet by cyclists on the Sam Merrill Trail, The El Prieto Trail and even the Mount Wilson Toll Road in Altadena, California. I no longer feel very safe on my own feet, much less on horseback, on my own home trails. I have had to adjust my riding schedule to avoid the cyclists. Mornings on the trail are especially dangerous. I remember the days before the cyclists, when you could walk or ride a horse without fear, without having to constantly strain your ears to pick up the sound of a fast approaching bike. I think we should preserve the last safe places that are left for us.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For those of us that spend a significant portion of our time enjoying our public lands west of the Mississippi, the story is far different than that told by the eastern and far western folks who advocate closures. We live in and among these lands and can explain, as \_\_\_\_\_ did, that the impacts you so fear are overblown propaganda that little resemble the truth. September 2009, the policy regarding public lands is that all roads and trails are CLOSED to public use unless specifically signed open, went into effect. 20 years ago, I had many miles of trail to ride my motorcycle on. Today, in my ranger district, there are only 8 miles of legal trail. There are literally hundreds of miles of trail that were user created by motorcycles due to the need for those trails. They are all but closed, so that an elitist group of trail users can selfishly use those trails on the occasional weekend. Now, on a daily basis, my right to use my public land has been stripped away. \_\_\_\_\_ is right. If it were anywhere near as difficult to close trails as it is to open them, we would be far better off.

Following the Bush admin decision of "closed unless posted open", all roads and trails on Federal lands are now "closed" unless they are specifically posted open. As previous comments indicate, no process is needed to close roads and trails. On the contrary, EIS procedures are necessary to REOPEN roads and trails closed with no public input and by arbitrary decision. We need MORE trails for OHV and motorized use, not less. Exploding population numbers dictate that a more dispersed impact will only be possible by increasing the number of trails available. This is common sense...which unfortunately, is no longer common.

What exactly is wrong with what he's doing? The property was legally acquired (paid for), and he spent money, his or his clients, to construct a residence for investment or habitation purposes. Why should the federal government be allowed to confiscate private property?

I live in Colorado, and I spend a lot of time in Southern Utah camping and hiking. I have seen many beautiful desert plants and biotic soil trampled and destroyed by ORVs going off the dirt roads and driving right across the landscape. In addition, as I have grown older, I have watched the Utah landscapes become more and more degraded due to years of illegal ORV damage. In the Southern Utah wilderness quality lands, there are less plants and less biotic soil than there were 15 years ago. Remember that these are endemic desert plants that I am referring to, which already grow slowly in a harsh environment, so being trampled and crushed only makes it more difficult for them to survive. The overuse of ORVs has already significantly affected the ecosystems of Southern Utah. Shutting down 15% of the dirt roads in Southern Utah will undoubtedly lessen the degree of damage to these fragile desert ecosystems. This is a solution that makes sense for both humans and the ecosystems, as people will still be able to access the land, but the plants and animals will get a small reprieve from the effects of human activity. Considering the high number of ORVs that (illegally) leave their designated roads and destroy wilderness quality lands in Utah, I think that ORVs should have limited access to wilderness quality lands. ORV users have proven themselves to be irresponsible and have already damaged a large portion of land in Utah. I believe that ORVs should only be allowed in designated recreational ORV parks and on certain, carefully selected dirt roads.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Missouri has wonderful state parks - some of the best in the nation. But our parks have suffered from inadequate funding in recent years and they have a backlog of repair and maintenance projects. The states need money from the Land and Conservation Fund. Full funding from the LCF should support the State Assistance Program. States should be able to count on full funding from year to year.

Most of the ecoregions of the United States are not represented or inadequately represented by national parks or wilderness areas. This is true of virtually all ecoregions east of the Rocky Mountains. As a result, most of our nation's ecosystems are not adequately protected from fragmentation, degradation, and the impacts of climate change. With a few notable exceptions (such as Adirondack or Baxter state parks), lands that are not within national park or wilderness areas are not adequately protected. They have little or no permanent protection from resource extraction, roads and motorized uses, and other activities that damage native ecosystems and degrade scenic and recreational values. This includes the vast majority of national forest, BLM, and even national wildlife refuge lands, as well as most state lands. Virtually no private lands have strong or lasting protection. The September 2009 report of the blue-ribbon National Parks Second Century Commission recognized the inadequate representation of existing national park and wilderness areas. The commission recommended a nationwide survey to identify potential new national parks in underrepresented regions of the country. That's a great idea that should be implemented.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Oh sure, let's make it easier and easier for gov't to raise "revenues" so it can spend it on its other successful programs like war in Afghanistan and Iraq and otherwise fund its 700 bases in 130 countries. Then there is the war on poverty and the war on drugs each of which ensures poverty and crime at the cost of countless billions more, not to mention that our doors can be broken down and our cars and houses confiscated at the whim of local cops. Let's continue to fund the gov't in its efforts to regulate every inch of our lives. Good job. All the fees that the gov't might receive from users of land owned by its citizens will not go to upkeep of trails and facilities. Nope. Most of it will go to salaries of the keepers of the trails and facilities. Have you not noticed the degradation of all public places, roads, bridges, National Parks in spite of fees, tolls, and taxes? Do you think gov't employees run the Post Office and Amtrak well, or might you know that these institutions have been running in the red from the start? Do you like how you are treated by the FDA, the USDA, the TSA, the BLM, and Timothy Geithner, among others too many to mention? What fools we mortals be to believe that fees collected by gov't at trailheads have anything whatsoever to do with trails and the great outdoors instead of knowing that the kleptocracy knows only too well that it has its useful idiots as evidenced on this very site. And think about this. If you were not taxed as you already are, and this comment is only meant to be read by those fewer and fewer who actually do pay taxes, do you think you would be more generous with your time and treasure with respect to all aspects of your life, not just in support of trails and so on, but in terms of helping those who suffer in your own universe without any middleman and especially not a middleman like the incompetent and corrupt gov't we all know and love? Humans, surprise surprise, are naturally generous. The demigods in office have convinced us that gov't should take over the role of taking care of, well, everyone, and instead of noticing what needs to be done in our own neighborhoods, we erstwhile generous persons can pursue our interests in celebrities who travel to Africa, in Presidents who promise hope and change, in TV where we can live it up vicariously, and in football where our tribal instincts get some harmless exercise. And of course we relative few who love the outdoors can go hug trees whenever we want so long as the money holds out.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If you want government to intervene domestically, you're a liberal. If you want government to intervene overseas, you're a conservative. If you want government to intervene everywhere, you're a moderate. If you don't want government to intervene anywhere, you're an extremist.- Joe Sobran [1946 - 2010] The trouble with socialism is that it takes too many evenings. --Oscar Wilde You want gov't in your lives to protect your interests? You got it. But there is a problem. Since the Federal Reserve was established in 1913 the purchasing power of the dollar has declined by 96%. "So what?" you say, "My standard of living is the highest in the world!" Oh, okay. So when you retire and you need to live on your savings and the interest rate is close to zero on your cash and the bond market looks like it is going to crash and the stock market looks about as safe as putting your money in the fireplace, who ya gonna call? Bernanke? This country of ours is in debt. In fact without debt in this country there would be no "money." Yes, that is correct. The Fed creates money by issuing credit. Voila! And what backs up that debt? Nada, and that may be why gold is going up while we sleep in our arm chairs or discuss how we might pay the gov't a bit more for using lands we own. Is there no end to human folly? Have you noticed on this very thread the tangled web we are weaving upon the revenooer's deceiving? This will not end with civil discussion but in war, as it always has. There is but one solution to the problems of human nature and it is -- nah, I won't get into it here.

The link you provided took me to a blog with a few individual readers' opinions about a newspaper article about a County Commision press release about a District Court advisory provisionally allowing an unspecified width of a road to be maintained for 9/11ths of its length. In every way, this is the \*opposite\* of an official government announcement detailing a road closure. As a concerned citizen, I would like to scrutinize the actions of our government when there are repeated allegations of wrongdoing but this is very difficult when those making the allegations can't present the direct factual evidence...in this case, what seems to be missing is a government document announcing a road closure with justifications that are allegedly insufficient, inadequate, mistaken, or somehow illegal.

You want to encourage young people to start a career in which the rewards for service are structured to diminish as they gain experience and ability, just like their mentors? This is a procrustean solution.

The forests are more than the cheapest available water filter -- behind all the industrial-management talk about "forest health" and "treatments" (which could include logging for private profit in the name of "fire safety") there is no provision in this Idea description for the conservation/restoration of biodiversity in natural habitats.

(per Comment #1): It sounds like you'd like to propose "Oil Spill National Park" as an alternative Idea -- go for it!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Why should domestic, imported sheep have preemptive 'rights' over native species in our wildlands? Wildland ranching has resulted in the invasion and disruption of our natural ecosystems, including interfering with the instinctive feeding patterns of our native wolves, which did not evolve in the presence of docile, foreign farm animals. In many ways, we're doing a better job than our ancestors keeping our ecosystems healthy, but your story illustrates one of the many areas in which there is still room for significant improvement. The incident you describe shows that the sheep didn't belong where the rancher was keeping them.

(per your address to me in Comment #6): It was obviously the DOMESTIC, IMPORTED SHEEP noted in the original Idea, above, that I labeled in my Comment #2 as "invasive" (a technical term, properly applied here). Humans have the ability to learn from written history -- and correct their past mistakes -- if and when they take the opportunity to do so. Please see the Idea: "We will always have more to learn from native species and their natural habitats -- don't sacrifice our teachers for a cheap thrill or a quick buck."

If the Pebble Mine were to extract every ounce of recoverable gold according to the most optimistic estimates of its proponents, then by the end of this century it would add slightly more than 1% to the world's gold supply. This is far, far less gold than we could recover by reducing, reusing, and recycling it and at an astronomically higher environmental price. The Pebble mine is all about privatizing profit for a few and externalizing costs for the rest of us. King Midas tried eating gold and it didn't work out so well. I prefer wild Alaska salmon.

(per Comment #9): The Idea at the top of this discussion is *\*based\** on the many other Ideas, Comments, and Votes on this website concerning various adverse environmental impacts of the Pebble Mine on the Bristol Bay ecosystem as well as the resulting adverse impacts on the existing sustainable economy there if the Pebble Mine is permitted. Searching "Pebble Mine" and/or "Bristol Bay" on this website, you will see that many of us who have commented here have previously contributed the kind of information that you claim we have not. As for your suggestion that the locals should have the loudest voice in this discussion, the same search will show you that many of them have already weighed in against the Pebble Mine on this website and that 79% of Bristol Bay residents are against the Pebble Mine according to a poll cited in the Idea "The people don't want Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay, Alaska."

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

\_\_\_\_\_ 's legal case involved a number of technicalities alluded to in Comment #11 and I think that the court found properly in his favor by applying existing law. Your Comment #17 brings up broader issues which would require changes in existing law -- in the process of such changes, I would hope that the democratic process would bring to the fore various opinions such as those expressed on this website (even those with which I might disagree -- let's "get it all out there"). Your opinion seems to be in favor of user fees, a concept which has been defended on the grounds of fairness by saying that those who impose the costs on the system should help to defray (some or all of) those costs. Others have argued against user fees on the grounds of fairness by saying that our public lands belong to all citizens, regardless of their ability to pay for access more than they already have through their taxes. Another argument that cuts across these two is that resources should be allocated according to the demands placed upon different public lands -- user fees do only a very approximate job of this and there are other means of appropriately allocating funds. Further thoughts?

In my opinion, "recreation" is also a form of "resource extraction" to the extent that it impinges on the natural environment. For example, even "peace and quiet" is a "natural resource" -- noisy and/or fast-moving forms of recreation, in particular, can disturb the survival/reproductive behaviors of wildlife. Tread lightly.

Here are some specifics on just part of what would be at risk if the Pebble Mine is permitted: The Sportsman's Alliance for Alaska ( { Link } ) states that: "no where in Alaska, do so many salmon return as to the Bristol Bay watershed. Just a few of the superlatives in this region include: The Kvichak River is home to the world's largest sockeye salmon run and is also within Alaska's designated trophy wild rainbow trout area. Other species found in the Kvichak include Chinook (king), Coho (silver), pink and chum salmon, Arctic Char, Arctic Grayling, Dolly Varden, northern pike, and whitefish. The Nushagak and Mulchatna Rivers support the largest Chinook (king) salmon runs in Alaska, and perhaps the world. Other species found in these drainages include Sockeye, Coho (silver), pink and chum salmon, Arctic Char, Arctic Grayling, Rainbow Trout, Lake Trout, Dolly Varden, northern pike, and whitefish. Lake Iliamna is Alaska's largest lake and America's last undeveloped "great lake" as it is the same size as Lake Erie. It is home to one of only two freshwater seal populations in the world, as well as all five species of Pacific salmon, Arctic Char, Arctic Grayling, Dolly Varden, Rainbow Trout, northern pike, and whitefish."

Thank you for raising this additional critical issue. While our democracy is equipped to follow the wishes of the people over the long run on broad policy issues (e.g. "Should significant resources be devoted to save species from extinction in their native range in our country?"), it is not equipped to inform all citizens and take a vote on every individual issue every time a decision is required (e.g. "Should OHV traffic be more restricted in the Imperial Sand Dune Recreation Area to save Peirson's Milk Vetch?") At some point, as you suggest, we have to hire/retain qualified professionals and let them do their job/duty, including making decisions on a scientific/rational basis in the face of counterfactual 'information' provided to them by local (or distant) interest groups.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

(per Comment #11): Your Idea "No wilderness should be designated in any state without local congressional support" made the same point and was effectively criticized from several perspectives as well as demoted by a majority. Many people do not trust your local politicians to do what is right for our National Treasures on our Federal Lands.

It sounds like you're suggesting that the federal government exercise eminent domain to make public trails through private property against the owners' wishes. This is problematic on several levels -- please clarify.

Hypothetically, of course, what if the federal government exercises eminent domain to force a trail through my property so that hunters or pagan tree-worshippers can pass through to hunt deer or perform unspeakable acts with vegetation on adjacent public land and I'm morally opposed to hunting or panentheism -- what recourse do I have for the expropriation of my property and violation of my beliefs while the hunters pass back by with carcasses slung on their shoulders or pagans parade around clothed only in leaves?

(per Comment #9): Setting the record straight, I didn't imply that Weyerhaeuser was exploiting natural resources on \*public\* land and I hope that you're not implying that Weyerhaeuser is \*not\* exploiting natural resources on private land (cutting down trees is how they make their money, of course). In any case, none of this addresses the Idea at the top of this discussion, which complains about "groups" owning land and preventing those who would exploit the environment from crossing it. \_\_\_\_\_ seems to have abandoned this discussion immediately after starting it, so I would again suggest that you post some form of your Comment #7 as its own Idea and perhaps he would deign to comment/vote on it.

(per Comment #1): Your caricature of this Idea is completely inaccurate and misleading, not constructive criticism. A "variety of camping alternatives at Wilderness trailheads" was proposed, not "tents, horse corrals, signs and pavement at every trailhead." "Turnarounds and sites large enough for horse trailers, as well as tents" are not "Disneyland style parks" either -- I went to both last summer and can assure you that they bear \*no\* resemblance to one another. Perhaps Priscilla Burton could recommend where/how horse corrals/campsites could be sited to minimize any real or perceived negative impacts to the environment while having even greater positive impacts for "America's Great Outdoors," as she alluded to originally. Also, the collection and disbursement of user fees related to this very valuable service would be worth discussing, as they have been for various other recreational uses of our federal lands proposed/defended on this website.

According to this link ( { <a href="http://www.resourceanalysis.com/trails/trail113/tr113.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) the St. Vrain trailhead is not what your Comment #3 nor Priscilla Burton's Idea describes: "The parking area for the [St. Vrain] trailhead is narrow and will accommodate about 12 vehicles. Horse trailers could not be turned around here."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

(per Comment #11): That's a good start -- others might contribute some amendments (and I don't mean "horse manure") -- but what about user fees for individuals and/or businesses, as noted at the end of Comment #10? Also, if those fees are lower than at operations on nearby private property, will those property owners complain about taxpayers subsidizing operations on public property and undercutting their businesses? On the other hand, if those fees are higher than at operations on nearby private property, will the users complain about the government trying to take advantage of them? \_\_\_\_\_'s original idea is not so simple, it seems.

Implicit in the last two sentences of your Comment #1 is the argument that a few animals must sacrifice their freedom for the sake of others. This is one of the many sad results of human destruction of their native habitats, but we can make it much less sad by holding zoos to the highest standards in how they house and treat their animal guests while they are there (e.g. providing ample room in naturalistic enclosures) and by helping zoos "to restore endangered and threatened species back into the wild" as you say.

We need to encourage our new citizens to connect with the great outdoors, too. If a government function happens on public lands, it usually has to do with public lands policy. What are you imagining being more expensive about this? (Note that I didn't say "all" new citizens would have this privilege/pleasure and remember that they all have to get to their swearing-in ceremony on their own, wherever it's held.) The federal government wouldn't even need to "rent the hall" because it/we already own the National Parks/Monuments! Naturalization ceremonies are shown on national television most every year around the 4th of July and this would remind all of us that the national treasures of our National Parks/Monuments \*and\* of our Citizenship are part of what we love about our land and our values.

(per Comment #5): You would preserve the application of this outdated motto at the expense of the environment. "The land of Many Uses" MEANS "Use This Land" not "Conserve This Land." Your opinion that we must invade nature in order to "save" it is debatable, to say the least.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

(per Comment #18): Thank you for helping to "unpack" your original Idea further. While I agree that human access to the natural world is essential for our spiritual and material well-being, I would also argue that it is in our HIGHEST INTEREST to preserve *some* undisturbed natural areas (particularly with critical habitat for endangered species) from *any* human intrusion that is ecologically unsustainable. I suspect that you would agree with this and that we are only debating the location/extent of such natural areas and the intensity/type of human incursions that should be permitted (i.e. *what* activities are environmentally sustainable *where* and *when*). To put a very fine point on the argument, I would be content if research scientists and documentarians had sole access to the *most* vulnerable ecosystems (but only if they could enter and leave without undue disturbance) -- sharing their findings with us on something like the "Discovery Channel" (to borrow a term of mockery from anti-environmentalists) -- while I had personal access to similar but less pristine examples of those ecosystems which would not be irreparably harmed by my visits. While I prefer to hike, if your OHV riding was according to similar precepts (in separate areas from my hiking trails, by the way) then I'd have no problem with it whatsoever. So, I will agree with the motto "Land of Many Uses" if and only if it some day becomes commonly understood that one of the most important of those "Uses" -- paradoxically -- is not to "Use" the most ecologically-significant land for any human purpose that alters its natural state.

(per Comment #21): Thank you for further clearing the air and continuing this discussion -- I hope/intend to do likewise and I invite others to join us in the same spirit. We do seem to agree on the general principles but disagree on the degree and manner in which they should be applied. For example, I don't think that someone bushwhacking a trail that is then followed/maintained by many others over the years (whether it was legal or not in that particular place and time) should preclude a later closure of that trail if it is found to put an endangered species in that habitat at significant additional risk of extinction. The legal mechanisms through which such a closure is accomplished may be troublesome to both of us (perhaps for different reasons), but existing laws, administrative rules, and administrators are all that we have until we change them. (Perhaps you could recommend some particular changes.) So, I guess that I'm more leery of getting hung up on the technicalities of the definition of "roadless areas" than you are and I'm less deferential to the argument that a particular road should continue to exist, despite demonstrated damage to critical habitat by traffic on that road, simply because it happens to have been there for a long time. Those who came before us sometimes made mistakes and we have the ability to make amends. P.S. I just searched "Discovery Channel" on this website and though your name came up often, I also found it has been used as a term of abuse on both sides of this argument, so perhaps we should just drop it (sorry!).

Wouldn't it be fairer and cheaper to let those who cause climate change make the changes needed to prevent it? Oh, sorry, too late for that!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

(per Comment #7): In reference to global warming, you state: "the only debate is as to the reasons why." Please note that this debate is only a political one at this point, funded and perpetuated by those who profit from dumping excess greenhouse gases into the atmosphere (thereby "externalizing" their costs) while making the politicians dither. Science itself clearly identified the "reasons why" some time ago: industrial disruption of the earth's atmospheric carbon cycle (NOT a "natural cycle").

(per Comment #9): Thank you for helping to continue this discussion. I respect your concentration on finding solutions and your concern about getting caught up in specious debates about causes of global warming, but many of the "global warming skeptics" argue that we can't possibly have the capability to slow, stop, or reverse global warming because we have no control over its causes. That is some of the 'thinking' that climate scientists are up against, armed only with facts (i.e. real, verifiable observations of the natural world) and logic....

(per Comment #4): Giving kids ages 12-15 jobs instead of decent educations (and protecting them with an effective social safety net) is a recipe for expanding the ranks of exploited workers (and all of the problems that come with that exploitation) -- you've convinced me to "Demote" this Idea.

If we sidestep the issue, as you did, and simply accept your definition of wild horses as a "native species" then why in the world would we be in favor of treating them with birth-control chemicals? Are you proposing to "study" wild horses, use them as "teaching/advertising tools" or what? The description of this Idea is too mixed-up and elusive to cast a meaningful vote.

What would the legal protections be for those providing recreational access on/across their land, for example, when someone is injured because of some problem on that land (e.g. an old, rusty barbed wire fence hidden in tall grass catching someone's leg and giving them tetanus)?

It is not part of the Wilderness Act that any and all people have the right to enter any part of any Wilderness Area by any means of transport necessary to get them there. More generally, while access is important, it doesn't trump environmental protection -- we must ensure that there is sufficient natural habitat for people to enjoy when they get there \*and\* for wildlife to enjoy when and where humans give them some space of their own. There is no scientific justification for setting the miles of trails of each type in a particular ratio -- which trails of which types in which areas are sustainable has to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. To be clear, wherever the environmental impact is minimal and no rare species are imperiled, I'm inclined to favor legally-permissible access trails so that as many people as possible can gain a greater appreciation for the natural wonders that we have succeeded in protecting from 'development.' Finally, if you take the time to read my Ideas and Comments on this website (including the one referenced in Comment #3, above) you will see that I am \*not\* "upset because the ORV Supporters as showing their numbers here" as you assert -- subjecting their opinions to the light of day is a good thing (on this specific point, please see the Idea description for "Participants: Please use this website to learn something and to teach something.").

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Implicit in the original Idea is the fact that off-trail racing in Wilderness Areas is not allowed because of the unacceptable risks of environmental damage there.

It is encouraging to see the USFS working on multi use trails and bringing many users groups together for the benefit of the many rather than the few. I agree that more access is important rather than less as our lands are a treasure to be shared responsibly rather than restricted arbitrarily. Mountain biking is a responsible non-motorized use appropriate for many of the areas currently restricted to it's use. I feel reconsideration of current designations needs to be considered in all of our lands. I agree that many Wilderness areas need to be set aside to hiking only, but many of the previous and upcoming designations are over reaching and excluding Americans and visitors from the outback experience.

Everyone needs space to call their own, but in the case of Mountain Bikers, any space they inhabit on the trail must become their own to the exclusion of others who might enjoy the area. Mountain bikes do not mix safely with either hikers or horses. This has been expressed eloquently above, and if you ask any hiker or horseman to recount a negative experience they've had on the trail with bikes, they will probably give you ten. It's just not safe and the potential for tragedy is too high.

I ride a mountain bike, it's my preferred transportation in town and vicinity, but only where bikes belong. Bikes increase trail erosion, pose a safety hazard to hikers and equestrians, and are not compatible with wilderness values. Exclusion from wilderness areas still leaves millions of acres of lands where other riders and I can ride.

The biggest problem with OHV use on our public lands is that these machines take away any sense of reward you get for working hard to get somewhere--everything, whether a sweet viewpoint, or an archeological site, is just another place to pass by on a machine. If you have to actually strive to achieve a location, then it places an intrinsic value on said place--a value that can never be understood or appreciated by those whose conveyance places them apart from the joys of the natural world. That's why you see so much more vandalism at a site accessible to machines than those with foot-only access. The second biggest problem? there's no way to identify specific OHV riders, so until they have legible identifying tags, folks like me will continue to classify ALL OHV riders as destructive and irresponsible (and I ride a dirt bike and have a vehicle built for desert travel--but I still support balance and Wilderness).

A refreshing idea! I drove 44 miles into the Gila "Wilderness Area" Wednesday to visit the cliff dwellings built by people whose only transportation from their ancestral home hundreds of miles to the northwest was their feet. It was pointed out to visitors that until recently the only way to go see the place was by horseback, off-road vehicle, or helicopter. I have mixed emotions about my access, but if I had been polled about whether to run that crazy road in there I think I would have voted no. Most of us have only infrequent access to quiet places where the noise and smell of fossil fuel combustion does not intrude. I think what we have left should be preserved. Ten thousand years of human evolution adapted us to derive energy from plant combustion; look what the last hundred years of motorheads has done for our environment. Count me out of that party.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

After all the so-credible hype from the NRDC, it's good to hear from a native. Most of us will never see Bristol Bay, but we have seen such places and cherish them as untainted resources. The Pebble Mine project is intended to add a few kilotons of metals to the culture's foundries and a few billion dollars to investors' accounts, then it will play out and be abandoned, leaving -- what? Can such an environment survive the release of that much mine tailings, sulfides, fossil fuel exhaust, noise, and kinetic physical presence? Where will the salmon go from there, or the people who fish them? I agree that this ecosystem deserves the regulatory oversight to prevent mining unless it can be guaranteed not to impact existing flora and fauna.

No matter what you or I do, no matter how much good the OHV's do for the environment, no matter how much money we contribute to the economy, you will never change the minds of some people. All these people can see is death and destruction if everything is not run the way they want. These are the people who are responsible for the continuing downfall of this country and they cannot see the forest for the trees. You will find that those involved with the environmental movement are the most selfish people out there while claiming they are just trying to make the world a better place. We voluntarily vacated an area back when I lived in PA where we used our OHV's. We cleaned the place up, planted trees and grass to stabilize the area that was mined, and in general, made it a nice place with some nice trails. To make a long story short, we left the area after being run out and told them that we would no longer help to maintain it. That it was now their responsibility to keep the area clean as we will no longer be using it. The fit that was thrown was just downright hilarious. Those that wanted us out, cried and complained about who would clean the area up. We told them that they would. The area is now totally trashed and we refuse to clean it up as it was the environment's responsibility.

Take a look at this. Many of these roads that are being closed fall under this. { <a href="http://sxsnews.com/index.php/2010/09/kane-county-wins-its-first-r-s-2477-road-the-skutumpah-road/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } I know I have an article or two here where the BLM or the USFS closed a road even after it was proved to be under this. Give me a little bit to find it.

Is this one good enough for you? { <a href="http://www.deseretnews.com/user/comments/700061805/Kane-County-wins-its-first-RS-2477-road-2-the-Skutumpah.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Guess I could give you the legal right to access your property through mine them take it back anytime I want then, right?

I had thought you would follow the link at the top of the story. I'll give the link to the actual story posted. { <a href="http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700061805/Kane-County-wins-its-first-RS-2477-road-2-the-Skutumpah.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Pay special attention to the fact that this road was in the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument. What was illegal was the fact that the state has jurisdiction over the road under RS 2477 and the federal government decided that they could just do whatever they wanted.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Even though Kane County does indeed own the right of way, I would prefer to see them leave the road a two lane dirt track. We have many here in AZ that would classify as a level 3 road and many that would classify as Level 2. If Kane County decided to maintain it as a level 3 or level 2 road, which would require minimal maintenance, then it would in essence be a high clearance vehicle road. If the federal gov't cannot understand a written law that is only 26 words long, then what recourse are we left with. By the way, the federal gov't is also spending big taxpayer dollars to close these roads even when they do not have the authority to do so.

Under the wilderness act, if those tracks exist then it cannot be declared wilderness. The ultimate result of what Kane County did has yet to be seen. Under RS 2477, there was never a need to record these routes. All that needed to be done was to make a way through. Whether it was a horse trail or a four by four trail. it did not need to be created by a machine either. The Federal Government decided to enter into negotiations because they knew they would lose if they pursued this further. That being said, I have no problem if some of the roads in more sensitive areas were closed, but that option remains up to Kane County. I would like to see Kane County and the Eco's meet halfway on this.

I agree with you that there does need to be laws and regulations. However, EVERYBODY needs to follow them, including the eco's and the federal government. If you take a good honest, hard look at what is being done to the OHV's and a few other groups you will see exactly what we are talking about. No matter where we go with our OHV's, there is always something found. Whether it is an "endangered" species or some water quality issue. The funny part is that one of these "endangered" species are actually an invasive species.

I agree that if you can volunteer that much time, then you could get a free pass not only to your area, but the entire country. This is something that can be used to give people a sense of ownership of our lands. Put in a couple of hundred hours and get a free nationwide pass. Imagine what could get done. Oh, the possibilities.

Be careful what you label as "invasive". Some areas have been closed as a result of those "invasive" species that are now listed as endangered. If you are going to rally against "invasive" species, then rally against them all. Not just what suits your fancy at the time. The eco's tried to use the brook trout in the Tahoe National Forest to close that area to OHV's. Yet those trout ARE NOT native to the area. They were introduced in the late 1800's to provide a sport fish that put up a good fight. Rainbow trout, brown trout, and a few other trout ARE NOT native to North America. Yet they get selectively used to get what the eco's want. Things like that severely hurt your cause.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Whether you realize it or not, there has been a shift in the thinking of alot of OHVer's. We have been trying to and succeeding in rerouting someof the more sensitive sections of trails. Many areashave been "hardened" to protect areas that have a problem with standing water. This was done to keep these areas from turning into giant mud bogs. There where bypasses closed recently at both the Rubicon Trail and at Fordyce in the Tahoe National Forest. The main problem with us getting some ofthe more environmentally sensitive areas either rerouted or having work done to protect them is the USFS, the BLM, and the whole process with the gov't. The OHVer's have been doing alot of work on our trails. There is a massive amount of work currently being done on the Rubicon to meet water quality standards. Some of it needs done and some of it is just plain silly. I have no doubt over the next two years that this will be the model for th rest of the country.

So wht you are saying is that even though you travelled along F.R. 152 ( a forest service road) and parked on FS land you should not have to pay a fee? Didn't your vehicle contribute (No Matter how small) to the harsh condition of the road simply by travelling it? Sounds like you think you do not need to pay a fee because you think your better than everyone else.

Since we are proposing fees in accordance with damage, then let's charge a fees to all hikers to cover the damage they do when they inadvertently start a wild fire. Considering the Rodeo-Chediski fire here in AZ burned nearly 500,000 acres, I would propose a fee of \$10,000 dollars per hiker per year to be oput in a fund to help restore the habitat destroyed by those wildfires. According to some, OHV damage is so prevalent that AZ should look like a virtual wasteland. Yet since we have had a normal amount of rain this year where I live, the once brown desert is once again green.

Tell me something, why should any of us OHVer's support anything you want? especially when your side hasa track record of using it against us. I can see it now. A group of OHVer's helping to conserve an area, close some trails , and do some other environmentally minded things, only to have it turned against them by the enviro's saying, "See even the OHVer's support this," and we get stabbed in the back for trying to be environmentally friendly. YOur side has bred it's own problems. You made your bed, now sleep in it. I alos have an issue with the garbage you hikers leave behind and also the hundreds of thousands of acres that have gotten destroyed by careless hikers who started a fire through sheer carelessness. MAYbe I should start a campaign to ban hiking. After all, it's for the environment and the children.

I really love how the uninformed tree huggers will automatically start spouting off with the usual Sierrs Club rhetoric. Hikers and backpackers have done more damage to the environment than any OHV ever could. Think I'm joking? Start looking into the number of forest fires caused by careless hikers and backpackers. Most of these burn hundreds of thousands of acres before they are contained. As usual, the tree huggers ignore the facts and stick to lies and rhetoric to stir up emotions.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Where the intolerance comes in is shown by just browsing through this site. You have some that don't want OHV's in National parks or forests. You have some who don't want OHV's on public land. You have some here who try to claim you can't have OHV's on your own land as it "might" disturb there peace and quiet. So if you they would all get their way, then where would we have to ride. NOWHERE. We have seen the writing on the wall and we are fighting back. And as far as getting land owner permission, that is becoming less and less, not because of destruction, but because of the bullshit lawsuits being filed bu the enviro wackos.

My OHV's are able to be licensed for road use here in AZ. In fact there are times here where you will see more OHV's on the roads than cars. A lot of the trails I run are actually old rights of that over the years have been washed out by rains and lack of maintenance. I have said before and I will reiterate. I want you to have places where you can go to be away from the hustle and bustle of life to enjoy the simple peace and quiet of nature. I may use OHV's but I do enjoy the simple serenity of sitting beside a high mountain stream here in AZ. But, I should have areas to use my OHV's without having to spend more time cleaning up after stupid people and fighting to keep them open because an enviro wacko gets a bug up there butt. Until that time comes though, I am being forced to take a hard line.

This will help explain some of what I am talking about. { <a href="http://www.propertyrightsresearch.org/2004/articles11/scorched.htm" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

Here's the problem with this idea and I've seen it happen too many times. Once the greeners get a small victory they don't stop. They seem to think that their's is the only way and everybody should bow down and kiss their asses. The greeners whine, bitch, moan, and groan about OHV's destroying everything, yet not one word is spoken about irresponsible hikers and backpackers starting wildfires that burn hundreds of thousands of acres. The greeners need to clean their own houses before they have the right to tell me how to run mine. There are places that OHV's shouldn't be allowed but eliminating all access to everything is going to be the biggest mistake in a long line of mistakes the greeners have made. I see a lot on here touting the enjoyment of getting somewhere on foot after a hard hike. Well there is something to be said for the guy who spends all week working on his rig to get up that last pile of rocks. These people have a sense of accomplishment too. Either we find a way to co-exist or we shut it all down and NOBODY has access.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please don't make me call you out like I did to \_\_\_\_\_. He was caught red handed in more than a few lies. As for closures, take a real good look at what is happening to Johnson Valley. Much of the valley was closed due to the "possibility" of a desert tortoise getting run over by an OHV. Now 29 Palms is looking at expanding into that area. Guess the tortoise will like bombs better. So much for the precious desert tortoise. The only ones to stand up and fight this are the OHV groups. No enviro's are getting involved. As for only getting crumbs, take a really good look. Of course if you consider millions of acres crumbs, then I could see where you are coming from. I have no problem with state forest being off limits. But the problem is, once the enviro's get those closed, all they want to do is close more and more until only there way is left. Unfortunately, there are many more OHV's taking a hard line against closures due to the fact that the enviro's see compromise as weakness so if they raise enough hell then the OHV's will just roll over. As has happened in years past. Now we have been pushed far enough and we are fighting back. So what do the enviro's do? Fall back on lies and rhetoric, as has been proven here many times by many people. If I remember right, some of the anti-OHV evidence was posted here from a place in FL. Too bad the Enviro's forgot to mention that this area was reduced with the OHV's help and reclamation started. They had to destroy that effort by the use of lies and rhetoric. If the enviro's want a "fair" use policy, then they need to back off and come to the table like good little boys and girls. And work towards a reasonable compromise. The alternative is the fact that we vote and we will do so to protect our way of recreating. If that offends some people, well, too bad. We will have our voices heard and we are getting them heard by some pretty high level people.

I'm going to paint you a picture here. Make sure you follow closely. In Florida during 2003, The Picayune Strand State Forest was created by the South Florida Water Management District. In return for the OHV's vacating 287 miles of roads, the District PLEDGED to find 640 acres in return for the VOLUNTARY vacating of the property. In return this Water District tried to pawn off a Superfund dredge disposal site with very high levels of selenium and arsenic contamination in the muck dumped there. Fast forward to 2010 and the Water District has yet to fulfill their end of the bargain. In fact, Collier County is moving forward with a lawsuit to resolve this issue. Collier County and Miami-Dade Parks Commission have found a suitable replacement for the area VOLUNTARILY given up. It rests in the middle of the Everglades where Miami-Dade County had tried to build an airport in the 1960's. The funny part about all of this is the fact that the sticking point about this area is OHV's. Everyone is okay with RV's camping, hiking and the like. The complaints range from the environmental damage to the noise affecting the Florida panther. I find it extremely hilarious that the environmental groups will complain about the 96 decibal level of the OHV exhaust affecting the panther, but the panther was ok with jets doing touch-and-go landings with their engines screaming at well over 140 decibels. This is one of many such occurrences that I can find where OHV's have voluntarily vacated an area for various reasons under the promises of "We will find you another area." Yet it rarely happens. Once the greenies get what they want any and all deals are quickly forgotten.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You might want to check the records again. The enviros are losing more and more cases. I have no problem with the park being created. I really think it was a great thing, especially in Florida. The Everglades are on my list of places to see when I retire in way too many years. The problem I have with what they did is make a promise and then try to pawn off a toxic waste disposal site as the promised area. THAT and that alone makes it look like the liberals want our children to play on toxic waste. You've been outed. At least have the decency to admit it. Many these "roads and trails" were created long before the existence of these agencies. Stop trying to make it look like they were created recently.

Look up the uses of the plantain leaf (sp?). In most places it is considered a weed, but combined with a few other herb and plants, it makes an extremely powerful drawing salve that will pull just about any foreign body from human tissue. There are even cases where it has pulled melanoma tumors from the body with no relapses. I have no problem with conservation. What I do have a problem with is a small group of very vocal people trying to dictate to everyone else on how they should live their lives, raise their children, and even recreate.

So are you going to be the one to decide if I get to have kids or not? How about we do like China and practice infanticide. Maybe we could just line people up and use firing squads. Maybe if you would stand up and be a man and push for immigration enforcement, then we wouldn't have a problem. Some 30 million live here by a lot of estimates. They are here illegally. They broke the law. Round them up and send them home.

Bravo \_\_\_\_\_! Bravo. \_\_\_\_\_ #118, who wrote... "ORV recreation is a consumptive use of the public lands. The vehicles damage (at a minimum) and frequently destroy the ecosystem where they are used." And used that as the basis to state... "given the consumptive and destructive nature of that 'multiple use'; those areas should be limited and carefully selected to minimize the impact." You are drawing conclusions based upon unsubstantiated generalizations and vague accusations. While you may be able to find an irresponsible OHV user who acts in the manner that you've perceived and described, I can tell you, as a matter of FACT, that I, on my OHV have never, ever consumed any public land resource, nor damaged or "frequently destroyed an ecosystem". I will give you the benefit of doubt, and assume that you've actually seen an OHV user behaving in the manner that you describe. But, even then, I will not allow you to cast any such behaviors across an entire Community of people, myself inclusive and use that as substantiation for access-limitations or closures!

I don't know anything about Redrock, Utah, but I'll demote this Idea strictly based on your vague-all-encompassing Title! **\*\*"ORVs Are Inappropriate for Wilderness-Quality Public Lands"\*\*. Really? It's not enough that ORV's are not allowed in Congress Designated Wilderness Areas? Now you want to restrict me from "Wilderness Quality" areas too. Because.... I -Only-Ride-In-Wilderness-Quality-Public-Lands! And, the reason I ride there is because it's Wilderness Quality and I can't ride in the Wilderness Areas! If you want a Wilderness Quality Public Lands without ORV's, visit a Wilderness Area. Demote!**

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

That's exactly what I was afraid of. While I loved riding on your Coral Pink Sand Dunes a few years ago, and I'm somewhat familiar with Little Sahara, I am an outsider here. I came into the discussion as the title of this idea is smearing the entire OHV Community. Then, \_\_\_\_\_ eluded to this with his statements: "There is more area to hike in Eastern UT then to ride a jeep, bike, or ATV so go enjoy that part of UT and leave the rest alone." My thinking was that there was no way you guys were better off in Utah than we were in Calif. That little sliver of accessible sand at Coral Pink had me knowing better than that! Continue the fight, make more people aware. If there isn't one there already Start up a club, work with the USFWS. With 6.6 Million acres, this would be the nail in OHV's coffin. Tread Lightly!

\_\_\_\_\_ is talking Dune Speak to me!! Wow, I can post all day long about the Peirson's Milk Vetch (PMV)! Not only do I know just about everything one can know about this species (try taking THAT to the bank!), its THE ONLY species that I know anything about. :) Tom, the plant is not "Endangered" and it was never classified as such. Rather, in 1999 it was classified as "Threatened" under the 1973 Endangered Species Act (ESA). \_\_\_\_\_, given such, there is no science to show that it's not endangered, as it never was endangered. Now, Since the time that this plant was listed in 1998, 49,000 acres of the Imperial Sand Dune Recreation Area (ISDRA) were "temporarily" closed in 2000, the American Sand Association (ASA, OHV Organization of 37,000 members) employed a Botanist who conducted several in-the-field Plant and Seed Bank studies. The results of these studies was a report which the ASA formally submitted to the Department of Interior (DOI) along with a Petition to get the Plant De-Listed from the 'threatened' status under the ESA. In brief, this study found two major things, 1) the PMV is rain dependant as many more plants / seeds were found in the same study plots, in more recent High Rain Fall Years than in past dryer years and 2) The PMV species is in fact flourishing, in even open OHV areas. This is what \_\_\_\_\_ is referring to as "In the end, it's not 'threatened' at all". This was the OHV communities efforts to get back the 49,000 acres of Dunes that were still 'Temporarily' closed. This petition was rejected by the Bush Administration. The ASA was born in 2000 as a result of these PMV closures in the ISDRA. 10 years later, the 49,000 acres are STILL "Temporarily Closed". Recently, the DOI reviewed the Field Study Report in conjunction with a Economic Impact Report (EIR) and revised the Critical Habitat (CH) Area designations proportionally. The net change was a reduction in CH Area designations. A small victory battle for the OHV community in this big war. I don't know the total amount of money that has been spent on this plant. I know that the ASA spent just over \$150,000 on their studies and that other organizations spent money as well. In addition, I know that there have been several lawsuits filed on behalf of this species under the ESA wherein the prevailing party is awarded their legal fees and thousands of OHV volunteer hours dedicated to the studies. Given such, it's not hard to imagine an accumulated bill of a Million Dollars strictly for the PMV as \_\_\_\_\_ has stated. All on a plant that is flourishing, even in open riding areas!

A lot of people think PMV is listed as "endangered" as there are some Employees of Environmental Orgs who hit the media once in a while and point at OHV's driving around in the sand "devastating the habitat of fragile Endangered species". Referring to the 'threatened' PMV. I was going to link you to video of a Ecological Activist saying this on TV, but I guess it's not on the web anymore.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As an Avid OHV User and "Tread Lightly" advocate, I can't stand this uneducated tone #5, Let me understand: Because OHV has some "bad apples", and because OHV's can "destroy a stream crossing" then "their vehicles deserve to be locked out of wild lands.". WHAT???. #5, who wrote: "The problem with OHV use is that the minority of OHV-ers who are badly behaved can destroy vastly more territory than the same number of badly behaved hikers or equestrians." Ok. The trick is in your statement in "the same number". If you really want to get into a tit-for-tat with Hikers vs OHV, myself and a couple others can provide you with a weeks worth of bathroom reading in articles and references showing the past damages that hikers have done in one foul swoop. But, then both of us recreationalists will walk away with a Black Eye! You already gave us one, so I'm game either way! #5, who wrote: "Three or four of them can destroy a stream crossing or sensitive site in minutes." Do you know that in some areas, riding in streams is not against the law? Refer to my alternate post earlier today. If you would like to constructively address this concern, then you can advocate the construction of access bridges and work with your local governmental agencies. Or do you only care enough to post such concern from the comfort of your keyboard? #5, who wrote: "the fact is that the few bad apples in their bunch are incredibly destructive and, sadly for the others, that's why their vehicles deserve to be locked out of wild lands." IS THAT A FACT???. If that's really a FACT (Cause you said it was), you must have some Science I've never seen. Until you can post said Science, I'll just consider this another unsubstantiated, vague LIE from an Anti OHV advocate! Even with said Science, I'll still question how you go from Bad Apples and Stream Riding to "vehicles deserve to be locked out of wild lands".

If by "protecting and Saving our wilderness " you mean additional "Congressional Designated Wilderness Areas"... then No Thanks!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an off-road enthusiast and I love the land, my sport is so healthful and I keep losing trails even though I volunteer hour after hour to restore and maintain. There \_\_\_\_\_, is that what you wanted to hear from me? You said: "Trails that are being closed are trails where there has been documented environmental damage." This is not true! And with "forty years in the backcountry, dealings with BLM", I suspect that you know so, OR at least you should! There is presently a 26,000 acres Wilderness Area in Southern California. Prior to this being Wilderness Area, it was OHV accessible Sand Dunes. This area was not closed to OHV use because of documented environmental damage. It was designated by Congress as a Wilderness Area as part of the California Desert Protection Act. The Designation, nor the Closure had anything to do with the previous OHV activity! Near this same area, 49,000 acres of Sand Dunes were 'Temporarily Closed' by the BLM in 2000 to restrict OHV access from the area while a plant was studied. 10 years later, these acres are still closed from OHV Access. Meanwhile, additional studies have been preformed to report that the plant is flourishing, even in open riding areas. This closure had nothing to do with OHV use either. Documented environmental damage does not close trails. Politics closes trails. It doesn't seem that your experience has looked very close at Clubs either. The Club I belong to is "above and beyond" with education and information. Yet, you would say that they "fail to do so"? And you call it self-serving if a group holds a riding terrain "clean up" because they are in their riding terrain???? I can tell you that the Boy Scouts aren't going to clean up the riding terrain! If you think that OHV groups are lobbying for "more a more land", you need to look at the bigger picture! They are lobbying to prevent more and more closures, and to get previously closed lands (like my 49,000 acres) opened up again! And then there's this: " 'We the people' MEANS ALL OF US, not a selective slice of society advocating for a particular special interest." So, why then, are you trying to exclude 'some of us'?

I can copy and Paste too! If any laws are being broken in your 'dust bowl', call your local law enforcement. I don't know where you are located, but In California, it's illegal for kids to ride unsupervised. Unless you are referring to a plot of Federal Land (which I doubt since you say it's "a field that has been allocated for housing") then this forum isnt the correct place to bring it up as the Federal AGO Initiative is applicable only to Lands within their scope. If the owls are listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act, then I doub't if they will be building houses in the Dust Bowl.

#35, who wrote: "As far as I can determine the biggest threat proposed by ORV is the carbon dioxide emissions and energy consumption from getting to a place to ride." I hear you on that Justus! Heck, I used to be able to ride in my own County. Not anymore. Now, to get my family and OHV's to our recreation area, we drive past 3 closed OHV areas that would suffice just fine, and burn 30 gallons of gasoline to get there (one way!).

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If any laws are being broken in your 'dust bowl', call your local law enforcement. I don't know where you are located, but In California, it's illegal for kids to ride unsupervised. Unless you are referring to a plot of Federal Land (which I doubt since you say it's "a field that has been allocated for housing") then this forum isnt the correct place to bring it up as the Federal AGO Initiative is applicable only to Lands within their scope. If the owls are listed as "endangered" under the Endangered Species Act, then I doub't if they will be building houses in the Dust Bowl. The areas of closure that I refer to are nowhere near any Urban Development. They are in the middle of the desert, closed by environmentalists Orgs.

"Off Road Vehicles Ruin Natural Beauty People who drive off road vehicles have no respect for nature or the rights of others. Please ban or restrict their access to public places. " The Title is a lie, and I can prove it! The first sentece is a vauge generalization throwing an entire community under the bus. The second sentence is asking for limiations to be placed on this community without any valid justification or substantiation. \_\_\_\_\_ didn't take the time to slap up more than 3 sentences in this Idea (the title being one sentence), nor does he care to even answer our questions that are specifically addressed to him (ref my original post in this Idea). Clearly he's one to throw a punch and then run off. And yes, 874 people in this forum want to Promote this idea. Amazing!!!

Preservation of land FROM WHAT?

Wind, Solar and Thermal Industries are moving into California's Desert's Already. Deserts that are OHV Accessbile. The first thing they do is put a fence around the land they've leased from BLM. Until these industries learn to work with the OHV community, I will pass on this thinking every time! Demote.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Your assumptions are incorrect... and so are the things you think I "see". What I said was: "In fiscal year 2004~2005, \$25.4 M was allocated for The Conservation & Enforcement Services (CESA) Account within the OHV Trust Fund, specifically for "restoration of trails". In Jan2005, the OHV Community learned that "restoration of trails" is the act of taking existing trails and restoring them to NEVER be driven on or ridden on again. Here is a case where the money was there, it was even allocated for the use. But it was instead used against the community it was intended to serve while trails needing maintenance were left with no money!!! " In the OP, you stated that I should take "full and absolute responsibility for all the costs associated with maintaining and cleaning up after their group". So, I pointed out an exact case in 2005 where monies were provided by the State of California from the OHV Registration Fund to do just that! For the restoration and maintenance of trails. Money that came from the OHV Community was used to Restrict the OHV Community! Instead of seeing my point, and thinking that maybe our community is trying to take responsibility, you want to point out that "I need some training so I can identify the problems". ARE YOU DEAF??? THE PROBLEM IS, THE MONIES ARE NOT BEING USED PROPERLY! THE FUNDS WERE RAISED. THE MONEY WAS ALLOCATED AND THEN IT WAS HIJACKED. I know, you're probably hi-fiving yourself in the mirror to know that in California moneys were taken from the OHV budget and used to restrict access. But let "train" you on something. IF THE MONIES HAD BEEN USED PROPERLY, WOULD YOU HAVE NEEDED TO POST THIS IDEA, AND CALL PEOPLE NAMES FOR DEMOTING IT??? I maintain that this forum would be a better place without you!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To keep the long discussion from getting longer, I propose that we just talk about the kids. Not adults. I don't see that you've really addressed the questions in my earlier posts. That said, I will address yours as I hope you will of mine. \_\_\_\_\_ wrote: "things like helmets, OHV riding classes, better parental supervision, no night riding, no pavement riding, no doubling up on single rider vehicles are all good things, and if everybody followed these rules it would cut down, but not eliminate, fatalities." If everybody is not following the rules, then this would be an Enforcement issue. Not a "Ban" issue. So why are you trying to "Ban" it?? You wrote: "any people who follow every single rule in the book (a distinct minority) are still killed on ATVs because they are too darn unstable." I would agree that "Some" people don't follow every single Law in the book. That said, I would like to know where you are getting "(a distinct minority)" from??? In the place where I ride (Imperial Sand Dune Recreation Area), there is a lot of Law Enforcement Officers (LEO's) looking around. Everyone must follow all the rules or they will get a ticket for not wearing a Helmet, or riding two people on a ATV or towing a sand board behind them, etc. As a result, I would say from my observations in this Recreation Area that probably 99.5% of ALL users under 16 follow every single Law in the book. Given such, I would disagree with your statement that these laws are "nearly impossible" to enforce. "A safety certificate in a kid's pocket doesn't do him that much good when the machine flips and comes down on him, you know?" You're funny, but you're right, when a ATV is upside-down, it does no good. That stated, I can tell you that the ATV Safety Certification Course does teach kids how to traverse across a slope in a manner to prevent a roll over. How to travel up a slope in a way to keep the ATV from rolling over backwards. How to turn at speed without rolling the ATV over, etc. I have taken the time to read your 3.5 year old article from the The Oregonian and I have to question how long are you going to hang on to this for? Even I can tell you that there are more recent articles of the same ilk out there. Regardless, of all people and accident mentioned in the article, applicable to our '16 and under' discussion it cites the death of Four children at ages 4yrs, 7yrs and two infants all having occurred on ATV's in different parts of the country. While the article goes on and on about what the government hasn't done, should do, etc. It does not give any indication if these children were wearing Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), if the accident was a collision with another vehicle, how the accident occurred, if Alcohol was involved, etc. So, I can't speak much about these deaths. What I can tell you is that there are already laws in place to keep infants off of an ATV (no double riders), so no additional legislation would have saved those lives. The Ban that you propose would not have saved those lives. This is a classic situation where charges should be brought against those Parents or Guardian's. The article goes on to state that 2 million people have been seriously hurt since the commission began counting. In my earlier post, I have already explained that my son is one of these numbers as a result of stitches needed from a 2008 trip and fall in camp. He needed 3 stitches under his chin, and it was counted as a OHV related Emergency Room visit since we were coming from the OHV Recreation Area! Given such, I have great doubt that 2 million people sustained serious injury as the article claims. The article states, "The machines flip over with punishing regularity -- smashing faces, breaking necks, crushing chests." There is presently optional PPE that can be worn to prevent such injuries. Namely Full Face Helmet, Neck Braces and Chest Protectors. My son wears all three. At present this PPE is considered optional, as only a DOT approved Helmet is required and these do come in open face types. My recommendation is to amend your idea to address a revision to the PPE

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

requirements. The article reports that "specific models" are prone to overturn and that the ATV manufacturers point at 'operator error' as being the cause of the safety issues. I would agree that users are responsible for the proper use of their ATV's, but any "Specific Models" that The Oregonian has found to be prone to overturn should be reviewed by the Government. I question The Oregonian's agenda when they fail to mention WHICH MODELS they found!!! Given that this article is outdated, inaccurate and only tells part of a story, I think I've given it more attention that it deserves. After all, it does not very well support the argument to Ban Child OHV use. You are correct, when a family's child is killed in an ATV accident, no charges are brought against adults or parents. This is exactly what needs to change! Regardless of how appropriate it is, a kid dying because he wasn't wearing a helmet is evidence that the supervising parent or guardian was NEGLECTING to put a helmet on him. As the parent owning to Child ATV's, I would much rather find myself Jail than to condemn my entire community of the freedom to ride. "But even if those laws could be enforced (they are not), and people complied with them (they do not)," It sounds like you've convinced yourself of something that isn't true. Something that I've shown you "from my observations" isn't true in my area. I guess I disagree with "America's Medical Community". My child does have the maturity to control an ATV. He started riding when he was very young. At 7 now, his abilities have grown commensurate with his age. My banter here is all in effort to get you to revise your idea. If you have your Agenda and it's not going to change. Just tell me, and I'll start my own idea instead of trying to change yours. I would much prefer that two side come together and work out a balanced solution. To me, this would be much stronger than each of us having conflicting ideas. What say YOU?

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

You seem to be big on statistics, reports and articles. Numbers, Reports and Articles don't always tell the truth. Here are some examples that are not always applicable to your Idea, but they do show that numbers can lie and reports can skew. 1) At this { <a href="http://www.kswt.com/Global/story.asp?S=11388389" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }, you'll see an article titled "Man Killed In Violent Accident At Sand Dunes". This was a 34 year old man who fell to his death. Devastating Right? Well, later that day, another article is written about the same accident wherein they wrote, "Alcohol is considered to have been a factor in the accident". 2) At this { <a href="http://kxoradio.com/content/view/6319/1/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }, you'll read an article titled "62-year-old dies off-roading". At the bottom of the article it says "The Deputy Coroner says it appears to be natural" causes. As if a sensationalized title doesn't hurt enough, This mans death, while determined to be Natural Causes was counted as an OHV related death. 3) While you can find articles about deaths and injuries "on the rise" in the ISDRA, at this { <a href="http://files.americansandassociation.org/Images/ISDRA\_Medicals.JPG" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }, you can see BLM is actually reporting a steady decline in Emergency Responses over the past 8 years. 4) At this { <a href="http://kxoradio.com/content/view/6977/2/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }, is an article titled "55 Year old dies in Sand Dunes". As you read the article, he didn't die in the Dunes. Instead, he had shortness of breath in camp, and was in the process of being transported to the hospital when he died. This was deemed to be an OHV related death as he was camped in the Recreation Area. I can go on forever SP. These are just the articles that I knew of (because the events occurred in my riding area), I didn't even hit google for this stuff.

I am trying to work with you. Case in point, look at all the time I've put into this idea when it would simply be easier to create my own. \_\_\_\_\_ Wrote: "your agenda seems to simply to discredit anyone or any study or article that supports stricter ATV laws when it comes to kids." You clearly aren't listening to me. How can you possibly say this when I've stated the following: 1) I would agree that "Some" people don't follow every single Law in the book. 2) When a ATV is upside-down, (a safety certificate) does no good... 3) When a family's child is killed in an ATV accident, no charges are brought against adults or parents. This is exactly what needs to change! 4) A kid dying because he wasn't wearing a helmet is evidence that the supervising parent or guardian was NEGLECTING to put a helmet on him. In addition, I have asked you questions that you haven't answered yet: 1) If everybody is not following the rules, then this would be an Enforcement issue. Not a "Ban" issue. So why are you trying to "Ban" it?? 2) I would like to know where you are getting "(a distinct minority)" from? 3) Would you consider revising your idea to omit "Ban" and add "accountability"? And, while I've showed you several examples of how numbers get flawed, you continue to throw numbers at me. SP wrote, "six children under the age of 16 killed so far this year. " How did they die? Were they wearing PPE? Were they even on an ATV when it happened? And on top of all this, I provide novels of thoughtful information, and you come back with 5 sentences. Clearly, you don't want to work with me. You have my demote vote, and unless you want to put some energy into this discussion, I'm Done!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Demote. I might be wrong here, but I think by coming on this site and asking for the The BLM to provide interim protection to the lands it has already identified as having wilderness quality, you are seeking the BLM to conduct a task that the BLM can not conduct without the authority to do so.

If the BLM has the authority to provide interim protection to lands it identifies as having wilderness quality and they are not finding it necessary to exercise that Authority, then they must have sufficient grounds for doing so. If you disagree with that position, you would likely be better heard in your efforts by filing suit against the BLM than by appealing (here) to the Obama Administration.

I agree with you. The Idea is missing a lot (a common theme lately). I don't know anything about the significance of the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, but I would like to see some verbiage that your Idea would include some information about Outdoor Recreation. I am concerned about Alternative Energy growth because they are moving into the California Desert without any regard for who is using that land. The first thing they do is put a fence around their land that is leased from the public land managers and then public is blocked out.

More Legislation in the US is not going to "help Earth thrive". Not to mention, the AGO Initiative only goes as far as our shores. Your title states "Stop being an environmental hog" but them your OP doesn't address this. Instead you have "This going back and forth is nonsense" and "it takes every one of us to reach the goal" Yes, these generalities are all true. But HOW will your idea achieve this?

In 2000~2008, Field Research was conducted on a plant species in California. This research was conducted by a Botanist and funded by a OHV Org. It was submitted to the USFWS in the form of "Sound Science" in 2008, and formally acknowledged as such in 2009. In 2010, the USFWS used this data in conjunction with a Economic Impact Report to reduce the Plant Species Critical Habitat Designation. Specific to this case, \_\_\_\_\_ is wrong.

I as the Author of this idea agree to spend my time to address your questions in good faith that you'll return in kind in hopes that my Idea will earn your Promote vote. #1) What is your question? #2) I have not nor do not imply that Environmentalist Orgs are "illicitly receiving funds from the government". To the contrary, under the ESA these Orgs are legally seeking to recover costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) in lawsuits that they have originated. #3) I am NOT proposing to disban the ESA. I am all for the ESA with one exception... On Page 46 it states the following: "" (4) The court, in issuing any final order in any suit brought pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, may award costs of litigation (including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees) to any party, whenever the court determines such award is appropriate. "" And this is what allows the ESA to line the pockets of Enviromentalist Organizations.

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

The ESA needs to be revised to keep this from happening. { <a href="http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/CBB02A755EF40A7D8625779D0075435F?OpenDocument" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } The people, suing the government, with the governments money as currently permitted by the Endangered Species Act of 1973. For that reason, I can not Support and Defend the Endangered Species Act as currently written.

Extra flight time = more jet fuel being burned.

Reading through your strong Anti-Access / Anti-OHV stance, I can get behind your Idea with a couple of revisions. My concern is with access restrictions. If there are 5 streams that run like fingers off your hand through a current OHV Park, and I let you write a law that the rubber cant touch the water, then you've restricted my access to 80% of the park. While I do see the vague and blanketing statement that you're "appalled that people who tend to defend their recreation as responsible act so irresponsibly", I do not see any provisions in your idea for keeping access open to the OHV's for currently open lands on the other side of a stream (i.e. Bridge construction). Nor do I see any provisions in your Idea for the opportunity for this construction to occur without lawsuit, Impact Study, etc, etc, etc. If you can incorporate revisions per my comments, I will revise my vote. Now, what the heck is this all about? "I'm appalled that people who tend to defend their recreation as responsible act so irresponsibly" I am standing here defending my recreation. Which according to you means that I've irresponsibly recreated on my OHV? You would be WRONG sir! I rode through a stream bottom once. I hauled the mail, in 5th gear and it was FUN! It was in the San Felipe Wash in a California State OHV Park. Guess what.... RIDING IN THAT WASH IS LEGAL!!! So, it would seem, in this case, that what you call acting "irresponsibly" is what others like myself, other OHV Users, and LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS call "Legal".

I am an avid bicyclist BUT SORRY, NO way should bikes be allowed on trails such as the Pacific Crest Trail! These trails are for hikers and horseback riders ONLY!

Save Bristol Bay from gold mining. Nature, particularly as glorious as Bristol Bay, is infinitely more valuable than all the gold a mining corporation could extract. Experience has shown that there is no such thing as "minimal disturbance" when it comes to mining. Pebble Mine would be devastating to the beauty and ecological relevance of Bristol Bay. America values its natural treasures. Lets protect them from corporate greed and save them for the health of our communities and the survival of the amazing wildlife that lives there.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The brutalizing aggressive assaults on mustangs have been highly criticized by AZ Congressman Raul Grijalva in a letter of last October, and a letter of CA Senator Barbara Boxer of February 2010. The public is shun out from witnessing ALL operations, under the guise of "safety concerns". I have seen round ups and am one of those appealing to the BLM to include us, an independent humane observer that is, in their apparently covert operations. The transparency that Don Glenn preached about here in Denver remains yet to be seen. The horrific fatal outcome of the Calico/Tuscarora round ups is yet another evidential reason to doubt the whole conduct of BLM outfit. It is time BLM stops its propaganda and becomes more professional in it's program, which has fundamental problems, that have not been corrected. BLM has failed to take a hard look at the findings and recommendations of the GAO's report and is clearly violating not only the managing of horses, but is based on inhumane and fiscally irresponsible practices. The round ups under the current management regime are only another failure to address the effectiveness for the true protection of the horses, whilst other goals such as cattle, mining and drilling - are the true agenda carried out under the guise of "managing excess horses", whilst there are none of those, only excess lies. (How is the loss of 19 million acres range, assigned by federal law to the horses, justified by BLM?) The American people and Congress have been deceived and betrayed. BLM's outstanding problems and it's promise to integrate "transparency" with an allocated budget of \$ 500'000.00 according to Don Glenn, BLM Nat'l Advisory Board Meeting Denver, of summer 2010, have yet to be explored and corrected. It is time the failings in regards to BLM's systematic removals of entire herds, inaccurately determined HMA's/AML's numbers, more horses in holding than in the wild, no long-range plan that is ethically, morally and fiscally appropriate, and the irresponsible use of taxpayer's dollars to finance the current claims to gather, which are in violation with the 1971 WFRHB Act, are fixed. Despite thousands of calls and letters, BLM ignores the public and Congress. Craig Downer, wildlife ecologist, has repeatedly presented effective long-term solutions to BLM, which are conveniently ignored. BLM Board is not balanced with representatives of both sides, only consists of those whose interests are with BLM's and Salazar's main agenda and ulterior motives. It is time BLM agency is stripped of it's abusive powers and reformed.

Here's the story, I am pedaling along on a so called "illegal" trail and there is an elderly man with his presumably two grandsons. As I come closer he starts to tell me I am not supposed to be on the trail. I reply that how is it that a dirt trail has a "law" about it, it is dirt and an "Open Space." As I begin to pull away he actually starts to chase me! I stop and say, "sir, aside from my supposedly not supposed to be here, what have I done to offend you?" He starts to yell and tell me that "that is why, you are not supposed to be here." I ask him who decided that I am not supposed to be here to which he cannot answer but starts to give me ALL the excuses I have read here so far. I then say "why is it so hard for you to just allow me to pass by and enjoy this area just as you are?" to which he again cannot answer. The saddest part of the whole encounter is that his two grandsons are shivering in terror. I have done nothing to this man except "protest" the idea that cycles don't belong on a trail of dirt. I ask you, who is really the belligerent and unruly person in this story??

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Protecting Bristol Bay is good for people, business, salmon and wildlife. The Bristol Bay region is a treasure - both locally and internationally. The tens of millions of salmon that return to the region every year provide food for people and wildlife, pump \$445 million into the local economy each year and provide almost 5,000 full time jobs and as many as 12,000 seasonal jobs.

Thousands of Alaska native people live in this region and depend on clean, healthy rivers for their survival. Hundreds of local Alaskans own small businesses that depend on a healthy watershed to thrive. Thousands of people visit this area for the world class hunting, fishing and recreation opportunities it provides. One excellent program that I've had the privilege of working on that supports a healthy local economy and watershed is the annual Bristol Bay Fly Fishing and Guide Academy. It's a week long conservation and outdoor education course that teaches local Alaska Native youth the ins and outs of fly fishing, owning/operating a fly-fishing business in Bristol Bay, river ecology and much more. In the long term it prepares students for local sustainable jobs based on healthy watersheds. You can learn more about it here: { <a href="http://www.savebristolbay.org/blog/audio-slideshow-of-our-bristol-bay-fly-fishing-and-guide-academy" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } The proposed Pebble Mine would put all of this at risk. As an Alaskan, I urge the Administration to do whatever is in their power to protect this world-class region and stop the proposed Pebble mine.

Opposing the Pebble Mine. I am opposed to development of the proposed Pebble Mine, which would endanger the pristine beauty of Bristol Bay. This has not been a good year for extractive industries, because something always seems to result in significant damage to the environment. We should not allow greed to trump protection of the planet, even though the proposed mine would be out of sight of most of us in the "lower 48".

Ask any hiker or equestrian who has encountered a fast moving cyclist on any trail/path, much less a wilderness trail where consequences can be deadly, and the common sense answer to this proposal becomes clear. Even if you accept that the majority of cyclists are well intended, their fun factor includes going fast, which puts other trail users at risk. Cyclists should be focused on creating recreational areas where they can do their thing safely. Safe for them and not trying to introduce themselves into an existing successful and historical foot/h hoof trail system. Not to mention the damage/maintenance effects that their equipment causes to trails. The mix is simply untenable.

When anti OHV users complain about noise and air pollution does that mean that they hiked to the trail as well? I just haven't seen many smart cars and "green" vehicles that can make it up the fire roads and such that get you to so many popular hiking areas.

Wilderness areas are set up as safe havens for wildlife and to preserve pristine areas for generations to come. How do you propose to reduce the conflict with wildlife and keep species numbers from dropping now that noisy, polluting machines and human interaction is introduced? Or do you not care?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do you not care that wildlife numbers are decreasing and more species are listed on the threatened or endangered list than ever before and there are dozens more that should be listed but are not? If you are asking me if I feel so sorry for snowmobile users or ohv users that I would be willing to sacrifice the health of a forest or the survival of a species then the answer would be absolutely NO. I have watched deer, moose, rabbits, etc. run from the noise and presence of motorbikes on trails. What would have happened to that poor cub had it entered your camp? Would someone have shot it or could it have become frightened causing the mother to come to its aid? Most likely and then what would have happened? The mother and the cubs would have been round up and killed even though they did nothing wrong. NOTHING good comes of introducing humans to areas animals live.

Well said. If humans cannot find a way to live with the planet and the planet's species instead of destroying it then we deserve to go extinct.

Ah yes, let's reward the lazy, noisy, polluting, habitat destroying people and punish the nature loving, quiet, habitat protecting people not to mention the wildlife that lives in the areas you want exclusive rights to. That sounds fair to me. Why is it that every ohv idea is me, me, me, I, I, I, give, give, give, take, take, take? Just once I would like to see a ohv user propose an idea that promotes conservation and preservation of wilderness and wildlife habitat. Here is a novel approach Brent, how about you and your community stop harassing hikers, equestrians, skiers and wildlife on the trails and in the forest? How about you and your community actually follow the laws and stay off areas you are not supposed to go on instead of bypassing gates, ignoring signs and going wherever you want? How about you actually apply some of the empty words you like to throw around so much and stop ruining trails and wildlife habitat? Maybe then you would not get hassled so much.

I find it comical that you think sitting on a machine is actually grueling exercise. I think a more appropriate challenge would be for you to keep up with me on a trail WALKING ON TWO LEGS! Either way though thank you for admitting that you ride both recklessly and irresponsibly without any thought on the damage you commit. Pretty much my point on you people to begin with. As far as me losing land open to me I have lost plenty. Over development has taken thousands of acres I once hiked and camped and areas being opened to ohv use has taken 2 of my favorite trails. You are right that the fact you enjoy snowmobiling does not mean you are anti environment but the fact your votes demote all ideas on conservation and preservation says you are indeed anti environmental, anti preservation, anti wildlife and anti wilderness. If you want an explanation on what I mean by hassling you all you need do is see all the whining your community has done on this site since its implementation to now what I mean. That is a good one trying to blame environmentalists on your illegal activities. I believe rapists have tried the same defense...."She looked so hot in those tight clothes she was asking for it." Thank you for admitting though that you do indeed perform illegal activities and do not care. Another of my anti ohv points admitted by you. Please explain to me how my ideas and comments on protecting wildlife and wildlife habitat is somehow selfish. I am gaining nothing from a protected area but wildlife is. If you can do it without sounding moronic I would appreciate it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For the 100th time yes I rode once about 30 years ago and did not like it, have never done it since and never will again, Thank you too though for admitting you drive irresponsibly and recklessly. That is 2 ohv users that have admitted that. Do I see a third? I still find it laughable though that you people think sitting on a machine is strenuous exercise. Have you ever tried to do something on your feet besides walk from the couch to the fridge or the toilet? Do I think snowmobiles are as damaging as motorbikes, atvs or 4x4s? No, but they do chase wildlife from wintering habitat and away from food sources and in areas of little to no snow cover they are indeed damaging to the area. The trails in my area that were opened to ohv use were basically destroyed quickly after being opened. They became heavily rutted and littered with garbage and broken glass plus the added annoyance of drivers revving their engines as they passed me and having to get off the trail to allow someone on a bike or a truck to pass. The wildlife that once roamed the area were gone and it became too depressing between putting up with the idiots, the noise and seeing the destruction to continue to go there. I go to the forest to relax and enjoy the quiet not put up with jerks and hear more noise than I would on my own town streets. Maybe that is how "people like you" show respect to people who prefer to recreate in a non motorized way? From my experiences it sure is. Just returned from 2 weeks in BC hiking at high elevations with a fairly heavy pack for half of it. I think that is just a bit more strenuous than riding a snowmobile. IF you ever promote an idea about preservation or conservation that does include ohv access then maybe we can discuss what you are and what you are not but until you do I go only go by what I see and read. As I said snowmobiles are not as damaging as some other forms of ohv use but they are still damaging and can be quite a bit damaging if the driver is careless and irresponsible.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Well we can put to rest any notion you are concerned about the environment or are a conservationist like you claim now that you admitted to driving a V8 SUV. I always wondered something about you people..when you saw the news reports of all those poor birds, dolphins, turtles, etc. covered in oil and suffering horrible deaths did you feel any remorse, sadness or feel any type of responsibility? Or did you say they are only animals and jump in your SUV for a joy ride? How much exercise OHV use has nothing to do with this so we can leave it at that. I do not think there could ever be mutual respect or common ground because we both believe 2 totally different things. I believe wilderness and wildlife is something to be cherished and preserved and if that means I have to drive a small car, keep my heat low or give up access as a hiker and backpacker then so be it, I have no problem doing so. You and your community though feels as though wilderness is something to be used regardless of the consequences even if those consequences mean extinction for species of wildlife and plants. You will say this is wrong I am sure but going by the voting and comments on this site not to mention the things I have seen OHV users do with my own two eyes I can come to no other conclusion. To be fair though I have not seen much damage caused by snowmobiles. Maybe that is because I live in an area where there is not much use or maybe it is because they do not do as much damage as other form of OHV use so there may be something to your argument but I have read accounts of riders harassing wildlife and that is something I could never promote. One thing I will agree with you on though \_\_\_\_\_ is that the trails help wildlife move around easier. Still though does that make up for the harassment? Nice try but if I worried about every insult someone from the OHV community has said to me on this site I would have left months ago. Actually your insults are pretty much standard fare and lacking originality. Better luck next time. I don't apologize for mocking you either but tell me since you seem to want me to care, how would you go about protecting wildlife and wilderness?

Way to try to pass blame on environmentalists for what is the fault of ignorant people like you, Rush and Sarah would be proud but if that is what it takes to help you sleep at night then go for it. You obviously do not care about the environment though. As far as me commenting on your idea I am more commenting on the title or your idea since it covers a wide range of OHV use. If you want to change the title to snowmobile areas then fine but since you have tried, unsuccessfully, to deceive people with your title, something the OHV community likes to do, I feel I can comment as I like. Yes I have spent much time in the west hiking and backpacking so I know the areas you speak of and may have even visited some. As for you saying it is "desolate" place I find it not in any way so. I have seen wildlife that very much need those areas to survive, the reason you do not see them is because they run from your noisy machine and because you do not care enough to look for them. As for causing extinction you are not solely to blame but you are not helping in any way and as the saying goes..."if you are not part of the solution you are part of the problem". It would change nothing because you and your community would still be damaging wildlife habitat and killing off wildlife so environmental groups will still be there watching over you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The reason it is contentious is the author never mentions what happens to the wildlife that lives in these areas he wants access to. Like just about every ohv idea on this site never is there any regard as to the animals that call these areas home and in some cases the last remaining areas of range they have left. To grant further access to vital wildlife habitat just to accommodate a greedy ohv user and to put entire species at risk of extinction is ridiculous and I will fight that every time. If that sounds "radical" to you you like the author suggests in one of his comments then I really have to question your true motives as well. Plus I believe one of your most popular rallying cries is "do not punish one group of users", well isn't this idea punishing one group? Or is it because it is not your group that it does not matter?

" provide the snowmobile with a "cherry stem" into areas not frequented by skiers and close them out of said area. " Obviously we have an interpretation problem here. To me it appears the author wants access currently of limits so he can go to areas where skiers do not go. How does this read to you? Personally I think it is you that is trying to deflect the true meaning of this idea in order to prove a point you are trying to make and because you yourself want more and more access to areas off limits. As an expert on things I say you must know that time and time again I have said (including once on this very thread, comment 15, paragraph 2) I have no problem giving up access if it benefits wildlife. Tell me though since you seem to know everything about me, what is my "real motivation"? As for proof that human interaction with wildlife is bad for wildlife are you really that ignorant and dumb or are you just relying on the same stupid ohv argument that ohv use does no harm?

So protecting the last 3 remaining animals of that species is not good enough reason to close an area? I guess you are suggesting to just let the species go extinct because to try to protect them is inconvenient to you and your fellow snowmobile enthusiast? No I do not know the Timber Wolf is the one predator proven to have a major impact on the species. You forgot the most dangerous predator to ALL animal species....human beings.

Nope, I would say you made you intent clear. The beginning part I could agree with but there is always 2 sides of the story and I would guess the skiers would complain of snowmobile use in areas off limits to your group and damage to trails and the surrounding area which I can totally believe. The second part though pretty much speaks for what you stand for and damages the first part of your argument. Here you feel your own greedy, self centered pleasure trumps the need to protect forest areas, wildlife habitat and wildlife in general. That is pretty much what I figured you were all about so thanks for reinforcing my beliefs. Knowing this, and the many other things you have admitted to in this thread, I could never believe that you are an innocent victim in anything or that your idea is harmless and only a cry for fairness. Normally I would agree that 500,000 acres is a bit much but since this is the LAST 3 remaining animals of that species I would say that any amount of land blocked off, no matter how big, is not big enough to save the species from going extinct. The fact you do not agree is pretty depressing but again pretty much what I expected.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think there is a lot more than cloud seeding and weather modification going on up there. Lets not forget the grip pharmaceutical companies have on the country. Either way though I agree that it needs to stop.

As usual another ohv user wants to demonize environmental groups and blame them for all the worlds ills. Development, oil and gas drilling, mining, logging, and road building are fine but save a forest or a wildlife species and you are the devil incarnate according to \_\_\_\_\_ and his ohv cronies.

I did read the OP and yes I do realize what the subject matter is. If you had taken a second to check my voting instead of assuming how I voted you would see that I chose no opinion because I thought the idea had both good and bad parts to it so I neither supported it nor demoted it. It is not so much the responsible logging we are opposed to but the infrastructure that is needed to support the logging. Roads must be built through the forest to get to the area that is being logged and heavy machinery is brought in which causes disruptions in wildlife patterns. I strongly suspect though that your concern for the forest is merely a ruse. Everyone knows the ohv community loves roads being built and more access. What better way to get roads built and more access at no cost to you than to promote logging in areas that are currently off limits to you? I find it very hard to believe all of the sudden you have done a 180 and are concerned with the environment, wilderness, wildlife habitat and wildlife when you have not exactly been promoting conservation ideas since you came here.

How about america reduces its consumption of oil? We use nearly twice as much as the closet nation. Are the tens of thousands of wells we already have in this country not enough for you? Most of the oil drilled here is sold on the world market anyway and never even reaches our refineries or pumps. When are idiots like yourself going to realize that no matter how much we drill here it will do NOTHING to reduce our use of foreign oil or the price of that oil unless we reduce our consumption!

You forgot about humans killing elephants for their tusks and rhinos for their horns. Or how we kill grizzlies for their gall bladders and moose, elk and deer so some moron can put their antlers on his wall and prove how (un)manly he is. True facts are humans are the only species to hunt for "sport" and we are by far the most wasteful and destructive animal species there is. Animals have as much right to life as us. We are not better than them.

And as usual the ohv community, lead by lobbyists like \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_, demote any type of idea that demands responsible usage by the driver. Then they wonder why their community is looked down upon and has a bad name. Look in the mirror guys, the reason is you and your kind.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It amazes me how much the ohv community hates wildlife and wilderness yet they still want people to believe they are somehow respect nature. It is no wonder they could care less about the destruction and death they cause when you read "ideas" like this. You talk about "balance" yet many species are down to 1% of the original territory. How is there any "balance" in that? What you propose is taking away more territory even if it is that last 1%. Check the threatened and endangered species list and tell me there is "balance" going on.

"the average American spends 90% of his or her life indoors," Is this actually true? That is ridiculous. No wonder america is now known as the home of the obese and the land of the lazy.

Your average day of Quality Family OHV Time in the Forest: Driving as fast as you can as destructive as you can. Bypassing gates, boulders and signs to drive where you are not supposed to go. Chasing deer, elk, moose and any other forms of wildlife you come across from their habitat. Running over saplings on sides of trails, flowers in meadows and tearing up small streams. Running over a turtle or 2. Gunning the engine while you pass an equestrian or hiker to see what happens. "gee son wasn't that something the way you could hear her head bounce off the rocks after the horse threw her? HaHaHaHa. " Going deep into the forest to do target practice on unsuspecting birds and wildlife. Going home and telling everyone how you are a "responsible" ohv user.

"Promote ohv use and destroy everything in our path". The ohv users creed. Passed on from generation to generation of ohv users. A wonderful legacy to pass on to our nations youth.

"OHV recreational access to our public lands helps promote and educate on the beauty of the great outdoors. This in turn promotes conservation and good stewardship of our public land." I was always find it pretty odd to read ohv users say this then demote every idea concerning conservation or protection of our forests and wildlife. How exactly is your use promoting or educating you when you demote all ideas of conservation and good stewardship? I guess to you people the beauty of the outdoors is only what you can drive over and if your activity destroys or kills that beauty then so what and to you that is good stewardship?

You should change the title of this to "Sick people CANNOT recreate". I hike as often as I can but as a person who has asthma I have to pay attention to the air pollution alerts and if the warnings are issued I do have to refrain from hiking those days. Sadly this summer was brutally hot and with all the pollution in the air there were more days where I could not recreate than days I could.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Over the weeks and months I have become accustomed to your twisting of peoples words, your accusing people of lying when it is you yourself that is lying, your making fun of peoples fears for the environment, forests and wildlife and your attacks on people who have tried to limit their carbon footprint but making fun of people with disease and trying to belittle their ailments and deny the struggles they go through on a everyday basis is disgusting even for you. How many times have you been rushed to the hospital because of a severe asthma attack, shot full of drugs, hooked up to IV's and breathing machines and kept overnight for observation? Have you ever had your lips and fingers turn blue from lack of oxygen due to a severe attack? How many nights sleep have you lost because you were bent over trying to suck in air all night? Have you ever had to cut a vacation short, go home from work or seen a loved one break down because of your condition? No, well it must be really nice to be healthy and so high and mighty that you can make fun of others that are not so lucky. Tell you what \_\_\_\_\_, go out in the street and run as fast as you can for as far as you can until you drop and while you are laying there sucking for air you can experience what I experience all too often nowadays. Sure I can lead a normal life...if that "normal life" includes having to take 2 types of medicine (more if I am having problems) 3 times a day 7 days a week so I can breathe, medicines whose side effects include things like headaches, dizziness, nausea, cramps, ed or in extreme cases coma and even death. If it having to stay inside and refrain from physical activity when air qualities are rated as dangerous, having to carry a rescue inhaler at all times, being denied access to the military, staying out of smoky places or having to deal with the ignorance of others like yourself then yes I can lead that type of "normal life". On top of it all to lie about others opinions with this affliction is ridiculous. I can tell you are lying because no asthmatic would take objection to what \_\_\_\_\_ says because it is all true. Asthmatics like myself are very much a prisoner to things like air quality and it very much limits what we can and cannot do. I do not take vacations in the summer due to poor air quality fears and have to pick a choose my vacation spots carefully to make sure the activity I enjoy (hiking) is not jeopardized by my disease and the effects bad air has on my breathing. Many times I have had to change my plans or cut hikes short because of my breathing due to poor air quality and on occasions when I ignored the warning I have often ended up with attacks, some pretty severe. Maybe if I were some lazy, uncaring slob whose only access to the outdoors was on a motorbike or sitting my ass inside a 4X4 I could claim asthma was no big deal and not a problem but I am not nor will I ever be. For others who enjoy not only the outdoors but playing sports, walking their dog, serving in the military, going to a bar or even just enjoying what for most people is a "normal life" it very much is a problem and you prove you lack of understanding and caring with your callous statements. Now go ahead and twist that like you always do to make me look like the bad guy you jerk.

Preservation of wildlife and plant species must be considered before human use in all cases. If humans cannot find a way to live with all of earths creatures then we do not deserve to live at all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

More ignorance and lies from \_\_\_\_\_, no surprise there. Go tell the relatives of the 5000 people that die every year from asthma related deaths how clean the air is. So you would deny the world one of the most incredible discoveries ever if more ohv access is not given to you???

How immature and childish is that? And you wonder why the ohv community has such a bad name? So lets see we either destroy our last remaining forests and kill off our last remaining wildlife with oil and gas drilling and mining or we destroy it and kill it off with increased ohv use. Hmmm, seems like nature losses either way. Frankly I do not believe this story any more than I believe \_\_\_\_\_s relatives help invent hang gliding and set world records.

Sounds like you need to reintroduce predators to the region to return the natural balance of things. Why is the wildlife always blamed for what is really the fault of humans? Maybe if we stopped developing every last inch of land, stopped opening up so much land for oil and gas drilling, mining and ohv use which is driving these species to smaller and smaller areas and less and less food then there would not be this problem.

Leave it to one of the ohv communities largest spokesman to endorse the destruction of wildlife habitat and pristine areas. And he still wants us to believe ohv users care about wildlife, forests and the environment? Sure they do, just as much as the oil, gas and mining industries.

Well said. It is not exactly teaching young children the ways of respecting or enjoying nature either. Ohv use is more about destroying trails, streams, forests and meadows, going wherever you want, whenever you want, as fast as you want and as destructive as you want no matter if it is illegal or immoral. It's about ruining wildlife habitat, killing wildlife, harassing hikers and equestrians because it is fun to see horses rear up and throw riders or see hikers jump off trails before being run down. It's about promoting and furthering our dependence of fossil fuels and polluting the atmosphere and throwing trash all around the forest. It teaches young ones that our public lands are something to be used and abused and that wildlife does not matter because as an american it is your right to drive on, over and destroy every last inch of land even if it means extinction to entire species of animals and plants. It is about taking hiking trails and turning them into "multi use" trails and then running the hikers off the trails so they are no longer around. Basically it promotes the idea that nothing else matters except your own self centered pleasures so screw everyone and everything else and lets have our fun! Some will say this is rubbish but go ahead and check the "ideas" that the ohvers like \_\_\_\_\_ have put forth or the comments of the ohv users in so many posts and if that is not convincing enough go ahead and check the votes of their community and tell me I am wrong.

I live in this area and I totally agree with this mission. What will be left for our children, and our children's children. The same is true of all tribal lands that are shrinking and being polluted. Would the governments like that for their children and the homes they have?

Wolf Introduction is a Criminal Enterprise! By \_\_\_\_\_, Former USFWS Chief, and Whistle Blower of USFWS stealing 60-70 million dollars of Pittman Robertson Funds of Sportsmen Excise Taxes to illegally introduce the larger Northern subspecies *Canis Lupus Occidentalius*. Please watch. { <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uyu8\_X\_F4PM" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I wish ranchers would get on the computer, but they are too busy working outside for a living to scrape by. Defenders of Wildlife, known in states devastated by wolves as Destroyers of Wildlife which is a more appropriate name, only pay for confirmed livestock deaths. DOW infiltrated the USFWS under the Clinton Administration, when Jamie Rappaport Clark the former Chief of USWS was hired by Clinton to achieve this agenda. She oversaw the theft of 60-70 million dollars of Pittman Robertson Funds, excise taxes stolen to fund without congressional approval the illegal wolf introduction. \_\_\_ testified in front of congress these facts. DOW hired Jamie Rappaport Clark to become their Vice President. DOW under the Clinton Administration, were in charge of overseeing livestock depredations. \_\_\_\_\_ bragged that the real purpose of wolf "re" introduction was to kick 30,000 ranchers off open grazing lands.

DOW only pay for confirmed livestock deaths by wolves. In order for a rancher to prove livestock has been killed, he has to contact the USFWS to investigate the death. In most cases the USFWS doesn't make it out on time, and in many cases "confirmed" is just a method of saying, "prove it!" Only 1 out of 10 livestock deaths by wolves, are "confirmed." That means after USFWS is called. In most cases it can take hours to days. By the time they do come out depending on the condition of the dead animal, and the weather conditions a lot of evidence has been lost. USFWS spends your tax dollars America, performing necropsy investigations on dead livestock killed by an illegal wolves. After filling out paperwork, and jumping through red tape hoops, maybe 1 out of 10 dead livestock killed by wolves might get reimbursed. Most ranchers have quit participating due to the frustration of dealing with a corrupt Federal Government system, and DOW which is an anti-hunting, anti-ranching, radical animal rights group. DOW has no credibility.

What does that have to do with \_\_\_\_\_'s comment? Ranchers have lost livestock, sheep and cattle from wolves. They pay a predator tax for every livestock animal they raise. Many of the sheep and cattle were killed on their private property. If you are going to use that argument...Then we could say neither is your dog, cat, or horse that was killed by wolves. DOW don't reimburse people for their their horses, lamas, goats, and other pets. Henery Fischer of DOW admitted, pre-introduction of the Non-Native *Canis Lupus Occidentalius*, that Wolf "re" introduction would depend on the political climate and tolerance of ranchers. That is the only reason DOW decided to reimburse. I have spoken to many ranchers that said, the reimbursement was such a scam they wouldn't participate. Like the fox guarding the hen house.

I take it you are probably a college graduate in the field of Conservation? I've never ran into anyone in my entire life living in Idaho, or out West for that matter that refers to cattle as "non-native." That is a "term" being used to push the agenda of ending open grazing on our BLM lands, and dismantle the ranching sector of our poverty stricken rural communities under another "scam" of the ESA. So what are you saying Michael, everyone needs to get rid of all cattle, horses, dogs, cats, goats, pigs, sheep, lamas, etc etc, because they are non-native? How extreme do you want to get, can't grow gardens because they are non-native too? Can't grow yards because the rose bush is from Texas and not Idaho? Where are you coming from?



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Very well said. People like \_\_\_\_\_ are extreme environmentalists, with one agenda to end hunting, and ranching. Just like the Spotted Owl was the surrogate "scam" to end timber management of our forests, the environmentalists would rather see our forests die from bark beetle, blister rust, mistle toe, and other diseases. They would rather let the timber burn instead of be managed. I've never seen our forests so unhealthy as they are right now. I don't believe DOW should reimburse ranchers for wolf killed livestock. I believe the fraudulent people that stole the Pittman Robertsons Funds from the Sportsmen, DOW's own Vice President Jamie Rappaport Clark, and everyone involved with the illegal wolf introduction should be investigated and pay. I would like to see our legislators file FOIA on every NGO, all the plaintiffs especially DOW and Westernwatersheds, to see how much money their Welfare Lawyers are "milking" the American Tax Payers out of Millions-Billions in law suits, aimed at dismantling the hard-working rural American families.

Also Isle Royal is a closed ecosystem. The wolves are all inbred so bad they have congenital bone deformities. The moose would wildly drop, and then pick up after the wolves would starve and kill each other for protein. So it's been an ecosystem full of dips and increases of both predator and prey. Mech didn't go public with the predator pit situation on Isle Royal like he should of. He also kept the facts hidden that the wolves were deformed from inbreeding, weren't pure wolf but had been cross breeding with coyotes as well as inbreeding among themselves. He also hid the fact that the term Alpha female and Alpha male are obsolete. Many of these facts had to be brought out in the public after he was confronted with them. One thing about State Fish and Games they are so penetrated with non-hunters now, that IDFG is in a lot of trouble with the sportsmen of Idaho. Not only that but rural communities like Idaho County are now declaring a State of Disaster!

More Funding for Conservation. In areas with significant population growth and rapid urbanization, land and easement acquisitions are often the only way to achieve conservation and recreation goals. More LWCF funding is needed to fund land acquisition. Furthermore, now is the time to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Paul Sanford Director of Stewardship and Public Policy American Canoe Association [www.americancanoe.org](http://www.americancanoe.org)

Change the Paradigm on the Use of Public Lands. Complete the transition away from our historic emphasis on resource extraction (minerals, fossil fuels, trees and water) towards a greater emphasis on protecting the human experiences that occur on our lands and waters. Continue to allow necessary resource extraction where appropriate, but let the human experience drive your management decisions. The experiential value of lands and waters must given greater, or at least equal weight as resource extraction. This shift will contribute to a more sustainable economy. Director of Stewardship and Public Policy American Canoe Association [www.americancanoe.org](http://www.americancanoe.org)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Poor Water Quality. The Clean Water Act has brought about significant improvements in water quality, but there is a lot of work left to do. Even if we set aside the need for safe sources of drinking water, we still need to improve water quality in order to protect the value of the American outdoor experience. For example, without wildlife, the user experience in places like the Chesapeake Bay and the Florida Everglades would lose their essential character. They would be landscapes without a soul. To protect wildlife, we must improve water quality. Nutrient loading is devastating the waters of our nation, and if this problem is not corrected, they will no longer be the kind of places people want to go. We need to renew our commitment to improving water quality if we intend to preserve the value of the outdoor experience. Director of Stewardship and Public Policy American Canoe Association [www.americancanoe.org](http://www.americancanoe.org)

There you go - stereotyping those who desire to enjoy America's public lands. For your information, my mode of transportation is NOT "over-powered, knobby-tired". It is totally stock. While I agree there are those who do fit your stereotyped definition, the majority of those who enjoy America's public lands do so in a responsible manner. You obviously have ulterior motives. You should be ashamed of yourself in trying to restrict access to America's public lands. Remember, they belong to ALL Americans!

While this sounds like a good thing, it may not be as good as it sounds. Why? For example, Conservation Northwest. Sounds like a good organization, but since they are right here in our backyard (NE Washington state), I am familiar with them. They are proposing to designate an additional 214,000 acres of the Colville National Forest (CNF) to eventually become wilderness area. That may not sound like much, but it would result in one-third of the CNF becoming wilderness. While I'm not against wilderness - there's a place for everyone - I am totally against their way of proposing this. Over the last 5 or so years, there's been numerous attempts by the CNF to get user input on how to manage the CNF. Unfortunately none of the attempts have come to agreement so this fall, Conservation Northwest wants to go directly to Congress and request the wilderness designation. So rather than working through existing channels, since they can't get their way, they are going to do an end run and go straight to the approving authorities (only Congress can designate wilderness areas). I can't vouch for any of the other organizations on the list, but I suspect some of them may also be trying to do the same thing!

Absolutely! I get tired of eastern lawmakers knowing what's right for us westerners! Many of them probably have never visited the lands they want to declare as wilderness!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"Going for a walk on a national forest without use of specific services remains free." Mr. Crandall, this statement that you made to Ms. Benzar -#2 above- is a flat out lie. At Forest Service contrived "HIRAs" hundreds of thousands of acres of land require the payment of a fee for anyone who dares to stop his car and get out...it matters very little to the Forest Service that the nearest toilet, picnic table, parking lot, campground, etc. etc. is ten, fifteen, or thirty miles away. Ever been to the Los Padres National Forest in central California? "HIRAs" are entrance fees and public land access fees, not use fees. The whole fee program under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act is a total sham. Right now the Sequoia National Forest is under investigation by the Inspector General's office of the USDA for its "questionable" -to say the least- use of local recreation dollars. As a citizen if I were to present Sequoia National Forest type accounting of my taxes to the IRS I would be thrown in jail. Why is it that the government doesn't have to follow its own laws? What do you and those who you represent have to gain out of all of this? Doubleplusungood...or is it Seig Heil?

Last night I posted a response to \_\_\_\_\_. This morning it is gone. Technical reason, some other reason? \_\_\_\_\_'s statement... "Going for a walk on a national forest without use of specific services remains free." ...is a flat out lie. On millions of acres of land in the western US the Forest Service will cite you for getting out of your car (most often on state and county roads) in the middle of nowhere thirty miles from any sort of "amenity." Possibly could the Interior Secretary and Agricultural Secretary look at this? While you're at it check out how the BLM just got more of these illegal fees approved (via the Forest Service controlled "Advisory Committee") for entrance to the San Joaquin River Gorge in California. Check out the voodoo economics of the Sequoia National Forest's recreation and appropriated fee programs over the last ten years. (It shouldn't be that difficult, per Congressional request the Inspector General is currently doing an audit.) Corrupt Government.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It would seem from some of your comments that you have made an attempt to gather some specific on the ground knowledge of the area and that is very good. I appreciate the positive tone of your approach to land management questions and the opportunity to have this dialogue. It would appear that much of your information is second hand and some is unfortunately inaccurate, your sources likely not being up to date or complete. For the sake of others who might read this I would like to offer some insights as I live in the area, visit frequently (including a hike last Saturday up the Scotchman Peak trail) and participate in many public meetings on land management in the Panhandle. The local snowmobilers do access the Lighting Creek drainage through the Tresle Creek and from Clark Fork. However, topography and geography limit their ability to utilize any of the "Scotchmans". The more often utilize the area you mentioned, Porcupine Lake along with Lunch Peak and Trestle Peak areas. In many conversations with representatives from these clubs and with individuals, there are only a small \who enter the far northeast corner of the Scotchmans IRA (near Lighting Peak). This area is outside of the boundary for wilderness proposed by the forest service and not likely to be designated by congress as wilderness. The area of the scotchmans in Idaho proposed for wilderness is not utilized by the snowmobile community. On the other hand, snowshoers and backcountry skiers do use this area - last winter we had over 80 users on 10 group outings, and that is just the winter hikes organized by the Friends of Scotchman Peaks. The Goat Mountain Trail head is on Lighting Creek road about 200 yards past where the county stops plowing. The Star Peak trailhead is on Highway 200. Ross Creek Cedars trailhead is a plowed parking lot. The Scotchman Peak trail itself is used frequently despite the fact that the last 2.5 miles are closed during "mud season" to vehicles. I mention these simply to provide accurate information regarding winter access for back country skiers and snowshoers. These areas are popular for quiet recreationist because 97% of the Panhandle National Forest open to snowmobile use, reserving only 3% for people who prefer human powered recreation in a quiet setting. Still this is not the principle reason for, or benefit of, Wilderness designation. You asked about the benefit of Wilderness designation (in reference to winter) and the answer to that question is more about protecting habitat rather than providing areas for quiet winter recreationists. Snow mobile use is in direct conflict with providing for critical Mountain Goat Winter Range habitat and Grizzly Bear denning areas. I am not against responsible motorized recreation (winter or summer) and do believe that forest planning and projects should address needs for these user groups. And we need to diffuse the conflict created by extremists on all sides in order to find constructive solutions. There are approximately 12,000 miles of forest service maintained trails on the Idaho Panhandle National forest and the majority of trails maintained by the forest service are open to motorized use. Not all of these are trails, but then a majority of our local trails are open to use by all user groups including ATVs. In the Lighting Creek area, in addition to Porcupine Lake, there are also ATV trails to the lakes systems at the north end of the drainage and over the Strong Creek/Wellington pass, to name just a couple. The trail to Scotchman Peak, since you mention the condition, was cleared of all the downfall on June 12th by a volunteer work group in conjunction with the Forest Service. In fact, the Friends of Scotchman Peaks provided volunteers for 3 trail maintenance projects this last summer, including Star Peak's Big Eddy Trail and Pillick Ridge. Chainsaws were used, as were hand tools including pulaskis. Our volunteers are more than ready to use hand tools in the situations that may require them. Next summer we plan on additional projects in the area.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There are many benefits of Wilderness designation, from protecting habitat for critical species, to preserving big game hunting opportunities, to assuring quiet recreation and providing for the quality of life experiences which are important to economic development, but mostly, I believe, we owe it to our children to leave some places just as we found them. A more complete look at these benefits can be found on our website and in our hiking map and newsletter. If you are interested in joining us for one of our hikes, or trail maintenance projects we would love to have you come! You can go to our website and use the online subscribe button to sign up for our newsletter and / or notices. If you are interested in continuing a one on one dialogue about these large issues, I would also invite you to go to our website and use the "contact us" to access my email. [www.ScotchmanPeaks.org](http://www.ScotchmanPeaks.org)

I meant to write that there are 12,000 miles of FS maintained roads. "Trails" was a slip of the "tongue" as that was also on my mind. Most all of the FS roads provide access for all users. I don't have at my finger tips the total number of trail miles in the district (Sandpoint Ranger district) but seem to recall it's only a bit over 100 miles for all types of trails. A significant portion are open to ATV use, I seem to recall looking at it in detail 5 or 6 years ago, but do not recall the exact mileage. All, or almost all are out and back - due to the nature of our topography. I understand the desire, and usefulness of "loop" trails, particularly for the ATV users and think that this can facilitate reductions in user conflict by establishing some directional usage. I believe there is an effort to create such an experience in the Talache area and south of there through construction and linkage. There are probably other opportunities for adding to this system, both motorized and non-motorized, a need that can be addressed in forest planning, travel planning and perhaps in the Bonner County Trails Advisory group. I have participated in the former two, but not the latter, although I follow the BC Trails group's work. I think all three allow different user groups to come to a better understanding of needs and limits and help reduce conflict over land management decisions. Glad to hear you are involved.

I would rather subsidize park creation than say.....nuclear power plants, but \_\_\_\_\_ does make a point about re-development around parks displacing existing residents.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Protect scenic lands. I write in support of protecting our greatest unprotected scenic areas for future generations. I am inspired by family vacations over the past two summers. The first was a brief visit to Michigan State Parks along the southeastern shore of Lake Michigan. It was wonderful to swim and to hike, but I was overwhelmed by a sense of lost opportunity: due to the history of the region, the lakeshore became private property, and the state parks represent a miniscule share of the lakefront. Such a great treasure, so little of it available to the public---and in a densely populated region, where there is such need for the opportunity to experience unspoiled nature and serenity! Our second trip was farther north, along the Lake Superior shore of the eastern upper peninsula of Michigan. And again, I saw that as soon as the roads are built, development follows, and what we all take for granted is lost. A shocking case is the stretch of Whitefish Bay between the Taquahmenon River outlet and Whitefish Point: nonstop summer homes in the south, an endless stretch of real estate for-sale signs in the north: dozens of miles of gorgeous shoreline, with miniscule areas of unaltered shoreline, public land and public access. And it is clear that dozens of miles of unspoiled shoreline farther west will be developed in the coming years for private enjoyment, if it is not permanently protected. This story is not unique to the small areas I have described. Generations of Americans have taken for granted the greatest landscapes, seashores, and lakefronts of our country, unaware of how much is privately owned and ultimately will be developed. It's urgent to protect the most scenic of these areas for the enjoyment of our children and grandchildren. Some areas are so unique and special, they must be preserved for all. May our sense of the common good prevail!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

\_\_\_\_\_, You should indeed get out from behind your desk and see the real world. Fees in general are an abomination. Whether it be in business or government they are simply either another tax or a price increase. You cite toll roads. Toll roads are usually an enhanced travel option that is often implemented by private entities. There is usually an alternative tax funded travel option. Not so with the fee program. It's a government agency money grab with no alternative. Let's not hide behind the names. A Fee is a TAX. And these taxes are being implemented and raised by non-elected officials who have no accountability to the voting public. That is just about as close to "taxation without representation" that you can get. Your facts are incorrect and your statements turn a blind eye to the reality of poor administration by the USFS. This government agency will assess a fee wherever they think they can get away with it. Even on unimproved sites. It is a fact that the USFS spent MORE to administer the test fee program than it brought in. Here is a great example for you. My empty boat trailer was ticketed for being parked in a trail head parking lot. Why would I park an empty boat trailer in a trail head parking lot? Because before the fee program that lot was where we were told by the Forest Service to park the trailers (for 25 years). After Fee implementation, Fee happy rangers conveniently forgot that this was a general purpose lot and that they had done nothing to improve it in over 35 years and ticketed anything that had wheels. Needless to say I refused and the USFS decided not to pursue such an idiotic tactic that would have made them look even more foolish. The fact remains that the Fee program is a deeply flawed piece of legislation. Finally, you propose that "volunteers" get a free pass. I would gladly volunteer to help on forest conservation projects but I have a job and have to work to feed my family and PAY MY TAXES. I don't have time to volunteer. So you want those who have the time but don't pay taxes to get a free walk in the forest? Why not drop the TAX increases masquerading as FEEs and give us all a free walk in the forest??

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The rules that exclude mtn bikes from the trails are hardly vestigial. They are there for a reason; though, at the time many of the rules were written, mtn biking as a form of recreation did not exist or was in it's infancy. In general, hiking and horseback travel in the backcountry are the two major forms of getting from "A" to "B". These methods have existed since people started moving away from their birth places. The PCT was created to allow bikers and equestrians to travel from Mexico to Canada. It is a very narrow trail, oftentimes in areas that cling to the sides of cliffs with little opportunity to pass. When I have been on the PCT on horseback, several times, there was difficulty trying to get horse and hiker to pass because there was no way for either to get out of the way of the other. Now, add speeding bike to the mix, who is going to go off the side of the hill? Sure, a bike bell might alert hike, horse and rider but what's to alert the biker? Wilderness areas usually specify that mechanical devices are not allowed. Bikes are about as mechanical as you can get. Real diehard greens even try to outlaw horses claiming that the bridle/bit/reins are a mechanical device (lever) used to control the horse. These rules make trail maintenance a royal pain since chain saws are not allowed to remove fallen trees. If the rules don't allow for mechanical devices for such good things as trail maintenance, why should they be allowed for other reasons. Hiking and horseback riding are about as natural as one can get when being out in nature. These modes of transportation are slow, allowing one to fully experience the surroundings. How much nature is being enjoyed at 30 mph and vision focused maybe 50-100 feet in front? I almost see the PCT as being a test case, allow mtn bikes on one of the most heavily traveled trail systems, then they will try for the Appalachian Tail (on which even horses are banned with as much disdain as mtn bikes are on the PCT). I may be wrong but I just don't see mtn bikers clamoring to be the first to ride from Mexico to Canada on a bike. Their demands for access are more for the chance to ride some exciting downhills in the local area. Angeles National Forest offers many opportunities where a bike ride can be dropped off at the top of the mountain and ride the exciting PCT to the bottom, hikers and horses be damned.

Where I live, users try to show respect for the others. While traveling these trails as a hiker and cyclist, I've met rude cyclists, rude horseback riders and rude hikers. But, these individuals are the exceptions, not representative of their respective "groups." I will note that overwhelmingly it is hikers who leave the most trash and cut switchbacks. But, I view this (and other problems) as educational challenges. As a society we have become more alienated from the outdoors and the Leave No trace ethic is not well ingrained in the typically urban American. Anecdotal stories of the abuses by a particular group make good fodder for those who want to sow discord. But they should have no place in an reasoned discourse over public policy. It has been my experience overall that multi-use trails work well and people can all enjoy them. As a person who has volunteered many hours to trail maintenance, I see a far greater representation from the Mountain Biking community that any other group. This, of course, will vary from region to region (and certainly a wilderness trail that prohibits cyclists is not going to be a magnet for cyclists to do trail work). The point being, no group has a monopoly on good work or misdeeds. Perhaps people should perhaps rethink their opinions rather than look for reasons to become more entrenched in their pre-conceived ideas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

and it has a direct impact on local economies. Small town near where I live was pretty disappointed when a popular mountain biking area was turned into Wilderness, and they lost their contributions to the community.

I live in NE MN, on the edge of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, an over 1 million acre "wilderness." It is an amazing, beautiful, peaceful place. I have been privileged to paddle its lakes many times. However, there is also beauty to be found in my own back yard. I live one mile outside the city of Grand Marais MN, a small village on Lake Superior. I am fortunate to be outside city limits so I don't have street lights. There are many nights that I step out my backdoor and look up at the stars, so brilliant and so close it feels like I could reach out and touch them. I can hear the leaves rustling in the trees and birds and frogs making their comforting sounds. I can see fireflies flitting about and once in awhile I get buzzed by a bat. We often have backyard barbecues, enjoying the smell of the firewood and sharing S'mores with our grandkids. All of the wonder of nature is in my backyard, in the midst of civilization. The wilderness is precious yes, but it is underused -- the very young, the very old, the busy, the poor-- don't have the time, ability & money to travel to the wilderness and to hike or paddle to enjoy it. But we can all find the wilderness all around us - let's stop fighting & enjoy it!

The process is definitely broken! In Cook County, MN, the Forest Service has invested six years and over \$340,000 (and counting) on a reroute of a 2.2-mile snowmobile trail between 2 lakes. This trail existed in the 50s and when the 1978 Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act created the BWCAW, it cut off this trail. Somehow it was overlooked until 2003 and then the Forest Service shut it down. The trail users (cabin owners & icefishermen) have been fighting ever since to try to get the re-route done. These are average citizens, working hard, with no time to decipher the hundreds of pages of environmental studies and file "substantive comments." They are fighting corporate environmental groups such as the Sierra Club & Izak Waltons, who have executive directors and paid staffers to read environmental studies & find a loophole that environmental lawyers can take to court to block anything from happening. Environmental groups might have been helping the forest in the '60s, but now they are eating up precious funding that could be used to educate the public about the forest, to build trails, campgrounds, etc. And yes, these corporate environmental groups get reimbursed for their legal fees if they manage to win, which they do, because judges don't understand what is best for the forest!

We don't need more layers of government to oversee the use of our public lands! It is difficult enough to build a trail or a trail shelter or campground or anything now, with having to go through the bureaucratic processes of the US Fish & Wildlife Service and the US Forest Service. Just let them do their work without adding more redtape.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In NE Minnesota the US Forest Service has spent six years & \$340,000 in environmental studies on a 2.2-mile snowmobile trail because environmental groups (Friends of the Boundary Waters, Sierra Club, Izak Waltons, etc.) are fighting this in court. That \$340K is just environmental work NOT legal expenses! It is disgusting that this amount of money must be spent to appease people who will never be satisfied. In the research of the impact of the sound of this snowmobile trail OUTSIDE the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW), one "forest user" is quoted as saying they would be bothered whether they went to the BWCAW or not - they would be bothered by the fact that the trail existed! How can the Forest Service deal with someone like that? Let the people who use the forests, respectfully, on trails, use the forest!

Closures and restrictions are out of hand. Cost and regulations likewise. I'd like to see the government butt out and return land use to what it was 50 years ago when I could actually enjoy it instead of be afraid of my government.

OPosser attempts to take over private and state lands should be rebuffed by all Americans who do not believe in Marxist Socialism. How can you even remotely give any credibility to passing title to US lands to China when this maniac bankrupts the country. Not to mention the closing of property that belongs to the people in the mean time. Been a native Oregonian for only 63 years, but what I see today makes me ill.

As a Utah resident, I support and applaud this idea. I've posted some ideas relating to OHV problems and apparently incurred the wrath of some OHV users. However, I've seen the problems first-hand. Anyone paying attention can see the progression over the years of continuing, illegal OHV route proliferation and the resulting soil erosion, expansion of invasive/exotic weeds, visual scarring, and habitat fragmentation. And anyone who spends much time in rural Utah knows that BLM and Forest Service rangers are spread way too thin, and the odds of OHV scofflaws getting caught are very low. In addition, the dominant political culture and most politicians in Utah are so far to the extreme right wing that they make Bush and Cheney look like tree-hugging liberals by comparison. These Utah politicians profess to love the land and be good stewards, while they push OHV recreation virtually everywhere, and appear largely oblivious to the many problems and conflicts those OHV uses can cause. By the way, I'm not averse to OHVs per se, so long as they are used responsibly. I've ridden both dirt bikes and ATVs on primitive routes, but I stay on those routes.

Mountaintop removal coal mining is perhaps the most unsustainable and egregious example of our society's willingness to sacrifice long-term environmental health for short-term fossil fuel energy. It is a continuing national shame that we allow coal companies to blow up mountains and fill in beautiful valleys and streams to access coal. This issue will be a true test for the Obama administration and EPA on Clean Water Act compliance, and for Democrats in Congress on whether they will side with what's right or rather with the coal-state DINO's who are in bed with their coal company campaign contributors.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Actually state and federal levels are engaged in current planning to kill large numbers of wolves regardless of ESA designation. To the wolves one can add America's wild horses, the Yellowstone bison, bears, the rare Florida panther, the even more rare ocelot and so much more. Stewardship is not an option going forward, but rather an imperative. If we can leave no room for other lives and voices, we will ultimately find none for ourselves.

And behind ranching is banking that loans them the money. Without the ESA many species would have already joined the Passenger Pigeon and the Carolina Parakeet. If the majority of people working in agencies are good environmentalists and listen to good science rather than suppressing it, we can do better. There are reasons for words like environment and ecoSYSTEM. When we ignore the whole and interconnected nature of all things we end up destroyers, even when we mean well. In the above case, it is the prairie ecosystem that was essentially wiped out in an earlier era and now suffers abuse even in the effort to bring something back.

Regarding comment 1: One does not usually treat an addiction by feeding it. Wildlife, conservation, etc. were largely absent from the national election debates. Supposedly, the AGO itself is an effort at remedy. True leadership is a valuable and scarce commodity. We could use some more.

Paragraph two sounds a bit closer to what we have already been doing. Without a leap forward in human wisdom, "a more economic, cost-benefit style approach to see which of our options best suits us" would likely lead to our demise, along with the rest of the biosphere.

How did nature ever manage without logging? Much of the revised view of forest science has to do with trying to avoid the effects of past management. Sometimes old growth forest can and should be allowed to get along without the lumber business. Where management is more active, it should not become an excuse to clear cut. Timber interests are not all that excited about thinning diseased and dead trees. The author's idea sounds nice enough, but could as easily serve as speech writing for the head of a timber company. Bottom line is to honestly respect the ecosystem and the resource, something that seems hard to come by.

Actually, animals know and express much more than most humans are willing to listen to. However, even if we have no ears to hear, we could at least use our eyes. Animals (plants too) are the canary in the coal mine for the environment. They are taking a lot of punishment and they illuminate the problems and dangers all too well. They are good teachers for those willing to learn and good mirrors of what we are becoming. The American west contains the oldest known organisms on the planet (some approaching 5000 years) -- the bristlecone pine. They are dying. That should concern us. Each year for decades Americans have killed the numerical equivalent of the Holocaust in our animal control facilities... What happens to other animals ultimately happens to the human animal.

Some things are not a matter just for locals and some things require intervention due to local misdeed.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The uses available need to be determined by what the ecoSYSTEM can actually sustainably support. Too often, multiple use reduces to dividing the spoils. That is not conservation, just a mere shadow of it.

Funny, \_\_\_\_\_ intially attacks my comment and then in the end once everyone has started to black out from his "statistics"...he agrees in general. Snowmobilers have the accountability of use permits and tags that are paid for, certainly in Washington this is the case. I think you would have to have a 1x1ft sign in bright orange to help make any tag on the sled identifiable, let alone something you could read while moving to "nab" the violators. The first half of your "statistics" can also be applied to airplanes flying above. The second half are addressed with the education and peer accountability as I mentioned. There are many areas in WA that are closed when snow depths reach a certain "minimum" level to help protect the areas from the type of degradation you speak of. I just don't think these additional or modified tags will improve the suggestion that was made.

Opinions are just that.....Opinions. Sarcastically falsifying the truth is just ignorant. So here is the challenge for those whom believe the crap they type that is so negative towards OHV Use in the Forest that belongs to the American People.....All of US. A = Give the facts to back up your negative claims 1. I will give the facts to justify OHV People and their actions to preserve trails, take care of trails, care for wildlife and the forest. B = Show pictures of these claims, those of you who wish to continue to show negativity towards OHV People. 2. I also will show more pictures than your computer can handle that verify the volunteers whom take care of more forest trails than most Forest Districts ever have C = Give the facts - not opinions - of those who tear up the trails, pictures would be better, that ride an ATV - OHV - Motorcycle - 4X4 - Jeep - or even family car. 3. I will be able to rebuttal any of these claims the negative ones wish to commit with. I am an Advocate for Saving ATV/OHV Trails..... I do keep well informed - good or bad - and I would be the first to inform the USFS - LEO of those who are endangering our responsible recreation by abusing the forest trails. Also, I Do Not get any financial gain by any means for My Advocating unlike the "Greenies " do. They get their "Money " from any source that will believe the crap and lies that are to make corporations look good to the public. So..... I challenge the negative ones to reply to the questions above. Help USDA - USFS - BLM - Fish and Wildlife kick out the ATV/OHV Recreationist buy showing facts..... not just YOUR typed words and opinions. I would be happy to HELP YOU get rid of those who wish not to follow the rules like most of us do. I await responses!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

120) ..... OHV people are becoming very vocal because the "Silent Ones" have more Corporate Money with lobbyist to back them because they tend to fabricate the information to misleading corporations in to thinking "their ideas" are facts. Hence .....our very own President Obama even received a packet from many of the opposing groups telling the Pres. even much better fabricated information in order to get him to sign the "Monuments Bill" for which.....if one looks at the policies..... a Monument keeps all Americans OFF of it..... for any reason. So I request this..... for all of you out there..... those who support OHV Use for Recreation..... tell all of the corporations that you can about what will be lost forever, and our grandchildren's children will NEVER see, for them selves as to what our forest are like to be able to recreate in them because fabricated information by highly misleading people was propaganda to start with. So back to the point I was making here..... Get corporations to Donate to the protection of our recreation, our family time, our lives, and properly inform them where things are heading if certain groups fabricate any further. The Truth.!

Sorry..... 120) ..... if I made seem to be abrupt but there are too many people that are misinformed do to "gossip" and No Facts what so ever. Our "cities" and "developments" have become so tight with so many people so when a family tries to vacation in the forest..... it has been taken away. Then the family unit continues to break apart..... father's in home offices or watching sports on TV..... mother's may be in home office too or TV..... kids on video games..... and the family pet is considering on moving out due to lack of attention. Recreation is one of the fastest growing activities for families that is bringing them back together. Okay.....I have stopped.....again....I apologize.

Lands "Locked Up"..... Term used from USFS when areas are closed in many forms to public access. Dirt Mounds - Fell trees - Gates - Chains ..... SO if No One has not ever "seen" this "Locked Up" area than maybe you are not out there to actually see it. I am in the forest much more than any city and I come across this problem way too often. Open your eyes - see what is in front of you.....if you are in the forest at all.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

New Forest System Land Management Planning Rule. From..... Blue Ribbon Coalition Comment

We are concerned that the NOI strays far from the core purpose for revisiting the agency's planning regulations. In fact, the NOI threatens to create new, undefined goals and criteria which will exacerbate, not resolve, the planning gridlock accelerating through the agency. It is sadly ironic that the agency remains mired in a decades-long effort to promulgate valid rules intended to make more streamlined the content of Forest Plans and more efficient the process by which they are created. At the risk of belaboring the obvious, it should not take a Forest 10, 8 or even 5 years to revise Forest Plans, which are supposedly obsolete in 10 years. The NOI does not attempt to borrow from the best ideas of prior efforts, but instead threatens a new vision fraught with uncertainty. We urge the Forest Service to steer this effort back to its necessary focus- (1) to fill the current regulatory void; and (2) to redouble proper focus on the primary goals of efficiency and expediency in the Forest planning process.

C. Background The National Forests were originally set aside to provide a continuous supply of timber and for the protection of water sources for local communities and agricultural needs. Later, through the adoption of the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960, Congress determined that the forests should be "administered for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes," which purposes were declared to be "supplemental to, but not in derogation of" the original purposes. (16 U.S.C. §528) The Forest Service is required to "use a systematic interdisciplinary approach to achieve integrated consideration of physical, biological, economic, and other sciences" in its land and resource plans. The Forest Service must assure that the plans "provide for multiple use and sustained yield of the products and services obtained there from in accordance with the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act of 1960, and, in particular, include coordination of outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife and fish, and wilderness." The plans must "determine forest management systems, harvesting levels [of timber] and procedures" based upon all of the uses mentioned above, the definitions of multiple use and sustained yield as laid out in the law, and the availability of lands and their suitability for resource management. (16 U.S.C. §1604(b) and (e)) The regulations of the Forest Service have defined fundamental principles of planning for the Forest Service's natural resources. (36 C.F.R. §219.3) Land management planning is an adaptive management process that includes social, economic, and ecological evaluation; plan development, plan amendment, and plan revision; and monitoring. The overall aim of planning is to produce responsible land management for the National Forest System based on useful and current information and guidance. Land management planning guides the Forest Service in fulfilling its responsibilities for stewardship of the National Forest System to best meet the needs of the American people. (36 C.F.R. §219.3(a)) The Forest Service is also required, as part of the development and interpretation of information for plans, to consider and incorporate the concept and conditions of sustainability. "Sustainability...has three interrelated and interdependent elements: social, economic, and ecological." (36 C.F.R. §219.10) The overall goal of the social and economic elements of sustainability is to contribute to sustaining social and economic systems within the planning area. To understand the social and economic contributions that National Forest System lands presently make, and may make in the future, the [Forest Service] must evaluate relevant economic and social conditions and trends as appropriate during plan development... (36 C.F.R. §219.10 (a)) Important to interpreting this guidance is a proper understanding of the multi-

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

layered nature of forest planning. There are at least three tiers to this process, which have been described as "existing at the national, regional and local levels." *Citizens for Better Forestry v. U.S. Dept. of Agric.*, 632 F.Supp.2d 968, 970 (N.D. Cal. 2009). The third, project-level of this hierarchy is that which most directly has concrete impacts on specific sites and forest resources, and must necessarily contain adequate site-specific analysis to disclose the range of proposed options and justify the agency's chosen course of action. For the planning process to be even moderately efficient, it is therefore necessary that each level removed from the project level must be more general, less detailed, and less voluminous so that it may be completed more quickly and without inappropriately diverting human, financial and other resources to the planning effort.

D. The Planning Regulations must be efficient and yield timely results. The NOI threatens an excessively broad and unnecessarily complex planning framework. Indeed, a framework more unwieldy than that presented by the 1998/2000 regulations or either of the approaches rejected by the *Citizens for Better Forestry* courts. The planning process must function and advance the agency's mission which requires that management activity actually affect and conserve Forest System resources. We fear we are poised on the brink of creating a fatuously self-indulgent planning process even further removed from the ground. Our planning vision should advance the interests of a broad individual and ideological spectrum. Put differently, it is not tilted toward allocating resources toward one form of use or another. Those decisions are properly made in project level analysis, or at least in the generation of each Forest Plan. There is only one special interest class that benefits from planning gridlock. The ideological extremists, who seek to disown the unavoidable impacts that humans have on the environment. We are often perceived to be (albeit inaccurately) playing a role in an allocation debate such as "Wilderness" vs. "multiple-use", but in the current process the debate should be between "use" vs. "ideological preservation." Planning regulations that prevent timely completion of any plans serve only the perspective of those who would have minimal, if any, on-the-ground human use of the Forest System. We reach out to truly-interested officials, agency employees, organizations and individuals to stand up in this process for active and continuing use of the Forest System. Whatever our differences, we face a common foe who would seize this point in our bureaucratic "evolution" to transform the visions of Pinchot, Roosevelt, and Leopold into a Forest System that excludes meaningful use. The core vision is valid, only its implementation need be improved. We need incremental change to existing planning frameworks, not a dramatic new vision that only threatens continuing judicial skepticism.

E. The importance the USFS has in providing a diverse range of recreation experiences for a wide range of visiting public should be emphasized in the planning regulations. In the materials we reviewed regarding the planning rule revision we noted that the agency may be operating on the assumption that recreation opportunity is being lost because lands are being degraded or used in an unsustainable way. Such a rationale is often cited to support limitations on recreational use and for more land being "protected," or otherwise made off limits for recreation. However, this assumption is not consistent with the facts, at least for USFS-managed lands. The agency's own planning activities results in much more loss of recreation opportunity than any other factor. The overriding reason for loss of recreation opportunities is the yearly additions of the primitive recreation classifications, the thousands of miles of roads and trails that were closed via the agency's travel management rule, and the many miles and areas closed via other site-specific planning.

1. A diverse range of recreational



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

activities should be identified as one of the key "Ecosystem Services" that Land Use Plans should address. According to the National Survey on Recreation and the Environment, the popularity and importance to USFS visitors of off-highway vehicle and snowmobile recreation has drastically increased in recent years. Ditto for mountain bike and equestrian use. Conversely, the amount of USFS lands available for motorized, mountain bike and, on some Forests, even equestrian trails, have been reduced via legislation, implementation of Forest Plans and site-specific recreation plans. Therefore, there is a need to emphasize a diverse range of recreation in the planning regulations.

2. Please identify the need to emphasize a diverse range of trail-based recreation as a formal planning issue and develop at least one alternative where the planning regulations identify motorized and non-motorized recreation as a key ecosystem service and provides direction to enhance and expand opportunities for these popular activities.

3. Loss of recreation opportunity must be properly analyzed in the DEIS/EIS and addressed in the final planning regulations.

4. All of the Alternatives should reflect, and at least one Alternative should enhance the importance given to recreation in the agency's multiple use sustained yield (MUSY) mandate contained in NFMA.

F. The socio-political and economic importance of multiple use sustained yield (MUSY) must be reflected in the planning regulations.

1. All Alternatives should include a complete analysis of the history of the MUSY Act and its socio-political importance to states with large areas of federally managed lands.

2. The issue of "cumulative loss of multiple use sustained yield management" should be identified as a formal planning issue and brought forward for analysis. Each year more and more USFS lands are removed from multiple use management. Past planning activities and litigation have significantly expanded preservation oriented management and significantly reduced areas available for multiple use. The reduction of MUSY lands has been identified by many states and counties as a key problem affecting the health and economic well-being of local communities. MUSY is extremely important to states with large areas of federally managed lands. There is a reason Congress embedded MUSY in the NFMA; it is because management of federal lands directly impacts the lives and livelihoods of nearby residents.

3. At least one alternative should include planning direction to enhance multiple use sustained yield management. Both the Forest Service and the BLM are required to manage the lands under their jurisdiction pursuant to the principles of "multiple use" and "sustained yield." These terms have been defined within the provisions of FLPMA for the BLM and within the provisions of the Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 for the Forest Service. Both definitions are lengthy and worthy of a detailed narrative of the history and the importance of MUSY in the DEIS. The new planning rule should re-emphasize that MUSY management is to be considered in the context of the best combination of land uses that meet the present and future needs of the nation with respect to "recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, wildlife and fish, and natural, scenic, scientific, and historical values." The term "sustained yield" is defined to mean the achievement of "a high level annual or regular periodic output of the various renewable resources of the public lands consistent with multiple use." (43 U.S.C. §1702(h)). See also 16 U.S.C. §531 (b)).

G. The agency's stated focus on "Restoration" must be defined and carefully considered.

1. It is vital that the agency clearly define what it means by restoration. The agency must also disclose the effects of this new focus on how the agency will develop and revise land use plans.

2. Restoration, or any other agency initiated planning focus must not override the MUSY mandate. The stated focus on restoration in the Notice of Intent is of great concern to



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

BRC's members. Restoration is not listed as a multiple-use objective in either MUSYA or the NFMA. Other NFMA provisions confirm that MUSY is to be the overriding directive for the management of National Forests. The agency must not substitute its MUSY mandate with any other focus or initiative, including restoration. H. Planning regulations should focus on procedures for developing, amending and revising land management plans, not on policy

1. The agency should reevaluate the "Substantive Principles" and remove any that do not specifically address procedures for developing, amending and revising land management plans. The NOI states that this new rule will "consist of procedures for developing, amending, and revising land management plans" and it lists several "principles" that could be used in the development of a new planning rule. Note that none of the "Substantive Principles" have anything to do with procedures for developing land management plans, and only one of the "Process Principles" directly address the planning process. The agency says its existing planning regulations are costly, complex, and procedurally burdensome. We believe this is because the previous regulations attempted to address policy instead of planning procedures. Congress sets the policies for management of federal lands, and administrative agencies must act within those legislative limits. The new planning regulations should focus exclusively on planning procedures, not policy direction.
2. Planning regulations should avoid setting management direction. The new planning regulations should stress that Congress prohibited national level planning, specifically noting that "there is not to be a national land management prescription" in the NFMA or implementing rule due to the wide range of biological and socio-economic conditions in the national forests. (S. Rep. No. 94-893, at 26 and 35, reprinted in 1976 U.S.C.C.A.N. 6685, 6694.)
3. Regulations should clearly state that Forest Plans should be limited to:
  1. Establishment of forest multiple-use goals and objectives, 36 CFR 219.11(b);
  2. Establishment of forest-wide management requirements (standards and guidelines) to fulfill the requirements of 16 USC 1604 applying to future activities (resource integration requirements, 36 CFR 219.13 to 219.27);
  3. Establishment of management areas and management area direction (management area prescriptions) applying to future activities in that management area (resource integration and minimum specific management requirements), 36 CFR 219.11(c);
  4. Designation of suitable timber land (16 USC 1604(k) and 36 CFR 219.14) and establishment of allowable timber sale quantity (16 USC 1611 and 36 CFR 219.16);
  5. Non-wilderness allocations or wilderness recommendations where 36 CFR 219.17 applies; and
  6. Establishment of monitoring and evaluation requirements, 36 CFR 219.11(d).
4. The planning directives should ensure that planning guidance is based on the 10 key legislative mandates from Congress:
  - \* Forest Service Organic Administration Act (Act of June 4, 1897) (16 U.S.C. §§ 1. 473-478, 479-482 and 551, June 4, 1897, as amended 1905, 1911, 1925, 1962, 1964, 1968, and 1976).
  - \* Multiple-Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 (Act of June 12, 1960) (P.L. 86-517; 2. 16 U.S.C. §§ 528-531).
  - \* National Forest Management Act of 1976 (Act of October 22, 1976) (P.L. 94- 3. 588; 16 U.S.C. §§ 1600-1614, August 17, 1974, as amended 1976, 1978, 1980, 1981, 1983, 1985, 1988 and 1990).
  - \* Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Act of July 1, 1978) (P.L. 95-313; 16 4. U.S.C. §§ 2101-2111, July 1, 1978, as amended 1990, 1991, 1992, 1996 and 2008).
  - \* Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 (Act of June 5. 30, 1978) (P.L. 95-307, as amended by P.L. 100-521, Forest Ecosystems and Atmospheric Pollution Research Act of 1988, Section 3 (c), and as amended by P.L. 101-624, Food Agriculture
  - \* Food Conservation and

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Energy Act of 2008 (Farm Bill) (P.L. 110-234) (Title VIII - Forestry and Title IX - Energy) \* Foreign Operation Appropriations Act of 1978 (Act of November 5, 1990) 7. (P.L. 101-513, 104 Stat. 2070; 16 §§ U.S.C. 4501 note, 4501, 4502, 4503, 4503a to 4503d, 4504, 4505, 1641, 1643, 2101, 2109). \* National Environmental Policy Act (Act of January 1, 1970) (P.L. 91-190; 8. 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347). \* Endangered Species Act (Act of December 28, 1973) (16 USC 1531-36, 1538- 9. 40).

I. There is a need to streamline the planning and appeal process We agree with the agency's assessment that current regulations are costly, complex, and procedurally burdensome. There is a need to reduce the agency's costs and delays associated with administrative appeals. However, many of the "Substantive Principles" are likely to exacerbate this problem. It seems reasonable to ask: are we repeating our past mistakes? It was interesting to learn that even back in the 1970s there was a concern that professional foresters, not the federal courts, should manage National Forests. It was surprising to learn that Senator Hubert Humphrey submitted a report to Congress stating that the NFMA is "designed to get the practice of forestry out of the courts and back to the forests." 122 Cong. Rec. 33835 (Sept. 30, 1976). It is unfortunate that the courts are still managing much of our Forests.

1. The new rule should attempt to streamline the planning and appeal process. The analysis should disclose NFMA's legislative intent in this regard, and perhaps seek clarification from Congress regarding what level of environmental analysis is appropriate for both programmatic and site specific planning.
2. The issue of cost and complexity of planning should be brought forward for analysis and incorporated as a formal planning issue.
3. At least one alternative should be formulated that streamlines and simplifies the planning process.
4. The agency may also wish to ask Congress to clarify its intent on both policy and requirements for environmental analysis.

J. There is a need to clarify the distinction between programmatic and site-specific planning as well as what level of environmental analysis is required for both The proper relationship between Forest Planning and project planning is a topic of frequent discussion. In the past, the agency asserted the "programmatic" or "general" nature of Forest Plans. However, recently completed Forest Plans blur the line, viewing subsequent site-specific processes as mere reiteration or "implementation" of the Forest Plan decisions. In addition, the agency seems to suffer from a multiple and often redundant requirements for environmental analysis. Although not perfect, we supported much of the (attempted) flexibility contained in the 2008 planning rule.

1. All alternatives should clarify the distinction between programmatic and site specific planning and at least attempt to describe what level of environmental analysis is required in each.
2. We support Forest Plans that are strategic as opposed to prescriptive.
3. The new rule should address only forest plan-level issues in Part 219, and leave project-level considerations to the Forest Service Directive System. See 67 Fed. Reg. 72773-75, 72791.

K. Comment regarding state and local government coordination during the Forest Planning process

1. New planning regulations should support and enhance close coordination with state and local governments All of the alternatives should include direction to involve local governments in the planning process. Local governments, because they are elected by those who are most directly effected by the agency's land use planning, often adopt plans, programs and policies to directly influence federal natural resource and land planning efforts. Current planning regulations require the agency to coordinate "with the land and resource management planning processes of State and local governments." (16 U.S.C. §1604(a)) Current regulations state that "the Responsible [Forest Service] Official must provide

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

opportunities for the coordination of Forest Service planning efforts...with those of other resource management agencies." Current regulations also provide that "the Responsible Official should seek assistance, where appropriate, from other state and local governments...to help address management issues or opportunities." (36 C.F.R. 219.9) In addition, the agency is required to "discuss any inconsistency" between the proposed plan's provision and "any approved State or local plan and laws." Further, if any inconsistencies exist, the plan must "describe the extent to which the [Forest Service] would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law." (40 C.F.R. §1506.2(d)) Recently, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has supported an invitation to state and local governments to become a quasi-cooperating agency in the preparation of federal land and natural resource management plans and associated EISs. The invitation to become a cooperating agency is not based on the fact that state or local government are entities that may be affected by the outcome of the process. Instead, cooperating agency status is specifically based upon state or local government's position as professionals having jurisdiction by law in the planning area or professionals holding special expertise in an issue that will be addressed in the analysis or decision (memo from \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman of the CEQ). Of course, this quasi-cooperating agency status does not relieve the federal agency of the responsibility as the decision-maker, and does not guarantee a decision that the cooperating agency may necessarily favor. Cooperating agency status does allow the cooperators to participate in the scoping process, the inventory of data and analysis of current situation process, the preparation of alternatives, the impact analysis, and in the preparation of the draft and final EISs. This existing guidance should be incorporated in the new planning rule.

L. It is unwise to "proactively address climate change" in the planning regulations. 1. Please remove climate change as a "Substantive Principle" The agency's own Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis (January 13, 2009) states that the effects of climate change are unknown, will vary regionally and will range the gamut from increased droughts to increased flooding. The document states: "It is not currently feasible to quantify the indirect effects of individual or multiple projects on global climate change and therefore determining significant effects of those projects or project alternatives on global climate change cannot be made at any scale." it also states; "Complete quantifiable information about project effects on global climate change is not currently possible and is not essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives." The only thing that is certain is the climate will change from its current and/or its historical condition. Effects of climate change are unknown. Impacts to the climate from human activities occurring on the forest, as well as the impacts of climate change on the forest cannot be made at any scale. Please remove this issue from consideration as a "Substantive Principle." In addition, incorporating "climate change" into planning will be redundant. For example, the NOI says Responsible officials will also need flexibility to be able to adjust plan objectives and requirements where there are circumstances outside of agency control: For example, where increasing water temperatures resulting from climate change make it impossible to maintain a sensitive fish species in its native habitat. However, such "flexibility" is already embedded in land use planning, and specific management prescriptions, standards and guidelines already address important issues such as "increasing water temperature." Indeed, existing Forest Plans contain very specific guidance regarding the monitoring of and management for sensitive habitats, including aquatic habitat. 2. The agency's planning regulations should discourage utilizing data

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Current planning directs planners to draw on existing "synthesis and assessments" prepared by the IPCC. As recent media reports indicate, this data contains information that was not properly "peer reviewed" and some countries have even expressed a "vote of no confidence" in IPCC's data. Given the issue of climate change is controversial, and could conceivably affect a wide range of agency planning activities, the new planning regulations should require independent verification of any data from the IPCC.

3. Should the agency ignore our request and include direction to include climate change as a Substantive Principle, the agency should include an alternative that attempts to sequester carbon via aggressive vegetation management. As noted above, climate science is too "young" to be effectively incorporated into the planning regulations at this time. However, should the agency attempt to do so, we recommend an alternative that directs aggressive approach to terrestrial carbon sequestration. The "sink" of carbon sequestration in forests and wood products may help to offset sources of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, such as deforestation, forest fires, and fossil fuel emissions. Aggressive forest health practices can increase the ability of forests to sequester atmospheric carbon while enhancing other ecosystem services, such as improving soil and water quality by avoiding "fatal" wildfires, insect and disease. Planting new trees and improving forest health through thinning and prescribed burning are some of the ways to increase forest carbon in the long run. Harvesting and regenerating forests can also result in net carbon sequestration in wood products and new forest growth. If the agency insists on incorporating climate change concerns into its planning rule, these activities should be emphasized in at least one alternative

M. We strongly oppose the "all-lands" approach. Please remove this from consideration as a "Substantive Principle."

1. The USFS lacks jurisdiction over state and private forests. It should not waste valuable resources attempting to plan for lands outside its jurisdiction The agency has this exactly 180 degrees backward. Instead of trying to force adjacent landowners to abide by the agency's wishes, it should be mindful not to let the deteriorating condition of its own forest to result in damage to adjacent lands.

2. The "rationale" for the "all-lands" approach lacks the proper perspective On August 14, 2009, USDA Secretary Vilsack outlined his vision for the future of our nation's forests. ( { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/video/tidwell/vilsack.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) As part of his rationale for the "all-lands" approach, the Secretary made this statement: "The Forest Service estimates that over 40 million acres of private forest could be lost to development and fragmentation over the coming three to four decades." The agency's estimate may or may not be accurate. What cannot be denied, however, is that the Secretary's statement is completely out of context. While some private lands are developed, tens of thousands of acres are permanently protected each year. According to the Trust for Public Lands, many millions of acres of private lands have been "saved" from development. { <a href="http://www.conservationmanac.org/secure/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

3. If loss of habitat to development or fragmentation is discussed in the analysis, it must include a accurate accounting of the lands that have been protected. The analysis should incorporate a full accounting of the lands that have been conserved, lands added to the federal estate, lands added to state and local estates, and lands that have otherwise been removed from development (e.g. conservation easements).

N. The agency should develop an alternative that emphasizes a more aggressive approach to achieving the historic range of variability outside

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Roadless Areas and Wilderness No one can deny that a very large percent of the agency's forests are unhealthy. There is agreement that moving to a historic range of variability, at least in as much as we understand it, is probably wise. However, the only tool available to manipulate those variables in designated Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) is prescribed fire. This will be a big problem for the new focus on Restoration. Unlike what the general public believes, IRAs include lands that are highly modified, and not just by decades of fire suppression. Many have been commercially logged in the past and these "plantations" are susceptible to unnatural wildfire, insect and disease. The agency's current Roadless area management severely restrict any attempt to restore these lands to the historic range of variability. Therefore, it is logical to develop an alternative that emphasizes a more aggressive approach to achieving the historic range of variability outside IRAs and Wilderness. This should include commercial logging where appropriate, which achieves the agency's mandates for community health and prosperity, and also protects against so-called "fatal fires," insect and disease outbreak. O. Comment about the distinction between restoration and "adequate protection of roadless areas." On August 14, 2009, USDA Secretary Vilsack outlined his vision for the future of our nation's forests. ( { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/video/tidwell/vilsack.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) In that vision, the Secretary stated: Our shared vision begins with restoration. Restoration means managing forest lands first and foremost to protect our water resources, while making our forests more resilient to climate change. The Secretary also stated: "An integral part of our shared vision must be adequate protection of roadless areas. President Obama was quite clear during the campaign in emphasizing his support for protecting roadless areas." There is an inherent conflict with the Secretary's desire for restoration and the intent to provide "adequate protection" of IRAs. The boundaries of IRAs are determined via the agency's mandate to determine which, if any, of its lands it will recommend to Congress be designated as Wilderness. The single most important criteria is the presence or absence of a certain type of road. That's why they call them Roadless Areas, after all. IRA boundaries are not, as the general public is often told, the last remaining pristine areas in our National Forests. Many IRAs include lands that are highly modified, and not just by decades of fire suppression. Many have been commercially logged in the past and these "plantations" are now in a highly unnatural state and extremely susceptible to unnatural wildfire, insect and disease. The agency's current Roadless area management, which is purportedly focused on "adequate protection," severely restricts any attempt to restore these lands to the historic range of variability. Except for a very few exceptions, the only tool available is prescribed fire. This situation begs the question; what is the agency's definition of protection? If by protection we mean moving the lands to a state that mirrors the natural ecosystem function then there is a conflict with his policy for protecting IRAs.

<b

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Continued..... . . . Comment regarding state and local government coordination during the Forest Planning process

1. New planning regulations should support and enhance close coordination with state and local governments. All of the alternatives should include direction to involve local governments in the planning process. Local governments, because they are elected by those who are most directly effected by the agency's land use planning, often adopt plans, programs and policies to directly influence federal natural resource and land planning efforts. Current planning regulations require the agency to coordinate "with the land and resource management planning processes of State and local governments." (16 U.S.C. §1604(a)) Current regulations state that "the Responsible [Forest Service] Official must provide opportunities for the coordination of Forest Service planning efforts...with those of other resource management agencies." Current regulations also provide that "the Responsible Official should seek assistance, where appropriate, from other state and local governments...to help address management issues or opportunities." (36 C.F.R. 219.9) In addition, the agency is required to "discuss any inconsistency" between the proposed plan's provision and "any approved State or local plan and laws." Further, if any inconsistencies exist, the plan must "describe the extent to which the [Forest Service] would reconcile its proposed action with the plan or law." (40 C.F.R. §1506.2(d)) Recently, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) has supported an invitation to state and local governments to become a quasi-cooperating agency in the preparation of federal land and natural resource management plans and associated EISs. The invitation to become a cooperating agency is not based on the fact that state or local government are entities that may be affected by the outcome of the process. Instead, cooperating agency status is specifically based upon state or local government's position as professionals having jurisdiction by law in the planning area or professionals holding special expertise in an issue that will be addressed in the analysis or decision (memo from \_\_\_\_\_, Chairman of the CEQ). Of course, this quasi-cooperating agency status does not relieve the federal agency of the responsibility as the decision-maker, and does not guarantee a decision that the cooperating agency may necessarily favor. Cooperating agency status does allow the cooperators to participate in the scoping process, the inventory of data and analysis of current situation process, the preparation of alternatives, the impact analysis, and in the preparation of the draft and final EISs. This existing guidance should be incorporated in the new planning rule.

L. It is unwise to "proactively address climate change" in the planning regulations.

1. Please remove climate change as a "Substantive Principle" The agency's own Climate Change Considerations in Project Level NEPA Analysis (January 13, 2009) states that the effects of climate change are unknown, will vary regionally and will range the gamut from increased droughts to increased flooding. The document states: "It is not currently feasible to quantify the indirect effects of individual or multiple projects on global climate change and therefore determining significant effects of those projects or project alternatives on global climate change cannot be made at any scale." it also states; "Complete quantifiable information about project effects on global climate change is not currently possible and is not essential to a reasoned choice among alternatives." The only thing that is certain is the climate will change from its current and/or its historical condition. Effects of climate change are unknown. Impacts to the climate from human activities occurring on the forest, as well as the impacts of climate change on the forest cannot be made at any scale. Please remove this issue from consideration



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

as a "Substantive Principle." In addition, incorporating "climate change" into planning will be redundant. For example, the NOI says Responsible officials will also need flexibility to be able to adjust plan objectives and requirements where there are circumstances outside of agency control: For example, where increasing water temperatures resulting from climate change make it impossible to maintain a sensitive fish species in its native habitat. However, such "flexibility" is already embedded in land use planning, and specific management prescriptions, standards and guidelines already address important issues such as "increasing water temperature." Indeed, existing Forest Plans contain very specific guidance regarding the monitoring of and management for sensitive habitats, including aquatic habitat. 2. The agency's planning regulations should discourage utilizing data provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Current planning directs planners to draw on existing "synthesis and assessments" prepared by the IPCC. As recent media reports indicate, this data contains information that was not properly "peer reviewed" and some countries have even expressed a "vote of no confidence" in IPCC's data. Given the issue of climate change is controversial, and could conceivably affect a wide range of agency planning activities, the new planning regulations should require independent verification of any data from the IPCC. 3. Should the agency ignore our request and include direction to include climate change as a Substantive Principle, the agency should include an alternative that attempts to sequester carbon via aggressive vegetation management. As noted above, climate science is too "young" to be effectively incorporated into the planning regulations at this time. However, should the agency attempt to do so, we recommend an alternative that directs aggressive approach to terrestrial carbon sequestration. The "sink" of carbon sequestration in forests and wood products may help to offset sources of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere, such as deforestation, forest fires, and fossil fuel emissions. Aggressive forest health practices can increase the ability of forests to sequester atmospheric carbon while enhancing other ecosystem services, such as improving soil and water quality by avoiding "fatal" wildfires, insect and disease. Planting new trees and improving forest health through thinning and prescribed burning are some of the ways to increase forest carbon in the long run. Harvesting and regenerating forests can also result in net carbon sequestration in wood products and new forest growth. If the agency insists on incorporating climate change concerns into its planning rule, these activities should be emphasized in at least one alternative M. We strongly oppose the "all-lands" approach. Please remove this from consideration as a "Substantive Principle." 1. The USFS lacks jurisdiction over state and private forests. It should not waste valuable resources attempting to plan for lands outside its jurisdiction The agency has this exactly 180 degrees backward. Instead of trying to force adjacent landowners to abide by the agency's wishes, it should be mindful not to let the deteriorating condition of its own forest to result in damage to adjacent lands. 2. The "rationale" for the "all-lands" approach lacks the proper perspective On August 14, 2009, USDA Secretary Vilsack outlined his vision for the future of our nation's forests. ( { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/video/tidwell/vilsack.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) As part of his rationale for the "all-lands" approach, the Secretary made this statement: "The Forest Service estimates that over 40 million acres of private forest could be lost to development and fragmentation over the coming three to four decades." The agency's estimate may or may not be accurate. What cannot be denied, however, is that the Secretary's statement is completely out of context. While some private lands are

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

developed, tens of thousands of acres are permanently protected each year. According to the Trust for Public Lands, many millions of acres of private lands have been "saved" from development. { <a href="http://www.conservationalmanac.org/secure/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } 3. If loss of habitat to development or fragmentation is discussed in the analysis, it must include an accurate accounting of the lands that have been protected. The analysis should incorporate a full accounting of the lands that have been conserved, lands added to the federal estate, lands added to state and local estates, and lands that have otherwise been removed from development (e.g. conservation easements). N. The agency should develop an alternative that emphasizes a more aggressive approach to achieving the historic range of variability outside Roadless Areas and Wilderness. No one can deny that a very large percent of the agency's forests are unhealthy. There is agreement that moving to a historic range of variability, at least in as much as we understand it, is probably wise. However, the only tool available to manipulate those variables in designated Wilderness and Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) is prescribed fire. This will be a big problem for the new focus on Restoration. Unlike what the general public believes, IRAs include lands that are highly modified, and not just by decades of fire suppression. Many have been commercially logged in the past and these "plantations" are susceptible to unnatural wildfire, insect and disease. The agency's current Roadless area management severely restricts any attempt to restore these lands to the historic range of variability. Therefore, it is logical to develop an alternative that emphasizes a more aggressive approach to achieving the historic range of variability outside IRAs and Wilderness. This should include commercial logging where appropriate, which achieves the agency's mandates for community health and prosperity, and also protects against so-called "fatal fires," insect and disease outbreak. O. Comment about the distinction between restoration and "adequate protection of roadless areas." On August 14, 2009, USDA Secretary Vilsack outlined his vision for the future of our nation's forests. ( { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/video/tidwell/vilsack.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) In that vision, the Secretary stated: Our shared vision begins with restoration. Restoration means managing forest lands first and foremost to protect our water resources, while making our forests more resilient to climate change. The Secretary also stated: "An integral part of our shared vision must be adequate protection of roadless areas. President Obama was quite clear during the campaign in emphasizing his support for protecting roadless areas." There is an inherent conflict with the Secretary's desire for restoration and the intent to provide "adequate protection" of IRAs. The boundaries of IRAs are determined via the agency's mandate to determine which, if any, of its lands it will recommend to Congress be designated as Wilderness. The single most important criteria is the presence or absence of a certain type of road. That's why they call them Roadless Areas, after all. IRA boundaries are not, as the general public is often told, the last remaining pristine areas in our National Forests. Many IRAs include lands that are highly modified, and not just by decades of fire suppression. Many have been commercially logged in the past and these "plantations" are now in a highly unnatural state and extremely susceptible to unnatural wildfire, insect and disease. The agency's current Roadless area management, which is purportedly focused on "adequate protection," severely restricts any attempt to restore these lands to the historic range of variability. Except for a very few exceptions, the only tool available is prescribed fire. This situation begs the question; what is the agency's definition of protection? If by protection we mean moving the lands to a state that



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

mirrors the natural ecosystem function then there is a conflict with his policy for protecting IRAs. The agency should clarify the distinction between restoration and "adequate protection of roadless areas." P. The environmental analysis should provide accurate information on water quality and related infrastructure We were interested to view the large amount of information on the agency's website devoted to water quality. We agree that USFS lands are an irreplaceable source of water resources and protection of water quality should be a priority. However, our "on the ground" experience with several projects over the years have taught us that water quality for human consumption is much more about big technology than forest management. One of our object lessons in this regard is the "Hayman Fire" on the Pike National Forest in Colorado. A large number of OHV enthusiasts were volunteers in mitigation efforts after that devastating fire, and subsequent rainstorms. Our members saw for themselves how wildfire can destroy water quality for wildlife and fisheries. What was interesting and surprising to our members, is that the human population, which shares the same water sources, was not impacted by same significant drop in water quality. Why? Because water is treated before it is made available for human consumption. Our intent is not to diminish the importance of protecting watersheds. To the contrary. Our request here is that the agency disclose water quality for human use and consumption in the proper context. Q. The environmental analysis should include accurate disclosure and detailed discussion of the social and economic impacts of the proposed rule. 1. The environmental analysis should include accurate disclosure and detailed discussion of the social and economic impacts of the proposed rule. 2. The analysis should include a detailed analysis in the DEIS of how the proposed rulemakings for planning, roadless area protection, and long-term road management policy, fit together so the American people can asses impacts, compare and contrast alternatives and develop informed comments. 3. The analysis should include a Regulatory Flexibility assessment of the proposed rules that discloses the potential impact on small business. R. Special attention should be given to providing clear definitions of all key terms in the agency's planning documents and the DEIS, FEIS and ROD. In our review of materials regarding the planning rule provided on the USFS website we came across two definitions of restoration: A Definition of "Restoration" FSM 2020 defines Ecological Restoration as "the process of assisting the recovery of resilience and adaptive capacity of ecosystems that have been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. Restoration focuses on establishing the composition, structure, pattern, and ecological processes necessary to make terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems sustainable, resilient, and healthy under current and future conditions." The new policy broadens the definition of ecological restoration beyond the traditional approach of reestablishing specific past resource conditions, such as those defined by historical range of variation. Because restoration objectives reflect diverse public values, ecological restoration is based upon collaboration. And Restoration means managing forest lands first and foremost to protect our water resources, while making our forests more resilient to climate change. ( { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/video/tidwell/vilsack.pdf" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ) This demonstrates the need for the agency to provide clear definitions of all key terms throughout the rulemaking process. S. The agency should review and consider revising the Purpose and Need statement for this important rulemaking. BRC strongly encourages the agency to revise its Purpose and Need statement to focus on the addressing previous planning regulations that were costly, complex, and procedurally burdensome. Discussion: The NOI

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

articulates the Purpose and Need as: The Agency now has an urgent need to establish a planning rule that protects, reconnects, and restores national forests and grasslands for the benefit of human communities and natural resources. A new planning rule must be responsive to the challenges of climate change; the need for forest restoration and conservation, watershed protection, and wildlife conservation; and the sustainable use of public lands to support vibrant communities. It must be clear, efficient, and effective, and must meet requirements under the NFMA, as well as allow the Agency to meet its obligations under the MUSYA, the ESA, and the Wilderness Act, as well as other legal requirements. It also must provide for a transparent, collaborative process that allows for effective public participation. A new rule should also be within the Agency's capability to implement on all NFS units. After admitting that the agency's 1982 planning rule was "very complex; had significant costs, was lengthy, and was cumbersome for public input," and its 2000 planning rule was "costly, complex, and procedurally burdensome" it is very disappointing then to read a Purpose and Need statement with so many undefined terms and potentially conflicting management focus. For example, what does "reconnect" mean in this context? How can a planning rule be "responsive to the challenges of climate change" when the agency's own directives (Considering Climate Change in Land Management and Project Planning) admit that effects of climate change are largely unknown? How can any planning rule be "clear, efficient and effective" when it uses undefined terms like "reconnect" and desires to be "responsive" to effects it admits are unknown? T. Answers to questions posed in the NOI: Substantive Principles for a New Rule 1. Land management plans could address the need for restoration and conservation to enhance the resilience of ecosystems to a variety of threats. Specific questions we would like the public to address include: • What do you see as the biggest threats to forest and grassland health and ecosystem resiliency? The agency's own avoidance of hard questions, wishful thinking regarding the effectiveness and acceptability of prescribed fire, misinterpretation of technical and scientific information, and complete disregard of the legal requirement for timber production and other human benefit objectives. The following is from the Petition for Writ of Mandate and for Preliminary and Permanent Injunction in Quincy Library Group v USFS: On April 22, 1998, twenty-five government employees, all but one from the U.S. Forest Service [USFS], met in Sonora, California as the Sierran Province Assessment and Monitoring [SPAM] Team. They were working on pieces of their "Ecosystem Conceptual Model," a theoretical construct of how literally all the pieces fit together and interact to form the entire Sierra Nevada ecosystem, from geological processes of soil formation from bedrock and the effect of climate change on photosynthetic capture of solar energy, right down to th

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank You. Following up with Forestry will be a difficult endeavor for sure. What "BRC" (Blue Ribbon Coalition) is basically deriving at here is that USDA/USFS is attempting to take away our recreational rights which will violate polices and closure of trails for many groups use for which is illegal. . . The paragraph above answer your question?.....then attempt to change to Promote.....please..... (21 Sep 2010) , I personally don't have time to read the book you have posted here. Could you please summarize some key points in a paragraph or less? Until then, I am demoting. . We..." Did you mean to create the impression that yours is an official document downloaded from the Blue Ribbon Coalition rather than it just being you speaking for yourself in your own words (and calling yourself "We")? Are you the sole author, editor, and publisher of all content for the Blue Ribbon Coalition? The legal mumbo jumbo also suggests that your posting was vetted by the lead council for that organization -- are you their lawyer, too? Please forgive my confusion. ....apparently YOU did not understand the beginning.....It is BRC's type.....From them to (you read and see) Not Mine....even though I support all of it. Also.....a tid bit info for you here....."Those whom oppose with anger will remember much easier too".....thank you. . . (21 Sep 2010) This is not an "idea." It appears to be a legal brief arguing against something the government is currently doing. ....you are incorrect here in a way.....it is a "Comment" that must be given prior to an "Appeal Process" as per USDA/USFS policy . . So am I to apologize for submitting a "Comment from BRC" to inform many others of the actions being brought forth from our very own inexperienced and un-educated government officials lacking the knowledge of our forest, it's intended use for recreational purposes, and wildlife and even how the forest really came about because of President Theodore Roosevelt...??? Am I? Let me answer before others give extreme negativity here. . . NO . . Recreation in the forest is the right of The People as per documentation stating all the way back to 1934. Now when I see other ideas on here for a good cause, I will support them, even though they may not support what I advocate for - the recreational use of our forest. Thank you all who have supported and promoted this. As for those whom have not, there are those groups also but I thank you just the same.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Public Lands are just that....."PUBLIC". The Lands that are called Forest are the property of The People of this great nation, not that of the government. If YOU have any knowledge of history than you would know our very own President Roosevelt made a pledge about our forest for The People should use it for recreation and enjoy all it's beauty. By means of motorized transportation in order to be deep in the forest to be a part of nature and the wonders of it. That is why Pres. Roosevelt spent so much time himself in the forest he had replenished for all of us to enjoy. Today there are more causes and levels of importance than there are of results of any actions brought up. Recreation is the fastest growth of American use today. Many activities are taking place in our forest like, bird watchers, hikers, plant enthusiasts, All Terrain Vehicle, Off Highway Vehicles, bikers, campers, water activity, and so much more. If one person thinks they can be an Advocate for every activity and have a inch of success than so much more power to them. But.....there is no such person. Most users of trails rarely come across campers. Those that YOU say YOU experienced were fellow campers most likely. I am sure you did NOT confront them to ask them to be considerate of YOUR FAMILY time as well? This info in this blog type is not to promote or to use it for gain to a club or entity for OHV's. It IS for the government to read our concerns and what we believe in for our recreation as to the type of ways the OHV Community is involved in caring as well as taking care of our forest while also using it for recreation. . So I ask YOU, what do YOU do to help OUR Forest? Please say what clubs or associations YOU may belong to for which YOU support OUR Forest. Don't be shy!

AGAIN..... . . I would like to know how many OHV People actually belong to a Club, Association, or National entity to save Trails? Blue Ribbon Coalition is the Nation's Top entity containing all uses of recreation in our forest for Families. How many belong to them? Make a Comment about the Club YOU belong to and just how they are working to Save Our Trails here. This way those who are sitting on their couches and have nothing else to do with their time except make Negative Comments towards Recreation here on this site because they are afraid to leave their homes and really see our Nation at it's best. So load this site up with your Club Names, the good work they do saving Trails and make a point for all to see.

Well a few comments are wrong here. When USFS - BLM - and who ever else that are part of this Nations government, perform "studies" and reports , they MUST fit the criteria of that department. They Do Not perform a non-prejudice report or decision. It has been proven time and time again of this. Private sector has nothing to gain but an income of services and non-prejudice at that. I know of biologist and archaeologist who work for USFS.....it is a job....and a retirement for them.....they don't really have the interest as they once did because of the political side involvement and the Directors criteria they must meet. I do know of several private sector scientist whom have offered their services to perform studies for USFS and they were told" they may do so if they wish but it will not be accepted." That the Public will not be notified of such studies either. Beat that one! . This is our great government at work for sure.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is truly a underlined way of the government and environmentalist to take anybody's property they want and to keep us out of our God-given right to enjoy the forest in which God created for us to enjoy. What rights are they gonna take next? What are the people inside the borders with homes going to do? More regulations with what we can and can't do with our property. They already have too much control. NO!!!!!! ON SISKIYOU CREST NATIONAL MONUMENT!!!!!!

Quite Majority. All government: Fed., State, and Local have to start lessening to the QUITE MAJORITY not the outspoken 1% minority. I like to do a lot of outdoor activities from surfing to biking, hiking to OHV motorcycle riding, walking the dog in parks and beaches. The 1% minority is making this harder by closing, restricting, or blocking access all in the name of preserve and save. This I have seen in my 57 years. The land should be open for all beings, not closed because of the 1%'ers, there is more than enough for everyone and everyone.

Define damage the land... There has been so many acres ripped flat and paved, and wet lands built upon for houses, or a mall, or a place like Home Depot and that's fine. Where is the land then? I guess money talks. BUT DON'T get caught with an ORV in the power lines!!! Give me a break! Seriously! People are odd, and uptight these days for sure.

Define damage the land... There has been so many acres ripped flat and paved, and wet lands built upon for houses, or a mall, or a place like Home Depot and that's fine. Where is the land then? I guess money talks. BUT DON'T get caught with an ORV in the power lines! Give me a break! Seriously... People are odd, and uptight these days for sure!

Oregon does not have plenty of land already designated as wilderness, we lag woefully behind most of our neighboring states. Wilderness designation does not prevent people from enjoying an area, it guarantees all will continue to enjoy it just the way it is now, and in the ways they are currently able to enjoy it save for tearing it up with OHV vehicles. It is wild land, guaranteed to remain that way, open to all. The Owyhee country is staggeringly beautiful and remote, whether it be rugged canyons or windswept desert plains. It deserves to remain that way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Perhaps the greatest problem related to advocacy is the fact that the National Wildlife Refuge System (NWRS) has only a part time advocate at the agency head. The Service Director is compelled to represent all Service programs and consequently cannot be a full time advocate for the nation's third largest land base. In fact, the Assistant Director National Wildlife Refuge System (Refuge Chief) is one of eleven Assistant Directors in the Washington Office who report to the Director and Deputy Director. Leadership that is spread between several competing resource management disciplines of the Fish and Wildlife Service can never provide the focused advocacy that the NWRS deserves. A lack of refuge experience in the leadership is a further disadvantage when competing resource interests must be considered. For example, scarce water resources in Western states are allocated according to state laws, and the Fish and Wildlife Service must compete with other interests for water needed to protect fish and wildlife resources. When water needs for Endangered Species protection must also compete, they are usually given the highest priority while the poorly understood needs of migratory bird refuges can get less than fair advocacy and consideration. The same disadvantage of priority is apparent when scarce funds and manpower are allocated. Refuge priorities and needs are too often subordinated to the urgency and legal requirements of other resource management programs.

wow anybody who believes this post must truly be one of the most ignorant people i know. Heres MY question from the OHV side of things, where the heck are all of your Prius's batteries going to go when they go bad? One thing I can't stand is people trying to fight something they know nothing about, as a camper and ATV rider as well as UTV rider I have a HUGE appreciation for wildlife and nature, hence the reason we camp and ride versus going to the track. Why don't you try actually meeting some of these people rather than sitting in Starbucks drinking your iced latte and going on facebook.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Things like helmets, OHV riding classes, better parental supervision, no night riding, no pavement riding, no doubling up on single rider vehicles are all good things, and if everybody followed these rules it would cut down, but not eliminate, fatalities. Many people who follow every single rule in the book (a distinct minority) are still killed on ATVs because they are too darn unstable. See the Oregonian link above. I think the Oregonian found that the percentage of rule followers who get killed is the same as the percentage of reckless riders who get killed. A safety certificate in a kid's pocket doesn't do him that much good when the machine flips and comes down on him, you know? Those type of laws have been tried or are on the books in many states and have proven nearly impossible to enforce. And, generally speaking, when a family's child is killed in an ATV accident, no charges are brought against adults or parents even if some rule hasn't been followed because the family has suffered such a terrible loss. Who wants to prosecute them on top of that loss? I don't think that's appropriate in most situations. But even if those laws could be enforced (they are not), and people complied with them (they do not), that would NOT be good enough, according to America's medical community. Children simply do not have the maturity to ride safely even with helmets, training, and supervision, and the machines are too prone to flipping over. And those type of laws send the very misleading message that kids will be safe on these machines if they wear a helmet, etc. It's not that easy. ATVs are too prone to flipping over, and it is simply not safe for children, who do not have the physical or mental maturity, to drive them. The ATV industry and industry-funded user groups try to spread a different message, but the tragic reality is that machines are dangerous and too many kids are dying or suffering terrible injuries each year. I hope that the Consumer Product Safety Commission steps up to the plate soon and takes a hard look at the safety record of ATVs and children (c'mon, regulators! Do your job!), but in the meantime, at a minimum, children should not be allowed to drive these machines on public land.

Your agenda seems to simply to discredit anyone or any study or article that supports stricter ATV laws when it comes to kids. Why are you so invested in trying to blow smoke about this issue, which is pretty straightforward and clearcut. The safety rules you talk about are on the books in many states. For example, Michigan requires safety certificates, parental supervision, full face helmets, etc. but has already had six children under the age of 16 killed so far this year. Massachusetts is moving in the right direction--it just banned all kids under 14 from riding ATVs anywhere in the state: { <a href="http://commonhealth.wbur.org/2010/09/mass-first-to-ban-atvs-for-kids-under-14/" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> }

My suggestion is to adopt the recommendations of the medical community and ban all children under 16 from driving ATVs on public land. I have no obligation to "work with you" when you are proposing something different that I believe to be the cause of many child deaths. You are saying that better rules or better enforcement will adequately protect children. I fundamentally disagree with you. We don't allow children under the age of 16 to drive motor vehicles on our nation's highways, and I don't think we should allow them to drive ATVs on our public lands. In some states, underage children are allowed to drive them on public roads to the state or federal lands, a very dangerous practice. Also, would you kindly answer this question. Do you have any kind of financial tie whatsoever in any way to the ATV industry? Manufacturers? Dealers? Industry-funded user group?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

"The gunning down of wild wolves in the West is beyond appalling" News flash, all wolf hunts have been suspended in the West. You can thank Judge Donald Moly of Misoula MT.

"I have already suggested using highway corridors right of ways for this activity." Why dont hikers and bikers try using highway right of ways instead of trails? A. Because if you wanted to be on or in close proximity to a highway you would just drive in your car. B. It is not safe.

The ESA has actually been used more as a political tool to further an agenda. The agenda is to further restrict federal land use. "They need to hire more biologists and environmentalists who understand these complex systems" Actually I would say that the majority of the people who work in the natural resource agencies could be defined as "environmentalists". The have not been able to do a very good job so far.

I agree with you! But we need to start when kids are in kinder garden, not in high school. One class is not enough, the subject is very broad and it is important that kids understand what is really happening with their environment. In Imperial County there is a very high % of asthma, kids miss school, they need to understand why and what to do about it. The air quality in Imperial County is so bad. There is a lot of pollution, how can kids play outdoor if that is going to trigger an asthma attack?

Restore Our National Mall--Our Front Yard. The National Mall is in terrible disrepair and it is not only our nation's front yard but it is also the centerpiece of democracy in our country. Create a national fundraising campaign to supplement the taxpayer dollars necessary to properly design, rehabilitate and maintain the Mall for its multiple purposes. The design students working with Gary Hilderbrand at Harvard have created tremendous ideas and with Susan Spain's enthusiasm and passion the Mall could once again become our showcase of democracy in action and a role model of sustainable design and maintenance.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a retired U.S. Forest Service Professional in outdoor recreation management I am simply furious with \_\_\_\_\_ for literally hijacking recreation and his blatant attempt to commercialize and privatize the Recreation Resource on our precious National Forests. He has done much damage. The Washington Office of the Forest Service is abjectly culpable starting with Chief Dale Robertson of allowing this to happen. It is the American Taxpayer who is bearing the brunt of this tragic theft of our rights. These are OUR precious National Forests and we the people own the Commons. The Fee SCAM must stop! Fees disenfranchise lower and middle income recreation users and discriminate against ethnic groups. The ham-fisted and oppressive collection (extortion) of fees in inappropriate backcountry and dispersed venues by FS police agents is something the U.S. Forest Service should hang their head in shame over. The problem is they currently have no shame, and continue beating the Recreation Public over the head with a truncheon. Fees are simply a social and economic DISASTER. They are a circular self-defeating dead end. Mr. Crandall is a paid LOBBYIST. His group - the American Recreation Coalition (ARC)-- is an advocacy group for motorized Wreckreation. For goodness sake they previously lobbied Congress to drill ANWR! Their inner motivation is "cheap gas forever" to keep those half million dollar 80 foot long motorhomes tooling around. Anyone heard of global warming and PEAK OIL! The U.S. Forest Service has been in bed with the ARC for a long time. Scream bloody murder to the USFS higher ups to dissolve this unholy and destructive "partnership" with the ARC. Contact Chief Tom Tidwell and national recreation director Jim Bedwell -- ttidwell fs.fed.us jbedwell fs.fed.us -- and tell them loud and clear as a disgruntled taxpayer you demand they serve the recreation general public and CEASE serving corporate America. Do not be fooled one minute by either \_\_\_\_\_'s self-serving propaganda nor the out-of-control U.S. Forest Service. The Forest Service record of dismal financial mismanagement is well documented. Appropriated recreation dollars actually increased 13% between 2002 and 2009. They cry "woe is me--we don't have enough money." That's NONSENSE. They don't use the money they are allocated wisely nor efficiently. They can start by trimming the bloated bureaucracy at the top and getting the allocated Congressional recreation money down to the Ranger District level. I have studied and worked on the FEE MESS for 12 years and I will tell you that the literal future of Outdoor Recreation is at stake. Now is the time to help defeat these onerous fees once and for all! Urge your Senators and Representatives to step up to the plate & REPEAL the Federal Lands Recreation and Enhancement Act (FLREA). It is literally your future in Outdoor Recreation on the table. Please fight like mad for Fee REPEAL. Tell Mr. Crandall to take a hike and write a personal letter to President Obama. Enough is enough!

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

To the Obama Administration and interested citizens, My name is \_\_\_\_\_r and I am the Executive Director of an organization engaged in public land issues for the past twenty years. Since 1997, we have focused attention upon the efforts of certain commercial recreation interests to transform America's Great Outdoors into venues where access is offered for sale to those willing to pay to play. In this forum, has made various statements about recreation fees and claims that we Americans are still free to experience the outdoors as we did before "Pay-to-Play" replaced traditional birthrights. In the paragraphs which follow, I offer some unvarnished history. As \_\_\_\_\_ has pointed out, \_\_\_\_\_ stated in Congressional Testimony: "Recreation fees on public lands were one of the issues which prompted the creation of the American Recreation Coalition in 1979." In 1996, Crandall got what he was seeking when the Recreation Fee Demonstration Program became law. In 1997, the Wild Wilderness website was created, in part, as an effort to provide factual information regarding the still nascent issue of recreation user fees. In that same year, Chief of the US Forest Service \_\_\_\_\_, speaking before a recreation industry gathering announced: "It baffles me that the Department of Agriculture tracks the value of soybeans, corn, or wheat to the penny by the day, yet, rarely is recreation and tourism on federal lands understood as a revenue generator. Instead it has been perceived as an amenity - something extra that we are privileged to enjoy. Fortunately, that's beginning to change." With those momentous words, something very important began to change and I feel strongly that that change should be the over-arching topic of discussion for the entire "America's Great Outdoors Initiative" forum. Quoted below are excerpts of a speech given the following year by \_\_\_\_\_'s boss, the Undersecretary of Agriculture. The speaking venue was the American Recreation Coalition's "Great Outdoors Week." The message was heard loudly and clearly by \_\_\_\_\_'s associates. I suspect it was barely heard by the American Public. I trust the outcry of the American Public on this topic is now being heard by the Obama Administration. More importantly, I pray they are listening. \_\_\_\_\_, Wild Wilderness --- begin quoted --- Outdoor Recreation on the National Forests Remarks of the Hon. James R. Lyons, Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, U.S. Department of Agriculture June 8, 1998 Welcome to USDA and Outdoor Recreation Week.... During my tenure with the Department, we've not only tried to highlight our recreation program, but we've also tried to take a more business-like approach to its management and promotion. We developed a marketing strategy and an icon that we hope will become to outdoor recreation what the Nike swoosh is to sporting goods and that famous Mercedes Benz hood ornament is to automobiles - a sign that connotes high quality outdoor experiences and customer satisfaction... We're working to obtain more resources - through a proposed increase in the recreation budget, through fees collected through the demo program, and, perhaps, through an expanded role for concessions. What about a profit sharing arrangement with concessionaires where the taxpayer and the business benefit from the venue - in cold, hard cash - and the customer benefits from improved recreation opportunities. We're looking toward the private sector to provide more support for national forest recreation - for an expanded partnership with those who realize an economic benefit from recreation on the public lands. In this way, you can help us help you (as Jerry McGuire said) expand your business opportunities while helping us expand recreation opportunities on the national forests. Finally, to accomplish this and more, we need to develop stronger brand and name recognition for national forest recreation. Our challenge, in short, is to help

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

the public realize that when they're hiking the Pacific Crest Trail, or biking the Hiawatha rail-trail, or running the south fork of the Salmon River, or relaxing at Timberline Lodge, they're not on a national park - they're on a national forest. And we hope to achieve this through better marketing, through better information, and through improved development of our brand of outdoor recreation.... Can you think of any other entity - private or public - that has the breadth and diversity of outdoor recreation experiences that you can find on the national forests? I doubt it! We've got a great product to sell. And, with your help, we can make it even better! The national forests are truly America's Great Outdoors. Thanks for your continued support and partnership. We'll look forward to seeing you at Great Outdoors Week.

The reason we have designated areas is to protect wild lands from encroachment. If you make the public use areas inaccessible you are increasing prohibited use of sacred estuaries, preserves and unmonitored wild lands. To illustrate this: I have to travel 50 miles to the nearest OHV (which was recently in danger of closure) But instead of driving 50 miles, some people will ride and let their kids ride in a field that has been allocated for housing behind our home. This seems like somewhat harmless behavior since the land will be "improved" at a later date. However the field is unmonitored and currently is the home to endangered burrowing owls. The kids chase the owls from their burrows. I can't even begin to tell you the lasting message this is sending to those kids. If accessible areas were more convenient people would be more likely to use them and less likely to destroy non-designated areas. Keep the spaces we have open and create new designated areas to help preserve wild lands.

I've also seen these larger organizations sue under the guise of smaller special interest groups. I've seen lawyers suing and forcing closures of private and non-profits that help kids over technicalities. Again just for the money. It's a sad situation. Our courts should be empowered to take action against attorneys who file predatory and frivolous lawsuits to misuse the public right of access to the courts.

The writer of the article promoting bikes in Wilderness is none other than Jim Hasenauer, past president of IMBA, International Mountain Biking Assoc. He knows how to write as he is an associate professor in communications at CSUN, Cal State University in Northridge. His comments are not supported by scientific studies. His statement that bikes should be allowed wherever horses can go is nonsense. The Wilderness Act should remain in its good stead by not allowing any mechanical devices, and that includes bikes. The primary concern of trail users is safety. Mixing mountain bikers with hikers and horses destroys the trail experience that people seek - to have a relaxed, experience in Nature without the anxiety and worry of meeting a silent, speeding bike along a trail. As to the President's interest in improving the people's recreational opportunities, there are already thousands of places in the nation where people can recreate with their bikes. Bikes are an urban mode of transportation and not a rural way of traveling. The Wilderness areas are our last stand for hikers and equestrians - fight hard to keep them. I hope many people will strongly denounce the idea of allowing bikes in Wilderness areas. It would take a congressional amendment to make the change, I believe, since the Act was created by Congress.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Several people have been curious about what brings hunters to our Place. We have mostly elk, mule deer, antelope, coyote, and sage grouse hunters. Occasionally big horn sheep, sharptail grouse, pheasant, mountain lion, or bobcat hunters show up. People also hunt whitetail deer here. Our area is not whitetail habitat, but they are being forced into this area by overpopulation in their natural ranges. They cross with the indigenous mule deer, threatening to wipe out the species. We always encourage hunters to concentrate on removing any whitetail or crossbreds that they encounter and tell them how to recognize the crosses. Predation is of utmost importance to the survival and health of a species. If you had a pet cat, and she had four kittens twice a year and those kittens matured in 12 months and began to mate and also produce kittens (the averages for cats, according to the veterinary text I consulted), you would have 9 cats the first year, 25 cats the second year, and 73 cats by the end of the third year. At some point, you would no longer be able to provide each cat with fresh water, abundant food, and clean, healthy space. This danger also threatens wild animals if they reproduce faster than members of their population die. If they overpopulate, they must die slowly of hunger and thirst. Some will resort to cannibalism. The mothers will have to watch the weakest members of the population, their young, die of hunger. If one species overpopulates, it can damage the plants so much that many species will suffer. The only ways to protect species from overpopulation is by predation or birth control. Providing birth control to wild populations is complicated, and chemical birth control poisons water sources and kills aquatic life. Predation protects herbivores from overpopulation. However, predators can also overpopulate. Just as herbivores can stress and destroy the plant populations they depend upon, too much predation can destroy a population of birds or animals. If a wild animal predator is overpredating and harming the prey base, it can be very challenging to do anything about it. Human predators are much easier to control. If you have skilled state biologists, who can accurately gauge the number of animals that need to leave the population to keep it healthy, and honest hunters, who will obey the game laws, the well-being of your wildlife is assured. Of course, some people are not honest. In that case, you have ranchers, on the ground every day, who can watch for suspicious activity and abuses and report them to the wardens. No one hunts prairie dogs on this Place. There are none. Mother Nature wiped out four active towns with a disease epidemic. Some studies have shown that shooting encourages healthier prairie dog towns. Maybe if someone had taken the time to hunt a few of them, they would not have fallen prey to a disease that devastated the entire population.

Bristol Bay has crucially important fisheries and wildlife habitat. These are resources, renewable in perpetuity, that are needed for our very survival. Mineral extraction is a temporary producer of wealth which could destroy these vital living resources. Protect the Bristol Bay watershed; don't risk the permanent value for the temporary.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Create master website for US national parks, BLM national parks, US national cemeteries, and World Heritage sites within the US. This list should be sortable by state, category, size, recreation, campsites, etc. so potential visitors can schedule vacations. My wife and I vacation by zigzagging through states trying to visit as many of these sites as possible. We journal all our travels and very much like the current NPS brochures on each park.. Super sized website listing all NPS, BLM, National Cemeteries, and World Heritage Sites in the US. This website would be sortable by state, category, facilities, recreation, etc. so potential visitors can schedule travel and vacations. My wife and I currently vacation by zigzagging through states to see as many of these sites as possible. That list is about 600 sites long. We've seen about 175 so far.

There should be no access fees. I pay taxes each year. Also, what about the poor and unemployed? Do you want to shut them out and make the public lands the playground for the rich only? The fees under FLREA are very unreasonable and excessive. There are no alternatives that I am aware of to the Red Rock Pass in Sedona, AZ. If you park anywhere just to take a photo or sit and meditate, you have to pay the fee. This ture even in areas where there are no facilities or if you choose to not use the facilities. Also, how many hours would I have to volunteer to get a "free" one hour visit. This is just plain crazy talk. What a waste of resources to track these hours and a waste of my time to check the checkers. How many civil servants would be needed to track volunteer hours. Also, I want to volunteer for my favorite causes like the homeless and my church. I just want to visit MY public lands without a big hassle.

First may I say I do now, and have always had a Jeep. That said, I also am handicapped, and cannot hike as much as I used to. I am 64 yrs young, and now use a horse to enjoy the forests, desert where I live, even go to the beach camping with my horses. OHV's DO NOT BELONG in the forests!! No longer can you see wildlife close up from the trails, no longer can you dispersed camp without the loud buzzing of motor vehicles screaming across the desert nearby, or doing "donuts" in the fire roads of the forest. Riding up the sides of the banks of the creeks, and screaming across the forest duff making narrow tracks for natural rain to cause erosion and foul the watershed. This is not to mention the attitude of dirtbag dirtbikers, who trespass on private holdings, break fencing, burn up the line shacks for wood, destroy the grazing, and chase our stock. Nope! IMHO, I say; SHOOT - SHOVEL - AND -SHUT UP, are going to used to all OHV users on our land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Where we live we are very close to the PCT. The PCT was formed to allow hikers, and equestrians a trail with out motorized traffic, so they could recreate and move from the Mexican border to Canada. When Bicyclists come screaming down hills, and moving at high rate of speed along these quiet corridors, wildlife, and especially equestrians are spooked and driven away from using the areas. In our part of the Angeles Nat. Forest, they have taken to abusing the Pacific Crest Trail and even gone so far as to alter the terrain with berms and wider turns so they can move at high rate of speed. As both a hiker, and an equestrian who also enjoys the opportunity of photographing wildlife, I find them to be almost like "two wheeled Locusts". They destroy the trails, and scare both animals and hikers with their tactics of strong arming the trails. I admit, Equestrians are the LEAST organized group of users of the trails, but NOT the non-users they are depicted. One reason for not using trails near the population centers, is the preponderance of both bicycles, and OHV's which are so intrusive. Thanks for listening;

I have to interject about the biking community NOT doing trail maintenance. In the Montana De Oro State park of Central California, the trail maintenance is ALL done by bicycle clubs. These trails ARE shared by both equestrians and bicyclists, and hikers. That said, the traditional trails thru the trees, and across the narrow canyons have been re configured to accommodate bikes and some have been eliminated altogether. When camping with my horses at MDO, we met some of the most courteous mtn bikers,who were smiling and asked to come pet our horses, talked with us and when we could get off of the trail went by slowly. And some of the "two wheel locust" riders. I asked the rude ones where they came from to use the trails. ALL were from the Los Angeles area! I have ridden in three states and much of California from Oregon to San Diego. The area where I live is quite rural, and the trails are really narrow and ledgy. In fact so narrow and full of drop offs, many are not usable with out repairing the trail before we continue our ride so the horses don't fall or slip. By the way, you can't turn a horse around on a ledge trail with a drop off of several hundred feet. ALL of that maintenance is done by HORSE PEOPLE. In the Wrightwood CA. area, I personally have gone on 6 overnite trips to repair trails, cut snow downed trees and snags from trails, put in logs along washouts and used a pick and shovel to cut out the rocks from slides. The PCT in the Angeles Nat Forest, is very faint in spots due to the fires, and resultant slides. On the "city side" of the PCT, I have had to repair three trails above Altadena where the bikes have built berms and cut outs on the trails. They seem to forget that these trails were ALL BUILT by equestrians. The Doc Larson comes to mind, as does the Fat Grizzly trail, the Golden Moccasin, and the Silver Moccasin. In fact the Golden Moccasin trail has been given over to M/C use. and is no longer usable by bicycles or equestrians, and may get closed because of the ecological damage since the fires. Who do they think trims the overhead trees, puts the rocks back marking the trails in flat areas of little growth. Who transports the markers on mule back to clear the trails and trail camps far away from roads in the forest? And who thinks an equestrian wants to cut across switch backs? If anything you want to stay as easy as possible. It would nearly kill your horse to go jumping across switchbacks going up or down. If you knew what concentration it takes to ride an animal with a flight -or fight instinct, they would stay away from them. Instead we have so many close calls from encounters at high speed, been cursed out, and told WE don't belong on the trails WE BUILT? I have met some of the best and some of the worst...so IMHO, NO, Bicycles DON"t belong on the PCT, or any wilderness area.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm not against OHVs and I think there should be places for their use. It seems, though, some think their activity should be allowed everywhere. There are benefits to wilderness for people and animals. It seems there are narrow minded people in all groups that only want their way and don't care about anyone or anything else.

There are areas OHVs should be allowed and areas they are not allowed.

I don't disagree. Although things like hunting, fishing, camping, even OHVs in areas designated for them, are all better than public land being used for drilling and mining. Drilling and mining should be allowed on less of our public land. Wildlife and the health of the environment should always come first.

I would say some need to look past next week. With an exploding population, won't OHV trails become more crowded no matter how many there are. What do we do to "disperse" the impact then? There needs to be areas available to OHVs and areas that are not available, especially as the population grows.

I agree. Here is an example of true wilderness that some want to develop for profit. Can't we find places that have mineral deposits that don't threaten every last wild area, or is it less costly to mine in areas away from development. Some things are more important than profit. I guess we need to drill or mine in every valley. As we develop more in areas that are true wilderness, we can debate how much less wilderness we need in other areas. It has to be clear that wild areas are a diminishing resource. It doesn't make sense to me that after years of developing areas, some are still unable to see the value of areas without development. \_\_\_\_\_, you obviously work for a mining company. Mining is fine in some areas. In some areas it just doesn't make sense. Let's hope the regulations us average citizens grossly underestimate for the mining industry are better than the oil regulations in the Gulf of Mexico.

Not all "back country" should have motorized access. Some should, some should not.

I support the Nature Conservancy and the hunting groups mentioned by \_\_\_\_\_. I think one of the biggest threats to wildlife is habitat destruction. In Michigan, the Nature Conservancy worked with the state to try to purchase land that went for sale from a large lumber company. They were out bid and the land was sold to a private company but the Nature Conservancy was able to get easements to keep the land open to sportsmen.

The Idaho roadless rule allows road construction and re-construction in most areas. Also, OHVs are allowed on most of the areas. I'm not sure the roadless rule is the enemy you assume it is. Idaho has 20 million acres of national forest. I'm sure it is one of the few truly wild areas left.

I ride snowmobiles and have ridden dirt bikes, OHVs, etc. I'm not against this kind of activity but I demoted this idea because I can see the benefit of preserving some of our wild lands. There is room for wilderness and multi use areas. There are extremists on both sides.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I think some people get accustomed to all our modern conveniences, start to feel removed, and have trouble believing we are part of the Earth. If we destroy our environment, we will definitely feel the effects.

I could see a problem with special interest groups (oil, gas, etc). No land would be preserved and everything would go to the highest bidder.

If you noticed I used gas and oil as an example. The "etc" means other interests which could include other things like mining, logging, any other development, private companies that just want land. I don't know of any area that isn't under some kind of pressure for some kind of development. It is in no way a gross exaggeration. What area would preserve land for the good of all the people when money could be made. Money shouldn't always be the most important consideration.

From what I've seen, locals have the largest say. For an example, look at the Roadless Rule. It states use is determined locally. Also, if the land being referred to is BLM land, than it belongs to all Americans and all should have a say. Sometimes the will of the majority and the goals of the nation should take priority. You keep referring to extreme environmentalists. I don't consider myself any kind of extremist, although I believe we should preserve more of our land and some should be wilderness. Most of our land (referring to federal land) is already open to most development. More should be left to wildlife and recreation. To me, there is a much bigger benefit to people and wildlife when we preserve rather than develop it. I'm not against access and local use, as long as it doesn't mean development.

I'm not for the fossil fuels access. I think this is something we need to try to get away from. I know it's probably a long way in the future though. I think oil and gas should not be a primary concern when we are deciding what to do with our wild lands. I don't like it when they drill in Michigan on public land, either. I'm sure most reasonable people can decide on a balance between wilderness and non wilderness. Access is important and the activities you mentioned should have a place. I tend to lean toward more wilderness. I think these areas will be treasured as the population grows into the future.

Preserving our wild lands preserves fishing. Sportsmen have contributed greatly to conservation of our wild lands. The only thing in your idea I don't agree with is the gravel road in wilderness. Maybe we could make it a dirt trail.

Michigan has a huge amount of trails. From what I've seen, there are a great deal of trails in Michigan open to OHVs. The problem in Michigan is it is hard to get away from the noise of development due to the large amount of roads.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I also think we are mostly in agreement. Access and reasonable resource extraction is important. I would say a vast majority of our public land is open to development. My estimate is over 98% of the land in the lower 48 states allows resource extraction. I also agree that well managed logging is ok, especially if they can log and then remove the road used to access the lumber. Drilling is done all over our public land. If they only drilled on 1% of public land, I don't think anyone would have an issue. The percent of public land open to drilling is much higher. There are very few areas access is denied for development. I think wildlife/wild land preservation and recreation should be the focus on more of our public land. Balance is the key. I think if we could reach a balance and protect (or preserve) more of our wild land, alot of these issues would go away.

I don't think anyone wants to preserve anything in some artificial state of suspension, but to have roads and development everywhere would be irresponsible and not what I would like to see passed onto future generations. Roadless areas provide many benefits to wildlife and humans. There is room for both, roadless and roaded areas. Right now there are too many roads in most of our national forests. Because there are some select areas that don't have an excess of roads does not mean we should strive to build into every last region.

I don't think I'm wrong. I consider myself kind of an environmentalist and I don't want things preserved as they are this second, I just want to see areas preserved without human development. I think that is important. Your view of environmental groups is not one that advocates cooperation. You kind of lump all of them together kind of like I've seen others lump people in different groups together. If you are referring to the Roadless Rule, maybe it should be called the Limiting Road Construction Rule. All it does is limit road construction. It's not wilderness designation. In most areas, it allows road construction and re-costruction. As the population grows, these areas you enjoy may become more populated and crisscrossed with roads. As you stated, that's not the experience your looking for. That's why we need to preserve things now. If what you are striving for is limited roads, the roadless rule seems to be just what you described. I believe we need to plan carefully today if we want these wild areas to last into the future. I don't think allowing more and more development in these areas will preserve them in their wild state. Some sort of protection should be encouraged.

Wolves have lived on Isle Royal for years, how about the impact there. The only thing they do is keep the moose population in check. Are you saying wolves in Michigan decimated the deer population? How did you come up with this idea. There is no shortage of deer in the U.P. I might believe in disneyland (it's a real place), but you live in disneyland.

I'm not against hunting or even hunting wolves if it is proven they are no longer endangered in the lower 48 states. It seems there are some who just want wolves eradicated, repeating the same mistakes of the past. That's one good reason why I always advocate we leave enough wild areas preserved, roadless, and undeveloped so unpopular species will also have a place. Paul, I've never seen any information indicating the problems you have described that you state are occurring on Isle Royal. It seems to me you just don't like wolves. The last thing I read indicated wolves are keeping the moose population in check on Isle Royal.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I thought we were past "demonizing" wolves. I guess we should also eliminate other species like sharks, bears, etc., because they don't fit in with our society.

I think the reason some areas don't get the protection they deserve is because there are powerful groups who profit from development of these areas (gas, oil, mining, etc.).

With wilderness designation being 2% of the country in the lower 48 states, I would say a vast majority is open to development. That means mining (to use the author's example) can occur on 98% of the land right now. If there are mining rights in place when wilderness is designated, I believe those rights remain. That means over 98% is available to mining. I think once there is a balance, a lot of the debate would disappear. I don't think anyone wants to do away with any of our modern conveniences or development. Things like mining are important to our economy. We just need to consider if the money we get from developing all our wild areas is worth the price we would pay in the long run. I believe it would be irresponsible to open every area to development. If we can't make it work with, let's say, 90% of our land open to development, what is the chance opening 100% to development would make a difference.

OHV use should be considered as any other recreational use in the forest. There should be places they are allowed and places they are not allowed. Just like there should be areas that are designated wilderness and areas that are not.

I agree that knowing we have preserved wilderness in a specific area, even though I may not visit that specific area, is a comfort to me. I'm not against access, access is important. I'm only against further expansion of roads into our last wild areas. Some areas need to remain roadless.

I ride the PCT from Vasquez Rocks, Agua Dulce to Soledad Canyon, Acton Ca on a regular basis. Allowing Bicycles to ride the same narrow trail would be extremely hazardous. The trail is narrow and has many blind curves. Mountain bikes travel down hill at a high rate of speed and due to the short distances and speed of the bikes there is no opportunity to get out of their path safely.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In these partisan and trying times, Americans can scarcely agree on anything, but I believe that most if not all would agree on the fact that two million is a very large number. Whether it is two million years, two million dollars, or two million people, when discussing millions, it stands as a significant number. Well, in 2009, President Obama added two million acres of land to the federally protected wilderness. With the cloud of the "Great Recession" hanging looming over America's head, we must ask ourselves if our country can possibly afford to let another two million acres of land sit used. Conservationists already complain that current federally declared wilderness areas are underfunded and therefore are not being properly maintained, but you propose that we label even more land as protect wilderness. What is this saying to the world? Do we as Americans only desire these millions of acres of "declared wilderness" as a proverbial feather in our progressive cap, or should we aspire to have fewer acres of land but maintain the quality of these lands better? You say specifically that land expansion will "better represent American great outdoors," but I wonder if we want the global perception of American wilderness to be extensive amounts of poorly preserved land? In the August 24, 2010 edition of USA Today, journalist Shaun McKinnon reported on a followup study conducted by the National Parks Conservation Association presenting the most pressing threats to the continued life of the Grand Canyon Nation Park. Those inside the operation at the Grand Canyon report that a serious budget shortfall poses one of the most pertinent threats to national icon. Cutting back on area maintenance staff, the area is sure to become a shadow of its former greatness. David Nimkin, the regional director of the National Park Service, said, "When you look at all of the challenges, you find out that the Grand Canyon is at risk, at grave risk. We made a deal when we created the national parks, that we would support them, and we need to do that."

As a long distance hiker and a lover of the PCT, I would vote to continue to not have mechanized or wheeled vehicles on the PCT. There are plenty of trails that bikers can travel on. I would like to see this one kept to foot traffic only. Thank you.

The obsidian cliffs in Yellowstone had to be fenced off to keep rock hounds from loving them to death. You are not allowed to bring home animals and plants from our parks and public lands. The same should apply to rocks and minerals. Collection is destructive and permanently alters the nature of a place.

I am 67 years old and unable to access many areas that are only open to foot or horse back access. The number of areas where I can go in my ORV is being reduced and making it harder and harder to access wilderness areas of PUBLIC LAND, that all should have access to. I have no facts to prove my position, but it is my belief that there are far more miles of hiking trails in every state of the union than there are ORV Trails. I will agree there needs to be areas where ORV use of any kind is restricted, but how about you consider an equality between the amount of wilderness trail mileage. I think you would find the ORV groups would be very happy if they had just 1/4 of the miles that hikers and horseback people have. You are just upset because the ORV Supporters as showing their numbers here, just as they show their support in Volunteering to maint the areas they use. Can you say the same for your user groups?

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What kinds of "research, marketing and certain other purposes" are you envisioning with respect to these various industries? How would these benefit the environment, the users and/or the public in general? Thanks.

The most wasteful predators are people. We (people) killed millions of bison for their tongues and hides, often leaving behind even those parts. We still are killing millions of sharks for just their fins. Do you think there should be a season on people, too? Our growing numbers need to be controlled, don't you think?

re comment 6 The "problem with environmentalism" is that there aren't enough of us who recognize that extreme human arrogance like yours, for instance, has led to the destruction of natural processes worldwide. You are a classic utilitarian. re your comment to \_\_\_\_\_ you are not correct about that. Humans used to be part of our "natural ecosystem", but not any longer. Technology has changed the relationship.

This issue is not so much about your "access" as it is about the noisy, over-powered, knobby-tired machines that you bring along with you.

What do we have here? A college class submitting individual essays on the meaning of "wilderness"? At any rate, you've done an especially nice job with your essay. You've illustrated the subtle distinction that seems to be at the heart of many debates that have occurred in this forum. We no longer have any place on Earth that is completely free of human incursions; but we still should protect large areas where Nature is wild and relatively free of our influences and where the full range ecological processes that existed before our arrival can operate.

It's in the public's interest to conserve biodiversity. Did you not want grey whales and bald eagles to survive? The ESA is a visionary piece of legislation. Its shortfall is in the poor way that implementation has been handled.

Yes, conservation is indeed missing from the national debate. We are at least one whole generation into raising young people who have very little connection to nature. We've decided it's our God-given, American right to become anti-intellectuals and to feel proud of our stubborn ignorance. We seem to value no-nothingness in our politicians (think: Palin). We're fooled one election cycle after another by an obstructionist political party that distracts a majority of us with rhetoric about social issues while promoting military adventures and pursuing a pro-business, anti-middle class agenda. These days, it's very hard to get much done in the public-policy arena, especially on back-burner issues like conservation. For our own sanity, it makes sense for conservationists to work mostly through private, non-profit organizations. There are loads of great conservations organizations out there.

People seem to like large homes on small lots these days. Across from where I live, this kind of subdivision has sprouted up on a former soybean field at a rate of about one new house a month. The developer could have saved (but didn't) one or two lots near the center, planted native trees and turned it into a common area for the homeowner's association to control.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As to "when", it may come when enough people are sick of fundamentalist politicians pushing a "reclaiming territory for Christ" approach to the mission of our military services. (Read "C Street", a new book reviewed today on NPR) . I'm asserting that, as a nation, that the U.S. spends more on "defense" than all the rest of the world does put together. Excessive military expenditures are the most avoidable source of our financial woes. Beyond that, I'm personally willing to "kick in", and I do so. As a cyclist, I'd like to see more designated biking lanes. Thanks for your idea.

"Compromise" over mining in wilderness areas? You must be kidding.

There are privately-owned ranch lands and publically-owned (BLM) lands that are often leased to neighboring ranchers. That still makes these publically-owned lands just that: Public Lands. "Split-estate" refers to the subsurface (oil & mineral) rights that were withheld by the government back in the homesteading days. This is a separate issue, one that is troubling to both conservationists and ranchers.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Some of the equestrian posts remind me of England's defunct aristocracy. "[B]y the High Middle Ages, the necessity of hunting was transformed into a stylized pastime of the aristocracy. More than a pastime, it was an important arena for social interaction . . . and a privilege and measurement of nobility." (Source: Wikipedia.) "For royals and their imitators, forests were from the middle ages onward a 'supreme status symbol and a source of gifts money could not buy.' " (Lohmann 1999.) "Hunting . . . was restricted . . . in 1670 to those with manors or incomes of at least 100 pounds a year from landed property. 'It is not fit that clowns should have these sports,' \_\_\_\_\_ I reminded Parliament in the early 17th century." (Ibid.) Reread the posts above and you'll see not just echoes of these sentiments, but the same lordly mentality in full flower. It's useless to squabble with the equestrians over their insistence that the PCT remain their private preserve and I won't attempt to persuade them to share this trail. I would instead address Forest Service and other agency staffs: a tiny group can't legitimately hold hostage a major public trail that millions of taxpayers maintain, any more than the aristocracy could legitimately keep the nonnobility out of the forests in 1400. No law endorses, let alone compels, continuing to ratify the the reactionary sentiments expressed on this page. Safety concerns are, by contrast, a legitimate issue, at least in theory. Good trail management, however, has worked all over the U.S. to lower trail conflicts to an acceptable level. If all else fails, one simply allows horses and bicycles on alternate days and hikers on all days. (It's worth noting that on trails in the east bay of the San Francisco Bay Area, police statistics show equestrians injuring themselves at an astonishing rate; none of the accidents involve bicycles. This suggests insufficiently skilled riders and indifferently trained horses, deficiencies I suspect give rise to much of the kvetching here.) There is no longer much dispute, even from professional wilderness advocates as far as I've seen recently, that the Wilderness Act of 1964 did not ban human-powered transport. In fact Congress was worried about Soviet achievements and wanted Americans to use public lands to improve their fitness, self-reliance, and ruggedness. The prohibition on "mechanical transport" was a catchall for motorized uses other than the enumerated ones and anything left over that was mechanical but carried people or cargo around, like ore carts, wagons, winches, and the like. Do a bit of research on the Internet and you'll find the evidence of this. Since Mr. Hasenauer brought up the historical background and people here dispute his view, let me quote the following attributions (I have not been able to verify their authenticity as of this date, but I have no reason to doubt them): Lyndon Johnson, 1965: "The forgotten outdoorsmen of today are those who like to walk, hike, ride, horseback, or bicycle. For them, we must have trails as well as highways. Nor should motor vehicles be permitted to tyrannize the more leisurely human traffic." Frank Church, 1976: "As the floor manager of the 1964 Wilderness Act, I recall quite clearly what we were trying to accomplish by setting up the National Wilderness Preservation System. It was never the intent of Congress that wilderness be managed in so 'pure' a fashion as to needlessly restrict customary public use and enjoyment. Quite the contrary, Congress fully intended that wilderness should be managed to allow its use by a wide spectrum of Americans. "I believe . . . that the agencies are applying provisions of the Wilderness Act too strictly and thus misconstruing the intent of Congress as to how these areas should be managed. "Such policies are misguided. If Congress had intended that wilderness be administered in so stringent a manner we would never have written the law as we did. We wouldn't have excluded condemnation as t he means for forcibly acquiring developed ranches within the wilderness

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

areas. We wouldn't have provided for the continuation of nonconforming uses where they were established—including the use of motor boats in the part of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the use of airfields in the primitive areas here in Idaho. As these examples clearly demonstrate, it was not the intent of Congress that wilderness be administered in so pure a fashion as to needlessly restrict its customary public use and enjoyment. Quite the contrary, Congress fully intended that wilderness be managed to allow its use by a wide spectrum of Americans."

Another pertinent fact \_\_\_\_\_ ignores is that (more often than not) FLREA access fees charged to REAL taxpayers don't go to support REAL public lands infrastructure or the REAL management agencies responsible for those public lands. Instead they go to private companies contracted to collect those fees. Thus the fees often directly benefit private recreation-based companies rather than public lands. With such a self-serving view of public lands, it is no wonder fee supporters like \_\_\_\_\_ and his corporate-sponsored organization is willing to completely misstate and misrepresent the truth about America's public lands and the vast numbers of citizens who actually both use and treasure them. Such as \_\_\_\_\_'s statement justifying charging fees by claiming only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" uses public lands and facilities and therefore should "pay more." That twisted view of public ownership ignores that all Americans own these lands equally and all Americans pay taxes equally to support those lands. That is the very concept of public lands and why they are "public." The lie that only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" accesses and uses their National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, etc., is absurd. No one who has actually hiked a local forest trail, visited a National Park, or makes a living from public lands tourism would seriously make or defend that claim. It's ludicrous. In my state alone, public lands account for more than a third of Colorado's land area, and visitation to those public lands supports our number one industry: Tourism. That is no "small" portion, but rather the largest portion of our economy. Those are the real facts, Mr. President. Millions upon millions of Americans annually visit their public lands. Our taxes sustain public lands, and in return visitors to those lands sustain both local economies and state-wide economies. Forcing citizens and taxpayers to pay additional fees to access our own lands (whether a forest trail, picnic table, scenic drive, or parking area) merely causes those visitors to go elsewhere, somewhere they don't have to pay an additional access fee for. Mr. President, my idea is to restore REAL Congressional funding to our public lands and land management agencies, and eliminate FLREA. Fees are an insult to all American taxpayers, and only speaks to the corrupt mismanagement of our national forests, and parks, and economy. Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

Wilderness designation and stewardship. Our greed and stupidity, love of OHV and the gasoline engine, cruelty and wastefulness have reduced the wild world to a sliver of its former self. Stewardship is often talked about, but not practiced much (especially west of the Mississippi...) The gunning down of wild wolves in the West is beyond appalling. Maybe some day, when we are going extinct we'll regret our stupidity.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Support historic preservation as part of this initiative. Historic preservation has gotten the short end of the stick in terms of federal support. History is an integral part of the outdoors experience. Historic buildings, particularly those of ordinary people, need to be preserved to teach our children that the world did not begin with Wii.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear President Obama: Please consider that if we want to continue to "conserve outdoor spaces," we must first restore public funding to our public lands and end the fees \_\_\_\_\_ advocates and supports. As someone who has worked with various governmental agencies and stakeholders for more than 30 years to better manage and preserve our public lands (National Forests, Wilderness areas, Parks, and trails), I can think of nothing more important and invigorating to our society in these tough economic times. Funding our public lands and eliminating fees for access (which economically discriminate in favor of those who can afford them) will both conserve those lands and stimulate tourism-based economies around the country. In direct response to \_\_\_\_\_, who states: "It costs real money to maintain our nation's recreation infrastructure and, unfortunately perhaps, use of this infrastructure is actually used and enjoyed by a relatively small portion of the total US population. It is fair that those who derive the benefits pay a bit more toward the costs. The fees under FLREA are very reasonable, and in almost all cases there are alternatives -- including free access for those who volunteer." One needs to ask what real money is being talked about here? What about the REAL people and ALL REAL taxpayers who own these lands equally? Some facts to clear the air: Real people are not paying a "bit more." Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act fees are being used as a MAJOR SOURCE OF REVENUE AND PROFIT for private companies while at the same time FLREA is reducing and replacing the adequate congressional appropriations real government agencies need and should be receiving on the taxpayer's behalf. That is the REAL effect of fees and the deliberate strategy of corporate fee supporters like \_\_\_\_\_. So, rather than the "reasonable" scenario \_\_\_\_\_ paints (but cannot support), FLREA, like it's predecessor, Fee Demo, is a Frankenstein Monster in sheep's clothing that is destroying the both traditional equal access to, and historic purpose of, our citizen-owned national public lands. Just who is Derrick Crandall? As a major, supporter and idea man behind charging fees for citizens to access their own public lands, \_\_\_\_\_ represents NO INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS OR CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS. He represents no one who actually pays the majority of those taxes or fees, but rather represents a conglomerate of private corporate special interests and trade associations (ARC) who, in fact, benefit from charging fees. They include Walt Disney Corp., PriceWaterhouseCoopers, Capital Hotel Management LLC, etc, etc. etc. And none of these companies represent nor manage our public lands. Thus they should NOT be determining or influencing our public lands policies. Taxpayers should, because we pay the REAL bills. Another pertinent fact Mr. Crandall ignores is that (more often than not) FLREA access fees charged to REAL taxpayers don't go to support REAL public lands infrastructure or the REAL management agencies responsible for those public lands. Instead they go to private companies contracted to collect those fees. Thus the fees often directly benefit private recreation-based companies rather than public lands. So, Mr. Crandall is lying. With such a self-serving view of public lands, it is no wonder fee supporters like Mr. Crandall and his corporate-sponsored organization is willing to completely misstate and misrepresent the truth about America's public lands and the vast numbers of citizens who actually both use and treasure them. Such as Mr. Crandall's statement justifying charging fees by claiming only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" uses public lands and facilities and therefore should "pay more." That twisted view of public ownership ignores that all Americans own these lands equally and all Americans pay taxes equally to support those lands. That is the very concept of public lands and why they are "public." The lie that only "a relatively

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

small portion of the total US population" accesses and uses their National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, etc., is absurd. No one who has actually hiked a local forest trail, visited a National Park, or makes a living from public lands tourism would seriously make or defend that claim. It's ludicrous. In my state alone, public lands account for more than a third of Colorado's land area, and visitation to those public lands supports our number one industry: Tourism. That is no "small" portion, but rather the largest portion of our economy. Those are the real facts, Mr. President. Millions upon millions of Americans annually visit their public lands. Our taxes sustain public lands, and in return visitors to those lands sustain both local economies and state-wide economies. Forcing citizens and taxpayers to pay additional fees to access our own lands (whether a forest trail, picnic table, scenic drive, or parking area) merely causes those visitors to go elsewhere, somewhere they don't have to pay an additional access fee for. Mr. President, my idea is to restore REAL Congressional funding to our public lands and land management agencies, and eliminate FLREA. Fees are an insult to all American taxpayers, and only speaks to the corrupt mismanagement of our national forests, and parks, and economy. Sincerely, Thomas Phillips

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Somehow about half my comment wasn't posted. So forgive the double post. BTW, WEBMASTER: you should allow posters to edit or delete their comments. Dear President Obama: Please consider that if we want to continue to "conserve outdoor spaces," we must first restore public funding to our public lands and end the fees Mr. Crandall advocates and supports. As someone who has worked with various government agencies and stakeholders for more than 30 years to better manage and preserve our public lands, I can think of nothing more important and reinvigorating to our society in these tough economic times. Funding our public lands and eliminating fees for access (which economically discriminate in favor of those who can afford them) will both conserve those lands and stimulate tourism-based economies around the country. In direct response to \_\_\_\_\_, who states: "It costs real money to maintain our nation's recreation infrastructure and, unfortunately perhaps, use of this infrastructure is actually used and enjoyed by a relatively small portion of the total US population. It is fair that those who derive the benefits pay a bit more toward the costs. The fees under FLREA are very reasonable, and in almost all cases there are alternatives -- including free access for those who volunteer." One needs to ask what real money is being talked about here? What about the REAL people and ALL REAL taxpayers who own these lands equally? Some facts to clear the air: Real people are not paying a "bit more." Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act fees are being used as a MAJOR SOURCE OF REVENUE AND PROFIT for private companies while at the same time FLREA is reducing and replacing the adequate congressional appropriations real government agencies need and should be receiving on the taxpayer's behalf. That is the REAL effect of fees and the deliberate strategy of corporate fee supporters like \_\_\_\_\_. So, rather than the "reasonable" scenario \_\_\_\_\_ paints (but cannot support), FLREA, like it's predecessor, Fee Demo, is a Frankenstein Monster in sheep's clothing that is destroying both traditional equal access to, and the historic purpose of, our citizen-owned national public lands. Just who is Derrick Crandall? As a major supporter and idea man behind charging fees for citizens to access their own public lands, \_\_\_\_\_ represents NO INDIVIDUAL CITIZENS OR CITIZEN ORGANIZATIONS. He represents no one who actually pays the majority of those taxes or fees, but rather represents a conglomerate of private corporate special interests and trade associations (ARC) who, in fact, benefit from charging fees. They include Walt Disney Corp., PriceWaterhouseCoopers, Capital Hotel Management LLC, etc, etc. etc. And none of these companies represent nor manage our public lands. Thus they should NOT be determining or influencing our public lands policies. Taxpayers should, because we pay the REAL bills. Another pertinent fact Mr. Crandall ignores is that (more often than not) FLREA access fees charged to REAL taxpayers don't go to support REAL public lands infrastructure or the REAL management agencies responsible for those public lands. Instead they go to private companies contracted to collect those fees. Thus the fees often directly benefit private recreation-based companies rather than public lands. So, Mr. Crandall is lying. With such a self-serving view of public lands, it is no wonder fee supporters like Mr. Crandall and his corporate-sponsored organization is willing to completely misstate and misrepresent the truth about America's public lands and the vast numbers of citizens who actually both use and treasure them. Such as Mr. Crandall's statement justifying charging fees by claiming only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" uses public lands and facilities and therefore should "pay more." That twisted view of public ownership ignores that all Americans own these land s equally and all Americans pay taxes

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

equally to support those lands. That is the very concept of public lands and why they are "public." The lie that only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" accesses and uses their National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, etc., is absurd. No one who has actually hiked a local forest trail, visited a National Park, or makes a living from public lands tourism would seriously make or defend that claim. It's ludicrous. In my state alone, public lands account for more than a third of Colorado's land area, and visitation to those public lands supports our number one industry: Tourism. That is no "small" portion, but rather the largest portion of our economy. Those are the real facts, Mr. President. Millions upon millions of Americans annually visit their public lands. Our taxes sustain public lands, and in return visitors to those lands sustain both local economies and state-wide economies. Forcing citizens and taxpayers to pay additional fees to access our own lands (whether a forest trail, picnic table, scenic drive, or parking area) merely causes those visitors to go elsewhere, somewhere they don't have to pay an additional access fee for. Mr. President, my idea is to restore REAL Congressional funding to our public lands and land management agencies, and eliminate FLREA. Fees are an insult to all American taxpayers, and only speaks to the corrupt mismanagement of our national forests, and parks, and economy. Sincerely, Thomas Phillips

(O.K., I guess there are character limits and it would be nice if people were told that before writing and posting. So the rest reads): ...Thus the fees often directly benefit private recreation-based companies rather than public lands. So, \_\_\_\_\_ is lying. With such a self-serving view of public lands, it is no wonder fee supporters like \_\_\_\_\_ and his corporate-sponsored organization is willing to completely misstate and misrepresent the truth about America's public lands and the vast numbers of citizens who actually both use and treasure them. Such as \_\_\_\_\_'s statement justifying charging fees by claiming only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" uses public lands and facilities and therefore should "pay more." That twisted view of public ownership ignores that all Americans own these lands equally and all Americans pay taxes equally to support those lands. That is the very concept of public lands and why they are "public." The lie that only "a relatively small portion of the total US population" accesses and uses their National Forests, Parks, Wildlife Refuges, etc., is absurd. No one who has actually hiked a local forest trail, visited a National Park, or makes a living from public lands tourism would seriously make or defend that claim. It's ludicrous. In my state alone, public lands account for more than a third of Colorado's land area, and visitation to those public lands supports our number one industry: Tourism. That is no "small" portion, but rather the largest portion of our economy. Those are the real facts, Mr. President. Millions upon millions of Americans annually visit their public lands. Our taxes sustain public lands, and in return visitors to those lands sustain both local economies and state-wide economies. Forcing citizens and taxpayers to pay additional fees to access our own lands (whether a forest trail, picnic table, scenic drive, or parking area) merely causes those visitors to go elsewhere, somewhere they don't have to pay an additional access fee for. Mr. President, my idea is to restore REAL Congressional funding to our public lands and land management agencies, and eliminate FLREA. Fees are an insult to all American taxpayers, and only speaks to the corrupt mismanagement of our national forests, and parks, and economy. Sincerely, \_\_\_\_\_

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OHVs. OHV recreation including that using snowmobiles does not belong on federal land or land which is maintained in a natural or near-natural state anywhere. The pastime is harmful to wildlife and destructive of vegetation and soil. It pollutes waterways and the air. Its noise, exhaust fumes and fast moving vehicles are incompatible with many other activities which have far less adverse impacts on the environment, e.g., hiking, bird watching, and picnicking. Many off-roaders are not law-abiding and many managers of the activity are more interested in promoting it than enforcing the laws and regulations which govern it. The only places where the activity should be allowed are in sound-proof buildings which have purifiers for any air exhausted outside. I am sure that many off-roaders would consider it fun to ride in city parks or in the halls and on the large staircases of many museums. Providing amusement for the off-roaders would not, I hope, be a justification for allowing it in these locations.

Alaska Conservation, esp. Pebble Mine. When I was in my 20's and just graduated from college, I wanted to explore America and the great outdoors; I love to hike and camp and to be out in nature, much like John Muir. When I had an opportunity to visit Alaska around 1994, I will tell you that it was probably the most seminal event in my life, it its sheer beauty and majesty and with the knowledge it imparted that The Natural World held such splendor and beauty beyond what I ever could imagine was possible on Earth! The wild rivers, the salmon jumping out of the water, so big and beautiful you could literally go pick-them-up off their spawning grounds...the king brown bear, the mountains, the quiet, the "God's Country"! And I'll tell you this, there will never, NEVER be another that! This is a beauty and resource that one can never re-create! With every incursion into this Garden of Eden, we spoil for generations the un-told majesty of a world heritage area! I'll never forget the time I went hiking around a pristine glacier, with pure water tricking all-around! The area was so un-spoiled and pure that I literally felt like I was on another planet! I then had the pleasure of swimming in a pristine high mountain lake and I felt like I was on top of the world. The water was so pure and clear that it was un-like anything I ever thought this world was capable of producing! All of this majesty is made lost with man's development! Every single incursion, from the Exxon Valdez spills of the world, to even the much admired pipeline, diminishes "the natural wonder value" for generations to come. There will never be an Alaska like the one I enjoyed, for man's incursion. Please, please, please realize that the greatest resource to be developed in Alaska is man's ability, availability and opportunity to experience, much like I did, the un-spoilt natural beauty self-evident in its natural, un-spoilt state, not man's extraction of its natural resources. There is still time to keep this "heaven" the beauty and love that it is, and that means that we "look but don't touch", admire but don't covet. respect but don't take! Otherwise, others won't be able to experience the totally unique and God-given experience I was able to enjoy in 1994! That time is etched in my mind and heart as an event that seems like "I almost didn't deserve to have", b/c it was so awe-inspiring and "above the fray of mankind's quest to anthropomorphize the land of God! No to Pebble mine! No to developing and destroying Alaska's majesty!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Cancer. Wilderness use to play a large part in this country's history. It set boundaries, created challenges, and held our natural resources. Now that our country is settled for the most part we have lost a little part of ourselves, in the fact that there are very few places that are untouched by human hands. To get people back to wilderness several obstacles have to be overcome. Society has created a new outlook for people in America, one of technology and progression. Wilderness is opposite of this idea, it is natural and timeless. When a person goes to the wilderness there is a completely different time table and set of rules. This can be seen as backwards in the modern society, thus threatening our wilderness. One idea that seems to be prominent in America is to build or mine and not think about future consequence. People do not seem to care for the lack of nature we have left. An elderly man once told me a squirrel used to be able to go from Georgia and make it to Maine without ever having a touch the ground, he would jump from branch to branch, from tree to tree. This is no longer possible due to the amount of construction that happens. If a squirrel could even go several miles like that anymore I would be extremely impressed. David Brower in the book, Encounters with the Archdruid, has a famous "sermon" in which he says, " When rampant growth happens in a person, we call it cancer". Our society has become this cancer, we are constantly building new places, and feel like we must be building. We must overcome our love of expansion as a society. It endangers the security of the wilderness we have now, and the amount we will have in the future. Personally I would like my children to be able to see the "purple mountains majesty".

Mountaintop removal should be outlawed.. Not only is it destroying plant ecologies which have survived past ice ages; it's making people sick! I have a friend in W. Va who's been chronically sick from living a block away from the Monongahela River. That flows into the Ohio, which flows into the Mississippi, which flows into the Gulf. Which is sick enough already.

Stop Pebble Mine. It's bad enough that the Arctic is being put at risk by offshore oil drilling, and runoff from the Canadian tar sands; but now they're willing to do it for GOLD! Of what use is gold but to line somebody's pockets?

The endangered species act has been abused and perverted to lock out public access to non wilderness lands. It needs to be abolished or rewritten with the public's interest in mind.

Stabilize the U.S. Population or Say Good-bye to America's Great Outdoors. Are you finding it harder to have a genuine outdoor experience and not feel crowded? Wonder why? The US population, now at over 310 million, is growing at about 2.75 million people per year. At that rate, in about 7 years, additional growth will be roughly equivalent to the current population of the entire State of New York. Before long, all that will be left of America's Great Outdoors will be a few museum pieces with people on waiting lists to get in. We desperately need a national population policy that aims to stabilize the US population for the sake of the American landscape -- and for a lot of other good reasons as well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Just google "US Population Growth" and find and crunch the numbers. You can also readily find population estimates for all the States. The US growth rate has varied from about .87% and 1.15% since 2000. I used the 2008 figure of .915% and applied it to our current population of 310 million to come up with a yearly growth rate of over 2.75 million per year. The US Census Bureau seems to be saying the US growth rate is slowing, but I don't see any hard evidence for that. Ours continues to be well ahead of China's. S.Collins -- Yes, the liberal immigrant policies of the U.S. are a huge factor in our rapid population growth. Glen -- Build it (i.e. roads), and more will come. I personally have not found any restrictions to public lands, except for some state lands for which I need a hunting license to access, and some military restricted areas. Thank you all for your comments.

Sure I want families to get away from it all. This includes getting away from vehicles. Not just cell phones and TV (which you see more and more being toted along in vehicles to "get away from it all"). Contrary to popular belief in this country, "these feet were made for walking."

I have an idea.... let's have flamethrower parties in National Parks, Wildlife Refuges, and Wilderness Areas. Once it catches on and flamethrower manufacturers start making some serious money and jobs are created and the economy of an area starts to depend on those who come to town to burn things and the 'Flamthrowers Association of America' lobbies for their 'right' to use their flamethrowers on public lands..... then we'll have the same situation we now have with ohvs.

The idea that horses have to be spooked by a valid trail user, i.e. mountain bikes, is preposterous. It seems to me that horses were used by the military for ages exposed to exploding shells and numerous excitable incursions and yet remained calm and stable. it's merely a matter of training. if you train your animal to deal with what it expects to see on the trail then it will be able to deal with it, otherwise you have brought yourself and others into danger by exposing us to a ticking 1000 lb time bomb. I bring the right equipment to the trail when I show up by having the right tires, brakes and suspension to deal with what I'm about to encounter. If I showed up with a road bicycle or beach cruiser to a technical off road trail system then I probably would have trouble staying in control of my mount also.

I recently visited Yosemite National Park and was both awed by it's beauty and suprised by the numbers of people visiting. I think it is vital to our nation to protect our few wilderness areas, maintain limits on the number of visitors, and budget enough money that these areas can be maintained. Europe may have it's castles, USA has it's wilderness. We must keep wilderness areas as pristene as possible and not allow business and personal or corporate fiscal gain to impinge on what has always been Americas treasure. It is the federal goverments responsibility to maintain our natural treasures while continuing to make it affordable for all to visit.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For those who are confused about why off-road vehicles should not be allowed in National Parks, or other areas under the specific protection of the NPS, let me briefly explain: Off-road vehicles make noise, are a source of pollution, and damage terrain. There are plenty of areas under the protection of the USFS and BLM, as well as many state, county and local parks and recreation areas where you can take your motorized vehicles. And, although I am not in favor of off-road vehicles in general, I understand, and can appreciate the enthusiasm people who do enjoy off-road adventures - just keep them out of the parks. When I am in a National Park, Scenic Area, or Recreation Area, I want to hear and smell the natural surroundings, not a snowmobile or four-wheeler - they are an intrusion to the tranquility I seek. If this still does not help you understand, read a little of what John Muir wrote, it would expand your education.

I've tried time and time again to be friendly to mountain bikers while horseback riding on the trail. And I must say, there are some really nice and responsible bikers out there! Unfortunately, there are some very rude, and ignorant ones as well. It's the second of the two that continually make it dangerous for not only equestrians but hikers when on the trails. Perhaps if Mountain bikers could ally to ensure other biker users were respectful, safe, and took the time to help maintain the trails, I would have different feelings. But for now, this topic just opens a door for more accidents waiting to happen.

I just want to add the points that environmental groups have already skillfully articulated: - Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. - Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. - The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. - Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. - Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter. - Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. After the oil spill disaster in the gulf, let's learn the lessons and prevent a similar sort disaster in Bristol Bay.

Mile-for-mile is not the way to go for this idea. However as a hiker who disapproves of rampant and aggressive OHV use, I decided a few years ago that if I want OHV cherry stems (dead ends) closed off, or if I want OHV to stick to trails, I must be willing to do the same on foot. Such a rule MUST be for the sake of the lands and air around us. I support revegetating a minimally used OHV trail because where I live in the Four Corners, it is for the good of the community air quality and wildlife. If someone did their research and decided that keeping humans out of a certain area (as they do for Peregrine Falcons) was beneficial, including humans on foot (arguably the smallest impact of the types of recreation, at the very least because foot-travelers can cover the smallest terrain in the same amount of time), I would support this even if it closed off an area for me. There are SO many places to explore, we should be willing to "mother" earth and care for it if that is the most responsible approach for ourselves and our posterity.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Poor hikers and skiers, they only have 140 million acres of their own. Lets see, how many acres are exclusive to snowmobiles, I'm sure there 3 or 4 somewhere. Already had this discussion with the Ranger, number one complaint, skiers with dogs, number two complaint snow shoers stomping on skate ski trails, number three complaint skiers complaining about snowmobilers. Let's recap, #1 skiers complaining, #2 skiers complaining, and #3 skiers complaining. I got an idea on how to cut down on complaints, get rid of the complainers. No really, skiers are some of the nicest, and sometimes some of the most self centered people, much like any group 5% of the group sets destroys it for the rest. There is a concept in law, called reciprocity, you get one acre, I get one acre. You already have 140 million acres, so I want 140 million acres, if my math serves me, that's the entire National Forest, already split between the two of us. You do have to admit, snowmobilers always loose ground. RWA, WSA, Roadless, Y2Y, NREPA, National Monuments, wildlife, user conflict, Wilderness, the list goes on. When your a snowmobiler, your told that compromise is give up half of your land every 20 years. It's just the way it is. Well, things change, and one day, you may look back on these as the golden years. So, suck it up, and go enjoy the forest guys, and leave other people alone. If I where you guys, I'd be more worried about loosing what I have, rather than taking any more.

Daniel Boone National Forest, geeze that makes me laugh. Back when 4x4s roamed the Daniel, a person could hike that place without fear. But, after the 1/2 closure, and another 1/2 closure, and another 1/2 closure, they just closed all motorized in the Daniel. Then the pot growers moved in, and you don't dare walk the Daniel during the summer, unless you want to be killed execution style. Remember the 4 kids? Shared use does benefit everyone. Seen it in the Daniel, and have seen it out west. Usually, it's not realized until it's too late.

109.5 Million Acres of Wilderness isn't enough? 40% of the National Forest, already being designated wilderness isn't enough? We haven't even begun to mine our resources. You probably think the rivers are dirtier than they where in the 70's?

Funding for Multi-use Trail Plans. We need a source of modest funds to encourage states to develop statewide plans for walking/biking trails connecting communities, parks and other destinations. Much trail development now is done on a fragmented basis; it is time to look at the emerging patterns on a state level and identify the opportunities for interconnected trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While the Original Poster that created this discussion thread makes some interesting points, the O.P. and the subsequent discussion overlook an extremely important issue, that issue being Volunteer Management. I am a recreational trails volunteer on the 513,000-acre Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania's only national forest. For many years, my fellow volunteers and I have done extensive work on the A.N.F., building and maintaining trails and bridges, as well as keeping watch over the condition of said trails. During the 2008 Recreation Facilities Analysis (R.F.A.) on the A.N.F., U.S.D.A. Forest Service personnel proposed decommissioning many developed recreation sites on the A.N.F. Planning reports also revealed proposals to rely more heavily on volunteer work to maintain recreation facilities. I attended R.F.A. events held by the agency. During an R.F.A. workshop on 28 June 2008 at the Bradford Ranger Station, I asked about this proposal to rely more heavily on volunteers. Ranger Scardina told me the proposal was indeed being considered and this was the public's chance to give input and ask questions. I asked Ranger Scardina what the Forest Service's Volunteer Management Policy (V.M.P.), the policy (or policies) that governed how agency personnel recruit, retain, and recognize volunteers, was and if I could see the agency's V.M.P. documentation. Indeed, I made it very clear to Ranger Scardina that V.M.P.'s would require a fourth "R", for "recording", to account for a properly kept record of volunteer donations of time, equipment and material to benefit public recreation facilities. If a volunteer offers to use his chainsaw to clear storm debris out of a trail, and the agency requires a chainsaw-operating trails volunteer to take chainsaw safety and other training in order to work on trail maintenance, and the agency also requires that volunteers keep the agency personnel informed of trail work bees, then it would logically follow that said agency personnel would also be responsible for keeping a record of these donations to the agency as prescribed by the agency V.M.P. Correct? (Also of note: the Forest Service requires volunteers and volunteer-organizations to keep a current, signed volunteer agreement on file with the agency.) Whatever incentives (be they perks, a free "pass", or any other form of benefit) would (or would not) be offered to volunteers for their donations to the public good, one would think the proper procedures would be spelled out in the agency's V.M.P. So, one would think that with the Forest Service's doors open for their "open house" workshop in June of '08, and with the invitation for the public to ask questions about such an obvious issue as volunteer management, that the agency administrators would be right there with the obvious answer to an obvious question. At the very least, one would expect that it would not be hard to get the answer in a timely fashion. It's been over two years. To this day, my V.M.P. question remains unanswered. Nobody ever acknowledged my question. The point I took home: the Forest Service personnel don't want to answer the question. If they do have a V.M.P., they aren't sharing it with the volunteers. If anyone in Washington is watching this discussion, and you want feedback from the volunteers on public lands, here it is: It's time for all United States public land management agencies involved with public recreation facilities and volunteer-donations to review their V.M.P.'s, if they have any. Volunteers who donate so much to our nation's public lands are entitled to know that their donations are being applied properly, and that agency administrators are required to handle volunteer management responsibly. Without accountability and agency transparency, responsible volunteer management will not happen. Without responsible volunteer management, there is no logical reason to expect that any agency will be serious about recruiting, retaining and recognizing volunteers, let alone recording their good deeds.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I noticed that the Original Poster in this discussion thread mentioned a "nationwide pass" concept for volunteers. This stimulated my interest. There was a vaguely similar notion brought up in the "Respect volunteers" discussion thread. I would like to reiterate what I said in the other thread, because it seems to be even more relevant here: I am a recreational trails volunteer on the 513,000-acre Allegheny National Forest, Pennsylvania's only national forest. For many years, my fellow volunteers and I have done extensive work on the A.N.F., building and maintaining trails and bridges, as well as keeping watch over the condition of said trails. During the 2008 Recreation Facilities Analysis (R.F.A.) on the A.N.F., U.S.D.A. Forest Service personnel proposed decommissioning many developed recreation sites on the A.N.F. Planning reports also revealed proposals to rely more heavily on volunteer work to maintain recreation facilities. I attended R.F.A. events held by the agency. During an R.F.A. workshop on 28 June 2008 at the Bradford Ranger Station, I asked about this proposal to rely more heavily on volunteers. Ranger Scardina told me the proposal was indeed being considered and this was the public's chance to give input and ask questions. I asked Ranger Scardina what the Forest Service's Volunteer Management Policy (V.M.P.), the policy (or policies) that governed how agency personnel recruit, retain, and recognize volunteers, was and if I could see the agency's V.M.P. documentation. Indeed, I made it very clear to Ranger Scardina that V.M.P.'s would require a fourth "R", for "recording", to account for a properly kept record of volunteer donations of time, equipment and material to benefit public recreation facilities. If a volunteer offers to use his chainsaw to clear storm debris out of a trail, and the agency requires a chainsaw-operating trails volunteer to take chainsaw safety and other training in order to work on trail maintenance, and the agency also requires that volunteers keep the agency personnel informed of trail work bees, then it would logically follow that said agency personnel would also be responsible for keeping a record of these donations to the agency as prescribed by the agency V.M.P. Correct? (Also of note: the Forest Service requires volunteers and volunteer-organizations to keep a current, signed volunteer agreement on file with the agency.) Whatever incentives (be they perks, a free "pass", or any other form of benefit) would (or would not) be offered to volunteers for their donations to the public good, one would think the proper procedures would be spelled out in the agency's V.M.P. So, one would think that with the Forest Service's doors open for their "open house" workshop in June of '08, and with the invitation for the public to ask questions about such an obvious issue as volunteer management, that the agency administrators would be right there with the obvious answer to an obvious question. At the very least, one would expect that it would not be hard to get the answer in a timely fashion. It's been over two years. To this day, my V.M.P. question remains unanswered. Nobody ever acknowledged my question. The point I took home: the Forest Service personnel don't want to answer the question. If they do have a V.M.P., they aren't sharing it with the volunteers. If anyone in Washington is watching this discussion, and you want feedback from the volunteers on public lands, here it is: It's time for all United States public land management agencies involved with public recreation facilities and volunteer-donations to review their V.M.P.'s, if they have any. Volunteers who donate so much to our nation's public lands are entitled to know that their donations are being applied properly, and that agency administrators are required to handle volunteer management responsibly. Without accountability and agency transparency, responsible volunteer management will not happen. Without responsible volunteer management, there is no logical reason to expect that any agency

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

will be serious about recruiting, retaining and recognizing volunteers, let alone recording their good deeds. In addition, I would like to point out that the public needs greater assurance that these land management agencies are "playing by the rules" when it comes to proposing the application of fee-levying powers on our public lands. Case in point: the Kelly Pines Recreation Area in the Allegheny National Forest. In September of 2009, the Marienville Ranger Station sent out a scoping letter (under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969) announcing a new project: the Kelly Pines Recreation Area would be converted to a U.S. Fee Area. Here is the N.E.P.A. page: { <a href="http://www.fs.fed.us/r9/forests/allegheny/projects/recreation\_projects/kelly\_pines\_fee\_analysis/index.php" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } As soon as I received this scoping letter, I started making inquiries. Word of this scoping letter reached Washington in just hours. I less than two weeks, the Kelly Pines project was cancelled. The reason? It was improper of the the Forest Service to propose the conversion to a Fee Area using the N.E.P.A. scoping process. Fee Area proposals are supposed to be announced and decided through the F.L.R.E.A. process. Clearly, the Kelly Pines project was not being handled through the proper channels. How can we, as citizens, taxpayers and public lands users, be assured that this F.L.R.E.A. is a sound policy when the aborted Kelly Pines project underscores how easy it would be for a conversion of an existing Forest Service recreation area from free to a U.S. Fee Area through improper channels? As a private citizen, I exercised my free speech rights to blow the whistle on this obviously improper initiative. But how would you like to be in my shoes and still be involved in a relationship with those same Forest Service administrators afterwards? Would you feel more, or less, comfortable if you did not have access to an agency's V.M.P.?

Stop the FS before they steal again!. The FS is illegally charging money to park and hike in Sedona, Arizona. They were recently found guilty of this in court. So my "challenge", my "obstacle", in recreating in the outdoors is an out of control, rogue agency which continues to extort money from me and everyone else. \_\_\_\_\_, you've got to help us. Stop the FS before they steal again!

I am very favorably impressed by all the intelligent, well thought out comments of all those opposed to having to pay more to access our land but \_\_\_\_\_ said it succinctly and best: "Many generations have contributed to the creation and preservation of our national lands. Access to these lands should be freely available to all Americans. This land is our land." Indeed! This land is our land, and if the Forest Service was not squandering their budget they would not be trying to further nickel and dime us. As for poor \_\_\_\_\_, what a disgrace! "I'll make one more attempt to bring some sensible exchange of ideas -- and ignore the ridiculous emotionalism of some of the commenters here." So Daddy's going to give us children one more chance then take his ball and bat and go home if we aren't "sensible". "Sensible" must mean to agree with him and his variety of "ridiculous emotionalism". By his own words he exposes himself as the typical out of touch elitist. Pity he is in a position of power. Get hip to it, \_\_\_\_\_: The forests are ours, not yours.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I find that I agree with \_\_\_\_\_'s reasoning to an extent. It is certainly true that no extreme is likely to prevail, given that no one really agrees on the subject of wilderness preservation; however, I still think it is necessary to maintain such extreme points of view, even while compromising. To use the example of mining, I am an avid protestor of mountaintop removal. I do not agree with any form of coal mining, but I know that I will only make progress by compromising. I will fight mountaintop removal until it is stopped, and then I will fight another aspect of coal mining until it is stopped. I will do this until all coal mining is stopped, if I can. This may not seem like compromising, but it is. It is unrealistic to expect anyone to immediately conform to such extreme ideas as the abolition of mining. It is, however, not unrealistic to approach it from a less extreme point of view. In other words, I agree with her statement that compromise is key, but I would take it a step further and say that compromise only offers a temporary solution and should be used as a basis for further reformation. I do have to address one statement that \_\_\_\_\_ made which is false. Most people who protest mining do not protest it because it destroys the beauty of the area the mine is in. Most protestors of mountaintop removal (a particularly devastating type of mining) base the vast majority of their arguments on the fact that coal mining is extremely detrimental to society and to the environment; not just how the area looks. Mining is an inherently dangerous practice. In West Virginia alone mountaintop removal has caused multiple communities to completely disappear, and the government issued a warning about fishing in the southern part of the state because many of the fish contain unhealthy amounts of dangerous chemicals due to toxic waste that is dumped into the streams and rivers by coal companies. Ultimately, I like how Tara has chosen to approach some of the issues at hand. Compromise is an excellent way to begin. Not only does it start the process of getting something done, but it also allows people to find more common ground on which to stand. This is extremely important, especially in this country, where public opinion can get a lot more done than in most other countries. However, it would be unwise to consider compromise the solution to all of our problems.

Avoiding having waste to re-use is a lot of what \_\_\_\_\_ is talking about. I'm sure she would agree with the notion of going back and trying to recycle our waste, but her entire argument is based on avoiding something like that being necessary. I don't really agree that it's the answer to our problems, but you can't deny its obvious advantages.

Perhaps you should address your comments to the BLM--or an idea related to horses and burros. The concept of making the National Wildlife Refuge System a separate agency seems a strange place to be making arguments in favor of improving operations under the Wild Horse and Burro Act (the NWRS is not even subject to that law). Our wildlife habitats across America are under stress from many causes--development, highways, extending agriculture, global warming, disastrous wildfires to mention a few--and our refuge system is striving to combat such losses and degradation. They are hampered by lack of support and resources as they have been chronically. They need to get public attention to their needs and to the enormous potential for keeping America's wildlife, plants, and fish--and their habitats--healthy and available to a caring public.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Recommendations for Existing Federal Programs and Proposed Strategies and Activities to Achieve the Goals of the Initiative GOAL 1. Support and Invest in the Ecologic, Social, and Economic Resiliency of Rural Communities and Working Landscapes, both Public and Private, in the West (Department: Agriculture, Interior. Agency: Forest Service, Rural Development, Natural Resource Conservation Service, Bureau of Land Management) Actions for existing programs: A. Increase interagency collaboration. The high percentage of public lands in the West creates a unique rural landscape where even private lands are situated in a public lands context. Examples include rural communities surrounded by public land, a checkerboard of private and public land, or private land adjacent to a large swath of public forest or rangeland. In these public lands communities with natural resource-based economies, the land management agencies are often an economic driver. Increased dialogue between the Forest Service, BLM, FWS and Rural Development would leverage scarce government dollars and promote rural communities' efforts to engage in conservation and rural development. Additionally, land owners and stewards often work at the intersection of multiple land management agencies. For example, a rancher might work with the NRCS on private land, graze on both USFS and BLM public land allotments, and intersect with the USFWS and even NMFS for endangered species conservation measures. Increased interagency collaboration has the potential to expand the effectiveness of programs and regulations by integrating agency mandates, practices, and standards promoting the management of whole landscapes for conservation. In addition to potential cost reductions, increased cooperation also reduces transaction costs for communities intersecting with public agencies, and increases trust and understanding between local populations and the federal government. Actions for new strategies: A. Create and fund a Community Capacity and Collaborative Support Grant Program at \$50 million annually to enhance conservation and rural economic resiliency. Investment is needed to retain and build the capacity of community based organizations, collaborative groups, and small rural businesses to participate in landscape level forest and watershed restoration and stewardship activities, utilize the by-products of land management activities for traditional and emerging markets in payments for ecosystem services, and develop mitigation and adaptation strategies for climate change. Investment is essential to economic recovery in rural communities adjacent to public lands. The program will provide funding through competitively awarded grants to directly support and/or provide technical assistance for:

- organizational and staff support, including facilitation;
- travel related to collaborative group activities;
- workshops and training related to current science, management practices, facilitation, contracting, and other topics that will assist groups in building their capacity to meet their project goals;
- natural resource related business support services, including marketing and utilization of products and services resulting from land stewardship, grant writing, bonding access, federal bidding procedures and other technical advice;
- landscape level planning and modeling and watershed assessment;
- design of silvicultural and restoration prescriptions and treatments to enhance forest and watershed resilience, adaptation, and restoration;
- design and coordination of monitoring of ecological, economic, and social impacts of projects and management actions;
- dissemination of best practices and tools to assist collaborative groups and community based organizations in project development, implementation, and monitoring; and
- outreach and engagement of youth and traditionally under-represented populations.

Outcomes: • Ensure community based



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

organizations (CBOs) and collaborative groups have the financial and technical resources to convene, plan, implement, and monitor landscape scale restoration projects. • Strengthen the relationships and partnerships between the land management agencies, collaborative groups, and community-based organizations. • Create peer-to-peer learning networks among CBOs and collaborative groups working on projects across the region and in adjacent regions that will accelerate learning and adoption of best practices. • Provide training and technical assistance related to collaboration, multi-party monitoring, project design, and stewardship contracting for government agency employees, non-profit, and business partners. • Ensure best practices are employed and shared consistently across the region among nonprofits, federal employees, and the business community. • Support and enhance small rural businesses providing quality jobs in land management and restoration. GOAL 2. Support Landscape Scale Restoration and Community Revitalization for Public Lands Communities (Department: Agriculture. Agency: Forest Service) Actions for existing programs: A. Fully fund the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) authorized under the Forest Landscape Restoration Act at \$40 million in FY2012. This legislation requires a broad coalition of interests to assess the landscape together, identify priorities, and sketch out a collaborative plan of action. CFLRP should receive full funding for the next ten years and should be used as a template for other programs to invest in restoration and land stewardship across the West. Outcomes: • Appropriations for this legislation in FY12 would continue to fund priority landscapes and allow the creation of new priority landscapes, ensuring adequate funding to support comprehensive forest restoration and rural community benefit. B. Support and expand use of stewardship contracting as a tool for implementing collaborative forest restoration and stewardship. Stewardship contracting has been one successful and critical tool for fostering restoration of our nation's forests and watersheds while creating community benefit. The expansion of stewardship contracting should be should be aggressively pursued. Outcomes: • Increased administrative efficiency, collaboration, revenue for other restoration needs, and community benefit. C. Support and fully fund the Forest Service Integrated Resource Restoration Line Item in FY2011 President's budget. Consolidating funding for restoration and stewardship into one line item will enable land managers to effectively budget for integrated outcomes related to land management goals. The IRR line item proposed in the FY2011 President's budget fixes an outdated structure that stovepipes activities that are better integrated to give land managers more effective budget tools to achieve landscape scale restoration and stewardship objectives on the ground. We support all three components of the IRR line item, with the addition of performance measures and other related guidance. Actions for new strategies: A. The federal government must accommodate, support, and adequately fund collaborative efforts on the landscape. Collaborative community-based efforts present a high area of opportunity to make progress on the gridlock that has surrounded public land management in the West. Land management agencies must support and participate in these efforts. By participating, the land management agencies are not abdicating their authority, but are rather partnering with stakeholders to develop management solutions that have diverse support. Funding for CBOs is integral to support the collaborative structures and institutions that assemble diverse interests and viewpoints, and facilitate them towards common ground. GOAL 3. Promote the Resources and Incentives Needed to Support Private Landowners and Land Managers to Remain Viable and Restore the Land (Department:

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Agriculture. Agency: Forest Service and Natural Resource Conservation Service) Actions for existing programs: A. Fully fund the Farm Bill Conservation Programs at the mandated levels for FY 2011, \$4.3 billion. The NRCS conservation programs authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill are critical to enhancing ecosystem health on private lands across the nation. These programs provide technical assistance and financial incentives for conservation of private forest and ranchlands. These include programs such as the Forest Stewardship Program (State and Private Forestry), Farm and Ranch Land Protection Program, Grasslands Reserve Program, and Environmental Quality Incentives Program (Natural Resources Conservation Service). Outcomes: • Private forest and rangeland owners have the ability to achieve long-term, sustainable forest and range management. • Forests continue to be productive, and farm and ranchlands maintain stewardship activities. • Private lands are effectively able to contribute to maintaining public benefits like clean air and water, wildlife and fish habitat, and wildfire risk reduction, and are protected in an economically viable manner. B. Fund the new Community Forest and Open Space Conservation Program at \$10 million annually. This program, established in the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, provides an important tool for maintaining working landscapes, managing the pressure to develop green spaces so vital to the character and integrity of many communities, and management of changing land ownership. The program provides matching funds to help county or local governments, nongovernmental organizations, or Native American tribes acquire forest areas that are threatened by conversion to non-forest uses, and are economically, culturally, and environmentally important to local communities. Funds will also be set aside for technical assistance. This assistance will help each grant recipient develop and implement a required forest management plan, crafted with a high level of community input. Outcomes: • Drive conservation activity into areas where federal conservation grants have not traditionally been directed, particularly oriented around rural communities. • Conserve thousands of forested acres and increase carbon sequestration and storage values that would otherwise disappear as a result of development. • Retain and revitalize rural livelihoods through conservation and maintain important positive rural character and culture that is fundamental to America. C. Fully fund and increase the flexible utilization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), while increasing expenditures under Forest Legacy and USFS Land Acquisition. This program is critical to stem development pressure and helps conserve working landscapes, curb future costs to the public, and secure the land base for rural economic activities. Congress should give direction to federal and state agencies to increase utilization of LWCF funding for the purchase of conservation easements on private lands. Outcomes: • Assists states in protecting working forests that ensure water quality, provide habitat, produce forest products, and create opportunities for recreation and other public benefits. • Use of conservation easements on private lands will help prevent conversion and turnover of multi-generational private forest and ranch lands. GOAL 4: Promote Clean Energy Development through Community-scaled Biomass Utilization and Climate Change Adaptation in Rural Communities (Department: Agriculture and Interior. Agency: Forest Service and Department of Energy) Integrated community-scaled biomass utilization strategies can offset the costs of forest restoration and hazardous fuel reduction activities while contributing to rural economies, energy independence, and carbon emission reductions. The following programs represent a comprehensive approach to encouraging efficient, community scaled biomass utilization



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

strategies across the nation. It is critical that Congress fund all of these programs as each fulfills a different need for support, planning, and implementation of broad biomass utilization and climate change planning strategies. Actions for existing programs: A. Fully Fund the Community Wood Energy Program at \$5 million. The Community Wood Energy Program (CWEP) was authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill at \$5 million. The program will provide up to \$50,000 grants to qualifying state or local government entities to prepare “community wood energy plans.” Once a plan has been approved, the qualified applicant may request up to 50 percent matching grants toward the capital cost of installing biomass energy systems. B. Increase funding for the Woody Biomass Utilization Grants program under the Hazardous Fuels line item to \$10 million. The Woody Biomass Utilization Grant Program, funded under the USFS Wildland Fire, Hazardous Fuels Line Item supports the utilization of forest restoration byproducts from National Forest system lands. Outcomes: • The competitive grant program funds projects that demonstrate an increased use of woody biomass from forest restoration and hazardous fuels projects on National Forest System lands where there little or no capacity to use this low value material. • This grant program reduces forest management costs by increasing the value of biomass and other forest products generated from forest restoration activities, generates renewable energy from woody biomass, builds industry infrastructure around national forestlands where limited or no industry infrastructure exists, and expands working relationships between local forest products businesses and Forest Service offices. C. Fully fund the Climate Change Adaptation Initiative in the Department of the Interior at \$17.5 million. The Department of the Interior’s Climate Change Adaptation Initiative is a proactive approach to adapting to and mitigating for climate change impacts to our nation’s public lands. The approach is collaborative and based on integrating science with the broad experiences of partners across regional landscapes. This program will be vital to understanding potential climate change impacts on public lands and reaching social agreement on management actions necessary to address impacts and implement mitigation measures. D. Require the USDA Forest Service and NRCS to join the DOI Climate Change Adaptation Initiative efforts to increase interagency coordination on landscape scale approaches to climate change adaptation. Congress should advise USDA to join the DOI Climate Change Adaptation Initiative to increase interagency collaboration and coordination on climate change strategies. Actions for new strategies: A. Establish a Revolving Loan Fund to support retro-fits of institutional facilities that use petroleum-based fuels to generate thermal energy. B. Ensure every region has a USFS woody biomass utilization specialist. Currently, not every region has them, and in some regions the position is less than 1 FTE. C. Expand the USFS Fuels for Schools and Beyond Program. The Fuels for Schools and Beyond Program, administered by the US Forest Service in Region 1, is a significant resource for communities in the region to explore conversion of boilers at elementary and secondary schools to woody biomass from petroleum-based fuels. D. Establish a new competitive research and development program within the Department of Energy or the USDA Forest Service to encourage the development and implementation of appropriately-scaled dispersed energy generation technologies. GOAL 5: Provide Opportunities for Youth to Engage in Rural Communities and Resource Management, Building their Skills and Paving the Way for Future Employment as Land Stewards (Department: Agriculture, Interior. Agency: Forest Service, BLM) Actions for existing programs: A. Increase funding and strengthen existing programs to retain and encourage the next generation to remain and invest in their

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

family land-based businesses. Increased funding and outreach for participation in programs such as the Beginning Rancher Program (Farm Bill program) helps promote long-term conservation and intergenerational transfer of open space and working lands. Actions for new strategies: A. In addition to the US Forest Service Kids in the Woods program, create programs that support the engagement of young adults in the outdoors through job training and employment. Youth oriented work programs successfully train and employ America's young adults and serve as a critical bridge to long term, stable employment. Agencies can contract with these programs to achieve public land management goals. Employing young adults from rural communities builds community leaders, keeps youth and dollars working locally, and builds natural resource management capacity in public lands communities. Outcomes: • Meaningful and quality career opportunities for young adults. Summer youth programs have their place, but they often lack any capacity to transition into long term employment or careers. • Demand for forest-based work often exceeds available contracting opportunities. Ironically, thousands of acres of projects sit on the shelf due to administrative, financial, and legal barriers. Investment in programs that provide real opportunity for youth can help meet our natural resource management needs. • Youth would gain skills and interest in working in public land management. B. Create a program or re-tool an existing program (AmeriCorps, state Civilian Corps) to direct funding to land management agencies' district offices in rural areas to employ recent college graduates for 1 to 2 years. Recent college graduates are struggling to find jobs in the economic recession and often the land management agencies are understaffed and underfunded. Public land management is diverse work, providing opportunities to grow technical skills (i.e. facilitation, stakeholder outreach, archeological surveys, geology, botany, engineering, etc.), as well as labor-intensive skills (i.e. thinning and fuels reduction, riparian restoration, trail building and maintenance, facility construction, etc.). Outcomes: • Expose recent graduates to rural communities and career opportunities in land management. • Make progress on the backlog of work on public lands. C. Federal agencies should inventory existing youth programs across agency jurisdictions to 1) review programs for redundancy and, 2) create an appendix or report on all existing programs to help streamline program delivery. Funding for youth-related programs exists within numerous federal agencies – Agriculture, Labor, Transportation, and Interior. Thus, identifying and accessing these various programs to support long term youth training and employment programs is a challenge. Outcomes: All information about existing youth programs would be compiled in a single source to allow for greater accessibility. D. Restructure matching requirements and timelines to give organizations adequate time to secure the required financial support to make projects a reality. Match requirements for many federal programs place a significant burden on organizations that provide youth-oriented training, education, and work programs. These organizations are required to invest significant time and resources in identifying and securing private funds to meet match requirements.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Expand Existing Outdoor Education Programs on Public Land. Getting kids outdoors and reconnected with nature is not only essential to maintaining a healthy society; it also provides expansive benefits for students in our nation's schools. Examples of these benefits include better physical and mental well-being, improved science/math performance through hands-on activities, understanding of public land issues, and deeper comprehension of ecosystem functioning. The question asked in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative is how to improve conservation and get people, especially kids, outdoors more often. Many of us experienced summer camps or outdoor schools that laid the foundation of our love for the outdoors. Outdoor classrooms, especially those on public land, are a crucial component of sparking a child's interest and care of the outdoors, though many programs running such classrooms nationwide lack the funding to contribute to mainstream educational systems. Truly, there are countless organizations running outdoor education sites on public land with the materials, ability, and drive to reconnect our younger generations to the land. The only aspect holding many of these organizations back from reaching more students is a lack of public funding and awareness. Our belief is that further expansion and funding of existing outdoor education programs, as opposed to starting from scratch and spending more time and money creating new initiatives, will provide the outdoor opportunities required to reconnect children with the bountiful and beautiful land of the United States.

Better Use of Tax dollars. Radio ads telling us to "go to the forest" is a waste of our money. Since when is it the Federal Government's job to "reconnect people to the outdoors?" Instead of mowed lawns at schools, we could provide outdoor learning labs.

USDA's recent report, Private Forests, Public Benefits, focuses on the particular pressures on private lands. According to this study, as much as 57 million acres of rural forests may experience land use change by 2030 due to the competing economic pressures of other land uses. The resulting fragmentation and forest loss could have significant consequences for the benefits we derive from forests - clean water, forest products, wildlife and recreation. Indeed the report looks specifically at the implications for water quality, at-risk species, timber production, forest fire and forest health and finds that wide-spread land use change will exacerbate each of these issues.

As outlined in the USDA report, the average age of family forest owners, who own the majority of private forests in the U.S., is increasing. This in turn raises the probability that lands will change hands more rapidly, causing greater fragmentation pressures and loss of vital ecological function as owners change. Concurrent with these changes, there have also been significant changes in the ownership of forest lands formerly part of large integrated forest product companies as these companies have transferred ownership of their lands to organizations representing public and private investors from a broad crosssection of the public. Effectively engaging the full suite of today's forest owners in a manner that optimizes both the public and private benefits of the forests they manage will require approaches that build on a history of success while pursuing new and innovative solutions for the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most of America's forests and woodlands are privately owned, with roughly three-fifths of private forest land owned by families. To ensure these forests continue to provide a myriad of benefits - clean water, carbon sequestration, renewable energy supplies, rural jobs, recreation and wildlife habitat - the estate tax burden must be addressed.

Most forest owners are "land rich and cash poor," with the majority of families owning less than 100 acres. The estate tax is one of the biggest impediments to keeping forests land intact.

Each year when the estate tax is collected, an estimated 2.6 million acres of woodlands are harvested and 1.4 million acres are sold to pay the federal estate tax. One-fourth of the wooded acres sold to pay the tax are converted to other, more developed uses.

If Congress does not act, the estate tax will dramatically increase in 2011, applying a 55% tax to all estates valued at over \$1 million. In most cases, even a small forested tract is valued at well over \$1 million. This tax will impact many more family forest owners in 2011, leading to more forest loss - just at the time when we will begin to see an unprecedented intergenerational transfer of property because of aging demographics.

Prior to the Conservancy's ownership, the DLWA included dozens of miles of established traditional foot trails that were etched in place decades or even centuries ago. These trails were often made by the feet of thousands of individuals - but with little benefit of modern trail planning and construction techniques. As a result, trails tended to proceed in a straight line to the destination of interest (often straight up steep slopes or through wet ground) with little accommodation for environmental protection or the comfort of the hiker.

While there are innumerable opportunities to enjoy the great outdoors in Montana and our state is rich in natural wonders and public lands, many children simply do not take the opportunity to explore beyond the city limits. Many of our students are impoverished and never get to know what awaits them when the paved streets end and the trails begin. Our OHV exploratory changed that for a few of the kids. I hope as you develop recommendations as part of the America's Great Outdoors Initiative that you remember that motorized recreation can be a valuable tool to introduce children to the outdoors.

The RTP funding-distribution process is proven, having successfully funded in excess of 13,000 projects across the nation over the past 19 years. Despite this success, however, there is still a backlog of good quality, eligible projects, which exceeds the RTP funding available under SAFETEA-LU, the current transportation legislation, by a ratio of at least 3:1. For this reason, and because past legislation failed to make available all of the funds attributable to nonhighway recreation use of gasoline, we are requesting increased funding for the RTP.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am especially concerned about climate change since it will affect , for the worse , our entire planet.

Every year 3,000,000 acres of American open space are developed. It's a one way street – rarely are lands "undeveloped."

I see farms disappearing by my home. Who is going to feed us - the Chinese? Support real farmers, not agri farms, to protect the land. Preserve our great national parks. It is what makes our country so beautiful. Without this beauty, who will come to see it.

I live in Philadelphia, a very large and bustling city. There are individuals who never get to experience the wonder of nature and the wide open spaces that this country has protected over the years. We are only temporary inhabitants and must ensure that the legacy we leave is a better one than we are given!

Budget cuts are already badly cutting into jobs that we need to care for our outdoors. Children need to receive quality science education in elementary school so that we can have a better future of outdoor conservationists and protectionists.

I live in a rural community that is desperately working hard to preserve our history with very limited funds. Many times we pray that someone will come along and restore or rehabilitate a building simply because they too have a passion to preserve our history.

The Constitution is not all that needs preserving and protecting! Environment shapes human societies, and people, in turn, affect their environments. Our historic and natural sites reflect a wealth of locations, resources, histories and voices whose interpretations help all Americans celebrate our shared earth and heritage. We also need to do a better job of taking care of the ones we already have.

I recently visited George Washington's headquarters at the Brandywine Battlefield in Chadd's Ford, Pa., and was saddened to see it in dire need of grounds maintenance. Funds had been cut and there were no staff and the house was not open. Weeds and grass were tall and the walkway was almost completely hidden under grass and weeds. It was demoralizing to me to see this. Imagine what these conditions say to children and to our foreign visitors, and to all Americans.

MAYBE AUTOMATED EMAIL MESSAGES WON'T CUT THE MUSTARD, BUT JUST IN CASE SOMEONE READS THIS: The health and welfare of human beings is, or should be, the #1 priority. After decent housing and food, I believe conserving natural sites, historic and cultural sites, is next in line. Without access to nature, beauty and a sense of history, (as well as the arts, which I also advocate) our lives would be missing a vital source of inspiration and hope. IF WE DO NOT PRESERVE HISTORIC AMERICA, IT WILL BE LOST. IF WE FAIL TO PROTECT OUR WOODLANDS AND PARKS, THEY WILL DISAPPEAR. I want my grandchildren and all children to experience the majesty that is our home.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Patrick Henry once said that he knew of no other way of judging the future than by the lamp of experience. In this "me" culture world of MySpace and FaceBook and MTV, many Americans know little of their history and even less of their responsibilities as citizens. The lessons of American history are great, indeed: perseverance, entrepreneurship, the struggle for liberty and natural rights, the belief in government of the people, by the people and for the people. When more Americans can identify contestants on shows like American Idol than they can name Presidents or elements of the Bill of Rights, we are in trouble as a nation. This is why preserving--and supporting--historic and cultural sites is paramount to America's future. It is this next generation who must learn the great lessons of America to help keep it a strong nation, one dedicated to fundamental natural rights and liberties. James Madison voiced this so eloquently when he stated "Knowledge will forever govern ignorance; and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." Help historic sites around the country continue to provide Americans the knowledge of this great land's unique history so that future generations will be armed with the power to govern themselves and be responsible citizens and champions of American principles.

Please protect our Redrocks!

Please protect what LITTLE we have left!!

No more oil drilling on BLM land, end it now, thanks.

Please do a you can to save our widerness areas.

Action speaks louder than words, save planet Utah!!

I love the wildlands of Utah...please protect them NOW!

I have visited these lands and they are world heritage. Please help protect them.

Utah deserves more wilderness protection. Recind the Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy.

Utah is a fantastic and unique place. Please undo the terrible poicices of the Bush administration!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please protect this sensitive desert environment from destructive off road vehicle use and oil and gas drilling.

Please protect these areas from ORVs and oil companies. Do something positive for the environment.

Please put a stop to the policies the Bush administration has put in place. The policies are ghastly to say the least.

Please take action to protect what little untrammeled, untracked land that is left! We must preserve these delicate areas.

PS: Tar Sands project is also UNACCEPTABLE TO Us here in SE UTAH!! WHY AREN'T YOU MANDATING SOLAR/WIND POWER HERE? PLEASE HELP US!

Now is the time for you to follow-through on your promise and prevent further destruction of this amazingly beautiful region.

Utah's resources deserve careful land use management decisions to protect their wildland and wilderness values for future generations.

The Bush policies regarding wilderness and, in general, other environmental matters, were awful. I had hoped your administration would make sensible changes.

Over development and depletion of wilderness are destroying this country for future generations. Please reverse the Bush administration's positions.

Why is it that after nearly two years of this administration the "No More Wilderness" policy of George Bush is still the guiding policy? We need a more sensible approach.

You could really protect wilderness in Utah by passing "America's Redrock Wilderness Act" We are slowly getting this passed, but it would go much faster if you endorsed this bill..

Mr Obama, if you truly want to preserve "the majesty of our nation's wilderness" as you referred to it, then take immediate action to rescind the disastrous Bush Administration environmental policies now!

A few hours of "pleasure" - decades of damage. The health of nature means nothing to these airheads...OVER RULE them please! These few people shouldn't be allowed to ruin this magnificent country. Thank you,

You said you wanted to preserve canyonlands and other parks and wild open spaces for future generations to see and utilize. Please sunset the No More wilderness policy ASAP so there is some wild land left for future generations to enjoy.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In 2008 I supported you with campaign donations and as a campaign worker in New Hampshire but I have been extremely disappointed that for two years you have continued many of the Bush administration's land use management policies.

These lands are unique and pristine and should be protected as wilderness. While I respect someone's preference for motorized recreation, riparian areas and the very important biotic soil crusts are ecological resources that must be protected. Thank you!

Having just returned from a trip to this area, we've seen the destruction already apparent in some areas. It is unthinkable to imagine what additional destruction would do to one of the few remaining national treasures that we DO have the ability to protect.

Please support those of us who live in Utah. We are Democrats in the most-Republic state in the nation. One of our most significant issue is the environment, and we are particularly dedicated to Utah National Park, Monuments, wilderness, and wild lands.

Although I live in an urban area, I look forward all year to my annual pilgrimage to Utah, to backpack the stunning landscape and follow the streams. These unique areas deserve the highest degree of protection. Keep out the ORV and grazing animals. Celebrate the Wilderness!

The travel trailer group we belong to will be going to Dead Horse Point next week. I must admit to shock when we went there a few years back. We had originally gone there in 1959. The sight of oil wells was unwelcome. Some of our members commented on their trips to this area. We mustn't deface this area more.

Please Mr. President, It is so important to save as much of our wilderness as possible. So much was damaged during the years of republican abuse that it will take all your leadership skills and dedication of the American people to save it. Much has already been lost through climate change and who knows how much more damage will be done.

We voted for this admistration because we believed that as president, you would make decisions that would preserve our Wilderness areas for future generations. Instead it seems as though you are listening to the loud "me now" voices whose only concern is access to all public lands in ways that will permanently alter them in a very negative way.

Please end the Bush policy of no more wilderness and have Secretary Salazar work with the counties in Utah to develop plans to preserve wilderness, use all lands wisely, and Protect forever the beauty and ecology of the southwest. senator Bennett had begun work on a San Juan county land plan in the same vein as the Washington County lands plan. I hope this will continue even though Senator Bennett will not be representing Utah next year.

I am writing you to express my strong concern for threats to natural areas in Southern Utah.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

These special places would easily have National Park status in other parts of the country - but they are currently being destroyed a little bit every day, and a little bit of America's heritage dies every day with them. This is unacceptable. These wild places restore, refresh, and reinvigorate the patriotism of all who are lucky enough to spend time in them. I love my country because of such places - we are so lucky, but sometimes we forget how fragile places like Arch Canyon are.

One of the reasons that I, like many who share common concerns regarding the environment and quality of life issues, supported your candidacy was that Democratic administrations are generally more "environmentally benign" than Republican administrations, Nixon's positive actions notwithstanding. Please do not let us, your supporters, down on these issues. We look forward to continued support but, make no mistake, these issues are far too important to overlook when it comes time for the 2012 elections.

Please act now to insure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places.

As someone who has travelled in not only these lands, but many designated wilderness areas and parks both in our own country and abroad, I can say that the redrock country of Utah is well deserving of more wilderness protection. It has a stunning beauty equal to or greater than any place that I have ever been. It is also critical habitat for declining wildlife populations. Please rescind the "No More Wilderness" policy that imposes an unreasonable restriction for balanced land management policies in Utah (or for anywhere in the US). Thank you.

As an artist of the western landscapes I have witnessed an escalation of scarring due to ORV use in my native Utah to which I return to hike, paint and enjoy what's left of the real wildness of western America. If we are to protect this patrimony I think it is particularly important to reassess the BLM and to some extent the National Forest multi use mandates to update them to confront the chronic degradation of a an area whose principle resource is to uplift and sustain our imaginations and offer quiet beauty in an overcrowded and noisy world.

Last week I witnessed ORV abuse at the San Rafael Swell as inexperienced riders ran off the trails and ripped up the river bank. And this last trip I noticed an open pit strip operation near the Little Grand Canyon that was not there a couple of years ago. Come and see these places, and you will want to protect them. There was a tragic and pitiful face featured on Time magazine a few months ago, the result of deliberate inhumane cruelty. Our collective neglect is allowing the same thing to happen to the face of "Mother Nature." Please, sir, take action.

I have enjoyed a quiet hike into the canyons adjacent to Canyonlands National Park. I hope that trail is not inundated with ORV, they will not only ruin the quiet and solitude, they will destroy the beauty of the landscape and scare the wildlife away. I was shocked at the scars left along much of the area north of Moab left by the placing of pipelines. We must protect the BLM areas from the rush to find and extract every last mineral deposit. We need more wilderness and protected areas in the Canyonlands region of Utah. We need sound land use policies for all of Utha.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It is past time to rescind the last administration's destructive environmental policies, which viewed nature and natural systems as objects to be exploited for profit. Let us not make the same mistake again - we must protect what remains of our wilderness areas and not allow them to become just more degraded areas (which have, of course, made a few people very wealthy). Utah has many of these areas, which are now greatly threatened by oil and gas exploration and drilling. We must also prevent motorized vehicular use of these areas, as this severely damages vegetation and disturbs wildlife.

Several times a year, I vacation in the redrock canyon country of southern Utah. I am concerned that the wilderness aspect of this area is being lost to development and motorized recreation.

This month, Labor Day Weekend, marks my 20th anniversary of my first trip to Southeast Utah, a backpacking trip with my 20 year old daughter. This trip was a life changing event for me. I now travel to Southeast Utah frequently every year and have also purchased a home in Moab, UT with my wife Margie. She will be retiring from the State of California next year and we will be spending much more time in Southeast Utah. In 20 years the landscape has changed dramatically with all the overuse and abuse from off road vehicles. Please help get this matter under control before more permanent damage is done.

Please take steps to contain and limit the use of ORVs in our National Wilderness. The noise pollution alone makes them extremely obnoxious. In an era when people need to lose weight, urge people to walk and enjoy the beauty of the landscape. ORVs degrade the environment in many other ways already mentioned above. Allowing our precious lands to be degraded by gas and oil drilling is even more insidious. Every environmental caution should be taken before consideration is given to such operations. Fracturing for gas is destroying our water. Drilling for oil destroys the land and water. Please take care of our lands, our children's heritage.

Dust created by ORV traffic destroying fragile soil crust has created massive dust storms that travel to other states causing snow melt and other problems. We have new highway signs warning of dust storms. Grasslands have been replaced with drifting mounds of sand.

Edward Abbey must be writhing in his grave. Please do everything you can to reverse those last minute Bush sponsored changes which have such potential to ruin fragile ecosystems on the Colorado Plateau. Thank You

I live in Vermont, but travel to Utah every 12-18 months to hike and to explore the unique wild lands of that state. A significant area of Utah is clearly land of Wilderness Quality, with deeply carved canyons, archaeologically important sites, and forested mountains. This region is, however, threatened by policies from the Bush administration that threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a resident of Utah, and a frequent visitor to Utah's redrock country I ask you to please rescind the Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy. Leaving 80% of 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah open to oil and gas drilling and designating an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes is simply unacceptable. Those of us who value the beauty and solitude of redrock country vote, WE VOTED FOR YOU, and we expect you to stand up to the special interest ORV groups and protect this land. I mean really - in some portions of the plan EVERY single riparian area has an ORV trail. Have you ever personally seen the absolute catastrophic destruction that an ORV wreaks on stream banks? Its stomach turning and almost impossible to mitigate or repair.

The Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated an astounding 20,000 miles of ORV routes. Dust is a major problem affecting climate and water in the Colorado snow pack. Reducing traffic in these areas will help to mitigate this problem. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. Climate change, the overriding influence on the health of BLM lands, got just three paragraphs of the same boilerplate language in each of the 1,000-page Environmental Impact Statements instead of any real analysis.

Of all states that I have visited, Utah by far deserves wilderness protection. It contains so much archeological and geological uniqueness!. It stands above every other state in need of immediate protection. The desert environment is just too fragile to endure President GW Bush's "No More Wilderness" policy. It is not too late for Pres. Obama to overturn this nightmare policy. Oil and gas exploration is just one part of Pres. Bush's legacy. Worse yet is the off-road vehicle degradation from motorbike, ATV, and Jeep enthusiasts. The fragile cryptobiotic desert soil takes 50+ years to recuperate after even one set of tracks is left behind. But it cannot heal if continued off-road riding is allowed. And if it doesn't heal, the winds blow sand into huge dust storms; and the environmental disaster worsens.

Dear President Obama and Secretary Ken Salazar, As a Westerner who cherishes America's wild spaces, as an educator who works to impart the values of wilderness to others, as a writer whose voice is too often drowned out by the strident voices of ORV recreationalists and pro-development lobbyists, I urge you, please, to take decisive action to undo some of the damage of the Bush administration in regards to our vanishing wilderness areas. You face many challenges to make our country a humane place to live and grow, and you are doing good work of all kinds that will have a lasting positive impact. Please expand your efforts to create a legacy that preserves some of the remaining wild spaces in our great country for our future generations. Respectfully yours,

Though I live in Illinois, I believe the red rock canyon country of Utah is among our nation's most precious possessions.

Since living in SE Utah during the mid-1980s I have fought to assure that a good portion of it is set aside as wilderness (9 million acres of BLM land in Utah).

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I have a special fondness for the San Juan-Canyonlands area. My husband and I learned to rely on each other during a challenging hike in Cedar Mesa in 2003. In 2004, we got engaged on a moonlit night overlooking an ethereal crater. Thousands like me have stories to share about peaceful encounters, rugged physical challenges and blissful hours in the redrock country of Utah. My hope is that your administration will ensure that thousands, maybe millions, more will experience the quiet awesomeness of these public lands untouched by strip-mining, drilling and ORV desecraters.

I would beg to add however, that these areas remain more accessible to the young, the elderly and handicapped. This would not allow off road vehicles but would allow access to roads for passenger vehicles. I cannot imagine not being able to take my grandson to a total wilderness designation not accessible anymore to either of us. Further, many of the ranchers in the area are maintaining waterholes that benefit wildlife. Total wilderness designation would restrict access by medical personell in a vast area that has few medical facilities anyway. Serious illness and injuries need to be airlifted to proper facilities. BLM ground belongs to all of us, not to the special interests. It would be tragic to allow further filthy "drilling" for oil and gas. The amounts available are not worth the terrible pollution. Oil shale should not even be considered due to the extreme toxicity of the processing and the destruction of the landscape. America needs to get away from oil, but not with oil shale.

Mr. President, and Secretary Salazar,. Though we live in Washington, My wife and I go to Utah every year to hike and camp in OUR American lands. Many of the sites we visit are on BLM land NOT protected from ORV and grafitti vandals. We are owners of these lands, and we want you to protect them as Wilderness! Please do so! I read over the DEIS documents on each of these plans and wrote letters of comment. But in the final EIS I saw that every one of my comments was dismissed. For example, I wrote that Trachyte Wash stream was incorrectly planned to NOT get Wild and Scenic river designation, and cited specific errors BLM had made in deciding to omit it.. But BLM's final EIS stated that my arguments were irrelevant, since they had already decided that W + S was to be denied!

Why is the egregious Bush Administration policy of not allowing wilderness quality lands be managed for preservation? We are two years into the Obama Administration, and yet this backroom deal that abrogated well considered earlier management protections on valuable Utah wild lands is still in place. WHERE IS THE CHANGE I VOTED FOR? It simply is not acceptable that those plans stand unchanged two years later as well. These were politically and ideologically driven decisions that were not based on science. Yet the Obama Administration has (rightly) proclaimed that science would rule decision making for this president. I want to see that put into action now, on these issues.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Utah's redrock canyon country is especially vulnerable, biologically and scenically, to ORV use. The desert leaves scars bare and visible, not hidden under vegetation. It's hard to describe the sense of desecration that ORV use leaves on the landscape, and the degree to which the noise and impact of the activities of a few offroad enthusiasts degrades the experience of all other users, if you have not experienced it personally. Utah's canyon country is an utterly unique landscape and resource, one that belongs to all Americans. I believe that we also have a duty to protect this singular environment for the rest of the world. Extensive ORV use such as the BLM is proposing will DESTROY this landscape for little-to-no benefit. I would hope that it shouldn't affect your decision, but I would also like to emphasize that this is the single political issue that I follow most closely, and politicians' response to it directly affects my opinions and voting decisions. Please prevent the destruction of the canyonlands, America's most iconic landscape. It is the right thing to do, and future generations will thank you for it.

September is National Wilderness Month, and you did the traditional political thing, re-declaring it and asserting that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." Thanks. But policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country, and southern New Mexico's Organ Mountains-Broad Canyon-Portillo Mountains area. The Bush administration's "No More Wilderness" policy and resulting land use management plans for 11 million acres of BLM land in Utah have left 80% of these lands open to oil and gas drilling and designated a criminal 20,000 miles of ORV routes. In some of the plans, every single riparian area has an ORV trail, leading to pollution, erosion, shrinking water availability and lost wildlife habitat. Climate change, the overriding influence on the health of BLM lands, got just three paragraphs of the same boilerplate language in each of the 1,000-page Environmental Impact Statements instead of any real analysis. This is criminally irresponsible and I demand a change!

I know we are busy trying to fix things around the world. but let's take care of some things here too. We need to protect the land: our forests, BLM desert land and land that could be considered wilderness-worthy. Our lands that are under study for wilderness as well as those areas already designated wilderness, make the US so special from countries in Europe. In fact, in Utah, Europeans flock to our National Parks and wilderness areas, because they can't experience nature there, like you can here. But the quality of our lands is eroding and eroding quickly. Please reverse Bush's terrible land policies, especially when it comes to opening up pristine lands in the West to horrible destruction from ORV's, ATV's etc. The damage being done not only kills plant life and degrades our streams and rivers, but the destruction of the land itself will take centuries to repair, if it can be done at all. Please act to protect a very valuable resource, our wilderness. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In celebration of that declaration, I took some time in September to go backpacking into one of America's most treasured forests, the Kings Canyon region in the great Sequoia wilderness in California. The spectacular beauty, complete with alpine mountains, meadows and waterfalls, abundance of natural wildlife including deer, bears and fish, and unspoiled views of nature in harmony are enough to reassure the soul and enlighten the spirit. I encourage you to go for yourself. However, there is still work to be done.

The landscapes of Southern Utah are completely unique, and truly a national treasure. Indeed, these unique landscapes provide a positive image of the nation to the world--they signify the spirit of the very spirit of the American West. If you have never visited Southern Utah, I hope you will make some time and space in your schedule to go there because photographs, regardless of how stunning, cannot capture the unique spirit of the place. When you declared September as National Wilderness Month, you stated that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." I fully agree with this sentiment. However, policies from the Bush administration remain in place which drastically threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's redrock country.

I was so proud to hear your declaration of September as National Wilderness Month. I thoroughly agree with your statement that "we must ensure that future generations can experience the tranquility and grandeur of America's natural places." I have been quietly roaming the "Redrock" country of Utah for over 40 years and am still in awe of the dramatic landscape which cuts across the millions of geological layers. While walking across this incredible landscape, I have run into evidence (homes, farming and hunting areas, pottery shards) of the ancient Anasazi and Fremont Indians. Utah's Redrock remoteness and the arid weather has uniquely preserved these ancient artifacts for us to untangle the mysteries of people that lived here thousands of years ago. I have passed this "Redrock" appreciation to my children and now my grandchildren. If you have not taken your children to experience this wilderness, I invite you to come and see why so many of us are truly concerned in preserving this area for future generations. I'm so afraid that policies from the Bush administration remain in place which threaten the pristine natural beauty, quiet and solitude of worthy wilderness-quality lands throughout the West, especially in Utah's Redrock country. It would be an honor to have you and your family come and see why this area is a primitive wilderness and should be protected. Please contact me if I can be of any assistance planning a trip here to a place you'll never forget and will never regret knowing you helped save it for your grandchildren to see.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Last week I visited Utah's redrock wilderness on a trip to Capitol Reef National Park. I was once again struck, as I on each trip, by the extraordinary discrepancy in environmental stewardship within and outside of the protected areas of the landscape. There are many areas of the Utah wilderness that are no-go areas for people seeking a peaceful and respectful experience of nature, given the noise, erosion and gaseous pollution which is caused by the appearance of 'off road' vehicles. In other parts of the world where the vast majority of people seek to experience the Earth in it's elemental state (Norway, Sweden, the UK, France, Italy, Switzerland), these anti-social toys are simply banned. It is simply cowardice on the part of the US government, struck as it is with the idea of individual 'freedom', that this ridiculously selfish pursuit is still allowed. But, what 'freedom' does this leaves for the hiker, mountain biker, backpacker or ski tourer, who must remain in National Parks. Personally, any interaction with these people serves as a damning illustration of the selfish and lazy tendencies of the human race, and can turn a charming and pleasant day into one filled with anger and distress. Furthermore, the disturbance of the surface layer caused by offroad vehicles has been directly implicated in the increase in 'red dust' covering the San Juan snowpack, accelerating the spring thaw period, and reducing the capacity of the mountains to store water. This is an outrageous visual and economic impact of this selfish activity. Surely, a time must come when we stop thinking of ourselves as heroic pioneers of hostile lands, and start to think of ourselves as stewards of a delicate and precious resource? That time is surely upon us...

When it's gone it's gone for ever. Increased population pressure means increased need for the grand, unspoiled outdoors. I would hope the Obama Administration will be known for its brilliant record on conservation of our natural legacy, and for adding to the nation's store of preserved natural grandure.

I find "motorized recreation" abhorrent.

If we don't preserve wild places, I feel that it is a tragedy for us all.

When I take a hike in the woods, it is so refreshing to my soul; it would be sad if future generations didn't have that tranquil place to go.

But places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, the Siskiyou Wild Rivers, and Oregon's portion of the Snake River basin are at risk from dams, logging, mining, and other harmful development.

I have cherished the outdoors all my life, and sadly I have also watched it diminish and degrade during those years. I am grateful for the experiences and opportunities I have had connecting with nature, wildlife, and all that is wilderness.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

One of my primary concerns regarding conservation is the permanent establishment of corridors between wilderness areas in order for the animals to SAFELY travel between their various ecosystems. Corridors are critical to the ability to safely migrate and exchange genomes, thus strengthening the variability of the DNA of species. If you need further information on the importance of this issue, ask your science advisor about the detrimental effects of island isolation.

There is nothing like camping or hiking in outdoor areas that have a sense of solitude, free from the hustle and bustle of today's world with the noise and pollution that follows. These are beautiful treasures that belong not only to the present generations, but for future ones as well. For the wildlife that call our public lands homes and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance before it is too late.

I do not know where you go for peace, but I go outdoors. When thinking about how to contribute, how to make this a better world, I go to quiet, beautiful, majestic places, where I can look up at the giant trees and down at the glistening rivers. If I know there is pollution or destruction going on there, my mind drifts to the controversy instead of being nurtured in its creativity. Those quiet places are vital to humans. If we have nowhere bigger than us, more beautiful than what we can create, how will we rise up above our limitations?

Actually, to me, preserving our National Forests, Grasslands, BLM, Wildernesses, and our remaining undeveloped public lands for future generations to care for is the most important thing I care about. I guess I shouldn't care, because I am due to pass away soon, but I feel there is no greater heritage to have, and nothing says more about a people than leaving things better than I inherited them. I just care about the planet's future, and the attitude of human beings about the world they became in. I care about the above more than the economy, in fact we all know it is the economy that is what is tearing down what I care about most.

Keep America special through protecting a lot more Wilderness and by preserving many many more quiet recreation opportunities. It is critical that we act to preserve more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanently protect our carbon sequestering and beautifying remaining old-growth forests. Oregonians enjoy some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring public lands in the nation. We in Oregon have protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness. We are lagging far behind our neighbors. Yet we have a huge % who rely upon wilderness for sanity, recreation, and a way of living. We must also preserve the wildlife that calls our public lands home and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it really is now due time to correct this Wilderness imbalance.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for seeking public input regarding how to manage and preserve the beautiful wonders of nature we are so fortunate to have in our country. This past summer, my husband and I explored several amazing outdoor wonders--Crater Lake, the Three Sisters area, Yellowstone, and the Grand Tetons. Connecting with the towering trees, the wild flowers, the streams and rivers, the canyons and mountains, and the wildlife was an incredible experience. Wherever possible, it is crucial to help keep America special by protecting more Wilderness and quiet recreation opportunities, preserving more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanently protecting the remaining old-growth forests. It is deeply disturbing to me that we are still clear cutting old growth. When I am walking near old growth there is a unique presence and sense of wisdom that I feel. These trees feed the earth, the wildlife, and our souls. They are too precious to destroy.

Do not make them monuments!

. The Indian is still crying..... time to make a change.

. We won't be able to reverse the demise of the wild once it is gone.

. I also want the dolphin and whale slaughtering to be stopped.

heck I even want our current generation to enjoy it! Please stop raping our land!

. In Yucca Valley, our precious spaces surrounding Joshua Tree National Park are being threatened with improper over development. We desperately need a balanced approach.

. We are losing plant and animal species at alarming rates due primarily to habitat loss. It is time to step up and fully fund the protection of our natural resources, which we not only depend upon for our physical survival, but need for our emotional well-being as well.

I have had the great opportunity to visit many of our beautiful National Parks across America, from the Grand Canyon and Zion to Glacier, Rocky Mountain and Hawaii. While these places are breathtaking and serene, I worry that the parks and the rest of our wide open spaces will not remain natural and unscathed for the next generations of Americans to enjoy. Follow Teddy's example and protect our natural resources!

. Having lived in the Seattle region for 30 years, I've seen the expanding encroachment due to population growth of our wild spaces. With unregulated growth, in the not-too-distant future they'll be development up to foothills of the Cascade Mountains. Protection of our natural spaces is the only way to ensure future generations access to this region's and America's natural treasures. Sincerely,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I feel the best way to do this is to get people out in nature. What ever you use the great outdoors to do is what you want to conserve. I know I recently mourned the loss of the perfect tree. On the disc golf course in Willoughby Ohio parks services chose to kill the perfect tree rather than save it. While this tree has no national significance, for all of us it was actually a difficult loss. We need to discourage urban sprawl, and encourage natural landscapes.

Furthermore, please LIMIT and cut-back on the amount of wilderness and outdoor spaces that are open to ATV and other motorized vehicles in order to preserve the wild spaces, increase peace and quite, and reduce pollution and reduce destruction.

. Today, I wish to ask you to think of symbols of America. I think of wilderness, eagles, redwoods... these are the American legacies that bring people from all over the world. Richardson grove, a redwood grove on highway 101, may be disfigured by road widening. I travel this road and know it does not need widening. Why cut down the trees the tourists and locals love just to widen a road? The road is there because of those lovely redwoods, of which less than 4% still stand to carry on the legacy of wild forests and American pioneering spirit. Please Save Richardson Grove on highway 101 in california.

. Conservation easements and through-ways are important to preserve the natural movements of our nations wildlife while our population expands and our economy builds. Natural Gas mining is not the way to a better power system. The ecological damage of the toxic waters released, and the fact that the small size of wells eliminates regulatory requirements even when in a high concentration across the landscape. Congressional leaders who invest in this alternative invest in pollution and continued destruction of our natural resources. Allowing for the grazing of non-native species and drilling in our national forests and federal lands contributes to this trend of destruction and global warming. Please continue to support and protect our planet and stop allowing uninformed opportunists to destroy this great country.

It seems that not many realize how importance of mother nature and her inhabitants; all living things play an important role in the ecosystem. Much of the land we have now that has not yet been touched by man harbors a great deal of history within it. If we let the land become lost to cities and industrial productivity then our history will eventually be only a memory; something that we could only view within the pages of a book. We can't let the efforts of past generations, such as Theodore Roosevelt, go to waste. Therefore, I believe protecting America's great outdoors is essential, not just to preserve our history and the ecosystem, but to allow future generations to be able to appreciate the beauty of nature and create memories of their own by visiting all over the vast majestic land that is America.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I hope you all consider the needless horse killing of more than likely healthy horses near and far - get up off your chair and care just a little more than you are Actors and Actresses and those with the ability to do something about roaming horses that need their natural habitat saved for them - fence the idiots off that bought the land that is near them - cage the dummies that took the land near the loose or roaming deer or horses and other wild life give back that habitat to the horses and maybe consider thinking hard and researching the fact that for many 100's of years they roamed - USA and CANADA so YOU don't just ping them off. Its a shame we have let this get out of control amongst other things. Obama Harper what are you thinking???. Now and not tomorrow get up off your executive chairs or desk for some of you and do some thing to stop this crazy stuff. Why where and when does this happen and who inspects the locations and who benefits from this? YES of I want the next generation to enjoy America's and Canada's great outdoors too. I urge leaders in Washington CANADA to expand and protect our shared outdoor spaces So where are the deer all 6 of them that use to roam the park here across from my building -young and old you would see them there until they started construction and until they put a dog park near the big forest area and yes not anyone has stopped the deer hunt by the deer hunting dogs. So whats to stop the people from hunting in the park at night -that had "let the dog run loose by accident" it got out of the dog park - care someone there and here get real about caring all you big talkers there and here. Disappointing in the horses being shot in the brain after being cornered -disgusted in the message this sends to the people of the USA CANADA shame on you leaders for allowing this and pretending you don't know. Your vote may be affected next time.

WITHOUT PROTECTION, WE ALL LOSE ---FOREVER!

The Art of Nature, can not be repaired by man, once destroyed!

If we do not manage and protect these lands, who will?

PLEASE FOLLOW THRU ON THIS AS OUR BEAUTIFUL PRISTINE AREAS WILL BE RUINED FOREVER IF DESTRUCTIVE DEVELOPMENT IS ALLOWED!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments, including the removal of wild horses from these lands.

HOWEVER THERE IS A LOT MORE TO DO AND YOU BETTER STEP UP YOUR EFFORTS BECAUSE I AM NOT OVERLY IMPRESSED WITH YOUR OVERALL RECORD OF PROTECTION FOR ANIMALS RE. THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OR FOR THE HILLS OF APPALACHIA.

When I asked a friend from India what made the greatest impact on her, she said the natural wonders of America were the best part. PLEASE don't let corporations or others destroy the natural world were have preserved.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I THINK THAT PROTECTING OUR REMAINING WILDERNESS AND THE DIVERSITY OF OUR SPECIES, STRONGLY AND COMPLETELY. IS OF THE HIGHEST PRIORITY. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE AS THE EARTH ITSELF IS BEGINNING TO GIVE NOTICE OF THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT DOING SO.

I treasure the wilderness and yet have visited very little of it, which is the way it should be. We need to preserve even greater areas of pristine lands before they disappear. We need to protect the public lands as well from gas extraction.

Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development, and climate change. I'm asking the President to make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative.

I've been fortunate enough to hike, backpack and be inspired by our Wilderness areas. That's the way I spent my vacations for many years, and I feel great sadness at so many of those places being destroyed, and decreased by encroaching development. J

THANKS YOU FOR PROTECTING OUR GREAT PRESERVED LANDS FOR FURTHER DRILLING, MINING, AND/OR DEVELOPMENT!!!!!!!!!! IF WE LOOSE THESE LANDS NOW, FUTURE GENERATIONS WILL NOT BE ABLE TO VIEW AND APPRECIATE OUR GREAT AND WONDERFUL NATURAL PLACES PRESERVED BY OUR PAST LEADERS!!!!

(I do not, however, consider the wild mustangs to be a natural part of our wilderness just because they have been there for a long period of time; it is important to note that they have damaged the wilderness where they have been living and have caused hardship to native plants and animals there.)

My most important priority for wild lands are the WILD LIFE. The fact that killing licenses fund state agencies and federal agencies are biased to killing interests is a crime against the American people. The vast majority of us (95%) are LIVING wildlife appreciators. Yet trophy hunting and cattle ranching have RULED our public lands for trophy thrill killing and cattle grazing, destroying our native wildlife for recreation and profit. This is our COMMONWEALTH. IT should NOT be privatized to killing interests and profiteers. We the people need change to PROTECT OUR WILDLIFE. THAT IS MY TOP PRIORITY. I hope you see the threats to biodiversity and the web of life (even destroying our pollinators) as serious. END THESE SPECIAL INTEREST CONTROLS OF OUR FEDERAL AGENCIES.

I feel that a balance between enjoyment of nature and destruction of nature must be met. I will not accept a single endangered species in America. I want the limited yet existent rights of the wild species of the world to be respected and not abridged in any way. The best way to enjoy nature is to have some. I demand a lot. If nature continues to be infringed upon, I will opt to not re-elect any of those who sat complacently by and watched its destruction.

. Please do not sell public land for logging, ranching, or oil or any other profit scheme.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Take this opportunity to leave a legacy and please remove the four lower Snake River dams. This action would restore 140 miles of whitewater, 70 named rapids, and thousands of additional lands to the public. If you want to get folks outdoors in the Northwest, this is your best opportunity! Please do what you know is right and remove those dams! Sincerely,

Fishing for salmon and steelhead is a age-old family activity at risk for lack fish. Please do everything that you can to change course and put Columbia Basin salmon and steelhead recovery back on track. Follow the best science and do the right thing! Bring people together to craft a recovery plan that removes the four lower Snake River dams and reconnects salmon with their homewaters in Idaho, Washington and Oregon!

especially the Mogollon Plateau national forests described below: Conservationists have proposed a 480,000-acre Mogollon Wildlife Conservation Area is proposed to protect the extensive old growth forest and montane riparian areas of Arizona's southern Coconino and western Apache-Sitgreaves National Forests into a linked conservation system. The Mogollon Plateau forests (Coconino, Kaibab and Apache-Sitgreaves national forests) remain America's largest contiguous expanse of ponderosa pine. These forests contain important habitat for endangered species, including the Little Colorado spinedace, Mexican spotted owl, Mexican wolf, Chiricahua and northern leopard frogs and other important native wildlife such as mountain lion, black bear, elk, mule deer, American pronghorn, Gunnison prairie dog and goshawk. The forests also provide critical linkages for wildlife populations of the Blue Range and Gila wilderness complex of eastern Arizona and western New Mexico across the Mogollon and Coconino plateaus to the Grand Canyon and Arizona's Central Mountains. Since pre-settlement times, Arizona and New Mexico have experienced a 90% loss of riparian ecosystems (Arizona State Parks 1988). Arizona's riparian forests are considered one of America's most endangered ecosystems. The entire forested Mogollon Plateau watershed (i.e. East Clear Creek, West Clear Creek, West Oak Creek, Wet Beaver Creek, Willow Creek and Walnut, Sycamore, and Chevelon canyons) provides relatively intact, biologically significant core and wildlife movement corridors through a landscape otherwise generally fragmented by roads and logging impacts. The southern Coconino and Apache-Sitgreaves national forests' riparian regions including the Black, San Francisco, Verde and upper Little Colorado rivers and their tributaries offer some of the finest and most diverse, as well as threatened natural and cultural resources in the United States. This area remains an incredibly rich, biologically diverse forest and grassland refugia for imperiled and biologically important species described above. Anderson Mesa of the Coconino National Forest provides a relatively intact, biologically significant core and wildlife movement corridor through a landscape generally fragmented by roads and logging impacts. The Mogollon Plateau watershed contains remnant old growth mixed conifer and ponderosa forest. These values are significant, given that more than 200 years are required to develop old growth structure in southwestern ponderosa pine forests. Ecologists have determined that old growth ponderosa pine forests constitute one of America's most endangered ecosystems. They report that old-growth ponderosa pine has suffered an estimated 85-98% area loss due to destruction, conversion to other uses, and significant degradation in structure, function, and composition. Logging is one of the principal causes of this decline.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I consider myself an informed citizen and I care deeply about the preservation of wilderness. I have long been aware of the problems with the U.S. Forest Service, regarding lands that should be designated wilderness, and I have hoped that the current administration would move to correct this. But I am shocked that the BLM directive to cease all wilderness assessments has not been lifted. It is my sincere hope that this administration will move forward and right these grave wrongs done to our nation's wild, natural places.

I've seen first hand the horrific graffiti on Bonita Falls off of the South Fork of Lytle Creek. This points to a need for more rangers.

In the face of growing recreational needs in the urban area of Southern California, the ability of the Angeles National Forest to support visitors is actually declining with only about one dollar per visitor on law enforcement, educational materials, interpretive services, and visitor center management spent annually. Putting an end to youth obesity, a particular interest of Michele and a life-time career focus of mine as a dance and Physical Education teacher, and an end to the diabetes crisis of our youth can be directly attributed to access to our mountains and rivers for local recreation. A San Gabriel Mountains National Recreation Area could tackle this crisis. The America Great Outdoors Initiative that you launched this summer is a wonderful program. It will change many lives by acknowledging the problems of the region and recommending the creation of a San Gabriel Mountains National Recreation Area which would bring in the assistance of the National Park Service as well as more resources and rangers for the area and much needed support for outdoor recreation in our local mountains.

Also, work to provide access to appropriate spaces for recreation including equestrian activities. Thank you.

Without an extension of the tax incentives to potential landowners who are considering land protection under conservation easements, our efforts to preserve land are being severely compromised.

Developers, in the name of progress, continue to destroy land that has much more value undeveloped than turned into concrete. Please stop the destruction of undeveloped land and forests.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am the President of our local land trust and an avid Obama fan. My husband and I retired to the desert from the Chicago area, and are also avid White Sox Fans. I want to take a moment to let you know how much we appreciate your support of tax incentives, farm bill easement programs, LWCF and Forest Legacy. The tax incentives for folks who grant conservation easements is especially important to our work. We are in a struggle to protect fragile desert land that has had cultural heritage since the time before Christ. The petroglyphs are just a small testimony to the importance the riparian areas we are trying to save have been and continue to be important to the survival of fragile desert plants and animals in our area. The state of Arizona owns much of this important land and currently the policy, and law is that all their land must go up for bid for the highest and best use. The people in charge deem the most money from the land as the best use. This makes our work to preserve land in this state especially hard. We have had some success working with private homeowners of especially precious land to get conservation easements. The tax incentives are one of our few tools. Please don't take those away. They are a small investment that can make a huge difference in future Americans seeing the beauty of the desert and visiting important historical sites in our area. Thank you for launching America's Great Outdoors and recognizing the work of America's 1,600 land trusts to keep agricultural lands and protect important wildlife habitat. Sincerely

But places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development.

For example, places in Oregon like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development.

Oregon has protected only 4% of its land as Wilderness, lagging far behind its neighbors.

For the wildlife that call our public lands homes and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance.

Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development and climate change.

Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness.

Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments.

Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, the best wild salmon run in the world, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.

It will undoubtedly endanger Bristol Bay's wild lands, salmon runs and wildlife, its clean waters, and traditional ways of life.

Despite growing recreational needs, the ability of the Forest Service to support visitors is actually declining. The Angeles National Forest spends only about one dollar per visitor on law enforcement, educational materials, interpretive services, and visitor center management.

Outside of the forest our region's youth obesity and diabetes crisis is growing, bringing new urgency to connecting our people and communities back to our mountains and rivers.

\_\_\_ said Wilderness designations are not cost effective" The trails maintenance programs for wilderness areas cost almost nothing when compared to road maintenance costs for the non wilderness designated government land. Wilderness designation is the most cost effective management designation. We get clean water and clean air and it costs taxpayers nothing."

I kinda question just how much jet noise you realistically hear when there are overflights at 30-40K feet. Its one matter if the park in question is near an approach route to a major airport, but for high flying jets, I sincerely doubt you can hear much of anything. Another matter to consider is the significant amount of additional fuel airlines would be consuming by running a zig-zag route across the country to avoid overflying parks, etc.

Yosemite and much of the Sierra are certainly an issue, because the major airlines have to cross the Sierra to get to San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Sacramento, etc and as they are passing over they are either climbing or descending. Its unfortunately difficult to find a route over the mountains that doesn't pass over parkland or national/state forest. The east-west traffic is the bulk of the issue (north-south traffic usually flies just off shore or up the central valley). I live out here near Yosemite, and I wouldn't call much of any of Yosemite a wilderness" area anymore. Its got way too many people tromping around either on foot or in RVs. So I agree the noise level can suck in the Sierra - just not sure where you'd re-route the traffic to."

Wilderness, Land of NO Uses. Wilderness designations are not cost effective either. It actually costs the USFS more to go into Wilderness areas and do trail maint etc because they can not use motorized conveyances. It is not an effective land management tool, and you fools that think it is clearly have not spent much time in the Wilderness.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Too lazy to hike? Tough luck" Fortunately you only speak for yourself and there are millions of reasonable people with public land ownership rights. That is just plain ignorant nice contribution. This idea presents many issues. The idea that the USFS can not get use plans together in less than a decade now is a substantial problem. I have seen the process in action and it must be incredibly tedious to have to work through. Maybe it would work better if it was done in sections oil and gas one year grazing one year motorized use one year. They need a serious paperwork reduction act too. We do not need thesis writers managing land we need active managers with knowledge first hand knowledge of the lands they are responsible for. Then the apathy of the land managers. Would you want that job though? They have to listen to bleeding heart eco freaks all the time knowing full well from experience that they only bring fabricated problems backed by an agenda. This issue could be cured by making land managers accountable on a local level. We elect the Sherriff we elect county comissioners we elect the school board why not USFS and BLM land managers? In Colorado the Parks board is trying to mis-appropriate some OHV user fees. Shouldn't it just be obvious to people what the funds should be used for? If OHV users pay them they should benefit."

I support the idea of no more new laws, I think we have plenty on the books already. I support enhanced law enforcement for the existing laws. I think there are larger problems at the EPA than enforcement though.

Bar all closed minded keyboard eco-exclusionist. driving past the woods in your outback or volvo does not make you a forest user...

The sustainable" part of the current land requirements is lawyer speak (very subjective) and is being used to keep ORV use out of all the public lands near where I live. Land managers say our existing trails are not "sustainable" and close them and prevent any new areas from being introduced because they are not "sustainable".

This is a comment I wrote on the NEDB forum regarding a public meeting about future use of Myles Standish State Forrest in Plymouth,MA. A publicly owned 16,000 acre forest that was closed to dirtbikes 20 years ago. Other orv use was already prohibatted prior. I spoke at the meeting last night after the woman who founded the Friends of Myles Standish State Forest. She said DCR stands for dept. of conservation and recreation. She ended with conservation should always come before recreation. Realize who we are up against. I reminded everyone that without recreation in our forest, people will not care about conservation. I informed those in attendance that our state only has 130 miles of orv trails,mostly in Berkshire County. Down from last years 155. (-5 Freetown State forset / new highway ramps) (-20 Pittsfield State forest / Maintainance ?/unknown future for us) That puts our current orv footprint in the whole state at 47.27 acres. Do the math. 1 mile= 5,280' times 3' wide trail equals (15,840 sq.ft. / this is the square footage for1 mile of trail) 15,840 sq. ft times 130 miles trail equals 2,059,200 sq.ft of trail in MA offered by DCR 43,560 sq.ft. equals 1 acre 2,059,200sq.ft. divided by 43,560 equals 47.27 acre footprint in MA DCR parks. Myles Standish State Forest is a 16,000 acre park alone? Pathetic!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is considerable air traffic over Yosemite. I got the figure, over 50% of the time from this interview [ { <a href=http://bit.ly/bqeh7p" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } ] with the chief acoustical scientist for the National Park Service. While the noise of jet overflights are either unnoticed because they're unremarkable or they're drowned-out by the din of human activity they are much more noticeable in comparatively pristine wilderness environments. In these quiet locations the added background noise reduces the ability of wildlife to find their mates their offspring to be alerted to approaching predators or to detect nearby prey."

Good point. The lastest thing I read indicated the monetary value of clean water from roadless areas dwarfs the monetary value of the timber industry. Also, the government is not able to maintaining the huge amount of roads that are already in our national forests. That is a cost that could be lowered by having fewer roads.

I completely agree as well. There is no more precious resource that natural quiet and we are loosing it at an alarming rate and no one is noticing. This is the only time that we can really address this need. If we wait it will be too late. It is already too late for many of our wilderness" areas."

We need to preserve our land along with the air and water that surrounds us. If we do not then our children have no future! It is very sad that so many people just do not care any more. The time has come to make changes. If nothing is done then all hope is lost. Our children will have to try to survive in a dieing environment where humans have to trod through mountains of trash and polluted waters where nothing can live any longer. We all need to appriciate what nature has to offer and clean it up while we still can. Think back of how much fun the family (and friends too) had in the great open outdoors. The camping, swimming, fishing, sitting around the fire at night. The love and laughter was enjoyed by all! You would get to meet people from all over too. We need our parks. So do the wildlife. Please have some compassion for our future.

Due to my medical conditions, which include severe mobility challenges and the need for supplemental oxygen 24/7, I am no longer able to visit National Parks myself. I do, however, consider them to be part of the birthright of my two granddaughters. Even though I cannot travel with them, I do cherish the idea of them visiting our nation's parks with their parents or their on children one day. I have wonderful memories of visiting these places with my husband and our son, and listening to my husband's tales of visiting the Grand Canyon, the Badlands, Great Sand Dunes, Hot Springs, Joshua Tree, the Petrified Forest, Rocky Mountain, Sequoia, Wind Cave and Mesa Verde with his parents. These places must be preserved for our granddaughters. National parks help to connect people, young and old, to the outdoors, preserve the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contribute to the health of our people. They provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year.

Please Protect Our National Parks!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We really need to hand down some of the natural beauty that inspired our writers, our pioneers, and our conservationists to our children, and our grandchildren. No one can have much pride in the way things are being destroyed now. Don't let our country become a dump just because there's a profit to be had.

When I think of the great outdoors in the USA, I think primarily of the national parks. National parks play a tremendous role in connecting people, young and old, to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of the nation, and contributing to the health of people and the planet. National parks provide some of the finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. --Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect people to them in the next century. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew the national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare the parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting the parks for the next generation. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. The national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite children with hands-on learning experiences. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of the diversifying nation. I yrge you to evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent the changing country, and protect remaining natural areas before they are all used up. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in the parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on the pocketbooks of USA residents, national park visitation increased on average by nearly four percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of the national parks to people in difficult economic times. USA residents care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for future generations to enjoy. Remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve communities. National parks are good investments for the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Some of my family's favorite vacations, memories, and history lessons came from visiting national parks. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are good investments in our future.

Include the Ross Lake boundary adjustment in the final plan that the Park Service adopts.

Not only our National Parks need help, first and foremost, our City Parks, in major states; such as New York, Chicago, Florida, California. What I am saying is simply--I live in the Bronx and there are too many children playing in unsafe parks and recreation areas. What happened to helping people that do not have as much?

OUR NATIONAL PARKS ARE A SOURCE OF PRIDE, PLEASURE, EDUCATION, AND NATURAL BEAUTY -- AND SHOULD BE PRESERVED WITHOUT "SELLING OUT " TO CORPORATE INTERESTS.  
Our

I am 83 years old and many of those 83 summers were spent in our National Parks. In fact my children and grandchildren, with a friend, hiked in Lassen National Park last weekend. We have climbed Lassen Peak several times and skied down the ski trails that used to be there. My son and grandson will visit Yellowstone National Park this week as my grandson returns home from his tours in Afghanistan. Please don't let this wonderful experience diminish in anyway and do everything possible to save these places for my greatgrandchildren. Please heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans two them in the next century. Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. We need more parks for people to enjoy. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent our changing country, and protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

President Obama, now is the time to redevelop and restore our parks that have suffered neglect from lack of funding over the past 20 plus years. The issue of allowing people to openly carry guns in national parks is terrifying and that policy needs to be revoked and we need to have a new gun policy for national park safety. Your administration needs to do the following: --Stop the carrying of guns in all national parks, except where absolutely necessary to protect oneself from a bear or cougar attack. I cannot stress this issue enough. I used to go to national parks until this year when people are now allowed to carry guns into the parks. It makes camping extremely dangerous since no one knows who has a gun and who doesn't and who does or does not have a history of violence. Too many guns are sold at gun shows without proper identification and registration, making our national parks a refuge for illegal activity. --Stop contracting out park services to large corporations and, instead put it back in the hands of park service personnel. Some consessionares take advantage of students, especially foreign students by encouraging them to come here for the summer on a work visa and then not treating them properly. They are America's parks and should be operated by Americans employing Americans. Crater Lake is a good example of how things are being mishandled. Apparently there are plans to allow this same company to take over the venues at Yellowstone if they haven't already done so. --Limit and restrict the use off off road vehicles which tend to tear up and destroy parkland. --Stop all drilling and mining operations in and near national parks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who developed a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans to them in the next century. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. We to involve communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country. Don't let it be just another broken federal promise. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Our parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allow teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under-resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is already working in communities across the country. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find food and reproduce successfully outside, as well as inside, park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies, and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of our the parks to people in difficult economic times. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are good investments in our future.

For far too long, the condition of the national parks have been deteriorating, Under Bush and others, budgets have been cut back while visitor numbers have increased. rangers are overtaxed and parks are overwhelmed. This national treasure is the envy of the world, and we force them to make do with less. Shameful. We can rebuild foreign countries at untold billions, but no money for our national treasure. This must be reversed. The parks are the face of national morale, and if they look bad, this country is suffering. Restore and guarantee for the future a healthy park system.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

P.S. We need to keep our National Parks as a place parents can take their children to see our heritage, where loved ones can enjoy nature and see all our own country has to offer.

As a parent of two young children, an scholar in the field of education, a community college administrator, and a lover of the outdoors, I urge you to place priority focus on our National Parks System. Our parks offer something of value to everyone no matter age, ethnicity, or socio-economic background. In direct support of "Race to the Top" and "No Child Left Indoors," National parks provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions each year. Let's also create jobs through the Park System - WPA style. This will increase our understanding of American History, Conservation, and support active, healthy lifestyles. --Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund- spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Experiential learning is well known to be the BEST method for learning in all subject areas but particularly in math and science. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences.

Please stop the trend of privatizing/corporatizing our national parks. We pay taxes for our public lands and then get gouged by people who only care about a profit and nothing about the actual wilderness people are out to experience.

This is a critical time to protect and preserve our Natural Resources. A vital natural resource, our National Parks must be protected and preserved for future generations and their value to educate and enrich the lives of people young more fully valued and put to use.

**OUR NATIONAL TREASURES MUST BE NURTURED AND PROTECTED.**



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with everything written below but I would had this: PLEASE protect our parks, our great outdoors, our public lands, our communal places from the dreadful effects of Hydraulic Fracturing which threatens to pollute America irreparably. Our nation's underground water aquifers as well as our lakes, streams, rivers and waterways are under threat from the unconscionable practices of Gas companies that are able to operate without government interference. Overhead photography of fast areas of Colorado and Texas show a growing appalling wasteland. And now this same landscape of towers, drilling pads, roads and toxic pools threatens to take over vast areas of Pennsylvania and NY State. Please bring reason to bear on what is happening to our country regarding this industry! There is no way that our National Parks can escape being effected by this malignant and degrading solution to our energy needs. This is no solution to anything. This will only create a nightmare we may never recover from. What are we leaving our children if they have this legacy to try to clean up? --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and green-ways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country.

Let us work to protect and enhance our national parks. I am grateful to have been able to enjoy our national parks throughout my life. Let us insure that others have this opportunity.

I am saddened by the closure of many of our state parks as well, this is where we can go to get away from the daily grind, we need these, they are an inexpensive way for us to "escape" as most of us do not make the large incomes that politicians do, we are a family of four right now and we live on \$26,000 a year, we can't afford much and to have an affordable way to get away is very important to us. The reason I say we are a family of four right now is that only two of my five children live with us, it is important for all of us to come together and share our lives , state parks are so important , it keeps families vacationing together inexpensively. Please help us keep our National and State parks open and working well. It is usually the only vacation we can afford, if at all.

Also I would like to add that being a senior and on SSI and SSD, I would really love to find my National Parks "user friendly". Scooters, walkers, etc... and extremely low fees. I can afford to sit along side the parks, but I can't afford to stay in one and some even enter for one day. THANK YOU FOR LISTENING AND MAKING AN EFFORT.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of our national parks and National Forests. National parks and forests play a tremendous role in connecting people, young and old, to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contributing to the health of our people. Our parks provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. Forests allow trained and leashed dogs to accompany their people on leash and I personally find that to be a tremendous draw. I desperately want to save our precious lands that are already in the National Park and Forest classification and hope we can preserve other special areas that cannot be replaced once they are destroyed. If these areas are protected, the wildlife will have a home as well. We cannot afford to lose these necessary areas! They are our connection to our world. They are a place to renew spirits. They are a place for enjoyment. They are OURS and a part of our history and heritage. I do not pretend to know the specific steps your administration needs to take regarding preservation of our lands and wildlife. Perhaps the following steps are somewhat realistic:

I suggest that instead of paying extended unemployment benefits to the unemployed, they should be given the opportunity to work side by side with national and state park employees to better care of this valuable resource. It will not only give purpose to unemployed individuals, it will broaden their experience in a much needed area to maintain our national treasure, our state and national parks.

As more and more of everything is gobbled up by housing, strip malls, development, opportunities for quiet wild space time disappears. When I was a kid, all I had to do was to walk out the door and I was in the woods. That place today is all trailer parks and houses. Access to water, rivers, lakes and the ocean is restricted by private property rights. We need wild, quiet places to keep us sane.

My father was a Volunteer in the Park at Mesa Verde National Park for over 20 years, beginning in 1978. I have visited Mesa Verde on nearly a yearly basis since 1978 and have volunteered myself. I have watched the park struggle for funding, cutting back on valuable education done by the rangers and losing some extremely valuable human resources. At the same time the park administration did a great job of promoting the park in the SW Colorado area, bringing together peoples from diverse cultures, enabling them to work together. Mesa Verde National Park could be an amazing "classroom" if funded properly. It is a sin for our nation to not care for and support a World Heritage Park.

I live in New Mexico, which has both national parks and national monuments, including White Sands National Monument. I am a retiree, and my husband and I voted for you. Please make preservation of the national parks and national monuments a priority. National parks and monuments play a tremendous role in connecting people, young and old, to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contributing to the health of our people.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Living in Michigan, I am truly blessed with an abundance of green and state parks. However, this midwestern state has little to offer in preserving the great history and biodiversity of our nation. It is through parks like Gettysburg, Valley Forge, Ellis Island, and the like that a great historical need is met. But this is not enough. Imagine if we could no longer marvel at Joshua trees or wolf tracks or giant Redwoods or Old Faithful. Parks in all of our states are crucial to keep alive the individual spirit of each area that makes America so great. An American without National Parks is not an America that I want to explore. It is the parks that draw me out of a gorgeous and plentiful Michigan wilderness to see the greatness that is held within each individual nook of our great nation. Keep America Great--support our parks!

Recind all leases for our public lands the Bush Administration handed so freely to Big Oil and mining companies. No drilling in the Arctic ever. Save the polar bears and the many other wildlife there and the native Alaskans who depend on this area for their very lives. Big Oil will destroy all of this by their very existence there. Stop the killing of wolves by Cattlemen after taxpayers spent so much to keep them from extinction only to have them again to be slaughtered by this same group.

Many new jobs could be developed by having the parks cleaned up and the buildings restored. These jobs should go to people who are in need of work, especially the youth of our nation, and not be given to wealthy developers who wish to monopolize everything. The talented people who have smaller construction businesses could oversee the work and guide the staff with the work, developing a great work ethic as well as pride in a job well done. A couple of examples of this are the American Bison and the wolves. If they wander out of the parks, they are subjected to harassment and possibly, being destroyed.

Our National Parks are a much better deal than wars all over the planet. Please spend more on them and less on your military - industrial complex.

I have a special place in my heart for Valley Forge National Historical Park. There are beautiful walking trails and a paved path for walking and biking; many kinds of plant and animal life; and of course the feel of real history from Washington's winter encampment there. (My sister and I were watching some archeologists at a dig there, and the leader let us hold a piece of round shot ammunition that had last been held in Washington's time. So impressive!) I wish the federal government would/could purchase all the private land in the vicinity -- the park is under constant threat from developers who want to put up large hotels with convention centers, justifying this outrage with the lure of a really BIG museum. There is an information center there already, and it covers the needed facts. And most important, the main road through the park, Route 23, has already all the traffic it can manage in an area where pedestrians need to cross the road, and deer also cross it in unpredictable locations. Please protect Valley Forge Park. My sister and I love it so much -- we think that it must be a little like heaven (only heaven would not have so many bugs :-).)

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

An important part of this effort is to tell Secretary Salazar that he needs to do more to protect Americas wildlife. He seems to be continuing the Bush policies and ignoring the best advice of wildlife experts. His stand on perpetuating the hunting of wolves in Yellowstone and elsewhere is brutal and destructive and his overall action (or lack of) protecting America's endangered species is dismal. Whereas he should be acting as a steward of wildlife he seems bent on removing protections that are already in place.

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of OUR AMERICAN MUSTANGS, our FEDERAL WILD HORSES and how the BLM is stampeding them into pens on Private Lands and hauling them away in trucks! BLM is very bad--they have totally mismanaged the wild horse situation. DON'T EVEN ASK ME ABOUT YOUTH PROGRAMS UNTIL YOU INVESTIGATE BLM--the very same bad people who under the moniker MMS have totally ruined the Gulf of Mexico. FIX THE BLM. BUT WHEN BLM FINISHES THERE WON'T BE ANY WILDLIFE LEFT to look at. BLM IS EVIL. INVESTIGATE THE BLM AND ITS CRUEL HELICOPTER ROUND-UPS OF WILD HORSES. INVESTIGATE WHY BLM WILL NOT ALLOW HORSE ADVOCATES TO WATCH THEM KILL HORSES. INVESTIGATE WHY I AM PAYING TO KEEP 38000 HORSES IN BLM CAPTURE PENS. INVESTIGATE THE BLM CONNECTION TO THE RUBY PIPELINE AND BP.

My husband and I spend most of our weekends in the Congaree National Park. We have always spent most of our recreational time outdoors. With the recession we, like most Americans, experianced a drop in our standard of living. Thankfully the National Parks are either free or of little charge. We still are able to do something we enjoy, and actually get to do it more. Its no longer an option to go to dinner and a movie, but we have a really great time with hot dogs and a campfire. This past weekend we spent some time in NC enjoying the Blue Ridge Parkway. It was very dissapointing that ranger stations were closed, and that there were not any trashcans for us to throw away litter that we picked up on the trail. I understand that we must make hard choices right now about how to spend our money, but I think trashcans are a preventative measure to keep our parks beatiful, and while you may not be able to man every ranger station right now, we should be able to at least leave a stack of maps in a waterproof container outside. I hope you contiune to support our National Parks. Thank you for you time.

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of WOLVES. YOU HAVE SO FAR DONE NOTHING TO PROTECT THESE MAGNIFICENT CREATURES FROM THE PREDATIONS OF HUNTERS AND RANCHERS. WOLVES PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN MAINTAINING THE BALANCE OF NATURE. IF YOU , OR THAT LOSER SALAZAR KNEW ANYTHING AT ALL ABOUT NATURE YOU'D KNOW THIS. IN ADDITION: --We need more parks for people to enjoy.

Although your family can safely enjoy national parks, I no longer can enjoy national parks because of the few who carry guns. National parks were once somewhat safe but now trigger happy gun owners have me fearing for my and my families' safety. It is sad that a place of beauty and conservation is turned into a place of fear and destruction.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

ON A PERSONAL NOTE: I HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM CHINCOTEAGUE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE and for the second year in a row.to be going downhill. This year over a period of 4 days I could only find the miniature elk (Sika) 1 day, and it was a group of 4 together, and never found a white tailed deer. The other days there was nothing to be found. I complained last year about the missing deer. All these animals used to be plentiful in the late 1990's and early 2000's. This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is it's primary purpose a Bird Sanctuary. I found 6 Canadian Geese, but heck, I can go down the block to see them. Many people go to that Refuge go to see the Famous Chincoteague Wild Ponies. I know the horses are not considered to be wild, and they are owned by the Firemen on Chincoteague and they buy rights for the horses to graze on.the land, However the Refuge does nothing whatsoever to facilitate people seeing the ponies in the back areas and at the same time teaching them about the refuge system and the birds in the back portions of the refuge. That is currently being done a few times a week which is so sad as people do not learn about the refuge. It is very clear that the tourist is not wanted in this park. ON A PERSONAL NOTE: I HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM CHINCOTEAGUE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE and for the second year in a row.to be going downhill. This year over a period of 4 days I could only find the miniature elk (Sika) 1 day, and it was a group of 4 together, and never found a white tailed deer. The other days there was nothing to be found. I complained last year about the missing deer. All these animals used to be plentiful in the late 1990's and early 2000's. This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is it's primary purpose a Bird Sanctuary. I found 6 Canadian Geese, but heck, I can go down the block to see them. Many people go to that Refuge go to see the Famous Chincoteague Wild Ponies. I know the horses are not considered to be wild, and they are owned by the Firemen on Chincoteague and they buy rights for the horses to graze on.the land, However the Refuge does nothing whatsoever to facilitate people seeing the ponies in the back areas and at the same time teaching them about the refuge system and the birds in the back portions of the refuge. That is currently being done a few times a week which is so sad as people do not learn about the refuge. It is very clear that the tourist is not wanted in this park. ON A PERSONAL NOTE: I HAVE JUST RETURNED FROM CHINCOTEAGUE NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE and for the second year in a row.to be going downhill. This year over a period of 4 days I could only find the miniature elk (Sika) 1 day, and it was a group of 4 together, and never found a white tailed deer. The other days there was nothing to be found. I complained last year about the missing deer. All these animals used to be plentiful in the late 1990's and early 2000's. This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is it's primary purpose a Bird Sanctuary. I found 6 Canadian Geese, but heck, I can go down the block to see them. Many people go to that Refuge go to see the Famous Chincoteague Wild Ponies. I know the horses are not considered to be wild, and they are owned by the Firemen on Chincoteague and they buy rights for the horses to graze on.the land, However the Refuge does nothing whatsoever to facilitate people seeing the ponies in the back areas and at the same time teaching them about the refuge system and the birds in the back portions of the refuge. That is currently being done a few times a week which is so sad as people do not learn about the refuge. It is very clear that the tourist is not wanted in this park. -----  
However normaly This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is it's primary purpose. I found 6 Canadian Geese, but heck, I can go down the block to see

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

them. This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is its primary purpose. I found 6 Canadian Geese, but heck, I can go down the block to see them. This year there were very very few birds which was astounding since that is its primary purpose. I found 6 Canadian Geese

Americans want their wild places and wildlife protected - they do not want to see wild horses corralled but want them to roam wild and free; they do not want their wolves gunned down; they do not want their bison driven off the land they owned hundreds of years ago, for cattle ranchers to profit.

As long as guns are allowed in the National Parks, I am not interested in visiting or contributing.

Like you, National parks provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year, as a place for healing for the emotionally wounded with PTSD, the grieving, and the abandoned. Please, -- Heed the wisdom of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans to them in the next century. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. In similar tough times, Roosevelt would have! The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. You're good at that! --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised: to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just becoming another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. The children and the land are our future! --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand highways or boundaries on a map. You and I and all love-- "Pastor Mom"

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

America's Great Outdoors needs to get behind and make use of our national parks. Please consider these steps: --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country. --Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. The Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build on programs that work. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. Thank you!

Ban high volume horizontal hydrofracking for natural gas. This unconventional method of gas extraction is dangerous, and incongruous with the mission of the National Parks Service. HVHF should be permanently banned in the entire United States. As it stands right now we have no regulations to protect our environment, health and potable water from the toxic mix of chemicals that are used mixed with millions of fresh water to extract the gas.

Stop the Damn Wars so there will be money to spend on the outdoor infrastructure.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Protect undeveloped places from development or exploitation of any kind. NOT for americans, NOT for people, and MOST CERTAINLY NOT for tourism or the economy, but for the animals, trees, and other creatures of the earth who live there. Let them be the priority for once. -- Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks in the next century. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. --We need more parks. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up.

Please don't turn over our forests, parks and wildlife preserves to the oil drillers, mining companies and timber strippers who would turn this whole continent into a desert just to make a few bucks.

I also feel very strongly that the USDA, acting under the auspices of the Atlantic Flyway Council, should no longer be permitted to slaughter our native wildfowl as they are currently doing in so many of our parks. This is untenable.

Inspite of the contents of the last paragraph, Americans, including the government, need to understand that the land in our National Parks is a piece of the continent to be seen and loved for itself, independent of us the people.

My big concern now is what is happening all through Pennsylvania with the drilling for natural gas. Our entire state could be considered one big park with its many state parks, but the gas drilling is taking over . WE NEED TO CLOSE THE LOOPHOLE ON SAFE WATER WHICH WAS GRANTED THROUGH THE EFFORTS OF CHEANYWHO HAS CONNECTIONS WITH THE COMPANIES-- HALIBURTON TO BE SPECIFIC



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe --Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission. This group of well respected individuals spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans to them in the next century. . not merely using them. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under-resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is already working in communities across the country. In particular I think of the buffalo & Yellowstone - where buffalo that wander outside the Park boundaries are slaughtered by stupid ignorant people who maintain that buffalo carry brucellosis - despite the fact that there has never been a verified case of brucellosis in buffalo! This is a huge insult to every IndigenUs Turtle Islander (what you p.c. people call "Native Americans"). More parks will spread the impact of more visitors so that no one park is destroyed by the crush of visitors.

Stop "pimping put" our park lands to ranchers and mining operations, which degrade the lands set aside for all Americans AND our native wildlife. The latter practices practices have contributed greatly to the disappearing of some of our native birds and animals, like the wolf and California condor.

How about upkeep of the National Parks. As far as Rock Creek Park, Washington, MD (MNCPPC) perhaps making sure there are enough Park Police available would be a beginner. People drive through the park shooting off guns. Beach Drive traffic laws need to be enforced for there are trucks, 18wheelers etc using Beach which deteriorates the park. The excess use of autos is destroying the park according to my arborist since my property backs up to Rock Creek Park. There needs to be wildlife signs and Beach Drive needs to be closed at certain hours and closed on the weekends. There is no need for autos to be on Beach, it is now being used as a state road. There are vines and invasives in the park which need removal/control and when trees are destroyed due to weather, they should be replaced.

For me, our national parks have always been a place where the spirit may be renewed, as I stand in awe of the great mountains of the west or enter into the quiet of the forests of east and west, and pause as a wapiti or salamander crosses my path. But even if I never was able to go back, it would be essential for me as a citizen of this nation and the world to know these places remained protected from the relentless onslaught of development that has so damaged our planet and driven so many species and ecosystems into extinction..

Once our parks are gone, we cannot retrieve them, resources like our parks would take years to replace if not centuries, please protect them!!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of our national parks and our great state of Colorado. National parks play a tremendous role in connecting people, young and old, rich or poor, disabled or able, sick or healthy to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contributing to the health of our people in multiple ways. Anyone can visit a national park which is part of what makes them so vital, so wonderful, so precious. It's in the bones of humans to need their great outdoors to recuperate from the hectic mechanics of the concrete worlds we inhabit most of our lives. National parks symbolize the essence of freedom and what America truly stands for. How we all love our parks!!! National parks provide some of America's most outstanding outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. There's hardly a soul in my state who has not visited at least one of our national parks in the course of their lives. In fact most of us visit our parks often. I strongly request that your administration take the following steps: This is an outstanding way to bring people together during difficult times. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. It is crucial that this money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. We are all hurt by this tragedy. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. We have the grandest of grand theaters available to our people in the form of national parks. A stage from which both our heritage and our future can be visited LIVE any day of the week. I brought my kids to visit our national parks every opportunity we had and they have all benefited immensely from this introduction to the natural world and our environment. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. The Department of Education should work with the Park Service to motivate and inspire kids with hands-on learning experiences. I have seen such programs literally turn lives around. I would especially beseech you to protect these areas from corporate or personal greed so no one can build a house or factory within the borders of places that should belong to the people of this nation and not individuals. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We desperately need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. So many creatures have dearly paid for our selfish ends; particularly through the poor planning of fences. Wildlife corridors endure for GENERATIONS over eons. These critters are born with the instinct to use trails provided by their ancestors so it is impossible for them to find other routes without constantly risking their fragile lives. It is our duty to help the most vulnerable in our populations whether animal or human. But it doesn't require an economic downturn for people to visit parks. In Colorado as a whole the population increasingly uses our national parks on a regular basis. Many people are just now discovering the

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

fantastic gift we have received through the foresight of a few to protect these amazing areas for all of us ~ for each and every American ~ FOREVER. We need you to continue this work; as this is an endeavor of the heart. Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. I have many friends from around the world who have come to America specifically to visit at least one of our great parks. How proud I feel that for once they weren't berating us for our wars and poor economic choices! Our parks are a great source of national pride for all of us. That's why I'm asking you to please remember the VITAL importance of protecting our national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are one of the greatest investments in our nation's future. Thank you for your attention and

REINSTATE A PROGRAM similar to the CCC. Take our disadvantaged youth out of the inner cities and allow them to EARN, LEARN and FLOURISH. E L F...

I implore you to not let interests spend this money on anything except our national parks, waterways, seashores and forests. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and green ways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country.

Our National Parks are America's National Treasures. I am so eager and happy that the America's Great Outdoors Initiative is on the table right now. I delight in knowing that your administration is choosing to focus its time and focus on such a fantastic part of America. Helping to build a greater connection and a greater accessibility between Americans and nature is so life enhancing and important. Especially in the context of this time. I think we are hungry for a greater connection to the world around us. So, Bravo, for this initiative. I trust that America's National Parks will be a pivotal part of this next step forward. Hopefully our National parks will receive greater care and expansion. America is beautiful, and it is such a treasure that so much of that beauty has been preserved, let's keep it up! Better yet, let's expand on it. The dominant presence of nature heightens the level of happiness and the quality of life for the people around it. Great thinkers, who are the forefathers of America like Transcendentalists Thoreau and Emerson would agree: nature sparks appreciation in mankind.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a Natural Resource major from Colorado State University, I have been lucky enough to have had the opportunity to experience first hand the importance of our environment and recognize just how meaningful it will be for future generations. Whether I was out hiking, biking or camping near Ft. Collins' Red Feather Lakes, snowboarding in the Aspen Mountains, or simply just relaxing with the family in our cabin out by the Spanish Peaks, I have always felt a close connection with nature. What follows are recommendations put forth by the NPCA which I truly believe in. I would like to take just a minute more of your time to address the growing concern of the U.S. government and the attacks being made from many members of our society. It is extremely outrageous that your administration has received so many complaints making it seem like you and your administration are the cause of so much of the political and socio-economical problems we currently face. It is clear that no matter whom had taken over from the previous administration would more likely than not be taking on some of the biggest challenges we have ever come across. And though there are times when I have a crisis of faith in our government (because it is hard to say who is right and who is wrong), I still feel very strongly that those in power at this moment in time really do have the best in mind for all of us living in the United States. Though it might not be worth much, I would like you and all of your staff to know that I have never been more willing to pledge my allegiance to the flag of the United States and will continue to stand by so long as you continue to point this country back in the right direction. In closing, Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are by far one of the best investments in our future. Thank you for your consideration. Mr.

The --Follow the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans two them in the next century. --Make better use of the national parks to inspire and educate young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences.

America's Great Outdoors is a major part of my life, and I emphasize that I have enjoyed our national parks often as part of that. National parks are critically important in connecting people, young and old, able-bodied and (like me) disabled, to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contributing to the health of our people. National parks belong to all of us, and provide some of America's finest outdoor learning places. These fantastic parks also serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. Please keep this up. Our parks have been badly underfunded for a long time, and need some support in keeping themselves in decent shape, though.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Rescind the tax cuts for the rich and withdraw from Afghanistan and Iraq. Then, fully fund the national parks, schools, cities, infrastructure and alternate energy/high speed rail.

I firmly support the initiative of America's Great Outdoors and believe that the first step to promoting conservation is by PROTECTING and DEVELOPING our NATIONAL PARKS. If the ultimate goal is to connect our society and especially our children to the natural world we must implement this concept into all aspects of our life. WE MUST SET THE EXAMPLE OF A MORE EARTH CONSCIOUS SOCIETY FOR THE NEXT GENERATION TO BUILD UPON. ULTIMATELY NATIONAL PARKS ARE GOOD INVESTMENTS IN OUR FUTURE. The administration can be more responsible and promote conservation by SUPPORTING AND FUNDING ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND CAUSES. Here are a few ways to do so: --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. . --UTILIZE NATIONAL PARKS TO INSPIRE AND EDUCATE THE NEXT GENERATION. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. EDUCATION SHOULD WORK WITH THE PARK SERVICE in order to inspire and excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build on programs that work. THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. THE PARK SERVICE'S RIVERS AND TRAILS CONSERVATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. YOU ALREADY HAVE A GREAT PROGRAM, BUT ITS UNDER RESOUCRED. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that EVERY FEDERAL DOLLAR INVESTED IN NATIONAL PARKS GENERATES AT LEAST FOUR DOLLARS OF ECONOMIC VALUE TO THE PUBLIC. every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of our national parks to our people in difficult economic times. Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. WE MUST change our lifestyle to WORK WITH AND FOR THE ENVIRONMENT OR else we continue to STEAL FROM OUR OWN FUTURE. Ms.

Or improve our existing sites to better accommodate the crowds we are getting. If you can consider holding down on the price of tickets to enter our parks because everyone in my state (AZ) is poor now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I just started docenting for California State Parks and can't think of a better way to connect with the out of doors. If you support the National Parks and help states support their State Parks, it will keep this vital resource available to all. Being able to spend time outside shouldn't depend on salary or any other stricture of society.

When I travel to America's Outdoors, I go to our wonderful system of national parks. I am fortunate to live a short distance from three units in south FL. I trust that your administration will take the following steps: --Listen to the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, a group of well respected individuals who spent more than a year developing a vision for how to protect the parks and connect Americans two them in the next century.

America's Great Outdoors is not just our national and state parks. It is were we live, breathe, and share our walk upon this planet with all the other life here. Our national parks are a incalculable treasure that we are stewards of. There we can go see, reconnect, and feel raw untouched nature, and preserve some of the last remaining wild lands of our great country. But this should be an educational place as well because nature is also where we live and work. It is not a place we should ever plunder for our selfish geed. We are stewards of all the lands for the generations to come. Your administration should consider the following steps:

I would like to see programs that sponsor trips with inner city/under-funded children to the National Parks -- maybe with some cool folks as part of each group, names that these kids recognize.

I have taken my family to nearly every National Park in our country and implore you to help continue to insure the healthy state of our national park system. It is your administration's job as democrats to protect our national treasures, not destroy them like republicans do.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

HOW CAN ANYONE GET EXCITED GOING TO THE OUT DOORS. WHEN BP PLANS TO PUT IN A PIPELINE AND DESTROY THE NATURAL BEAUTY OF OUR STATE OF NEVADA. NOT COUNTING THAT BLM IS REMOVING OUR HERITAGE FROM THE PLANS. WHAT WILL WE BE ABLE TO SEE, NO MUSTANGS, NO WOLVES, OR ANY OTHER ANIMAL BLM OR HUMAN HAS REMOVED AND DESTROYED. A PERSON SAID, IF THE HORSES ARE STARVING AND HAVE TO BE REMOVED. WHY AREN'T ANY OTHER ANIMALS DIEING? THE PRESIDENT DOESN'T REALLY CARE OR HE WOULD OF ANSWER MY 4 ENVELOPES FROM THE KIDS AND PEOPLE FROM PAHRUMP, NEVADA. WE HAVE LOST HORSES ALREADY FROM THE IGNORANCE OF BLM. JUST BECAUSE HE CAN AFFORD TO DO THINGS. WHAT MAKES YOU THINK ANYONE ELSE CAN? THE POOR GET POORER AND THE RICH GET RICHER. BP OIL. 2ND LARGEST CO TO WANT TO GET RID OF OUR HORSES. (BLM AND KEN SALAZAR)..WHEN IS THE PRESIDENT GOING TO STOP LISTENING TO SALAZAR AND START LISTENING TO THE PEOPLE? I VOTED FOR OUR PRESIDENT. I MAY NOT THE NEXT TIME. WE HAVE A BEAUTIFUL COUNTRY. BUT IT IS GOING TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER. WHAT IS GOING TO BE LEFT ONCE THEY KILL OFF ALL THE HORSES, BURROS, WOLVES, BEARS, LIONS AND WHAT EVER ELSE ON 4 LEGS. WHEN HUMANS STARTED TO INTER FER WITH NATURE, ALL IS GONE. NEED TO MAKE THAT CHANGE, LIKE PROMISED. AFTER BUSH, THINGS WERE TO GO FOR THE BETTER. NOTHING HAS CHANGED. THE ROAM ACT IS NOT FOLLOWED BY BLM. THEY MAKE THE LAW AS IT IS NEEDED. LOOK AT WHO GETS THE REWARDS. BLM AND SALAZAR, BP OIL . THE TAX PAYER IS GETTING THE SHAFT, THEY USE MILLIONS OF \$\$\$ TO DO THEIR DIRTY DEED. SELLING THE HORSES FOR \$25.00 A LB. WHILE OUR GOV. IS GETTING PERKS WHAT DOES THE CITIZEN GET? A LOT OF WHAT I HAVE SAID WILL ROLL INTO OUR PARKS. THEIR WILL BE SOME REASONS TO OVER CHARGE TO GET IN. OR BE RESTRICTED, BECAUSE OF WHAT EVER.

Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Civil War Sesquicentennial provides to renew our national battlefield parks like Gettysburg, Antietam, Chickamauga, Shiloh, Chancellorsville, and Vicksburg. The administration should apply the lessons learned from the highly successful Civil War Battlefield Preservation Program, which protects endangered Civil War battlefields outside National Park Service boundaries. These lessons include developing new public-private partnerships to preserve Civil War battlefields for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our battlefield parks (which are tremendous outdoor classrooms for learning and exercise) for the next generation. --Do more to use national parks, including the Civil War military parks, to inspire and educate young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The national parks are for the people not for corporations. We need to stop all oil and gas leasing, cattle grazing, road building, hotel building, and whatever else on national parks. We already have enough hotels, roads, ranches, and oil/gas wells. Parks need to be a place to go to enjoy nature, not from a hotel veranda or car window while speeding by, but from a campsite. And oil and gas wells are not part of a natural landscape. People are taking all available land for themselves as we multiply more and more. Wildlife are animals too and need room to live their life.

As a former Administrative Assistant in the Department of Environmental Protection, FL State Park System, for almost 27 years, I can truthfully say - people of all ages enjoy not only the state parks, but more specifically the National Parks. The National Parks hold more history in them than most state parks do, and provide immense beauty that can't be seen anywhere else on earth. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies, and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map.

Everglades National Park is slowly being taken for development, and the panther habit is being systematically destroyed. See the St. Petersburg Times article entitled "Florida's Best Managed Extinction" If you would like a copy, I will be glad to send it to you. It's haunting to think that the government and developers are doing, and getting away with, this. Mitigating the land taken for development doesn't happen; there is none left to mitigate. Again, let me know if you would like a copy, if you can't find it on the internet. Ansel Adams said that it is horrifying that we have to fight with the government to save the environment. I think he hit the nail on the head.

I hike at Torrey Pines, a Park Reserve in my area, once a week. It's beautiful, it's a healthy pastime, and it's free. National parks provide a place for people to become healthier and happier, with beauty delivered straight from the Divine. --Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission to protect the parks and connect Americans to them in the next century. -- Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Expand programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. And the Department of Education could work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. -- Build on programs that work. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system and protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of our national parks to our people in difficult economic times.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live within 125 miles of something like 6 National Parks and Monuments. I have visited all of them at one time or another, and take visitors whenever I can. I am not a back country hiker, so I need these National Parks and Monuments to help me visit Nature as often as possible.

Now is the time - like TR's time - when vision and determination and -vigor(!) is desperately needed. Every day, every hour something goes in our Great Outdoors. We must preserve or it will go.

Ensure that national parks have the funds necessary to safeguard park wildlife and provide park visitors with a safe, clean, and rewarding park experience by the National Park Service's centennial in 2016.

Dear Mr. President, Eastern religious philosophy teaches that all life is interrelated. Commercialize the parks and natural areas and you risk losing life, and future generations. President Teddy Roosevelt understood this. So should this administration. The Republicans only care about business and profit, not life, beauty and national health. Don't fall into their traps.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

National parks also provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. They were established to protect important wilderness areas from destructive ideas and destructive corporate executives. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative toward developing a new public-private partnership that will prepare our vitally-needed parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign, one that will capture individuals' imaginations and that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Provide permanent, and mandatory, funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as yet unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised, exclusively to support parks, seashores, forests, and important waterways across the country, rather than just representing yet another neocon broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is for responsible Americans--Democrats and Republicans-- keep that promise. --Do more to use national parks in their role of inspiring and educating young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs such as Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low-income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers helping to develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build upon programs that already work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under- resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. A vastly overpopulated country drowning in pollutants emitted by supply-side economic madmen foisting off unneeded products onto brainwashed overconsuming victims is not capitalism, not Americanism and not even sane conduct. Study the loss of caribou alone; the lesson is clear. This is our most vital asset--people caring about perpetual upkeep of our living heritage, our air, our water and our wildlife. Real Americans, not pseudo-religious neocon reality bashers do in fact care very deeply about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Only the BLM and EPA and the corporate business lobby apparently hate reality so much they're willing to destroy it in the name of short-term stolen "profiteering". Please remember the importance of protecting state and especially our national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service; these are extremely central and vital programs that improve our communities, and generate jobs, income and tourism dollars as well as educating citizens about priorities in realism. National parks are good investments in our future--perhaps the best investment we have.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Reconsider the use of contractors for lodging and food in National Parks because the value offered in national parks is much less than it was in 1977 when parks were completely staffed by Civil Servants and summer helpers. The idea that parks are for private profit is not consistent with the idea that parks are for the good of the people. My family has visited many national parks before and after the use of contractors and have seen the degradation in both quality and value offered by the contractors in the interest of profit. Get rid of the contractors!

I had the privilege of growing up in a family that inspired my love of the outdoors. We spent many summers in our family's RV, camping and hiking. Much of that time was spent in our national parks. As I have become an adult, I still enjoy the outdoors and especially the national parks. I hope that my children will be able to have the same experiences in the national parks that I did. We need to do alot as a country to promote better stewardship of our public lands, keeping our parks in top shape and restoring a healthier environment that protects our national resources, especially improving air quality, preserving our waterways, and protecting endangered species. We need to encourage our children to get outside and learn to enjoy the beauty of the world around them , especially instilling in them the values of conserving these resources for future generations. The national parks can play an enormous role in this endeavor. I realize that this will all take a lot of money that is particularly scarce in the present economy. However, I believe this in a much needed investment in our public lands that will pay off in the long and short term.

Please include our great wild horses. We need to preserve the history of these horses and keep them safe from roundups and shipping them across the boarders for slaughter. PLEASE HELP.

Ensure that national parks have the funds necessary to safeguard park wildlife and provide park visitors with a safe, clean, and rewarding park experience by the National Park Service's centennial in 2016. The national parks were set aside by forward-thinking individuals many years ago. Please provide the parks with the necessary funding to make sure future generations will also have the opportunity to enjoy them. Fully and permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to enable the Park Service to buy private land within park boundaries from willing sellers. As our nation's population grows, so should our parks grow in order to accommodate greater numbers of visitors. Preserve large areas of public lands and waters to secure the health of our ecosystems, ensure wildlife conservation, maintain public access to parks and open spaces, reduce the impacts of climate change, and protect our cultural heritage. Wildlife deserves enough land to survive. Humans have encroached on their territory for many years. Strengthen the capacity for federal, regional, state, and local agencies and private landowners to work collaboratively in order to protect not only our national parks but the wildlife, plants, and rivers beyond park borders. Improve opportunities to use our national parks to get kids into active, healthy, outdoor activity that will help them lead long, healthy lives. I have found that when people fully understand a problem or situation, they are more likely to come up with solutions to solve the problem in an effective manner. Our children deserve the opportunity to appreciate nature and to be able to protect it for the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

MOST YOUTH OF TODAY ARE DISCONNECTED FROM NATURE AND THEIR FOOD, THAT IS WHY THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH TODAY'S YOUTH. LET'S GET THEM CONNECTED AND THEY WILL BE HEALTHIER EMOTIONALLY!!! THANKS

Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. The Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation.

My husband and I along with our son and Grandson plus occasionally Grandsons friends have camped in the Beautiful National Parks across America. My Husband is deceased now. I have Happy Memories in Tapes and Slides of those times. Don't allow the Enviroment to be altered.

Having travelled from the flatlands of Iowa for 30+ years to enjoy the mountains of the west, I can tell you from personal observation of the changes that have occurred in the Rockies in just this short period of time. We MUST do what we can to reverse the energy-based climate change that is happening all over the planet. Your administration is our last best chance to avoid catastrophe.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent our changing country, and protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the enhanced value of our national parks to our people in difficult economic times. Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are good investments in our future.

Dismiss Ken Salazar as Secy of the Interior. I believe he's the worst Secy of the Interior we've ever had!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ensure that the Halliburton loophole gets closed. The loophole in the Safe Drinking Water Act is poisoning one of Americas best feature, free, clean and safe drinking water. Much hydraulic fracturing or "fracking" occurs in our public land. All water sources are connected and steps must be taken to protect ever body of water we can.

sir, i am also concerned about the unemplment also , and i appreciate your fine effort of all you have tried to do for us the working poor, my wife and i live on \$35,000 and my wife will lose her job in january of 2011 so please help and keep up the good work.

All I can say is I would hate to have our beautiful gems become side-notes in our future history book revisions of what America used to look like.

I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, (and especially all the wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers) and historic sites, monuments and especially forrests. National parks play a tremendous role in connecting people, young and old, to the outdoors. I think the wild life must be preserved AND PROTECTED FROM THE POLITICCS AND SO CALLED "DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR". - The participation of ranchers and other private individuals should be MINIMIZED regarding the managing of federal lands: the federal government has absolute control of all federal lands and should NOT be influenced by anybody else."The Conservation of Wild Life" as mentionned throughout this discusssion of National Parks, etc., has no meaning, since the Department of Interior, the so-called Protector of Wildlife endorses the killing of wolves in federal lands...

Mr. President, I voted for you because I felt strongly that you could see through the complicity that runs rampant in Washington politics. The big-money-backed-projects win over issues that are important to 'We The People'. I am not naive to the tight-rope you must walk and the obstacles that are thrown in your path. This is why I feel that your advising team and Department heads' loyalties to what you stand for must be validated regularly. Our National Parks and the wildlife in this land have no lobbyists other than 'We The People' and what is important to us matters less and less with each passing year. These hallowed places must be strongly protected from their enemies. I worry that your head of the Department of the Interior and the US Department of Agriculture and Wildlife are too much influenced by "the good old boys" aspect of the complicity problem in their realm of control. Please assure yourself that your team is true to who you serve: 'We The People'. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Although this is a form letter from an organization I admire, I live in the State of Florida and have seen Coral Reefs dying caused by pollution. Lots of people in my State of Florida realize that if we do not save our precious Everglades, the River of Grass will be a river of pollution and affect all the natural wildlife in our state. This also affects our drinking water, because we store our water under the coral rock, and we need to stop the pollution before it reaches the natural flow of water. In this economy it will be hard to get started, but if we don't try now, then when. Time is flying by. Thank you for considering my comments and thank you for all the hard work you do as my President.

We would like the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why we are asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, rangelands and forests. One way is to end the incursion by utility companies' power towers. Building-integrated solar and wind energy on every rooftop would make these odious Power Links unnecessary. And stop the dump from Los Angeles from destroying Joshua Tree and the desert aquifer. The desert is not a dump. Keep it unblighted by bird killing, fire-hazard inefficient wind farms and Power Links. When we think of America's Great Outdoors, Peace and Quiet, we think of our national parks. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally promised to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. The growing danger of mass destruction happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. Keep fouling fossil fuels out of our parks, and collect the understorey for fire safety and biofuels! No Offshore drilling, - specially deepwater drilling that taps the Abiotic Oil that regulates the Tectonic Plates of the planet, and threatening mass extinction! --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. NO fences on the border with Mexico to protect endangered American jaguar, and other migratory animals and birds. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. It's worth it. Thank you for considering our comments.

I am a frequent visitor to the many National Parks, so is my family. My children love to visit and partake in activities they offer, wild life viewing and protection, including water born creatures. The only way to protect this is for you to help in clean water, conservation of our parks and animals. Especially the endangered species such as the Gray Wolf, Grizzly Bear. Stop the killing of Wolves in Alaska by airplane. Let's save all the animals and parks for our children and grandchildren.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Among the many disappointments of your Presidency to-date, lack on action on the environmental and climate change fronts tops the list. It seems that you made the political calculation to go after health-care first, and after expending all of your political capital on that ill-fated effort, have none left for any other major initiatives. You have influence but not control over the difficult politics -- but you have more control in the area of the environment through enforcing and expanding regulations than in other areas of your agenda. Please stop granting all permits for mountain top removal, nuclear power plants, and in so many similar ways allowing considerations for the cost of energy to prevent any action on the environmental front. As it stands your Presidency will be viewed as just one among a string of leaders who allowed short-term political concerns to trump long-term survival of our national parks, our food-production capabilities, not to mention the planet. Where is the leadership from your administration to alert Americans to the real risks we face of losing our environmental heritage if action on climate changes doesn't finally begin? Where are the so-called green jobs? The generic message, which I agree with although it's not nearly strident enough, begins:

I would like to start out with a request that you take a look at the BLM policy on wild horses. They are being systematically wiped out with unnecessary round-ups, slaughter and imprisonment. Many are run to death being chased by helicopters, airplanes and ATVs. Many are traumatized and injured so badly they must be put down. Please do not allow this magnificent symbol of our wild America to disappear. Our public lands need wild horses running free.

Thank you for reading this petition: I respect your time and will be very brief. Our parks and nature preserves are a fundamental connection between our identity and our nationality. My landlord once told me: "Everything's for sale". The problem is, "everything" by definition includes the heart and the soul, not to mention loved ones. Our Wilderness is our heart and soul: Two things that should never go on sale. Thank you for your time. Form letter enclosed below: I have left some information below that I believe could be valuable. Your administration may find it wise to take the following steps:

We just returned from a week in RMNP. It was great, but the crowds were greater than even--more visitors would decrease the pleasure of visitors, and put serious stress on areas and facilities. There are other wild areas in the country which could be carefully prepared to make great new national parks. Please support efforts to find and develop these new areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

I'm still glad I voted for you to be the current president, even though so far you've let me down by not ending the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, not appointing progressive judges to balance the courts Bush stacked in favor of reactionism, letting Bush's DEA head sit in her office doing her best to circumvent my state's laws that protect medical marijuana use waaaaaay too far into your presidency, and not, yet, better protecting our environment. How glad am I going to be that you're the current president when I vote in 2012? It's up to you. Our children deserve to enjoy the natural beauty of our country the way we could while growing up. Please seize your best opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's "great outdoors." Surely you realize that an overwhelming majority of American's expect their president to do ALL within the power of that office to protect our environment, including our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find more ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests. National Parks are vital to the health of our people. (Sort of like the Arts are vital to the health of our school children, so please work on get them back into our public schools ASAP, please.) Please direct your administration to immediately:

WILDERNESS IS CRITICAL FOR OUR HEALTH - FOR CLEAN AIR AND WATER. TREES HELP WITH OXYGEN AND LAND HELPS WITH WATER. IT IS NOT THE MATTER OF JUST "being pretty" it is the \*\*\* critical \*\*\* matter of SURVIVAL. FOR YOU AND ME EQUALLY. YOU ARE SUBJECT TO IT TOO. AND YOUR CHILDREN. WHERE WILL THEY LIVE? if the Earth gets messed up, where will your children live? I want the next generationS to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests.

I am 14 years old.I have been keeping very connected to the disastrous effect on the entire habitat of America by the OIL SPILL. I say this because wintering birds from as far as Alaska and Minnesota will soon be entering a disastrous situation. As I listen to the news I get more and more angry because of the people in charge are unable to protect what has been here longer than we have. I'm sad that the greatest nation in the world cannot protect what makes it great. The things we are destroying are something that is greater, stronger, and older than we can ever comprehend. As Americans we have only been here for 300 years. The only politician I ever liked was Robert C. Byrd because he got things done that needed to be done regardless of were it put him. Because of our carelessness, we have over 950 endangered species in only America! If Washington is to stupid and ignorant to see that we are to dependent on oil to take care of ourselves, I think we should have a sooner election. "Wild beasts and birds are by right not the property merely of people tody, but the property of the unborn generations, whose belongings we have no right to squander.' -Theodore Roosevelt



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We need to take care of our outdoor environment with great care. Perhaps, now with the withdrawal of our troops from warring countries, we can use that money to help ourselves. Our infrastructure has suffered much for over 12 years now and we need to take care of what we have with care. If we could spend billions, to kill people, maybe now we can use that money to maintain our environment safe. We have neglected this issue long enough!!!

Most of us refer to the "simpler times" where we could walk outside, keep our doors unlocked and enjoy our "freedoms" from our own backyards without the tainted worries of pollution, man-made dangers and disrespect. Over the years, our country has struggled intensely to keep the beauty alive within this great country and to watch it go south on a daily basis leaves us with no wonder why our attitudes go south as well. Remembering who gave us these things is crucial as well. God is kind and He provides. We also need industry of educational support as we piece back together the beauty we have destroyed, save the ecosystems and convince the world around us to do the same. Realizing that our needs can be met in other creative ways (food, shelter, clothing) other than robbing our earth's non-renewables or taking simply because we are too lazy to come up with better solutions is robbing our entire world and its heart and existence. Please, President Obama and First Lady Obama, we reach out to you to take care of your own first so that we may build a strong community against all odds. Additionally,

The BLM's current program of eliminating the American Wild Mustang from 11 Western States is the most egregious, outrageously inhumane action now taking place. In 1971 Congress voted to protect and defend this beautiful species of animal and now they are being wiped clean from the landscape. Hundreds of petitions have been sent to you and Ken Salazar requesting a halt to the roundups. Please don't let the American Mustang go the same route of the Buffalo. Protect all wild species of animals including the wild mustang. Do not allow arial hunters from wiping out Mountain Lions, wolves and other species.

The values of this nation are inextricably combined with the existence of its forests and wild places. Unfortunately, this great national treasure is in great danger. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, rangelands and forests.

**THE AMERICAN MUSTANGS AND BURROS NEED TO BE SAVED** for future generations. These are our icons of the American west, and our freedom. They need protection.

As our most important natural areas, the parks are barometers for environmental change that affects all of us. We need to focus on the environmental stresses they face and ensure that we satisfactorily address impacts on parks, as well as the impacts on our coastlines, forests, farmlands and urban areas. Degradation may be most visible in parks, but we may also be suffering the negative effects of pollution, land use change, etc.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As the American Indians believed, we do not own this world, we are part of it and are merely caretakers during our stay. This decade has seen some of the worst environmental disasters. We need to reverse this course and set precedents for our future caretakers. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. That's why I demand that you seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests. When I imagine where I'd rather be, often, it is in places like Acadia, Pisgah, Yosemite, or the Florida Keys. When many of us Americans think of America's Great Outdoors, we think of our national parks.

Your "America's Great Outdoors" initiative is welcome. Time is running out to make substantive changes in our land management policies that will ensure that future generations will have the amazingly diverse parks and conservation lands that we Americans enjoy now.

I was so very frustrated with the attitude of Geo Bush when it came to protecting our very special unique lands that we have here in the USA. I am counting on you, President Obama to do the right thing and preserve our lands for the future.

Now is the time to take action. Politics and big money cannot win out over our future. It saddens me to think of America's great treasures sold or destroyed for profit or political gain.

Supporting our national parks and the environment should never be a partisan issue. This is an issue that should unite us all as Americans.

I grew up around national parks. My dad worked in Yellowstone after WW2. I live now on the border of a National Forest. I have always made sure my daughters spent time in the parks and learned to appreciate. With all the acreage lost to development, some day soon these parks will be all we have left.

I grew up enjoying the National Parks system with my family. I am afraid that the joy I found there will not be available for my grandchildren. Please read the letter below and incorporate as many of the suggestions as you can into your action plan.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do it for your children, grands and greats! Our --We must protect America's parks. Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for the next generation. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as **ORIGINALLY PROMISED** to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country, rather than just another broken federal promise. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how **IMPORTANT** it is to **KEEP OUR TRUST AND RESTORE OUR FAITH IN OUR GOVERNMENT**. Thank you for restoring my faith in your stewardship.

Now is the time to protect our wilderness and the wildlife that depends on it for their existence. If you do not do this during this term of office, it will be lost.

A new ailment has been identified in America's children: nature deficit disorder. A scientific study in Great Britain showed that exposure to nature increases feelings of well-being and raises self-esteem. I would add that it gives life a spiritual dimension that can be lacking in many people's lives. I was lucky to be raised with parents who appreciated the outdoors but I can see that this is by no means easily accessible or sought out by many people anymore. It is essential to the health of our planet and the health of human beings that we live in proximity to nature. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests.

For too long for-profit corporate interests and inconsiderate users have encroached upon our National Parks. This must stop now. And you are in a position to make that happen. The parks should be available for all Americans to enjoy at minimal cost and without air, water and noise pollution, and desecration of the environment including plant and animal habitats. I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors. Please seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments. Corporate farming procedures and encroachments on public lands (factory farms, transection by oil pipelines, genetically engineered crops, timber harvesting, etc) are currently an anathema to environmental protection and controls protecting habitat and the spread of disease must be rigidly enforced.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I want the next generation to enjoy America's great outdoors too. I ALSO WANTS US ALL TO HAVE THE OXYGEN NECESSARY TO STAY ALIVE WITHOUT WEARING OXYGEN MASKS! That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests. FOR MY GRANDCHILDREN -- AND YOURS (SOMEDAY),

You must sign an executive order to stop all slick-water horizontal hydraulic-fracturing in all states where now exists. It poisons are water, our land and our air. People are getting cancers or die of methane explosions. The flow-back water poisons streams, rivers and lakes. Most homes that are sitting on Fracked land have their wells poisoned with methane and you can set your kitchen faucet water on fire with a letter. So just as but a moratorium on deep water oil drilling you should totally stop (BAN) hydrofracting in all state.

Please do more to protect our national parks and our environment in general form pollution and destructive forms of energy and development.

I think the above is of prime importance. States like Ohio, where people have made arable land and destruction of forests and wetland their priority, need to be urge to reorient their priorities

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Many selfish politicians do what is good for them, and many democrates and republicans, like the Kennedy's and others were given everything in their lives, and they didn't have to work for anything in their entire lives. Its past time that American's demand their leaders stand up, and contribute, not just "talk about" what needs to happen, but put the wheels in motion, to make things happen. Imagine what if the \$1T that was spent (lost) on America's big losers, that participated in the failure's in the banking business (Washington Mutual), car companies (GM), insurance companies (AIG) and other "bad, poorly run, failing organizations" in America, where the money was spent, and didn't accomplish anything.....except delay these ultimate failures.....of their bad leaders....and that same money would have been invested in successful enterprises like building America's infrastructure (millions of jobs could have been created), and loaned to already successful car companies (Honda, Nissan), and millions of aitiona jobs would have been created, and sucessful technology companies (and millions of additional jobs would have been created), and construction companies (and millions of additionall jobs wold have been created for dozens ofyears into the future)with the stipulation that 100% of this money must be spent in America....and employing American ! I ask 10 six year olds this question...."If you could give away \$1000, and your goal was to do the most good for America...would you give the money to someone who fails at what they do, and doesn't tell the truth, or would you give this money to someone whom is successful, and always tells the truth. Wow ! All 10 six year olds said "they would give the money to successful people, whom told the truth people ! Even 6 year olds understand the economics of... "the better the person we invest with, the better the return". Maybe Mr. President you should have some "logical six year olds on your cabinet"....and in the Senate...and in the House. The six year olds, and the children in America are America's future. I have take my children, Mr. President, to every Natonal Park in America, as my father did for me. I know, and my children know what makes America great. Its the people, but its also the great land we call America. Have you done this for your children Mr. President ? Sometimes when people are give everything, Mr. President (educations to Harvard, homes from the government, and positions you don't earn) its hard to appreciate what others have to do to "earn these things". If you are given things, like Harvardeducations, you tink everyone should be given the same things.....and you don't consider what it is like, or how hard the others have to work for the same things ! I want the next generation to enjoy America's great National Parks and nationally owned outdoors. That's why I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments, and to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranchlands and forests.

Americans care very much about the animals that are having their home taken away. They do not understand not having food to hunt. We need to be sure that we take care of that problem. You do realize that you cannot make more land! We can make man make lakes and rivers, but we can not make more land. Without land, we have no trees, no protection from the weather, and no animals.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

The parks have been a big part of my life and my children's, and I want to ensure they will be around for my grandchildren. They are a unique and irreplaceable resource. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are good investments in our future. Not only that, research shows that when we become separated from nature, we begin to lose our sensitivity to others, our humanity. This is not a frill but a necessity to protect our culture, our uniquely American way of life. Mrs.

No more oil exploration and no more drilling!

We have altered or destroyed a large percentage of the natural environment on our part of this continent. The outdoors and the wilderness that we say we love are threatened. It is my opinion that spending time outdoors in a natural environment could help or cure many people of depression and other mental instabilities. Protecting our environment also protects our health.

Indeed, these ideas are good. They are much better than stripping these beautiful places of their beauty and their spirit. However, there is an issue which has been ignored for too long. These forests were once the homelands of America's First Peoples. They were stolen from us, resulting in the decline of spiritual life ways which could be beneficial to every person, of every race, color, national origin, etcetera. A judge once ruled that the trees, rivers, lakes, etc., animals, fish, birds, and all beings considered inanimate, have a voice in court, and therefore has a right to be defended by people like me, simple Native man that I am. This point further serves to illustrate the importance of protecting what Great Spirit has made. I do not necessarily speak on behalf of human beings, and their right to enjoy these sacred places. I speak for the eagle, the bear, the wolf, the trees, the plants, the waters - ALL living beings on Mother Earth. And, yes, I speak for the ghosts of my ancestors, their blood and bones buried beneath these sacred stolen lands.

My personal concern comes from the monetary influence from big business. We see many very interested companies and associations contributing money to decisionmakers' campaign funds. I know this is part of American Politics but I ask you to carefully research the Pros and Cons for each issue. The American people voted you into office to hopefully make this a better country. Please make the hard decisions sometimes. Thanks!!

Please do not allow government lands in the Tetons be sold for condos!!!!!!

IF WE DON'T PRESERVE SOME -as much as we can!- OF OUR GREAT U.S. -and planet earth! - IN ITS NATURAL STATE FOR US TO ENJOY THE EARTH'S \*TRUE\* BEAUTY, THERE WILL BE A TIME WHEN OUR CHILDREN WILL NEVER KNOW WHAT THE BEAUTIFUL EARTH LOOKED LIKE! -- PROTECT AS MUCH AS WE CAN! PARKS AND WILDERNESS \*SHOULD\* BE A SPIRITUAL NECESSARY FOR ALL OF US!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our children's futures are at stake, and our entire planet is at stake. It is time to take the promises of the campaign trail and make them a reality. You have a lot of work on your hands, and you are making some progress. Sometimes, things that don't seem so urgent are precisely the things that are of most importance in the big picture. It is easy to ignore the environment, our incredible parks, our amazing children and pay more attention to easy profits, big business, the squeaky wheels of the economy... But what is at stake is our future. With your creative vision I am sure you can find a way to live up to your promise of hope for the future by taking the needs of our wildlife, our national parks, and all the things that make our country great, including our children into consideration when you make decisions about the economy, about war, about what big oil companies who are only interested in profit can and cannot do. We voted you in to take care of our future. Your responsibility is great.

Stop putting out poisons on public lands. This is barbaric and dangerous. BLM needs to be cleaned up and cleaned out. Salazar has done a terrible job.

GET THE LAND-GRABBING PROFITEERS OUT OF POSITIONS OF POWER. Until you do this, nothing else is going to be effective, and you know it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. In my hometown of Lytle Creek, CA in the San Gabriel Mtn. chain we are surrounded by the Angeles National Forest. We work locally with the USFS rangers in many ways. Currently, our students living in the canyon are participating in the Forest Service's "Junior Ranger Program" to gain hands-on knowledge of how our forests work and are managed by rangers to survive within our country's current "protective" status. Also, our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. -- Build on programs that are already working. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. The Park Service's Rivers and Trails Conservation Assistance program has a long history of working with cities, suburbs, and small communities across the country on conservation efforts and providing expertise to help conserve rivers, preserve open space, and develop trails and greenways. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country such as the Conservation Assistance Program and Junior Ranger Program. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. We have lost so much of our country's native treasures due to mismanagement and over development on nearby lands. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system that better represent our changing country, and protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our parks can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within park boundaries. In the Angeles National Forest, our community participates with Park Service personnel and USFS personnel to perform counts of animals native to our area, e.g., eagle counts and Big Horn Sheep counts. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. A sad state of affairs has evolved in our forest due to resident aliens from the valley coming to park along side of the road to recreate in Lytle Creek. Unfortunately, they bring with them ignorance of the proper and appropriate safe and sane uses of our parks. With the staff reduction of Parks Service, our community has stepped in to supplement oversight with, unfortunately limited, numbers of trained volunteers to assist with education, oversight and monitoring of sites where people tend to congregate outside of proscribed, monitored, safe-camping park service sites. On more than one occasion, these volunteers have been beaten and left for dead by alien nationals visiting the park, fires have been started from picnic cook fires set outside parameters for safe campfires in the forest clearly posted and communicated in English and Spanish, and moreover, trees, brush and rocks are regularly vandalized and, with regard to rocks, are removed from the forest by these uneducated peoples. On my way home two weeks ago I stopped three Hispanics who were chopping deadfall for their campsite fire. I asked them, "Please stop; what you are doing is illegal. That tree belongs where it is for a reason. Please do not remove it." The guy who was chopping the tree with a



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

machete replied in limited English, "The tree is dead" and continued to shop away. I replied, "It is not your dead tree. I am reporting your license plate number to the federal authorities." That got an immediate response; they stopped removing the wood to the back of their new Cadillac SUV but did not remove the wood already placed there and left at high speed down Lytle Creek Road, narrowly missing other recreators along side the road. I reported the license plate but have no idea of the result.

We have successfully managed to squander away our nations financial resources for generations to come. Let us NOT do the same to our nations lands, that Americans have fought so hard to preserve. We must not rob our future generations of their just inheritance. This is OUR responsibility. Your administration, MY GOVERNMENT, needs to take the following steps: --Heed the advice of the National Parks Second Century Commission, --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides. The administration should apply the lessons that were learned from the Centennial Initiative to developing a new public-private partnership to prepare our parks for their next century. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Do the right thing and follow through. What's happening in the Gulf of Mexico reminds us how important it is to keep that promise. --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country.

Mr. President, In addition to the following remarks, I would like to add that I am sorely disappointed in your administrations failure to halt the slaughter of wolves. These beings are also a part of the great outdoors and for you to allow the continual eradication of them is shameful. If you care about the outdoors and all that it has to offer, then you must also care for the wildlife that live there.

I also feel very strongly that there are far too many commercial tourism flights in the Grand Canyon. I have hiked the Canyon many times since 1954, and the obtrusive noise of helicopters and winged aircraft is ever increasing. The best part of wilderness hiking is the sounds of nature, not the unending noise of aircraft engines. The trend of increasing flights must be reversed.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I agree with all the statements below, for the most part. I also understand that you have a responsibility to the country to try to get the nations budget under control. If only money grew on trees. Well, in the past it did and we allowed industry to destroy many of our beautiful forests. I have every confidence that your indigence will not allow that to happen. I would appreciate it if you could enact legislation that could prevent other administrations. As for your effort to encourage the children of America to connect with the great outdoors, I truly commend you for seeing the importance of this. I have recently turned 50 and over the past few years have also been trying to reconnect with the outdoors. It is of the utmost importance that today's children embrace the great American outdoors. It is also our responsibility to ensure it is there for them to experience. No better return on investment will be found than educating our children with the importance of the wilderness

Have you ever taken your children to any of these parks? I have been to many of them. And the thought of them not making it gives my stomach knots...It will be ashame that your grandchildren and great grand children wont enjoy every single park.

Thank you for taking your family to Acadia in Maine. I have been there as a child, and spent time at many other national parks as both a child and an adult. I cannot understate the value of national parks for our country and particularly our children. In this day and age, more than ever, we need to preserve these unique spaces and get our children back out to connect with nature.

I want everyone to have access to wildness, a unique resource that provides balm for the soul and ecological benefits.. Unlike most Americans, I am fortunate enough to live across from a National Estuarine Wildlife Refuge where more than 370 species of birds migrate. The open space helps create a quality of life that is extraordinary.

I can't even express what the outdoors meant to me as a child and now as well. I don't believe it is healthty for a person to seldom experience the beauty of our country. Thank you so much for considering my comments.

Please Don't Let Land Delopers And Oil Compaines Destroy Or National Treasures.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a child, there were few places for my siblings, friends, and me to play besides outdoors. We had two acres of fruit and veggies and some of the best times were helping Dad spray the trees and helping Mom harvest and can the veggies and fruits we raised. Driving the tractor to pull the sprayer was how I learned to drive. One didn't monkey around when Dad was walking behind on the other end of the spray hose. If I wanted to go to my girlfriends house, I walked 10 blocks. We often made the round trip several times a day. Often I'd go to her house and help her get her chores done, then we'd come to my house and do mine. When we were really prosperous on a Sunday afternoon, and had a quarter between us, we would stop at the store and buy a cola. If we were really flush and had fifty cents, we got potato chips to go with it. then we wandered to a little creek that ran through a small rural park and chat about all the important things that were of concern to us. We were'nt obese. We were active and went outdoors to keep out of sight, lest we be put to work because we seemed idle! Today there seems to be so much to fear, even in what seems to be "nice neighborhoods". Children aren't let out of the parents control for a minute. The one safe place, as I see it is the wonderful Great Outdoors of the National Parks and National forests. Please, Mr. President, Help us to guide this generation of children toward the stimulation and exercise and the joy of them

Do not allow guns in National parks!

Very selfish, our kids and all descendants are counting on us to make the right decisions to this situation and our planet! WAKE UP PEOPLE!!!!!!

I love the Parks but, since I'm on a fixed income, I can't visit my favorite Park! They used to sell yearly passes up here in Alaska, which only cost a minimal amount but now it's \$14 a day. Is there something that you can do? Maybe discount passes for people like me?

For example the killing of wolves needs to stop now!!

I am 86 years old. I was born and raised in Montana, and luckily my dad (being a contractor) built many of the motels etc.in Glacier Park This gave me the opportunity to spend quite a bit of my grade school summer there. Now when I get to visit Glacier, I am REALLY upset and discouraged by the lack of Glaciers and how so many people really don't see the beauty around them.

IF THESE BEAUTIFUL PLACES ARE NOT PROTECTED, THEN DEVELOPMENT OF ALL KINDS WILL INVADE AND RUIN THEM FOREVER!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of our public lands, including national parks, national forests, national monuments, wildlife sanctuaries and other protected ecosystems such as those under the protection of the Nature Conservancy. These natural lands provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. --Stop the poisoning of wildlife on public lands. Every year, more than 13,000 animals, including coyotes, wolves, bobcats, bears, foxes, and unintended animals such as household pets, are poisoned on our public lands under the Department of Agriculture's Wildlife Services Program. In the name of "predator control" government agents in the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) routinely place toxic poisons in national forests and other public lands. Two of the worst toxins that they use are Compound 1080 and sodium cyanide. Compound 1080, which is placed in collars around the necks of sheep and goats, is a neurotoxin so hazardous that it has been banned in two states and in many other countries around the world. Sodium cyanide is delivered through spring-loaded M-44 devices that poison any animal who tugs at the bait. Target and non-target animals killed by these toxins suffer unnecessarily painful deaths through convulsions, failure of their central nervous systems, cardiac failure and suffocation. --Increase law enforcement on our public lands to protect innocent citizens from illegal marijuana growing operations and other criminal activities. --Do more to use national parks, forests, and monuments to inspire and educate young people. These natural lands are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. And the Department of Education should work with the Park Service to excite kids with hands-on learning experiences. --We need more natural lands for people to enjoy and connect with nature. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system, and protect remaining natural areas before we use them all up. --Provide wildlife corridors to ensure that the wildlife in our natural public lands can find the food it needs and reproduce successfully outside, as well as within protective boundaries. We need cooperative efforts between federal, state and local agencies and private landowners, because wildlife doesn't understand boundaries on a map. Americans value their natural public lands for recreation, education, and relaxation. Please make it a priority to increase funding for the many wonderful areas we already have under federal protection, and for acquiring new areas to accommodate our growing population before these unspoiled areas are developed by the private sector and lost forever.

We just returned from a trip through many of the Southwest National Parks and Monuments. It is a real shame that more Americans travel abroad so much and do not avail themselves of visiting the National Parks here in this country.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is essential if the parks are to continue to support the large predators that are vital components of maintaining a healthy ecosystem. I moved to this country in 1978 from England. I have been so impressed by the national parks as showcasing everything that is best and most admirable about this country. I now live near Mount Rainier National Park--a beautiful place--and while some rebuilding has occurred, it saddens me to see shabby restrooms, worn out facilities and reduced ranger programs. The parks are an incredible resource that can be used for environmental education, fitness, environmental preservation and a celebration of all that is best about this country.

Many say we have lost our connection to the earth which provides us with stress relief, reduction of inflammation and the ability to look at life more objectively and less emotionally. Having access to the great outdoors in our national parks plays a role in the calming of the minds of many and therefore the betterment of our nation and the world.

National parks and National monuments provide some of America's finest outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. It greatly disturbs and saddens me that we could lose these valuable parts of our national heritage due to economic factors and lack of financial support to take care of them and to add more. Americans care about the future of these incredible places, so they will be there for our children and grandchildren to enjoy. Please remember the importance of protecting national parks and the many programs managed by the National Park Service that improve our communities. National parks are National treasures and good investments in our future.

I live in the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of VA at the foothills of Shenandoah National Park and the George Washington National Forest, both of which I want protected and preserved. I have seen one of our local mountains, Massanutten, taken over by a resort corporation and developed to the point that the animal and plant wildlife are consistently being destroyed. I certainly don't want that to happen to Shenandoah National Park, George Washington National Forest, or any of our national parks and forests..

My husband and I spent many, many years traveling in an RV and we always made a point to stay in or explore the National Parks. I cannot even express the feeling of joy and contentment it gave us to be in these national parks provided us, acting as a balm to the soul as well as the health of our bodies. Much taxpayer money was collected for the benefit of the national parks that was used by congress for other purposes; leaving less and less money to be able to care for the parks properly.

Show pictures of our beautiful parks. Exploration of natural gas is destructive to large areas and uses too much water.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live in NYC and eventhough the city parks are spectacular and I appreciate them greatly, nothing compares to heading upstate on the metro north train to Mt Tautus and Little Stony Point State Park. The air is so fresh and crisp, the nature is an unbelievable sight to behold and the various terrains that can change with every footstep make the experience of spending time there very special to me. I wish I more of an opportunity to explore this kind of recreational activity as a kid. I wish that everyone could experience the amazing feeling of being in and around nature.

We need to do more to protect the parks' natural beauty and stop the mining and drilling and four wheelers and airplane flights over, trucks , motor homes etc.destroying the quiet and polluting the air. My family and I have enjoyed the National Parks for years,at least from the Smokies to the Grand Canyon and now our grandchildren are having the privilage of this same enjoyment and appreciation of our nations beauty and cultural history.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I had hoped to come to the recent meeting in Asheville NC to provide my comments, unfortunately I have two small children and my husband was out of town, so I didn't get to come. I would like to take this opportunity to provide my comments and suggestions. Do I think Americans need to get outdoors? You bet I do! On a recent trip to the Blue Ridge Mountains, my husband and I visited two national parks: Grandfather Mountain and Mount Mitchell in NC. It was quite apparent to both of us that not enough park visitors do much more than visit the main visitor center. Few stray farther than that - in fact, only 20% of national park visitors stray 1/4 mile beyond main roads. We witnessed this in our hikes on trails that were gorgeous and wonderful and full of nature and provided us with some GREAT hiking. But we saw probably only 50 or so other people. Yet at the main center and tourist spots, there were easily several hundred. In one way, I was pleased. I can't imagine the masses walking the trails and how it would impact them and scare away the wonderful bit of wildlife we saw. But on the other hand, I couldn't help but think HOW much these people are missing out on what nature can give you! Another good example is Yosemite National Park where 90% hit Yosemite Valley, which is only 5% of the park! I've not been there yet, but I would imagine the other 95% of the park is immensely beautiful and a wonderful landscape only for those seasoned hikers who will stray beyond and find treasure. Another thing that bothered me...Literature for Grandfather Mtn encourage visitors NOT to explore the trails. For example: "In truth, even if you never leave your car, the summit area is a wonderful place to breathe deeply and rendezvous with nature on a whole different level." I suppose this is good for visitors like us who do venture beyond, because it provides solitude for us. But it makes for overcrowded conditions in the main areas of the park. I find it sad though that so many do not venture out, explore, and reap the benefits of truly experiencing nature. But that quote also brings to subject the TRAFFIC. At both parks, and also Chimney Rock, which we've visited several times, parking is at the top at each park! There are simply TOO MANY CARS within the park, too much traffic and hence too much pollution wreaking havoc on the flora and fauna! Acid rain and pollution destruction was very apparent at Mount Mitchell and Grandfather Mountain. I would think the daily traffic coming to the top of the mountain also contributes to destruction of the trees. A suggestion I would have: reduce effects of car emissions by providing parking at outskirts of parks & energy-efficient transit into areas of park. You should also provide hiking trails to to the top and encourage visitors to HIKE. All these suggestions would eliminate traffic, encourage walking and reduce noise & pollution within park boundaries. Our national parks ARE America's Great Outdoors. Our national parks connect people, young and old, to the outdoors, preserving the natural and cultural diversity of our nation, and contributing to the health of our people. They are nature's outdoor classrooms and serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. --Create parking at the outskirts of parks & provide energy-efficient transit into areas of park, including hiking trails, to reduce traffic, pollution and encourage WALKING instead of driving into parks. Encourage or MAKE visitors get out of their car.

When I think of America's Great Outdoors, I think of the fact that you and your administration have done NOTHING to preserve wildland and wildlife.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

WE need to get young people working in the Parks as both volunteers for school credit and as paid employees building trails, and all the other essential things needed, not just run the concession stand. Work needs to be done and young people need jobs that pay and teach them to take responsibility and direction. Just like Vista and the Peace Corps, and PWA, this is a job for people awaiting jobs-often with no idea of what direction their lives will take. It will greatly increase interest in the environment, history, economy, and more.

As an avid traveler, camper and hiker in our national parks, monuments, historic sites and recreation areas, I implore you to increase funding to the National Park Service. We must not only protect those units we now have but need to acquire new potential sites for the National Parks system. I am now in my mid-70s and cannot travel or hike as much as I used to, but these treasures must not be lost or degraded. Our children, grandchildren and future generations deserve better. As a resident of Los Angeles, I hope your administration will seriously consider the establishment of a National Recreation area in our San Gabriel Mountains--an underfunded part of the national forest system. These mountains are heavily used but the visitors experience is limited by lack of access, lack of rangers, undeveloped areas for parking, lack of information about the geological and biological significance of the area. The area is now being surveyed for consideration as a national recreation area. In order to connect wildlife corridors in the region, including the San Gabriel River, Rio Hondo and the Puente-Chino Hills in a NRA is important to allow free access of wildlife from the San Gabriel Mountains down the rivers to the Puente-Chino Hills in to the San Ana Mountains. And if financially possible, allow visitors to stay without current fees for parking. This discourages those with limited income from visiting the area. On a broader scale,

Pursuant to the America's Great Outdoors initiative, --Swt up a program for priority purchase of conservation easements from rural landowners threatened with foreclosure, provided such landowners use the funds for paying down their mortgages. and paying arrearages. --Preserve large areas of public lands and waters to secure the health of our ecosystems, ensure wildlife conservation, maintain public access to parks and open spaces, reduce the impacts of climate change, and protect our cultural heritage. --Strengthen the capacity for federal, regional, state, and local agencies and private landowners to work collaboratively in order to protect not only our national parks but the wildlife, plants, and rivers beyond park borders.

Please do not give Pesticide lobbyists and former or current corporate CEOs or those who work for them the legislative freedom to make decisions which go against life on this planet. Pesticides kill. Do not allow pesticides to be used in State Parks and other public land areas.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am asking you to seize this opportunity to better protect America's public outdoors spaces, including parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments., National parks serve as a basis for conservation, history, and civics education for millions of people each year. --Seize the opportunity that the upcoming Park Service centennial provides to renew our national parks. We need a new national campaign that will involve people in communities throughout the country in protecting our parks for future generations. --Provide permanent, mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Seventeen billion dollars in revenues, primarily from oil and gas leasing, have accumulated during the past several decades in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, unspent for its intended purpose. This money should be spent as originally intended to support parks, seashores, forests, and waterways across the country. --Do more to use national parks to inspire and educate young people. Our national parks are classrooms for discovery and learning for students and teachers. Programs like Teacher to Ranger to Teacher (TRT) allows teachers from low income school districts to spend the summer working as park rangers where they develop and present interpretive programs, staff visitor centers, and develop curriculum-based materials which they bring back to the classroom. This program should be expanded. . --Build on programs that work. The National Park Service has tremendous technical expertise and know-how that can help communities preserve their special places and provide recreational and educational opportunities for people. You already have a great program, but it's under resourced. There's no need to reinvent the wheel. Invest in a model that is working in communities across the country. --We need more parks for people to enjoy. The park system must also evolve to fully represent the history and culture of our diversifying nation. Please evaluate and consider new sites to bring into the system. A recent study commissioned by the National Parks Conservation Association found that every federal dollar invested in national parks generates at least four dollars of economic value to the public. In 2009, as the recession took its toll on Americans' pocketbooks, national park visitation increased on average by nearly 4 percent, demonstrating the value of our national parks to our people in difficult times. National parks are good investments in our future.

From the time I was a small child, growing up, and having a family of my own, who are now grown with families of their own, the national parks have always been places my family has enjoyed and valued. Through the years, our park system has gone through great changes and usually not for the best.

National Parks are truly (one of) America's best idea(s). Unfortunately National Parks are under a variety of threats, from global warming to other kinds of pollution to overuse to an enormous maintenance backlog. the upcoming centennial of the National Park system is an excellent opportunity to focus needed attention on improving our National Parks.

Our open spaces are quickly disappearing thanks to uncontrolled development and the virtually unregulated removal of natural resources (especially logging, coal mining, natural gas "fracking", and oil drilling). It is essential that we maintain green and un manicured outdoor spaces for our health and the health and welfare of the planet and future generations of humans. We are quickly destroying the only home we have!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You have the opportunity to improve our unemployment rate by putting people to work on America's greatest idea (National Parks). I have visited our National Parks for 30 years now, and have personally witnessed their degradation due to insufficient maintenance. The National Parks desperately need workers, and many workers are out of work. It doesn't take a lot of brilliance to realize how to minimize these problems. Fund a program (similar to WPA, CCC) that will restore our National Parks by putting people back to work. I don't want my grandchildren to miss the beauty and mystique that is fading from the parks. Do something, PLEASE.

The Alliance for Responsible Recreation is a coalition of all-volunteer conservation and community groups organized to address the crisis of unmanaged and uncontrolled OHV abuse of our private and public lands in Southern California. We believe that federal land use policy should be based on good science and sustainable management to protect America's Great Outdoors for future generations. The OHV industry is extremely influential in Washington, D.C. as are rider's groups across the nation. We view the unmanaged use of our public lands for OHV recreation as a public subsidy of the industry at the expense of environmental and cultural resources. In surveys, OHV riders have reported that they breach designated routes the majority of the time resulting in widespread damage to soils, plants and animals, and OHV recreation has been identified by the Department of the Interior as one of the major threats to our nation's natural and cultural heritage.

As indicated in the June 2009 Government Accountability Office Report to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands, Committee on Natural Resources in the House of Representatives, OHVs represent a clear and present danger to our public lands. Some of the conclusions of the report indicate that our federal land use management agencies cannot manage or control OHV activities that result in the destruction of lands held in common for generations to come. These conclusions reinforce our observations on the ground that OHV activities are a major threat to our public and private lands and that abuse of these lands continue with impunity.

Federal land use managers report an increase of OHV activities with adverse impacts on natural and cultural resources, conflicts with other federal land users and an increase in accidents including fatalities.

The majority of federal field units indicated they cannot manage existing OHV areas in a sustainable manner.

Field units reported that they are hampered from protection of our public lands from OHV activities due to a lack of resources.

Federal land use agencies lack key elements in strategic planning for responsible and sustainable OHV recreation.

Federal land use managers need to improve communication with the public about legal OHV areas and trails.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Current federal OHV enforcement is inadequate to protect public lands.

Fines for illegal OHV activities are not sufficient to curtail damage.

Research in California indicates that OHVs are making a significant adverse impact on climate and public health due to the production of green house gas emissions and dust.

In many parts of the country, public lands are intertwined with private lands. Unmanaged and uncontrolled OHV activities on public lands result in trespass and destruction of private property and at times violent conflicts with private property owners. Local law enforcement and emergency response agencies are overwhelmed with this added burden and the costs of these impacts become the responsibility of local taxpayers. During holiday weekends, OHV recreationists converge on hundreds of thousands of acres of public lands resulting in wholesale damage to those lands. In addition, the lack of signage and public education exacerbates these problems.

Recently, public attention has been focused on the tragic impacts of an unmanaged OHV race on public lands in California that resulted in the deaths of participants. In our view, these large scale races are inappropriate for public lands, constitute a public safety hazard, represent a federal subsidy of the OHV industry and consume federal law enforcement rangers' time and efforts leaving communities and adjacent public lands unprotected.

These large-scale races result in the destruction of large swaths of federal lands impacting endangered, threatened and sensitive species, hydrologic systems, habitat and vegetation. The "collateral damage" from these races includes private property destruction, increased DUI accidents, and conflict with surrounding communities.

Adding to problems with OHV law enforcement is that these vehicles cannot be easily identified since they do not have visible license plates. In addition, unlike other recreational activities on public lands, federal agencies do not have a permit system to control OHVs.

Protection of American Indian cultural resources including sacred sites, petroglyphs and intaglios from illegal OHV activities.

It is tragic to witness the gains of the last few decades to protect America's great outdoors unraveling before our eyes by irresponsible, unmanaged and uncontrolled OHV activity. In many cases, due to a variety of reasons, the federal government has failed to protect this nation's cultural and natural heritage from the adverse impacts of OHVs. This must change with a renewed effort to control the millions of OHVs on our public lands while we encourage the American public to experience our public lands by engaging in more sustainable and responsible recreation.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would love to see all national parks not destroyed. I would like to take my son to them when he gets older and can appreciate them for their age and beauty. I haven't seen all the national parks but I would like to. I love nature. I would hate to see this whole planet be nothing but one giant city that thinks it can still live without nature. Why would you want to destroy what nature gave us anyway? To make something we can live without? If our forefathers could live without all the high tech stuff we have now then so can we! I love nature, I think it's beautiful, wonderful, relaxing. And isn't nature one of the top "cures" for diseases? If you think you can make a better planet by destroying what was given to us and many before us then think again. Just because it sounds cool and effective doesn't mean it will be. So rethink what you want to do before you destroy and make humans an endangered species.

I implore you to stop the Bristol Bay Pebble Mine from destroying a beautiful wilderness area. I had the pleasure of working at the Wood Tick-Chik State Park in the Bristol Bay area of Alaska and will never forget the incredible beauty of this vast landscape. I would never want that to be lost from this earth. I vividly remember the salmon runs and when I think of the Pebble Mine and the impact it would have on the salmon, I don't know how we will survive if it starts up. Those wild Alaskan Salmon are one of the few fish left with so many health properties that are not loaded with mercury and other harmful chemicals. I pay twice as much for those salmon and will not eat farm-raised salmon due to health concerns. The oil spill has done enough damage to our country's water eco-system for one generation. Please do everything in your power to protect Bristol Bay and the salmon. Stop a few people from profiting from the mining activity and keep the natural wealth for all Americans. Thank you.

Do we really need an excuse to do what's right? People need to slow down the use of fossil fuels. We can not continue to pull on the earth as we do and think that it can go on forever. We need to do all we can NOW to save all of nature, because if the air is completely polluted, the water is contaminated and the balance of nature ceases to exist all by the hands of people abusing it, instead of treasuring it, will anything else really matter? The Bristol Bay is their home not ours to do with it whatever we want. Every corner of this world IS NOT OURS and should be left in its pristine natural environment.

To all concerned with the permitting of Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay: It is with sadness that I hear of yet another attempt to gain profit at the expense of the environment. Is there no end to the unbalanced approach to the use of our natural resources? Is there no end to the lack of respect for our native people and for the wildlife which inhabit the few remaining wild places? Please do not permit this inevitable tragedy. Make greater efforts to insure the protection of such places. This type of activity has no measure of guarantee for the protection of the environment. It only guarantees a disaster in the making.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I write to express my deep concern about the prospect of the Pebble Mine being a destructive force in Pebble Bay. Having travelled recently in Alaska, I had the chance to hear directly the concerns of Native Americans living in villages that would be negatively impacted by this mine. There were concerns that the innocent and collegial social relationships would disappear, especially among the children, as evidenced by the villages already impacted in this way by mining. There were even greater concerns for the wildlife. Salmon will be negatively impacted. I am concerned for these people, for the wildlife, and the environment. I understand that toxins will pollute this pristine watershed. I urge you to stop this mine. I urge you to strictly control and monitor all mining in order to protect the environment and the web of life that depends on it. Substantial fines and legally enforced cease and desist orders cost money, but are necessary tools to protect this precious resource. Please move quickly. Thank you

As Franklin D. Roosevelt once said: "The nation that destroys its soil destroys itself." Nothing more needs to be said!

If there is one thing we are learning about our world, it is that everything is in a finely balanced relationship. The predators that we vilified turned out to be vital to healthy herds of their prey. Bees, while unpleasant in your house, are necessary for agricultural products. This interrelationship exists in everything. Having the effluent from a mine would poison the water in the ground table, and it wouldn't only impact Alaska! The survival of the human race is at stake today. We must cut back, give up, save, if we are to continue living. We can no more let dollars be the primary consideration in our decisions.

Dear Sirs, Please consider the long-term impact of large-scale metallic sulfide mining for short-term gains. In one sense this mine is not needed at all, but if it is to go through it is our duty to make sure it does not have long-term impacts on the area's pristine environment. In Alaska it takes years for the environment to recover from our trespassing. Just look at how much oil still remains from the Exxon Valdez spill 20 years ago. Regards,

Mining does nothing except enrich the mining company. The expense, which not enough people understand, is the destruction of the environment. The US government only receives a nominal amount of money anyway after considering all expenses, so we end up destroying our planet, killing wildlife, including our food supply, and for what? To enrich some company who will then not be in business in 50 years when the environmental problems finally are discovered. Don't do it!!!! Please do all you can to help our dying planet. We don't have another one. Our en

As a taxpayer, I am urging you to support expansion of the federal government's efforts to preserve and protect as much public land as possible. As we search further and farther for more sources of natural resources, we encroach closer and closer to sensitive areas that need protecting in the face of ever-expanding demand for wood, coal, oil, gas, water and mineral resources. Really, only the federal government has the power to keep these demands in check and protect natural areas and the organisms that call them home. We truly need these areas protected, if not for me, for future generations.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have been asked to send this e-mail to encourage you to protect what is left of our planet. We cannot continue to do with it what we will and need to take steps to correct what damage has already been done. Money is being spent by the ton on war, research on outer space, ocean depths, human life, etc. etc. What if we took proper care of all we have been given so that we can live in peace to enjoy life as it could and should be? We cannot continue what we are doing without dire consequences. The risks are not worth it and common sense needs to prevail once and for all. Yours,

As one who truly appreciates the great outdoors, it troubles me a great deal that the beautiful area around Bristol Bay could possibly be ruined for many generations, perhaps for millennia, by development of the Pebble Mine. I have seen other natural, wilderness areas that have been blighted by mining. It is pathetic! Especially when you consider the consequences to the wildlife of the areas affected. Until we learn to mine without such devastating results we should learn to do without the minerals we think are so important. I, for one, would be willing to put up with any hardship that results from not mining. I feel the Federal should be able to veto any project like the Pebble Mine that could have similar consequences.

To President Obama & Administration Officials: Compromising Bristol Bay is not acceptable. Whatever "practical," or "realistic" rational that might prompt you to do so would be a grave error. Earth does not have an infinite capacity to absorb the indignities we impose on her. Clean water, wild life, wild salmon and a healthy sustainable eco system must be passed on to future generations. It is our duty to preserve some of today for tomorrow. If someday there is no "Wild" left, except the sad, disempowered creatures in our zoos, something in us will know and will grieve. It will be a poorer world we leave our children. Please consider well our connections. When we degrade and pollute the earth, we degrade and pollute our bodies too. We have all expected of you that business-as-usual would not be your mantra. Be the advocate for change we all have expected of you. Thank you for your consideration.

I've seen the devastation that mining has brought about in my home state of West Virginia: mountaintops stripped bare, creeks and rivers polluted, fish and wildlife threatened or wiped out, communities flooded, people sickened by toxins....the list goes on and on. Please don't set the Pebble Mine loose on Alaska. Stop it now, I beg you. Thank you for listening.

We are in a fight to preserve the last remnants of the great american west that have not been settled and roaded. This is not once is not a once in a lifetime opportunity its a once in a civilization opportunity to leave our roadless unprotected wilderness alone for all future generations by protecting them now. These areas are so vital to leaving the western landscape intact as near as it was that it should be the top priority for the administrations conservation efforts. I am a hunter and I value these lands, as do the other hunters. Leaving areas roadless is the best way to protect clean water, preserve habitat, and give all Americans a chance to step back in time to what the pioneers felt and saw. Thank you for considering my comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Throughout history the public has had to foot the bill for superfund sites left over by industries unwilling to take care of the earth after plundering it's resources. How can anyone blame people for rallying against these industries looking for future sites. I, for one, ask that this project be suspended indefinitely. Thank you,

I'm a retired commercial fisherman, what you are doing, again and again and again is destroying the small fisherman and the salmon, for a corporation to make big bucks and once again crap on the little guy. Stop this insanity!!!

If this is the moment where a decision can greatly affect the future of our nation's wilderness, wildlife, and water, please let it be one that will be a step in the right direction. So often in the past, decisions were made without any concern for the future of the environment. We now know, environmentally and scientifically, what these decisions did to our nation's outdoor health. We now have the ability to make better decisions, for the present and for the future.

I voted for President Obama. I would vote for him again. I believe he has a solid concept of what we need for the environmental health of this nation. Please let this be a decision in the right direction; one that will keep our biggest state free of more pollution, waste, and irreparable damage from big industry. Sincerely;



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The area under discussion and motivation to change one of the most beautiful areas in our great land are in direct contradiction to each other. To see the earth ripped and destroyed in such a way makes me wonder if we have any qualities left in ourselves, not overpowered by the great wanting to make money. The allowing of this by our past president greatly saddens me as much as other things he left office allowing. What crimes are being committed in this country just because he gave free range and opportunity to people whose main object in this life is to make yet more money - at whatever cost it takes. Although I am over 70 and have seen and experienced many things in this life, my heart is sad and heavy with the thought of all the entries the last president of this land granted secretly during his term of office. I am wondering if the three bodies of the government designed to protect and furnish the people of the United States with possibly the best living can offer equal to anywhere in the world is no longer an effective kind of government, as changed as it has been in the last decade. Now it seems there are people wishing to do nothing but destructive mining and destroying some of the most important species of animals we have in this world. The Pebble Mine would certainly add its deadly pollution materials to the waters of Bristol Bay in such quantities as to finish off the wild salmon who have been coming there for literally thousands of years. In turn, the mammals that eat the toxic salmon would in turn be destroyed and it would go on and on down the food chain, besides harming the waters and their vegetation content. If the human race is going to continue on this earth, it has to have nutritional food free of toxic hazards. We are getting so we wish to overlook these terrible possibilities so we can enjoy the profits from these types of enterprises, but really who wins. Who's grandchildren or great grandchildren will suffer from diseases caused by these toxic chemicals in the waters. What animals will be closer to extinction because they drank and swam in the polluted waters - these are not just harmless thoughts of a liberal person. This is being written by someone who cares a great deal about our marvelous way of life, about our outstandingly beautiful country which must be kept livable for future generations of all beings from the whales to the wolves and include the humans too. I often wonder why human beings think they have the right and own all other animals on this planet. Because we are at present the dominant species - not counting many kinds of insects - we think if we have the money to start a toxic industry which will make more money - all systems are go, except for our human systems, except for all the animal systems, except for all the systems that combine metals and chemicals in non-extreme conditions, and except for all the systems began on this earth before there were any living creatures here. Please please look again at this proposal and see how devastating it would be to allow it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The web page is TOO CLUTTERED - NOT CLEAR AS TO WHAT ONE MAY SAY - or WHERE - - LOOKS LIKE 2 THOUSAND TREE HUGGERS HAVE VOTED 34 THOUSAND TIMES - - REAL REPRESENTATIVE ! Resident Obama and his cronies DO NOT HAVE AN IDIOT'S IDEA ABOUT WHAT IS NEEDED WHERE ! LET EACH STATE DETERMINE ITS NEEDS AND DESIRES FOR ITS OWN PROPERTY !!! NOT LIKE CLINTON STEALING ALL THE UTAH SCHOOLS' FINANCING BY LOCKING UP THE CLEAN BURNING COAL LANDS SO THEY COULDN'T MINE FOR IT OR SELL IT !! WAY TO GO HORNEY BILL !!! Texas has wide open spaces - of desert, mountains, beaches, forests, and WE TEXANS CAN TAKE CARE OF THEM JUST FINE - Thank You! NPS IS SO OVERWHELMED - when Yellow lap dog democrat Chet Edwards tried to get them to take on a local paleontological site - they finally said - after 3 years - THEY COULD HELP "SUPERVISE" IT BUT HAD NO MONEY TO PUT INTO THESITE! AND HERE YOU MONEY GRABBING IDIOTS - ARE ALL TOO HAPPY TO STEAL EVERY SINGLE CENT FROM HARD WORKING AMERICANS - AT LEAST THE ONES WHO CAN FIND JOBS NOT TAKEN BY ILLEGALS !!! SO YOU CAN TAKE OVER MORE LAND - !!!!! WHEN YOU CANNOT TAKE CARE OF WHAT YOU ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR NOW !!!

America's great outdoors are special to us all. We have a great responsibility to protect them for future generations. Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, lagging far behind our neighbors. It is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance. Thank you for considering my comments.

I applaud the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. It is inspiring to see the President make conservation of America's treasured outdoor places a national priority. But if you are so interested in the people enjoying the great outdoors than you need to protect those places. Or is this just a PR opportunity? Walk the walk and stop talking about all the wonderful things we can do and just do it. The American people are tired of talk.

I recently did a river clean up in the Hackensack River in New Jersey. We spent four hours at the clean up site, each of us with a specific task at hand. Some worked along the shore line, others deep in the marshes and a few were out in canoes cleaning up the water itself. At the end of the day, we filled a 40yd truck bed with everything from plastic bottles and styrofoam to such crazy things as toilets and car parts. The lack of concern this country's citizens has for its parks, rivers, and land is a disgrace and needs to be challenged with more heavily fined penalties, educating, and organized clean ups.

People who value gold, a non strategic metal, above wildlife and Earth itself are enemies of humanity. There's no middle ground. Stop the destruction!

To Whom is Listening, Want you to know I have witnessed the exact thing that is being proposed for Bristol Bay. It was heat breaking to see such devastation. Please find it in your heart to reconsider. I can't imagine that doing this feels good. respectfully,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You know all the scientific reasons for not mining at Bristol Bay; you know how it will foul the water and hurt the wildlife so I won't bore you with "the facts." There is another factor not talked about in these discussions - and that is the aesthetic concern. Mining is a dirty business. Companies that mine don't care about the environment or how they leave their mess for the tax payers to clean up. It's an eyesore. We have so few pristine places left in America. Why do you want to spoil yet another one? For a few pennies? When will it end? Why not just dig up the entire Earth and destroy the planet? Will you be happy then? An untouched environment is priceless. If our past President's hadn't stopped the mining in the Grand Canyon - imagine how the most magnificent natural wonder of the world would be spoiled. Now is the time to say "no more." Beautiful places with healthy air and happy animals are far more valuable than anything extracted from the dirt. If you go ahead and foul up Bristol Bay for finite resources - you'll just move onto the next place to ruin. It's never ending. Please, even if you aren't a hiker, artist, poet, musician, scientist, naturalist, tourist or citizen, or animal lover even...aren't you horrified by the wanton destruction? A child would tell you to stop the destruction. Please put the welfare of this beautiful place and it's animals before profit. That's how I see it.

Good morning one and all. As a user of earth's resources, I really wish and pray for my children that you will stop raping our environment. I live green, it can be difficult but it is a must to save earth. I want wild places left for my grand kids to enjoy and appreciate. Please, please leave this area alone. Thank you

I thought we voted in 2008 to change the federal government from one that was operated by and for the big corporations, especially the oil, gas and mining industries. I thought we voted for this change because we want to save ourselves and the planet. The Pebble Mine project at Bristol Bay sounds like a Bush-Cheney idea. We decided those guys were criminals. Can we now change their rape and pillage the Earth policies? Can we stop this project?

Will the rapacious white man not rest until every bay, river, habitat is filled with his excrement? Will greed and lust for power never abate? Leave Bristol Bay alone!

Please stop Pebble Mine!!

I work in the technology field in Silicon Valley and believe that to counterbalance our urban lives we need places of great natural beauty. The site of the pebble mine is one of these. Many decades ago farsighted men and women created our national parks and public lands and while we all embrace the idea of multi-use, this does not mean that anytime something of monetary value is discovered in one of these places that we have to go and destroy everything that surrounds it so a company can profit. Particularly when that profit comes at a cost not only of destroying something of beauty and value to the environment but also threatens an extended ecosystem. The type of mining intended, using metallic sulfide on a large scale, has impacts on recreation and habitat that are not acceptable, and this project should not be allowed. Sincerely

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Sir: The mine would likely pollute the Bristol Bay, leading to a loss of fishing and reducing the chance to live subsistence lifestyles. Public lands in the area's watershed should absolutely be closed to commercial-scale metals mining. Our items of high priority should be recreation and protecting the habitat. The Federal government should exercise severe supervisory authority over the permit issuance process and analysis of the possible impacts on the watershed. The various relations among the tribal governments and the Federal government should be strengthened. Standards for any development in wetland areas should be stricter. This includes applications of the Clean Water Act to mineral mining; these standards should be more stringent. Thank you for your attention.

Bristol Bay and its watershed are extraordinary, largely untouched wilderness in southwest Alaska. The bay is sandwiched between two National Parks and borders a Wilderness Area and a National Wildlife Refuge. The cold, shallow waters here are home to enormous salmon populations -- critical to the survival of whales, seals, brown bears, eagles and other wildlife, and a part of ancient cultural traditions for native peoples. These waters also support one of the world's largest wild salmon fisheries. The economic value of the fishery is incalculable. This wilderness has been closed to commercial mining and drilling for more than three decades! Hard rock mining, such as the proposed Pebble Mine, pollutes water 85 percent of the time. If the waters of Bristol Bay are contaminated by mining the effects could be devastating, transforming the region and affecting the entire food chain. For this reason, public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, traditional subsistence ways of life and recreation resources should be the top priority. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and cultural traditions. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent, and standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We applaud the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. It is inspiring to see the President make conservation of America's treasured outdoor places a national priority. Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development, and climate change. We need presidential leadership now more than ever to protect our wilderness quality lands so that future generations may also enjoy them. We ask the President to please make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President, and we urge that this be done. Expanding America's wilderness preservation system is the best way to protect wildlife, watersheds and recreational opportunities. Again, we want to thank the Obama Administration for taking the initiative to protect America's Great Outdoors. We look forward to seeing the president use this opportunity to establish a new and substantial legacy of wilderness conservation, one that can stand as a visible and enduring accomplishment of his presidency.

The proposed Pebble Mine development in the Bristol Bay, Alaska appears to be a catastrophic disaster if allowed to proceed. Not only will this, if allowed, endanger pristine wildlands and their inhabitants, it will create water pollution that threatens the important salmon resource. We now have a golden opportunity to prevent permanent destruction of valued land and related environmental consequences with appropriate action.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The genie in the bottle of the Pebble Mine proposal is the chemistry and the physics of open pit mining. Once the land is broken and the mine started, no power on earth, no technology, and no litany of corporate promises can halt the destruction of the world-class Bristol Bay ecology. So the question is not “can it be done responsibly?” but rather “is the price of the loss of the Bristol Bay ecosystem worth the economics of the mine?” If there is any doubt of this, see ‘Modern Montana’, from ‘Collapse’, Jared Diamond; also ‘One Round River’, Richard Manning; also the history of the FARO open pit mine in Faro, Yukon Territory, the clean up for which is entirely in the hands of the Canadian public and is expected to run initially in the billions to be followed by a cost of 3 million a year for 500 years. (July 30, 2008, Yukon News “Faro an expensive lesson.. .”) Pebble is a classic in two senses. In the first case it is a classic in the Tragedy- of -the-Commons series of major ecological and societal losses to big development, which includes mountain-top removal and oil sands development. And in the second case it is a classic in the Killing-the-Goose-that-laid-the-Golden-Egg series that includes the loss of salmon-based ecologies all the way from the Sacramento (which had enough salmon to support canneries) to the Yukon River in Alaska which had a run of millions of King Salmon that is now down to a handful of remnant thousands. If the mine is developed, in the end Bristol Bay will be an ecological desert, the minerals and the jobs will be gone, and nothing will be left but a fading memory of unrecoverable bright days, big fish, and healthier times. A word about the nature of the public debate: There is absolutely no accountability built into the system, and no individual and no corporation that is currently making arguments and promises will be in place when the time comes to prove up on the “responsible” and “clean” development promises. They can say anything they want, and ultimately the individuals will be gone and there will be five, ten, or more corporate legal veils between the public interest and the mine ownership when the time comes for accountability. (See FARO mine history; the EXXON Valdez oil spill litigation; the Bhopal chemical industry disaster; the ongoing whitewash in the BP well blowout.) The only protection available to the Bristol Bay commons is the government and the permitting process. Given that corporate behaviors and development pressures have destroyed or massively damaged every single salmon system from the Sacramento to the Yukon, this last reasonably healthy system should have the benefit of a cumulative sense of protection that has not been successful in any other individual case.

I am very concerned about the proposed Pebble Mine project in Bristol Bay. This is a pristine ecosystem, home to wild salmon, rare and beautiful wildlife, and unpolluted (for now) waters. Large-scale metallic sulfide mining will destroy habitat. It is not sustainable. It should not be destroyed forever just for short-term financial gain. Will my children and grandchildren want to visit this wonderful wild place after mining has stripped it of all it once was? Not likely. The government has a responsibility to thoroughly analyze the impact of such an operation and to provide more stringent Clean Water Act standards. The permit process must be reviewed with local and tribal governments in mind, not just big business' interests. Please hear us: our last wild places are priceless. Don't let them be destroyed to line the pockets of mineral developers.

Please cancel this harmful project.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

America's wild places are special to us all and we have a great responsibility to protect them for the wild animals who live there. They were there long, long before humans began to dominate the landscape. We can help keep America special by protecting more Wilderness and quiet recreation opportunities, preserving more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanent protecting remaining old-growth forests. Here in Oregon, we enjoy some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring public lands in the nation. But places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development. Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, lagging far behind our neighbors. For the wildlife that call our public lands homes and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance. Thank you for considering my comments.

Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed, close public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining, strengthen its relationship with tribal governments, and tighten standards for mineral development in wetlands and for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Thank you for your time and consideration.

It is appalling to me that mining pristine Bristol Bay is even under consideration but, I suppose, it should not as we seem to be forever fighting for our few and precious wildlands. Please, PLEASE, stop the Pebble Mine and any other for-profit-only ventures that threaten our natural world. Our entire family voted for Obama but his performance in the area of environmental issues has been disappointing, to say the least. Please restore our faith in this administration and protect Bristol Bay! Thank you for listening,

Hi, I think the pebble mine isn't good for the nature in the Bristol Bay because it's toxic for the animals and for the whole cycle because it's toxic for the fish and so the bears won't have enough to eat. And it destroys the whole nature there. So it has more disadvantages than advantages. I hope that the nature won't be destroyed. Bye

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ladies/Gentlemen I am writing to express my opposition to allowing the Pebble Mine to operate in the Bristol Bay area. Such a mine will create devastating and unalterable destruction to the waters, land and water wildlife, survival of indigenous populations, indeed to the whole ecosystem. Once gone, that cannot be replaced. The Bristol Bay ecosystem is far more precious than any minerals which might be extracted. Each bit of wilderness we destroy impoverishes all of us. The Pebble Mine would provide a monetary profit to a few and the expense of the many, those whose lives would be forever altered for the worse, and those of us who would then have even less of wilderness area for ourselves and our children to share. It is my opinion that this mine should absolutely not be allowed. At least, do a thorough environmental impact investigation and public statement of that examination. This should be done by independent scientific investigators, not those employed by the government or by the Pebble mine people. The group should include several members of the indigenous populations, who best know the region. I believe that such an investigation, properly done, would reveal the vastness of the destruction the mine would create. Altogether, we need greater commitment to wilderness areas, and greater oversight of activities permitted within them, particularly extractive activities. In this specific case, please disallow the Pebble Mine.

Dear AGO -- Please act decisively to block Pebble Mine. Now of all times, it should be clear that our natural resources must be preserved and that we must be extremely cautious in the way we make use of and impact upon those resources. The effect of Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay would truly be disastrous. Please preserve this and other natural resources for the generations that follow us, and please work to make our existing laws more effective and stringent so that other resources may also be preserved. Sincerely

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Since you have proclaimed this September National Wilderness Month, I want to ask you to protect the Bristol Bay Alaskan Wilderness, whose pure waters and untouched ecosystems are threatened by a vast opencast mine, Pebble Mine. Powerful international mining companies like Anglo-American, Mitsubishi and Rio Tinto, who have no stake in the land, its wildlife or its native inhabitants, are seeking permits to extract low grade gold and copper, minerals whose value in no way equals that of the habitats and natural beauty that their project will irrevocably destroy. These pristine wetlands support millions of migratory waterfowl and land birds, as well as rare freshwater harbor seals, bears, wolves and a huge array of other wildlife in the sea and on land, in a delicately balanced ecosystem which has evolved undisturbed over millennia, and notably includes the biggest run of sockeye salmon in the world. Much wildlife depends on these fish for food, and Bristol Bay's commercial fisheries also generate \$300 million in every year - one third of Alaska's fishing revenues, which are based on sustainable practices. Since even minute increases in copper dust above natural levels have been shown to damage the salmon's ability to find its way back to its spawning stream, the inevitable pollution from the mine would have disastrous consequences on salmon stocks and consequently on the livelihood of native populations, both animal and human. You have said that close attention should be paid to the views of indigenous inhabitants when protecting the Wilderness. Bristol Bay Native Corporations have formed an association, "Caretakers of our Land" to oppose mining in the area where they have lived in harmony with nature for centuries. Please make sure their views are heard, and their ancient way of life protected. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tightened by law, every aspect of the permitting process for mining in untouched wilderness should be re-examined, and the cumulative environmental effects over time fully understood and given their due weight. In my view nothing can ever be justified which causes irreversible damage to an untouched wilderness, since these are quite simply irreplaceable, while minerals can be found in many places. It is far better to enjoy their beauty and marvel at their teeming wildlife in ways that respect them, and I applaud your plan to increase the number of national parks - Bristol Bay should become one of them.

I want to know that my leaders in government cherish America's natural spaces as much as I do, and that leaders will go to the mat to preserve our landscape for the next generation and the one after that, too. It is a top priority to preserve what we have already set aside and to expand our shared outdoor spaces including parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, rivers and monuments and to conserve our farms and forests. Please, please take the long view and put preservation before short-term energy, industry or special interest desires.

We still haven't cleaned up mining messes from a century ago. The Gulf Spill hasn't been cleaned up, and it WON'T be-for years and years. We've got a Midwest ecological disaster with the damned carp-an environment changing problem that will NEVER go away, no matter how much money we throw at it. And now we're gonna do the carp bit AGAIN(oh no, they could NEVER escape-until they do) with engineered salmon. And of course-the middle class gets stuck with the freakin' bills for all this. No Pebble Mine, Thank You! And while we're at it-remove non-functioning dams-they're HAZARDS-and ALL the dams blocking fish migration, please. (unless we can put the tailings and poisons in Limbaugh's backyard-or Cheney's and Rove's-- in THIS, case I support the mine wholeheartedly)!! Just A Citizen, (who's NOT making a profit off this)



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to express my opinion to you about the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska. The Pebble Mine threatens the clean waters, wild salmon, and the traditional ways people make a living in Bristol Bay. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. If we allow mining or drilling in every pristine place on this planet, what will we have left? It is our responsibility as stewards of this planet, to take care of it. Do you really think the earth was designed to dig up, poke holes in, and strip it of all its minerals. If we continue to destroy the earth, it may end up destroying mankind. I have lived in Alaska and I have seen the majestic wildlife up close and personal. Don't take that away from our children and grandchildren. They have the right to see the land the way it was supposed to be seen. Beautiful, majestic and wonderful. Please put a stop to the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Thank you.

Aren't we losing enough of this planet to pollution? What kind of inheritance are we leaving for our future generations?

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

The CHALLENGE involved in protecting Bristol Bay is that its unspoiled, valuable wilderness lies adjacent to the proposed site of the controversial Pebble Mine which, according to the NRDC, generates over 9 billion tons of waste generated by hard rock mining. The Natural Resources Defense Council states that a survey over 40 years shows that hard rock mining pollutes nearby water resources 85 percent of the time. This pollution, which is a matter of record, would threaten the Bristol Bay watershed, which is one of the world's most productive wild Chinook salmon fisheries, and is critical to the survival of Alaska's eagles, brown bears (Alaska's grizzlies), and seals, as well as native Alaskan communities. Clearly, our world is now a global community. There is not a doubt in my mind that the pressure involved in providing the energy required to sustain modern life is enormous; however, we dare not jeopardize any further the interdependence of ecosystems that are already hugely impacted by global warming, if only because we ourselves are ultimately just as threatened by global warming as are the currently endangered polar bear, beautiful white beluga whale, the brown pelican, etc. Even if one's house were made of gold, its beauty and protection could easily slide into oblivion should it be overtaken by mudslides like those that toppled trees in Japan. Fortunately, we are not without resources. WHAT WORKS regarding effective strategies for conservation, recreation and reconnecting people to the outdoors is applying the wisdom of four-star environmental protection groups, rendering their experience specific to stated environmental challenges. As regards the Bristol Bay Watershed and the Pebble Mine, I am writing this letter at the behest of the Natural Resources defense Council, "the earth's best defense." However, I'd like to quote the words of \_\_\_\_\_, taken from his visit to the America's Great Outdoors website earlier today, that "Both the Nature Conservancy and the World Wildlife Fund are nonpartisan, well-established organizations with a long history of promoting habitat protection and restoration and using funds efficiently [while] working with the local population to find practical ways of achieving environmental protection and helping the local economy." Let's roundtable with these fine organizations. How can the FEDERAL GOVERNMENT be a more effective partner in helping to achieve conservation, recreation or reconnecting people to the outdoors? President Teddy Roosevelt has been quoted as saying "We are not building this country of ours for a day. It is to last through the ages." In our own day, it has been found in the instance of Bristol Bay, that the Bristol Bay's salmon fishery is a GLOBALLY significant resource and a top conservation priority. I believe this is the CRUX of the matter regarding the Bristol Bay. As Peter Lehner of the NRDC observes, the danger is that the region is now at risk of being permanently transformed if hard rock mining resource extraction commences there, with potentially devastating impacts on the fishery. This is NOT good news, particularly coming at a time when traditionally rich fishing regions have been devastated by the Gulf oil spill, additionally coming at a time when it has been found that deep sea fishing is depleting otherwise stable fish populations. MY HOPE AND REQUEST, like that of many others, is simply that you act now to RETAIN THE EXISTING LEGAL PROTECTIONS FOR THE BRISTOL BAY WATERSHED. Please keep them in place so that the health of the public lands, waters, wildlife in and around Bristol Bay, along with the native cultures and industry they sustain, will remain secure and continue to thrive. Best regards,

Please stop the Pebble Mine project. Protecting long term employment from sustainable ways of living like fishing and ecotourism should be a priority on places like Bristol Bay. Thanks

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm writing with great concern for Bristol Bay, as it is threatened by the prospect of the Pebble Mine. The bay's now beautiful clean waters, teeming with wild salmon and other wildlife, would be destroyed by large-scale metallic sulfide mining. We won't get another chance, or another bay.

I am writing to urge the government to protect Bristol Bay from the threat of Pebble Mine. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's water, wildlife and traditions. There should be no large scale mining on public lands in this watershed, where protecting habitat should be the first priority, followed by maintaining strong relationships between federal and tribal governments. The federal government has a responsibility to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and assess the full impact to the Bristol Bay watershed. The standards for mineral development in wetlands are too weak, and the standards under the Clean Water Act for large-scale metallic sulfide mining need to be tougher as well. The government needs to put more rigor into these oversight processes in order to fulfill its historic responsibility.

Dear decision makers, This is too obvious an environmental disaster to understand how the Obama administration could support it, unless there is some sort of blackmail political trade-offs involved. As a retired Park Ranger I'm naturally opposed.

The great outdoors are such an important part of Wyoming living that the people who live here are willing to accept lower wages to be close to such great public lands, hunting, fishing, hiking, and wildlife viewing. I would ask you, Mr. President, to take a personal interest in protecting the public lands in the Adobe Town potential wilderness from industrial use, and to provide federal funds to purchase or swap checkerboard lands that make up The Haystacks,

Dear Mr, President Although I doubt you will read this or even take into consideration the thoughts of this countries low class public, I still feel obligated to make an attempt at letting you know how I feel about the Bristol Bay Pebble mine. Not only does the mine threaten a beautiful landscape which political officials seem to have no concern over. It is a major pollutant, now lets be honest, all of us (even you) have to deal with the future water problems from pollution and overpopulation and I cannot comprehend any plausible reason for allowing even more pollution to continue. It threatens multiple natural ecosystems and also a large population of salmon. You made multiple environmental promises in you campaign that have thus far been unfulfilled and as much as I hate to do it, environmentally you are another Bush... Protecting these natural habitats needs to be a top priority and if great men in high positions cannot make a stand how do you expect the masses to do it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In response to your invitation for input on protecting our treasured wildlands, I am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed open-pit Pebble mine that threatens Bristol Bay. An accident here would be grievous indeed, jeopardizing a large, valuable ecosystem. Given the environmental disaster that occurred in the Gulf of Mexico this year, in spite of assurances that the deep drilling of oil was safe, it seems to me that the federal government needs to take extra precautions to protect another sensitive habitat before allowing a mine of such huge proportions to be constructed. In addition to providing strong oversight, the federal government needs to strengthen its clean water standards and work more closely with local Alaskans and tribal leaders. This project seems to me to be another tragic environmental disaster waiting to happen.

Hello, Our country is blessed with special places that make living here an honor - Bristol Bay is one of those places. It should be preserved in its natural state, free of mining, road building, and resource extraction. It is essential that we, as Americans, use conservation as a primary tool in protecting our future. It is necessary for our health and well being - it's the reason we live for. Save Bristol Bay for everyone. Make the honorable choice.

Dear Folks: I reside in "nawth" Idaho in a rural area surrounded by low and medium height mountains and forests. I was born in Los Angeles, CA in 1937 and in 1987 CHOSE to move to my present home/ranch. My use of my ATV in and around this area is of critical import. Some winters that use may and can be life saving for folks visiting who may be unfamiliar/unused to rural/remote terrain. Please consider the ENHANCEMENT of off-road use. It is sad to have to beg for reason.

To ye, Overseers of Government Lands, I am writing to urge you to block Pebble Mine's disastrous metallic sulfide mining activities which stand to threaten the pristine waters of Bristol Bay, its wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Indeed, the public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining and protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources for posterity should be the top priority of the federal government. In closing, let me say that I see it as incumbent upon you, as Overseers of Government Lands and the Public Trust, to see that standards for mineral development in wetlands as well as Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining be more stringent. Many thanks for your time. Yours

The Alaska landscape is part of my heart. My Grandparents lived and raised my Mother, Aunt and Uncle at the remote lighthouse known as Tree Point. The rustic beauty that encompasses the southwest end of the misty fjords along the Inside Passage must be preserved along with Bristol Bay. Please don't destroy what Alaska has to offer future generations. Stop the Pebble Mine.

Oil is not a renewal energy. Please do not drill in Bristol Bay for oil. Thank You,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm writing to urge all efforts be made to prevent the hazards posed by permitting Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay. Any threat to the well-being of Bristol Bay's ecosystem must be clearly identified, confronted and eliminated. This defines the purpose of conservation: to preserve & protect our public natural resources from the destructive actions of profiteers. To do any less abdicates the people's authority & trust (through their representative government) over our national heritage causing failure in government's responsibility to ensure the nation's bio-treasures for future generations of Americans. If they want to mine – try Afghanistan – there are plenty of mineral reserves and their economy could use the stimulative effect to defray the cost of incessant war. Faithfully,

Bristol Bay must be saved from the damages of mining! Once the wilderness is gone, it is gone forever! Thank you,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear America's Great Outdoors: The Vermont Traditions Coalition (VTC) is a coalition of over 20 organizations from the forest product, maple syrup, agriculture, sporting, snowmobiling, outdoor guide, and lake association sectors. We have a daily presence in the Vermont Legislature and play a prominent role in all major public lands issues in Vermont due to the depth and breadth of our statewide network and our knowledge of issues involving Vermont's predominantly rural landscape. VTC believes that a healthy economy, healthy communities and a healthy environment are inextricably linked. VTC works with local and state organizations, state agencies and leaders to protect Vermont's rural traditions, identity and ways of life. Below you will find the March 31, 2010 Vermont Traditions Coalition Public Comment on the New England-New York Forest Initiative Concept Paper. This Concept Paper proposed a massive federal and preservationist group land purchase throughout New England and New York. This proposed regional land purchase stood in stark opposition to everything VTC and a huge groundswell of grass roots Vermonters has stood steadfastly against during the Vermont Land Wars of the last 12 years. Rather than reiterate those March 31, 2010 Comments for you in the context of the Great Outdoors Initiative, VTC will simply include them here. VTC strongly suspects that the Great Outdoors Initiative is headed toward the same policy that's advocated by the Concept Paper. VTC therefore asks that you simply extrapolate the comments from the March 31 VTC submission to the Great Outdoors Initiative. If the Great Outdoors Initiative is headed in the direction of restrictions on recreation, timber management, and road access to federal lands or federal lands to be acquired, VTC's opposition and the rationale for it are clear. Based on the experiences of the last 12 years, both in Vermont and nationally, VTC does not trust the federal government as a landowner and strongly opposes land ownership interests being conveyed to private preservationists groups with restriction agendas. The White House Conference on America's Great Outdoors on Friday, April 16, 2010 stated that: "America's outdoors are part of our national identity. They are the farms, ranches and forests that we take great pride in, and the neighborhood parks, trails and fields where we spend memorable time with our families and friends," said Nancy Sutley, Chair of the White House Council on Environmental Quality. "Too many of these places are disappearing. In launching this conversation, we strive to learn about the smart, creative community efforts underway throughout the country to conserve our outdoor spaces, and hear how we can support these efforts." VTC understands the importance of the great outdoors and the need to reconnect the people with nature. More importantly we understand the importance of protecting Vermont's rural identity and traditional land use practices which make Vermont as unique as it is. As more and more lands are being conserved in the name of the public good, the rigid, broad-based federal land restrictions that come with these purchases are taking away our way of life, piece by piece, year by year and in essence disconnecting people from the "great outdoors". These federal land restrictions have worked to displace hunting camps, shut down snowmobile trails, outlaw all motorized use, ban horseback riding and mountain biking, close off road networks, shut down timber harvesting, end fish stocking, and on and on. These federal restrictions and ever changing land plans cater to, in many cases, unnecessarily to only a small user group. VTC believes all forms of recreation are important. Not only to the people who visit, but to those who live there and depend on recreation to fuel the economy. These broad-based restrictions that are filtered down from federal agencies working in conjunction with wealthy, national,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please consider protecting our wetlands, wildlife and habitat strongly in regard to the proposed mine at Bristol Bay. How much more of our pristine land will mining and construction be allowed to destroy?

We must save our pristine wild lands or we are doomed as a functioning society. Our natural areas are important to our survival for the ecological services they provide like clean air, water, soil, and biodiversity. It's where we came from. It (biodiversity) sustains us. Its gives us peace and quiet. It allows us to see the wonderful birds and other wildlife that give us emotional well being. Bristol Bay is just one of many wild places that must be saved. A society is only as strong as its wild places and with an economy based on recycled and reused materials instead of virgin materials that we have to destroy beautiful wild places to get.

Dear Sirs: I am writing to oppose the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Is there no end to the destruction of ecosystems? Please protect this habitat by saying "no" to this destructive project. Protect the public interest. Thank you.

I prefer that my kids have access to healthy salmon rather than myself having access to cheaper cell phones, etc. Given that nearly all other sources of salmon are ranked low on the FDA's fish consumption safety information, Alaska appears to be the last source for unpolluted salmon in the U.S. if not the world. Please do whatever it takes to keep it that way. Thanks,

I don't know how or why this terrible idea was approved in the first place, except that it reflects the former administration's complete disregard for a pristine environment and the wildlife that dwell in it. The effluent flowing from this disasterous mine would poison nearly everything around it, kill wildlife, and render the local environment a wasteland. Is this what our Federal Goverment does now? Permit mining and drilling for the benefit of a very few and to the detriment of nearly everyone else? Not permitting the Pebble Mine to go forward is not environmental extremism, as so many of the visitors to this site like to say, it is an example of environmental responsibility, and the ability to look forward generations from now to preserve a beautiful thriving habitat from complete devastation. Please do not permit this terrible idea to go forward. Dump the Pebble Mine! Thank you.

I forgot to say that in making a decision, please consider this. . . If Theodore Roosevelt were alive today, what would he do? Best regards Subject: Pebble Mine/Bristol Bay You seem to be one who embraces our natural resources and wants to protect them. It's like those who want to take care of Mother Earth seem to have to fight really hard to do so. Big industry, for more than a century, can only see dollar signs in its eyes. It never cares about the garbage it dumps on our beautiful country and planet. Now, another huge, greedy industry wants to again, destroy one of our last (how horrible), nearly perfect natural resources left on this earth, Bristol Bay in Alaska, home to Wild Salmon, Beluga Whales, pristine, yes pristine waters. I have been to this area in Alaska. I cried when I saw it as I had no idea we had place this beautiful and clean left on earth. I hope and pray with all my heart that you will help stop these greedy and selfish company from ever building a single foot of mine. Put up a huge Stop Sign for Pebble Mine, please Mr. President. Best regards,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You seem to be one who embraces our natural resources and wants to protect them. It's like those who want to take care of Mother Earth seem to have to fight really hard to do so. Big industry, for more than a century, can only see dollar signs in its eyes. It never cares about the garbage it dumps on our beautiful country and planet. Now, another huge, greedy industry wants to again, destroy one of our last (how horrible), nearly perfect natural resources left on this earth, Bristol Bay in Alaska, home to Wild Salmon, Beluga Whales, pristine, yes pristine waters. I have been to this area in Alaska. I cried when I saw it as I had no idea we had place this beautiful and clean left on earth. I hope and pray with all my heart that you will help stop these greedy and selfish company from ever building a single foot of mine. Put up a huge Stop Sign for Pebble Mine, please Mr. President. Best regards,



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for the opportunity to submit my comments. The proposed Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened; standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter; and Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. The Bristol Bay watershed is one of the world's most productive wild Chinook salmon fisheries, and is critical to the survival of Alaska's eagles, brown bears (Alaska's grizzlies), and seals, as well as native Alaskan communities. For more than 30 years this vital watershed, which is surrounded by protected areas, has been closed to mineral extraction. However, the Bureau of Land Management, under direction of the Bush administration, proposed a Resource Management Plan that would open up 1.1 million acres of this unspoiled wilderness to hard rock mining, putting subsistence and commercial fishing activities, as well as wildlife, at risk. The Management Plan is particularly problematic because the land is adjacent to the proposed site of the controversial Pebble Mine which, as one of the world's largest gold and copper mines generating over 9 billions tons of waste, would pose a risk to the entire Bristol Bay ecosystem. The State of the Salmon conference concluded that Bristol Bay's salmon fishery was a globally significant resource and top conservation priority. Yet the region is now at risk of being permanently transformed if hard rock mining resource extraction commences here with potentially devastating impacts on the fishery. Please do not reverse three decades of sensible protections in favor of an ill-advised, ill-informed Resource Management Plan from the Bush administration, which failed to set aside enough Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and also failed to designate enough Wild and Scenic Rivers. Therefore I urge you to reconsider the Bush plan that favors short-term mineral development over long-term land management and direct BLM to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that reflects the exceptional value of the lands and waters of Bristol Bay. Working to maintain the current withdrawal of public land from federal appropriation until adequate safeguards are put in place, BLM will fulfill its obligation to this public land. Until a better plan is devised, please act now to retain the existing protections for the Bristol Bay watershed. The health of these public lands and waters, and the wildlife, native cultures and industry they sustain depend on it. Thank you for considering my comments.

I live in Kentucky and Tennessee. In eastern Kentucky mountain top removal has caused disastrous and irretrievable damage to the beautiful mountains and caused hardship to local people who live near the affected mountains. The coal-ash spill near Kingston, Tennessee was horrific, devastating. Think of the images from the EXXON Valdes and the Gulf oil spill. We simply must stop desecrating America's natural heritage. I am furious that my government is considering exposing Alaska's Bristol Bay to this kind of desecration. It should be stopped. Pure and simple, stopped. Now.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear sirs, Please ban the mining of Bristol Bay. This is an amazing beauty to be preserved. Please respect this and think of our grandchildren.

Hello, I am writing to express my concern about Pebble Mine. I understand that this project means big business and although I am not opposed to that per se, it seems to me the environmental risks and burden of this mine is not worth the profits. Please work towards legislation that will stop Pebble Mine.

I am against this mine. I live in Alaska. A few jobs aren't worth the risk to a beautiful and sensitive ecological area, one that I have experienced first hand.

All mechanical modes of transportation (save handicapped vehicles) need to be excluded from National Parks. To be mentally healthy, people need a quiet place to contemplate their lives. This no OHV policy will promote a natural peaceful experience for visitors in national parks rather than encourage opportunities for an aggressive and cacophonous competition for space on the trails that will only serve to annoy all who visit. Visiting National Parks should be like visiting a museum. It should be a quiet place to inspire contemplation of the views and not encourage hedonistic antagonism. Would you want OHV's on your land if you had created a garden on it for all to visit? Can you envision skateboarding through the roses?

Greetings, Please save Bristol Bay. I believe we ought to SHARE the earth with the animals.

I applaud the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. Our natural resources are threatened by exploding population, unguided overdevelopment & climate change. Make wilderness protection a central component of policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate cooperation among federal public land agencies & Congress to identify eligible landscapes for protection as wilderness. The US Forest Service now uses restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness; BLM remains bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President; as an emeritus member of the American Institute of Biological Sciences (AIBS), I ask that this be done.

we are writing to submit our comments on the proposed sulfide mine in Bristol Bay... we support : stopping the development of the Pebble Mine. not endangering the ecology of Bristol Bay by such mining strengthening relationships between federal and tribal governments tighter standards for mineral development in wetland - in Bristol Bay and everywhere else! thank you for receiving our comments

It's unfortunate that a mine is going to be established in Bristol Bay. Have traveled quite a bit to Alaska. I am 100% against it. Thank you for your time-

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Thank you for initiating this dialogue. One of us attended the session on the lawn of Lewis & Clark Community College on August 20, but was one of those for whom there was not time to speak publicly. The other was unable to attend because the session occurred during the work week. So we are submitting our joint comments by email. Challenges Reconnecting to our rivers: Missouri is blessed with many opportunities to connect with the outdoors, but more needs to be done to make those opportunities accessible. We could do more to provide connections with our major river systems. The Columbia Bottoms Conservation Area is a good example of effort to provide access to the great confluence of the MO and MS rivers. But at the same time, that Conservation Area is under threat of a major casino development virtually next door and within the floodplain. More thorough analysis by FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers of all "external" costs of such floodplain developments could help local and state governments to understand the true costs of such developments to taxpayers and society. The MO River from Kansas City to St Louis is highly channelized. That results in a narrow and swift flowing river which limits safe opportunities for visitor enjoyment. Programs such as the Big Muddy Wildlife refuge will provide more varied habitat along the river which will be good for fish and wildlife as well as recreation. More funds and emphasis should be placed on that and similar projects. The topic of reconnecting should also include restoration. We cannot reconnect to what is no longer present. In Missouri many of our grassland, savannah and prairie habitats have been lost. Efforts to restore those habitats on public and private land should be supported. Private Lands: Most of Missouri's grasslands and forests are in private lands. A significant portion of the state is managed for agricultural production. Supporting good conservation practices on private lands is essential for protection of the great outdoors. Initiatives for conservation easements, for example, are a good tool. However, such conservation easements need to be enforced. In Missouri conservation easements have been granted along the Ozark National Scenic Riverway, but not always fully enforced by the National Park Service. Crop Reserve Programs are another way to encourage stewardship on agricultural lands. Our growing population and suburban sprawl constantly put pressure on family farms and forests. We should encourage tax and other policies that enable families to keep their land undeveloped without incurring unnecessary hardship and expense. Public lands: Missouri has many public land ownership levels -- federal, state, county, municipal. All provide levels of access and types of high-quality outdoor experiences. Missouri's outdoors are perhaps best known for our Ozark rivers and streams. We are blessed with the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, which include stretches of the Current and Jacks Fork rivers and is managed by the National Park Service. That linear park is currently undergoing a revision of its management plan. The process has highlighted some glaring management problems which have been a growing concern for years. The NPS has failed to follow the mission of the Scenic and Recreational Riverways designation and has allowed numerous illegal river access points, unauthorized ATV traffic and excessive equestrian use to mar and pollute the rivers. Due to agency analysis and public input, a goal of the management review now is to focus on improving water quality and river habitat and to provide for appropriate, but not destructive, recreation. Carrying through will be a difficult task. The background message to this experience is that proper manage

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm writing to urge you to disallow the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. It is no place for metallic sulfide mining. It threatens habitat, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to such an operation. Instead, this beautiful land should be protected for future generations. Furthermore, standards for mineral development in wetlands should be highly stringent. The Pebble Mine would be disastrous environmentally in this region.

You all are intelligent human beings with an understanding and experience of what mining does to the environment. Without a strong environment -- long term -- what is there. Find your integrity and the courage to act in the best interests of the environment which includes the health and well being of humans, including your relatives now and to come. Just do it in the ways you know are correct (Maybe that's not doing it.) and let the lust for money subside. It's your responsibility. Use it wisely and with great care. With intense sincerity and hope,

"In wildness is the preservation of the world." St. Henry of Walden evolution means the creation is the creator, we must have enough respect to leave as many places alone as we can, wilderness should be increasing, and the human stain decreasing.....

Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and the way of life of the residents of the area. Public lands in that watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining so that the habitat and recreation become priority. The federal government ought to be stepping to see that the permitting analysis and process protects the Bristol Bay watershed. The partnership between the federal and tribal governments needs to be kept strong s to insure high standards for mineral development in wetlands. Restrictons need to be tighter and the Clean Water Act respected.

There are few natural wonders left undestroyed by greed for profit. Please prevent Pebble Mining destruction.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Having read about the Pebble Mine proposal in the Bristol Bay area of Alaska I felt I needed to let you know of my concerns. My background was as a Refuge Manager for 34 years with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in the western states and the last four years of my career I served on the 7.5 million acre Koyukuk-Nowitna Refuge Complex, Galena, AK, on the Yukon River. I oppose this horrible Mine proposal and hope it is never permitted to start. It is the worst mining proposal I have seen in my life, and I'm 70 years old. I cannot believe it is seriously being advanced in such a magnificent wild area of Alaska. I have seen what these mines have done to the environment in Nevada, Oregon, California and Utah where I have worked and lived. Uplands are ruined, streams destroyed, primarily never to be able to be used again, or be productive for fisheries and wildlife, plus the vegetation takes many years to ever come back. The present information given out by the Pebble Mine proponents say they will protect the environment and take care to assure fish and wildlife and their habitats will be protected. What a joke. This has ALWAYS been shown to be false with these mining operations that I've seen and read about. These companies always leave their work areas as ecological wastes, with very minimum cleanup and restoration. If the price of gold had not reached such a high rate, I'm certain this plan would not have been made. What will happen to this whole area once the gold price drops, which it will? Will there just be a big hole left in the ground, with the associated pollution? Who will be responsible for the cleanup, the state of Alaska? This proposed mining and associated support areas involve some of the last wild rivers for sockeye and chinook salmon in North America and the pollution and habitat destruction will ruin required river habitats and spawning areas for these fish species. Many studies of similar mining activities show that 85 percent of them pollute nearby waters. These total areas will be destroyed for grizzly bear, killer whales, beluga whales and other associated wildlife use if this mine is built. The entire ecosystem will be ruined for short term economic gains for a few individuals through the hard rock mining operations if the Mine is allowed. After the mining is completed, the companies will just walk away from the area and leave it in ecological ruin as has occurred time and time again by the mining industry, particularly in the western U.S. Records show this is the truth. With the continual ruin of salmon populations up and down the Pacific Coast and in the Bering Sea areas this river degradation would be one more man made destructive project of another magnificent salmon ecosystem. Just look at what is happening to the salmon populations that utilize the Yukon River. Man's destructive activities are slowly eliminating the salmon. The Native Americans cannot set out their nets on the Yukon River, which these subsistence living people need and have done for thousands of years, because of the destructive activities of the commercial fishing activities on the salmon populations. This Mining proposal will have similar effects on the subsistence life-style of the Native American villagers, local fishing industry plus the sport fishery this great area provides for the Bristol Bay area. Based on current and past scientific information, which identifies the destruction of natural resources by hard rock mining, and associated chemical pollution this proposed Mining operation should not be allowed to continue in the Bristol Bay Area. This area needs to be left in its natural condition.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

dear sirs. i have fished in the bristol bay area since 1983, making a total of 16 trips to two different fishing lodges in the region. without question, the bristol bay area is one of the most beautiful places in the united states, but it is also home to the the world's most spectacular rainbow trout, bear, bald eagles, foxes, wolves, and caribou--all living in a delicately intertwined interdependence. any damage to anyone of those species would have a chain reaction that would effect the viability of the others. the potential for environmental destruction by the proposed pebble mine is frightening. to those who say the mine is safe, let me remind the that i have been hearing that for years about offshore drilling in the gulf (i live in louisiana). witness what we have just endured with the BP spill. we can not as a nation take a chance of destroying something so valuable and so beautiful by allowing this mine in such a sensitive ecological area. i implore you to stop this madness. thank you,

To those with a deep love for the Natural Beauty of our Blessed country in preserving that beauty for our children and future generations to come, please look deep into your hearts and minds and do all you can do to STOP the mining in Bristol Bay. President Obama has coined September National Parks month, so let's honor that intention just like our forefather Teddy Roosevelt, who was a supporter of America the Beautiful!!!! Pebble Mine threatens clean water, wildlife, salmon and pristine environments. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative IMPACTS to the Bristol Bay. So, please let's ponder the repercussions and the ripple effect of what this continued mining can do and remember our children, they deserve to see America the Beautiful like we and our forefathers have witnessed it. God Bless America land that I LOVE, stand beside Her and guide Her. Thank you for your time and Consideration

To Whom it may concern. I am writing to express my opinion that I believe the Pebble Mine is an avoidable disaster. In now way should we even consider the option for this project which has the potential to compromise, reduce, or even eliminate the most productive salmon fishery in the world. Thanks for your time,

Sir or Ms, Pebble Mine will almost undoubtedly degrade Bristol Bay, its waters, flora and fauna. Bristol Bay belongs to all of us. These are public lands. As stewards of the public trust, you must not allow this to happen. Thank you, in advance, for your defense of these public lands.  
Respectfully

Mining is so destructive to our environment. Bristol Bay is home to wild salmon, traditional subsistence ways of life, has amazing, beautiful clean water and should stay this way. Opening the area to large-scale metallic sulfide mining would destroy it. It would impact the habitat in a way in which could have lasting damage. This area needs to be left as it is and standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter  
Regards

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir, I am writing this morning and wish to mention that I don't have a great deal of time to put into my thoughts and I hope you will realize that what follows comes from my heart. I know that through organizations I participate in (NRDC and National Wildlife Federation, to name two) I have probably sent you comments about the Bristol Bay (Alaska) Pebble Mine issue. What comes to my mind this morning follows. First, I live in a state (AZ) where so much of our focus is on immigration (a terribly important issue, by the way) and on the sad ways our state political leaders are choosing to deal with such issues, which includes paring down our government to bare bones, etc. Because of this, it is not easy to see any citizens here caring about our environment and I want to let you know that there are some -- my husband and myself, for sure. Second, just this morning I read an article about how grocery stores are moving in a direction to protect seafood availability. It is so important that we care about the food we have available to buy and eat -- how to stay as healthy as possible. Both of the above make me feel that I just must write and ask that you consider the following: 1. Bristol Bay represents a place where we must protect both the wilderness there and also the relationship with the native people in the area. 2. We desperately need better regulation of the permitting procedures for the mining industry. 3. There must be strong analysis of the effects of mining -- analysis that can only be stronger if it involves the federal government. Alaska is for all Americans, not just political leadership in that state. 4. Wetlands are precious -- and we all see that we have not developed good standards for mining effects there. Thank you for taking time to consider my thoughts on this issue. My husband and I have never visited Alaska, but we still have a real love for that place -- as we do for so many wilderness lands in the world!

Please block Pebble Mine: it threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters and wildlife and subsistence ways of life.

Dear Sir: Please do your part by stopping Pebble Mine in order to save Bristol Bay's clean waters, the wild salmon which are almost gone, wildlife and the environment. Please. Thank you,

Dear Mr. Salazar: Bristol Bay is under attack. At least that is how we, who appreciate the great outdoors and love to eat wild caught fish from Alaska interpret the mining industry's proposed incursion upon this watershed. Policies exist in Alaska to protect the waters and streams there from overfishing. I already have lived this year without U.S. wild caught shrimp from the Gulf of Mexico. That because of improper oversight over the oil industry in those waters. Now it looks as if our wild caught salmon is also in danger of pollution from nearby large scale mining operations. Please ensure that the fishing industry is not compromised so that the Earth can be mined. Frankly, I fail to see a way to protect these waters should mining commence. The Lord has given us dominion over the land. With that control comes responsibility to care for and protect fast disappearing wildlife, wetlands, and Native American ways of life. Have you looked into the sky lately? This season when I looked into the skies, I saw very small groups of birds in V formation. Where have all the birds gone? They have gone to farming, road, home, and infrastructure building. I pray that you require stringent standards for water quality should mining commence and that the Native American community in the Bristol Bay area become participants in the decision making process in a proactive way.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sirs, Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining and instead the priority should be on protecting the local habitat, subsistence and recreation resources of that area. The Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining and the standards for mineral development in wetlands should be required to be more stringent. By allowing the federal government to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed, a more adequate protection would be ensured. Furthermore, it's important to strengthen the relationship between the federal and tribal governments to create a better understanding between both parties. By allowing mineral development, Pebble Mine ultimately threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life. Lastly, I oppose any decisions that will cause environmental degradation in Bristol Bay by allowing the drilling of minerals at Pebble Mine. Thank you for your time with this matter

Dear Ladies & Gentleman: Here in the United States, we have a long history of preserving special places in which Americans can recreate. Sadly, fewer and fewer of these places exist today either in whole or part because we have allowed greed and mis-management to take priority over enjoyment of our national parks, wilderness areas, national forests, etc. You should not allow the Pebble Mine to move forward because there is no viable way to proceed without destroying the surrounding lands. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble Mine, showed that 85% of them polluted nearby waters. Bristol Bay is one of the LAST places you should consider such an open-pit mine as it would ruin the habitat for the people who currently live off the land as well as the wild salmon and wildlife who call this place home. The priority should be to protect this habitat and make its recreation resources a priority. A single accident would be disastrous and as we have seen with the Exxon mobile spill a few years ago and now BP in the gulf, these large corporations can not guarantee that similar catastrophes will not occur. This is MY public land. I do not want it to be used in this manner. I'm a taxpayer and the fact that mining claims/rights are given for a mere pittance, like candy, to greedy corporations is a disgrace. Our elected officials and government need to first change the mining laws so that these corporations like Mitsubishi, Rio Tinto and Anglo pay heavily into the American coffers for mining rights. And why, might I ask, are we letting foreign corporations pollute our waters and land an air on our nickel and in our back yards? It doesn't make sense. I'd like to see much more stringent oversight and legislation applied to any and all types of mining wherever they may take place. I want to see the Clean Water Act standards for all mining strengthened and the permitting process be comprehensive and scientifically based. As to Bristol Bay, the answer is NO. It simply does not make sense. It would disrupt the entire ecosystem in a most egregious manner.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am a lifelong resident of Maine and I oppose the proposed development of the land in the north Maine woods by Plum Creek. This company has proven itself ( in this and other states) to have the barest minimum of regard for the environmental impact its activities have upon the land it is a steward of. The people of Maine were not consulted when Plum Creek was allowed to purchase the land, and now many people are not allowed to have any say in the way the land will be used. The LURC commission paid lip service to opponents by having public discussions, while Plum Creek officials kept their cars running by the doorways with police escorts. Obviously the land cannot remain unused, but the 900 house lots will permanently change the character of the north woods, making it just another development. Money should not always be the bottom line. There would be jobs available for locals with the creation of a national park, but I believe the environmental damage would be minimal compared to the Plum Creek plan. Thank you

To those concerned: When it comes to our environment and now the Pebble Mine proposed in Bristle Bay I would feel there shouldn't be any such thought to impose that area with more of the same. Any or all of our Public Land area does not need blatant disregard for moral responsibility and regulatory lunacy for what has been going on these past eight or ten years what with oil spills and all. We show no regard for this Blue Planet and will probably end up with another moon to live on.

Bad idea - please protect the last remaining Beluga whales!

I love nature and wildlife as very many caring people do. Please stop the Pebble Mine from going forward as it would be devastating to the local environment as well as the area's wildlife. We have a moral obligation to protect both. Please do so. Thank you.

President Obama: Please take the time to remind yourselves of the rare beauty priceless resources of the Bristol Bay area. The most important of these is water, clean clear potable water. It not only supports the wildlife and flora, but in the long run will be ever more important to have areas where we can have clean water, a fast diminishing resource. The true cost of loss of these resources as a result of mining is never paid to the American Public. And in the end we always end up paying to clean up the mess after. It seems a losing proposition to keep giving away something irreplaceable for such short term gains that profit the few. Please, do not allow this mine to go through.

I am heartsick at the possibility of development of large-scale metallic sulfide mining upstream from Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. These lands are treasures. Once they are despoiled they are lost forever and there is no going back. My plea is that the federal government will provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. We need high standards for mineral development in wetlands and Clean Water Act standards to protect waterways from large-scale metallic sulfide mining.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To Whom I have a Concern, My son has fished in Bristol bay for a number of years as a drift netter and I am very concerned about the watershed in this area due to the proposed Pebble mine. As the world's foremost area for returning wild salmon, Pebble or ANY mine in the Bristol Bay area would have a devastating effect not only to the bay, but the river systems, aquifers, biological resources, and communities. We, as a planet, cannot afford the greedy attitude of Alaskans to take money and bite the hand that gave it, as told by an article in the Seattle Times recently. I have heard of two "never fail" tailings levees that have poisoned the rivers, land and peoples lives down stream, the last in Kentucky. Pebble Mine proposes an eight hundred foot tailings levee near a fault line. A lake is below and river systems and Bristol Bay. How many disasters have to happen to stop companies who don't care? Exxon has ruined Prince William Sound with crude oil as has B.P. in the Gulf for how many years? When will this government stop this greed by companies when we have seen their disaster plans don't work! Or in the ones I have cited, don't have them! Please don't let Bristol Bay die.

I am writing again because I'm not sure I had success in sending the last one. My son drift nets in Bristol Bay and that proposed mine would not only ruin his livelihood, it would ruin the largest salmon run in the world. That's a big deal. Think about it. The WORLD. Greed too often wins in this country without thought to the future. That the foreign company that wants to build this mine near a faultline is senseless. The cost of lives in a mine collapse, their proposed tailings wall collapsing into the lake below, the river filled with tailings, the bay filled with toxic outfall for untold centuries is a horrific scenario. Is the money that leaves the state of Alaska worth the pittance the state would receive? Fishing brings in billions of dollars, it 's impact is sustainable, and it has gone on for at least 13 thousand years with minimal impact. Mines can't claim that record. Please don't allow it. Sincerely,

Please stop Pebble Mine. It threatens the clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Our top priority should be protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources. Standards for mineral development in wetlands and Clean Water Act standards Must be more stringent. This is important. Please. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I want to urge you to do all you can to stop approval of the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay Alaska. Bristol Bay is a pristine refuge for endangered salmon and other fisheries, bald eagles, bear and countless other species who live in that ecosystem for all or a portion of the year. I am an avid birdwatcher and I understand the importance of saving intact refuges for wild species, because these wild lands are shrinking profoundly. The number one cause of loss of biodiversity, the storehouse of wealth of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity within species, is habitat loss or habitat degradation and this is especially true of our oceans and coastlines. Mines always generate very toxic waste and our world is littered with toxic sites left behind for the public to foot the enormous bill to clean up the mess, if that is even possible. One example of a species that would be harmed by the mine is the Arctic tern, a species which breeds in Alaska and uses the bay's resources, flying the tremendous distance of 12,000 miles twice a year between high northern and southern latitudes, amazing us with their migratory prowess. This and countless other species call this ecosystem called Bristol Bay their home and a mine may possibly ruin this pristine and important habitat. I urge you to reject this mine and vote for saving wild spaces. Future generations will be profoundly grateful for your foresight and willingness to forgo short term profits reaped by a small group of people for greater environmental good for humans, as well as for the plants and animals found in this ecosystem.

I've known about Bristol Bay for 40 years because my uncle fished for salmon there. I'm delighted to learn that it is still a prime pristine fishery but I am appalled to learn that about the proposed Pebble Mine. I urge you to stop this mine.

I strongly encourage you to protect the Bristol Bay area. I do not believe that mining can be done safely in this area. The native community is very concerned regarding destruction of habitat that supports their livelihood. The planned mining method has shown substantial negative effects on the environment and the effect on wildlife would be devastating. This would no longer be the wilderness that it is supposed to be. I strongly encourage you to prohibit the Pebble Mine from occurring. As a family physician, I am concerned regarding the future of the health of all of us on this planet. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely yours

To whomever it may concern, The proposed Pebble Mine in the Bristol Bay watershed is an idea that should be extinguished. The uniqueness and the diversity of the Bristol Bay region should not be put at risk. Currently Bristol Bay's clean waters harbor wild salmon and other wildlife providing recreational and subsistence resources that are dependent on the current ecosystem conditions. Prior to even considering future mining projects in this and other areas, regulations should be reviewed and tightened to include more stringent Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining and more stringent standards for mineral development in wetlands. Thank you for your consideration,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Dept of the Interior, I understand that the Obama administration has invited input from all Americans regarding how to best protect our nation's cherished wildlands and outdoor spaces. Thank you for this. I would like ask that you work to protect Alaska's Bristol Bay wilderness area from the Pebble Mine project. This area is currently unspoiled, pristine, and important to the health of not only America's wild places, but to that of the earth. The pollution from a metallic sulfide mine would easily destroy the habitat of the salmon in the region, which are a base layer of the ecosystem. Damaging or destroying the central food source of bears, whales, seals and eagles would devastate the ecosystem. Even from a solely human angle, the potential destruction of this habitat would severely harm Native communities that have thrived here for thousands of years. Beyond the pollutive effects, the effects of just building the nearly-half-mile-deep, two-mile-wide mine, with its necessary roads and accoutrements, would be destructive enough to damage the important interconnections of the ecosystem. Please protect the Bristol Bay area -- please keep it wild. Thank you, -

Enough already! stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay. Block this disastrous mine, which would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wild lands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife. Our entire planet is under attack in one form or another. Please leave it alone! Let our planet heal. We're damaging our nests. Thanks for listening and hearing me,

Please do not permit the Pebble Mine to threaten pristine Bristol Bay. The Bristol Bay area is "Alaska's Wildlife Eden". The clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife habitat and traditional subsistence way of life would all be threatened if the Pebble Mine is allowed to be built. Alaska is one of America's wildlife sanctuaries and we have a responsibility to our children and grandchildren to protect its natural beauty and bounty. Please abide by the Clean Water Act and protect the pristine waters of Bristol Bay from metallic sulfide mining. Thank You,

I love the America's Great Outdoors Initiative; please use this exciting new opportunity to protect pristine areas like the redwood forests of the northwest coast and Bristol Bay's clean water and salmon. Our way forward MUST be through renewable materials and energy, so that strip mining, clear-cut logging and other industries that rely on the destruction of our beautiful national heritage can be replaced with alternatives that are sustainable and economically viable as well.

Please stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay. There just isn't a good reason to destroy this natural habitat. Thank you,

Whatever we can do to stop that horrendous pebble mine in Alaska should be done. Why can't people realize that the natural beauty and the salmon have infinitely more value than the metal that could be brought out? One day we will see this point. I only hope it isn't too late on this one.

the gold will do you any good when there is no more clean water to drink, clean air to breath, or safe food to eat.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

The environment is an important part to our everyday lives and fighting to protect and expand it will only better our lives and the lives of our loved ones. There is so much beauty all around us and it would surely cause troubles in the future if it began to shrink. Please help in preserving the wildlife and environment around us. We will need every bit of it!

The risk of the Pebble mine project in Bristol Bay is one we can't afford to take. The ecosystem in the area depends greatly on the salmon run; if the waters are polluted, the salmon population would fall, the predators of the area (including grizzly bears, wolves, and seals) would lose a great deal of their food supply, and when you disrupt one level of the ecosystem, inevitably the entire food chain collapses and struggles to recover. The presence of a single man can disrupt the natural ebb and flow of life in any ecosystem; an entire mining project, especially one so large and devastating as the Pebble Mine, can completely ravage it. Alaskan locals are proud of the wildlife there - they won't stand for such destruction of what they call the true gold of the region. How can we take this risk with the waste proposed to be located so close to an active fault line? One single earthquake is all it would take to send the whole thing tumbling down, in turn releasing over nine billion tons of waste into Bristol Bay. One of reasons the Obama administration was chosen by people such as myself was the promise to defend the natural world. I urge you to follow through on this promise: eliminate the Pebble Mine project from the plans and save Bristol Bay.

Bristol Bay belongs to the AMERICAN PEOPLE, not to oil & gas companies. YOU have no right to lease this land, thereby destroying the bay & killing wild salmon (which we like to eat weekly). Wild salmon feed grizzlies & the orca... kill the bay, kill the salmon & you destroy two of America's greatest APEX PREDATORS. Without apex predators, we are overrun with deer, moose, caribou, rabbits... DO NOT LEASE BRISTOL BAY to oil drillers!

\*\*\*\*\* "Our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter." -- Martin Luther King, Jr.

Dear Sir or Madam: I would hope that you might consider the terrible consequences to Bristol Bay as result of the proposed Pebble Mine. Clean waters, recreation, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life are all threatened. The federal government should analyze the environmental impact in detail before permitting any mineral development in the area. Wetlands across North America should have strict standards for mineral development. Large scale metallic sulfide mining should not be permitted in beautiful land created by God to uplift the soul. No amount of money could ever compensate for its loss. Please consider this.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The Subject line of my e-mail says it all. I copied it from the your website. But I fear that the Pebble Mine will threaten Bristol Bay's reputation as "An Irreplaceable Ecosystem and National Treasure." The mine threatens the bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. The public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed must be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. The DOI should be protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources and not allow private interests to over rule the public interest. The DOI should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and the analysis of the cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. The standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter and the Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be made more stringent. Thank you for your concern for the pristine conditions of Bristol Bay.

Save Bristol Bay—stop the Pebble Mine.

I am not opposed to extractive processes, organized industry, or wise use of natural resources. But the plan for Pebble Mine represents the worst practices of the first two and seriously threatens the integrity of the minesite and its environmental surroundings. It makes no sense to destroy the integrity of our living space and that of species interdependent with us. To do so is to commit species suicide -- a stupid and ultimately fruitless policy. We cannot destroy our future merely for temporary profit. We need instead to develop a truly bounty environmental policy: one that will promote the life-supportive health of our living spaces by preserving its interdependency and using its resources for the future as well as merely for ourselves. We cannot live on the corpses of our children.

Hello, I am writing you to urge you not to allow the proposed Pebble Mine to go forward. The activities of this mine with the resultant toxic slurry would be detrimental to the very important fisheries that abound here. As it stands now, a huge earthen dam would be necessary to contain the sulfuric acid and cyanides that result from such mining operations. Alaska is a seismically active state and this includes the Bristol Bay area. An earthquake would cause the earthen dam to fail releasing all the poisonous liquids into the system. Also, there will always be natural leakage and seepage that will introduce these chemicals. The risks simply are not worth it. It is simply wrong to push this project for a short term gain that only benefits a small handful of people. Bristol Bay is an area rich in bioproductivity. The runs of Sockeye Salmon there are legendary. There is great diversity of wildlife there be it the many species of birds that come here, the bears, other mammals. More importantly, the people who live there depend greatly on the fish for their survival. Pebble mine would take this away from them. This pattern of sacrificing rich ecological areas for short term profit while causing great injury to the local people must stop. Pebble Mine would be another item on this sorry list. As an oceanographer, I have worked in the region and can attest to the richness there and can attest as well to the devastating impacts to the region if this mine were to proceed. Companies can never be trusted to police themselves or spend the money to implement the proper safeguards. We have seen examples of this time and time again. One only need to look at recent events in the Gulf of Mexico. I urge you to not let Pebble Mine proceed. Thank you for considering my comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Secretary Ken Salazar, America's "Great Outdoors" are not vanishing by some spontaneous black hole. They are being actively destroyed by for-profit interests, and their protection requires the Administration to confront and stop these interests. You may start by desisting from further permits for the blasting of the Appalachian Mountains by coal companies, one of the Greatest Outdoors our nation enjoys. You can also stop issuing permits for the filling and destruction of wetlands by developers, and stop issuing timber sales and oil leases in our remaining wilderness landscapes. To make a contribution to America's Great Outdoors, the Obama Administration can simply stop doing harm.

Dear Sirs, I'm writing in support of saving Bristol Bay, while the discussion continues about the proposed Pebble Mine. It seems that there will be many negative effects on the environment by a mine being built---I've seen photos of the wilderness there, and read about the many plant and animal species that stand to be impacted, as well as the water-quality, and the quality of life of the people living there. I hope that more research on impacts will be done, and that the government will be stringently trying to protect the animals, plants, people, and water of the area. Thank you for your time,

Absolutely NO: Wilderness -- NO MORE! It should have been finished in 1974. National Monuments -- NO MORE! Far too much power in the Executive Branch. Landscape wide planning -- Absolutely NONE! This is Environmentalist fanaticism carried to extremes. United Nations Wildlands / Wildlands Project -- NO! NO! The United Nations has no business interfering in our affairs. The Wildlands Project, wherever it comes from is antithetical to all Americans, to the way we do things, and to our rights to travel through and use our country as we choose. It is essentially a Communist way of controlling the land and the people. Very bad. Wildlife corridors -- NO MORE! Very little of this is actually needed and the USFS and BLM and NPS are already doing what is based on real need. This false issue. Toss it out. Grants to Environmentalists -- NONE. ABSOLUTELY NONE! Federal and state grants to Enviros amount to taking people's tax money and using it to whip them and deny them opportunity. National Scenic Trails -- Drop support for these. The development of these trails, eg the CDNST, is prejudiced on behalf of the non-motorized recreationists, as if motorized recreationists had no need of such long distance travel opportunities. The whole NST push is basically a payout to the "outdoors" industry, eg, REI, et al. Fish stocking -- Reduce it. Too much time, effort, and money are spent on behalf of fish abusers, especially abusers of trout. Good things to say YES to: Multiple Use. Much enhanced OHV opportunities, since so many have been taken away. Much more single-track riding opportunities for motorcyclists. Back Country Recreation Motorized. More logging; grazing permits. USFS, BLM, and NPS lands open to use of firearms, as has been the case for decades. NO MORE shooting closures.

Please do not decide for me how to enjoy my world. I would like to continue my OHV experience with the same respect I have always had for the environment. OHV users are more respectful and protective of nature than most, realizing it needs to be preserved for all uses.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I believe the natural resources of our country should be protected from development when the activity hurts wild life and will result in issues like metallic sulfide or other toxic byproducts polluting water sheds. Stop the Pebble Mine development. As we can see from the disaster in Louisiana's Gulf Coast, all the money in the world can't replace the loss of wild-life and natural non-toxic habitats.

I implore you NOT to endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding area wildlife, by stepping up to block the disastrous plan to permit Pebble Mine there. The federal government should take measures to strengthen, make more stringent, the standards contained in the Clean Water Act, which would disallow such large-scale metallic sulfide mining in precious territory like Bristol Bay, and tighten standards for mineral development in all our wetlands. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority of our interior department.

To Those Who Decide, As one who is concerned about the ever-vanishing habitat for species who depend on it for survival, I urge you NOT to enable the Pebble Mine project in Bristol Bay. The disruption and pollution of the environment caused by a mining operation in this still-pristine area would be unconscionable. What you would gain in profit from allowing the operation of this mine is paltry when compared to the loss of relatively undisturbed, clean habitat needed for survival by species that we all value, mostly because we know that their numbers are steadily declining. As Hemingway once said in a short story, "Once they take it away, you can never get it back." And that applies to the few pristine habitats remaining in our world, along with the valued wildlife species that depend on these places for their very survival. Look what BP's greed for oil has done to the once-viable marshes and other wildlife refuges and other coastal habitats along Louisiana, Mississippi, and parts of Florida! My hope is that you will choose not to live with the guilt of knowing that you have followed BP's greedy path to the desecration of yet another remaining segment of our now-painfully-rare undisturbed wild places. Surely, no amount of profit or wealth can compensate for the feeling that would ensue from that.

Bristol Bay is beyond beautiful and serene. It is home to species with whom we share this planet. Our assigned task is to act responsibly on behalf of all species. Mining in this precarious and vulnerable area will result in degrading and poisoning Bristol Bay habitat. If allowed, this will degrade our own existence and debase the value of the adjacent Public Lands. Intelligent and insightful leaders will recognize the true value and act to protect and preserve Bristol Bay and the surrounding area. Where will you stand? If you care, you will review this situation and act responsibly. Respectfully submitted,

In regards to Bristol Bay and any of OUR treasured natural open spaces, please consider the huge value of its pure BEAUTY. There are plenty of scientific reports which can make an argument either way of whether to exploit or not. May you consider the worthiness of protecting the few remaining places of wildness and beauty for that alone and not attach dollar values to everything we can extract from it.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a lover of Alaska from afar ( we have been there four time and hope to visit again) I have been dismayed at the prospect of the Pebble Mine project ruining the pristine Bristol Bay. I strongly urge your reevaluation of this project using the strictest environmental standards and your closing of all public lands to large scale mining. Thanks you for your consideration/

Hello, I am writing about the proposed Pebble Mine. Because Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life, I ask you to close Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. An important aspect of the Pebble Mine proposal should be that the federal government provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. If standards for mineral development in wetlands need to be tightened, they should be. The same goes for Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Make them more stringent if needed to protect Bristol Bay. Thank you.

This is no time for compromise or for cutting corners either to bolster corporate coffers or cater to political influence. We are smack up against an environmental catastrophe and preserving havens such as Bristol Bay is of utmost importance for our continued survival on a planet that has nurtured and sustained us; that is until we decided we could play Russian roulette with our living legacy. You can actually do something to ward off an ecological disaster. Please do what is right for me and mine, you and yours.

Hello, Please do not allow any mining at all in Bristol Bay. This area is rich in marine life and mining will ruin it!! Thank you,

Please do all possible to protect Bristol Bay from the Pebble Mine. Thank you.

To whom I hope it concerns: I fear that our priorities are seriously off-kilter when we consider allowing the possible destruction of a wilderness area on public lands like Bristol Bay to be sacrificed for the sake of profit. Consider the impact of a project like this on Bristol Bay: "A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building). As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line." What short-term gains could possibly warrant the likely permanent loss of a resource like this?

my understanding is that the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay is unwarranted and ill-conceived. please consider closing the Bristol Bay watershed to all large-scale sulfide mining. preservation of habitat should be the prime concern, not short-term financial environment. thank you for your attention to these critical choices,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please don't allow big mining to ruin this wonderful area. Our waters should be protected against big monied interests. We need to protect our environment against these things to preserve what is left for generations to come. The affect of this mine on the area would be devastating to the indigenious animals and peoples of the area. Do what is right for us - the people - and the environment.

The Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument is unique and beautiful. Please do not let the BLM destroy these valuable areas.

The outdoors are about more than our personal enjoyment--they're about our survival. Outdoor spaces need to be conserved even--actually, especially--if they are being underutilized, because "utilizing" the world is the root of many of our current resource and health problems. I urge leaders in Washington to expand and protect outdoor spaces including parks, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, rivers and monuments, with special reference to ecological, rather than traditionally human-based, needs.

Please stop the Pebble Mine.

If you care about air and water quality, please stop the Pebble Mine from proceeding. I realize politically it is difficult with this insane rhetoric, but strong leaders always advance. You can be that leader. Many thanks,

Greed, two foreign mining companies and few already rich American backers get richer. \$270 millions of the Alaskan economy will be gone. Depleted will be the sockeye salmon along with the Chinook, Coho, and Pink Salmon. Trout, Pike Char you name it, gone. Now for the wild life, bears, wolves moose and eagles to name a few, gone. It takes a strong leader to make tough decisions, this decision is easy however, Stop the Pebble Mine.

Dear sir I am discouraged to hear of another attempt to despoil such a beautiful place as Bristol Bay. The Pebble Mine should never be allowed to proceed. It is home to wildlife and native people and its waters will be polluted despite what the corporate chiefs say. Think the Gulf and BP. The clean water and wildlife is more important and valuable than any greedy company's profits. I do hope that the right decision to preserve and protect Bristol Bay is made and that a poorly thought out decision based on the profit motive to destroy and pollute such a natural jewel is seen for the heinous crime against nature that it is.

Please do not go ahead with this project. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, their wild salmon, their incredible wildlife and the very way of life for many of the traditional people there. Instead of destroying this land, it should be protected for generations to come! I am so disheartened by this potentially devastating decision and I implore you to leave the miner's interests by the wayside and protect this special place. Thanks,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear administration officials, I am writing to you concerning the proposed Pebble Mine near Bristol Bay in Alaska. Being a native of California where our state's economy faces many challenges, I sympathize with the people of Alaska not to build the mine. Construction of the mine will contribute to the destruction of the beautiful forests many tourists come to see. In addition, pollution leaking from the mine could leak into the bay and harm the salmon population the fisheries depend on. Being that my own state is facing an economic crisis, I would hate to see the people of Alaska suffer the same fate. Instead I would like to see federal regulations put into place that protects Bristol Bay much like our national parks here in California. Now that we are recovering from the effects of the BP spill, I think everyone can agree that we would hate to see another local economy destroyed. This is why I am urging that the federal government work with the local people, and tribes people, to find an effective way to defend to beautiful land for everyone.

When are we going to stop gouging out the earth, to destroy precious habitat and an irreplaceable environment. There's a lot of talk about not penalizing future generations (e.g the growing deficit). Well it's time we took action to halt the environmental deficit - a deficit condition that can never be fixed, once the destruction has taken place.

Dear Sirs, No fancy words needed. We humans are guests on this planet Earth, and we have yet to treat it as it deserves. It's not all about us! We are leaving behind a nasty, nasty footprint that future generations will be left to deal with. Please don't allow our species to have access to all of our planet, especially not a place as pristine as Bristol Bay. We've yet to learn some things are best left untouched. Thank you,

Bristol Bay is very unique as are all pristine areas. We have destroyed so much flora and fauna in the past, let's start now to preserve what is left. It is time to stop mining and drilling and start using green energy. I can remember when I was a child seeing deer and antelope grazing in the fields along the side of the road in Texas. It was such a memorable experience. My children never saw that. Let's save the wilderness areas so our grandchildren and greatgrandchildren can enjoy them. Please save Bristol Bay. I've lived many years in Texas and Arizona. Both states have lots of wind and sun, as I'm sure do other states. Sure, it costs money to build windmills and solar panels but it also costs money to drill and mine. We are depleting resources and destroying the environment by drilling and mining. Using windmills and/or solar panels doesn't take anything away from the environment. The sun keep shining, the wind keeps blowing. Please save Bristol Bay and all other pristine areas.

Pristine areas like Bristol Bay must be cherished and saved. Too many places of such great value have been spoiled and contaminated by corporate activity with profits the only concern and no consideration for safety and preservation of natural habitats. Just look at the Gulf of Mexico! Don't let these special places be developed and contaminated.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing to ask that you stop the disasterous Pebble Mine that is up for approval. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean water, wild salmon, wildlife and the traditional subsistence ways of life. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreational resources should be your top priority for public lands, which should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. After the disaster we've seen in the Gulf, it should make even clearer that standards for mineral development in wetlands should be even more stringent. Thank you,

do you hear a voice crying in the wilderness...it's a composite voice. it's telling you that if you allow this it will be devastated forever. when do we as a socieity say we have taken enough? - that now we should make sacrifices so that sacred things are protected and cherished. I am very much ashamed of what future generations will say of our greed, insensitivity, and ignorance. a smart person said "the idea of wilderness needs no defense...it only needs defenders". I am asking you to join us and choose the right course for this irreplaceable gem.

Please stop this proposed pebble mine. The area and its inhabitants does not need to be sacrificed for the enrichment of a few people. Please stop this madness before it begins. Recreation, subsistence fishing and the protection of the waters of Bristol Bay should be given priority.

I am an investor. I have many gold mining investments in many companies around the world. I have been aware of the Pebble Mine project as an investment for many years. When I first learned of the project, I did research regarding its potential resources and its potential environmental impact. I realized at that time that however rich its resources, the price of its potential environmental impact was too high to justify development. The proposed mine is located in a pristine environment that is prone to seismic activity. The proposed environmental impact mitigation and safeguards do not seem nearly strong enough to genuinely protect this delicate habitat and watershed from devastation in the event that there is even the slightest deviation from the expected mitigation conditions. The safeguards need to have far more stringent standards and a far greater safety margin for errors and contingencies before this mine would make sense from either an environmental or investment point of view. We have seen from BP's fiasco in the Gulf the extreme risks of inadequate planning and implementation of envrionmental safeguards for mineral extraction. It may someday be possible to extract Bristol Bay's minerals safely, but the current plan fails to address these issues sufficiently to warrant approval at this time. I urge you to reject the proposed mine until such time as the standards for mineral development truly reflect the needs and conditions of the local environment. Thank you very much,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir or Madam, Please stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay, one of the most pristine areas on this earth. The Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. In my opinion, public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. Further, the federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter. And, Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. Thank you

I am writing to you as a protest to the very thought of mining in the delicate environment of Bristol Bay. My daughter lives in Alaska with her family and her whole community is opposed to the Pebble Mine. Gold mining is a dirty poisonous business and should not be allowed in Bristol bay where the far more valuable salmon make their spawning runs. Do we really need more gold at the expense of nature and priceless animals etc.? We have spoiled so much of our planet. Please, it is time to nurture nature instead of exploiting it.

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT OBAMA AND ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS This is our country. It does not belong to corporate interests which will pay for leasing rights, tear up the environment, vow to reclaim the land, report that it is restored and walk away, heading for the next pristine environment which may hold profits. We have seen the Exxon Valdez disaster, the 2009 TVA coal ash containment pond disaster, the 2010 West Virginia mining explosion which killed many miners, mountain top removal mining scars throughout West Virginia with heavily polluted streams, an estimated \$6 billion clean up of nuclear waste in South Carolina, and most recently the BP Gulf Oil disaster. Space limitations allow mention of only these few examples. In 2009, the EPA had to agree to buy out the people of the town of Treece, Kansas, because the whole town is contaminated due to mining for lead, zinc and iron ore which occurred up to the 1970's. This followed the buy out of Picher, Oklahoma, just across the road from Treece, for the same reasons. These are all instances of man-made disasters. For the most part, these disasters occurred in plain sight. Some occurred due to outright error, some because lax regulations allowed profit-seekers to implement the cheapest methods of extraction, containment, disposal of waste and safety oversight, regardless of the dangers to human health or the environment. Please reconsider any approvals for foreign or national interests to mine the pristine environment of Bristol Bay in Alaska. How will the U.S. government control abuses to the environment -- the land and water, the air and the animal population -- not to mention the human populations. What if there were an earthquake in this fragile area which released contaminated sediments into the wetlands and coastal waters? How will this area ever be fully reclaimed after the intrusion of so many new roads, equipment and infrastructure to sustain such a huge project? You could look to the north in Alberta, Canada, at the environmental disaster created by mining for oil at the Athabasca Tar Sands Pits. Or fly over our own State of West Virginia.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing today urging the President to make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. Our natural resources are severely threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development and climate change. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President. Thanks for your consideration of my comments.

Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Pebble Mine is a bad idea. Thank you for your consideration.

For many decades, the good of the earth on which we live (our only place to live), has taken a back seat to every interest in taking and largely squandering it's limited resources. The interests I mean are businesses. un for profits. Profits are in the front seat, driving, always. The US government is just as guilty as our businesses for the overuse of every respource, the polution that rings the entire planet, inseas and in air and the devastation of so many thousands of square miles, that no one has ever bothered to count them, literally. Stop it now. God sees us and what we do. I used to be ashamed of things I'd done or allowed. Now I don't do them and don't allow them if I can help it. You should make such a change. Everyone in any position to stop the degraadation of the planet should make such a change. It's all we have to live on. It's all our grandchildren will have to live on, but they'll be fighting wars over clean water, thanks to us. We already have wars over oil and natural gas, diamonds, land and other minerals and resources. Water wars will come shortly. You can make a difference on this planet. Start now, before it's too late. God bless,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Ladies and Gentlemen: I've been reading about a wondrous place called Bristol Bay. I haven't been there but I sure would like to visit. I've also been reading that some foreign mining companies want to exploit this amazing place for short-term profit. I hope you won't let them destroy Bristol Bay and its watershed -- as their mining surely would -- before I, and my children and grandchildren, get a chance to visit. In fact, I hope you won't let them destroy it at all, because I hear lots of magnificent animals (probably including some humans) would be destroyed in the process. If you let the profiteers have their way, they will wreak destruction on Bristol Bay and all of its present inhabitants. The waters and lands will be irremediably fouled. Untold salmon, sea lions, bears, whales and eagles will be poisoned or starved, or both. The lives of people there will be forever changed -- for the worse. The job of the U.S. Government is to protect its people and their ways of life (the Declaration of Independence says as much). It is not the job of the U.S. Government to maximize the short-term profit of private Japanese and European conglomerates (regardless of their campaign contributions). When the Bush/Cheney/Rove crowd left the White House, I believed, and hoped, the U.S. Government would resume doing its job. So far, I've been disappointed. \* You must not allow our lands and waters to be befouled, even a little bit, with mining chemicals (and I think the Clean Water Act and other laws require that). \* You must protect the natural habitat and subsistence and recreation resources of the Bristol Bay watershed. \* You must assess the cumulative environmental effects of this mining proposal based on on-going, thorough, thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of all independent scientific information, and you must rigorously control every aspect of the permitting process accordingly. \* You must develop and improve the U.S. Government's relationships with the peoples who live there. \* You must create and impose mining standards that prevent the sort of desecration that Anglo American, Rio Tinto and Mitsubishi threaten. (You know those companies don't care about the land or the waters or the people or the wildlife; they care only about their profits.) If you don't get this right, the people of the United States will pay an unimaginable price, far in excess of the petty profits of the foreign mining companies. Sincerely yours,

I believe we have damaged our environment beyond repair. And we continue with business as usual despite the growing accumulation of evidence that our air, soil and waters are massively polluted - most likely beyond repair. The Pebble Mine is an enormous mistake, as our current practices are vastly inadequate to insure proper disposal of waste generated. Money would be better spent on education to hold the current human population in check, as there are too many people worldwide. We can not continue to live at the expense of all other living things. I feel we should stop letting big business call the shots. I am an American, and proud of it, but - with every passing year, I despair of anything actually being accomplished to save ourselves, which can only be done by protecting All living things. We have done enough harm to the very things we need to live well.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our planet is in such grievous trouble right now that many of the people I talk to are losing hope of saving our natural resources. But I cannot believe that money-driven greed can be allowed when the last and beautiful landscapes of the North are in such danger. A project such as the Pebble Mine is such a travesty and to expect the public to swallow the soothing phrases of "No Danger", "There will be no pollution," etc. etc. is to think that we are ALL totally gullible. Just look at the disaster in the Gulf and lives and creatures destroyed! For all our sakes as well as yours, please put a stop to any further discussions about the Pebble Mine!

I am writing to urge consideration of the following points regarding Bristol Bay: Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. I believe the Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent.

Hi, Please stop the disastrous pebble mine, for a chance to a future with hope for all .

Dear Director Abbey, I am writing this letter to ask you to make a different choice. Since the beginning of the industrial age we have allowed the decimation of our planet and resources. We are feeling and seeing the effects this destruction and exploitation has on human lives, in the forms of numerous cancers. Almost everyone has lost someone they love to some form of cancer. The destruction of watersheds and deforestation has led to recognizable shifts in the world's weather patterns. This affects everyone, including big businesses. Natural disasters in the last 20 years have cost governments and businesses hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars. So you have a choice to allow this mine and in doing so please know that you are personally responsible for the loss of all of these species, loss of a way of life and income for countless people, and a contributor to the destruction of this magnificent planet that abundantly supplies you with the air you breath, the water you drink, and the sunshine that grows your food and warms you. You could also have the courage and the vision to make a different choice. To choose life, beauty, and wholeness for yourself and the entire planet that will be affected by this massive project. You can say no to the Pebble Mine. But before you make your decision I ask you one favor. Go and sit in this magnificent wilderness. Witness the living creatures, the water, meet the people living there. Sit and breathe the air and feel the sun on your face. And then decide if you can sleep at night knowing that you were responsible for it's destruction. I wish you all the support in making your decision. I truly hope the Earth and the other living creatures that do not have a voice are honored in this choice. Thank you, - "So for all that we struggle and for all we pretend, you know it don't come down to nothing except Love in the end". David Gray



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Administration Official, I am amazed that the Pebble Mine is still on track for being developed. It poses a dramatic threat to a rare and fragile area that belongs to all Americans - for the benefit of very, very few. Chemical waste in this area - when standards are already too loose - would devastate the place. You have a responsibility to the rest of us, to protect the unique and beautiful Bristol Bay. I urge you to act responsibly.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN, AND IT SHOULD CONCERN US ALL, FUTURE GENERATIONS OF OUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN ARE DEPENDING ON US TO PRESERVE AND PROTECT OUR ENVIRONMENT, INCLUDING OF COURSE OUR WATER. PLEASE SAVE BRISTOL BAY. PREVENT PEBBLE MINE. WE COUNT ON YOU

Hello, I've been following the Pebble Mine issue for some time. It makes no sense to endanger one of the last pristine Salmon and wildlife habitats left on earth for the short term gain of 2 foreign owned company's to destroy something as valuable as the Bristol Bay watershed. No amount of money could ever replace what would be lost by this ill conceived project. Please take this issue under serious consideration and put a halt to it. Thanks You,

A huge problem to be caused by the Bristol Bay Pebble mine is endangering the spawning grounds of wild salmon. This a major spawning ground and an accident at the mine, the process of creating the mine and then mining it would cause the pollution to eliminate this fishery. Thank you

Especially with climate change upon us and likely intensifying immensely over the next 100 years, we need presidential leadership now more than ever to protect our wilderness quality lands so that they will be available as crops fail and there are massive population movements to escape devastating changes in regional ecosystems in the South and Southwest. Having places and pathways will be critically important not only for humans whose livelihoods fail, but also for the migration and protection of animal and plant populations in places they can fit ecologically. I'm asking the President to please make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worst: The Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President, and I urge that this be done.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We must cease putting our rare and beautiful wilderness areas and seas in jeopardy because we are too greedy and lazy to invest in alternative energies and resources. Soon, we will not have any more of these places to enjoy and marvel at because we have destroyed every beautiful place that we have tried to preserve. Soon, we will have destroyed ourselves with our selfish, greedy ways and the human population and all other beautiful creatures God has given to us to protect and cherish will be gone from this planet. The short sightedness of these kinds of decisions is far reaching and even if it doesn't happen in our lifetime, it is nonetheless a tragedy and a crime against God. I trust you will have the foresight to see the lack of wisdom in this venture and vote to stop the mining at once

As one who cares about wildlife and the environment, I am writing to encourage you to not let the Pebble Mine project go forward. It is my understanding that if Pebble Mine is built, Bristol Bay's clean waters will be threatened, as will its' wild salmon. The wildlife in the area will undoubtedly experience habitat destruction. There should be no place for large-scale metallic sulfide mining on public lands, or in a watershed area. For all these reasons, I hope the federal government will provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process, as well as stringent analysis of the cumulative effects to the watershed. It is also my hope that this project will be denied. Thank you for your consideration.

Bristol Bay is a pristine area with clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. It is a wonderful place to enjoy and to want to leave for our children. It is not a place that could be re-created. The Bristol Bay watershed should be off limits to mining and development. Unless we protect areas like this now, they will be gone forever and our lives and those of our children and grandchildren will be less rich because of it.

I request that the permitting for the Pebble Mine be denied. Because Alaska is so far removed from the familiar for most Americans, we don't hear or see much about projects like Pebble Mine. But when one considers what is at risk downstream--in Bristol Bay--we have to speak out in order to avoid disastrous consequences. Bristol Bay is the 'breadbasket' of fisheries that provide a remarkable abundance of the very best seafood. The health of the Bay is essential to the continuing stream of seafood from Alaska to our dinner tables, to the continuation of one of the world's best fisheries and the thousands of jobs it supports. FOREVER is the word we must remember when discussing the health of Bristol Bay. One need only look southward down the Pacific Coast to see what can be lost: for example, California, where salmon are now virtually extinct despite the incredible abundance that was found there a mere 100 years ago. There is no way that adding vast mining waste and runoff to the tributaries of Bristol Bay can do anything but harm the Bay fishery. There is no way that the inevitable toxic mineral runoff from the proposed mining can do anything but harm the health of the marine ecosystem. Please make the intelligent choice for all generations to follow us, and reject this mine.

Plain and simple...ANYTHING that may result in the forever destruction of our natural land and seas should be avoided at all cost. There is NO excuse. Our planet will eventually die, but until that time it should remain with enough places that give one pause and sigh as only nature, unspoiled can bring. Please halt any potential mining at Pebble Mine. Protect forever Bristol Bay

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I haven't personally visited Bristol Bay, but from photographs I have seen the beauty and majesty of the lakes, rivers, and mountains, and all the wildlife. Besides being breathtakingly beautiful, this area supports the world's largest sockeye run and Alaska's largest Chinook run, which provide food for bears and seals in the region, as well as an economically potent commercial fishing industry. I hope this pristine wilderness survives the upcoming threat posed by Mitsubishi, Rio Tinto, and Anglo American, who seek to open more than one million acres of public land to mining. This proposed open-pit mine would be two miles wide and 2,000 feet deep, exposing the surrounding lands and wildlife to potentially dangerous and deadly conditions. This mine, once constructed, would generate more than NINE BILLION tons of waste! A study of similar mines showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. Whatever these companies hope to mine out of the ground cannot be worth more than the clean water, precious landscapes, unspoiled wilderness, and healthy ecosystem of the Bristol Bay area. Please, do what you can to promote awareness of this potentially devastating mine and prevent it from happening!

I am writing to ask you to stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay. My country has been blessed with vast and beautiful natural resources. We, as Americans, have spent decades slowly eroding these resources. We have polluted our air and water, we create urban sprawl, we destroy vast amounts of wilderness through logging, mining, drilling, and forest fires. Our political landscape is overwhelmed by corporate lobbying in contrast to plain old common sense. It is time for all of us to protect our blessings and look for modern-day energy solutions, not the same old destructive ideas of the 1900's. Please stop Pebble Mine. Thank you for your consideration. Very truly yours,

IT IS ONLY SADLY SURPRISING TO NEED TO EXPLAIN WHY SAVING BRISTOL BAY IS NECESSARY.

Citizens are very aware of the impact of draught years and that they are inevitable and that they will get worse as the decades go by. There is not enough water or power or water sewage treatments or roads available to accommodate for more people and more buildings. We need to take a stand that over-population is ruining our social and wildlife resources. It makes us braced to claim the dismal water and power resources for our own. The reality is that if we take care of open spaces, our wilderness areas, and protect farmland we have a chance to keep our communities and this State alive and sustainable. Local governments are misguided to encourage more building in order to get more money for their coffers. It is an act of desperation but the ethical considerations are being ignored. Saying 'no' to more homes and buildings would help create an ethical decision to take care of what we have and stop over-crowding, more traffic jams, more water scarcity. We must stop local politicians from bringing in more people to balance their budgets. They did not rebuild the infrastructure and plan for the inevitable draught years when the budgets were in the red, they just increased their own salaries. Now must come a time of correcting this mistake and returning to sanity. More over-population will not solve our problems. Please put the long-term view first and give our children a land that we leave for them that is sustainable, that promotes agriculture, and that protects as much open space and sanctuaries for wildlife as possible. These decisions are difficult but they are ethical. thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

*(cont.)*

I am very distressed to think of harm coming to Bristol Bay. We are given this gem, this gift from God and we would carelessly trash it for dollars. How sad and what a disappointment we humans are.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To: President Obama, On the Preservation of America's Natural Wonders "If you ignore beauty, you will soon find yourself without it...But if you invest in beauty, it will remain with you all the days of your life." ~Frank Lloyd Wright I LOVE Beauty – beauty in all its intricate and splendid forms – be it, a spectacular sunset descending into the pink hue sky, a school of dolphins charming us with their spins and flips, a tiny hummingbird hovering before our very eyes, a beaver building a dam, horses running in freedom and ecstasy through a meadow of lilies and daffodils, a rugged mountain challenging us to climb, or simply a quiet walk through a dense forest – the list is endless. As you have admired works of art in the finest of museums, I invite you to imagine this magnificent planet as a canvas upon which a higher power has created and manifested the most stunning, staggering and breathtaking beauty of all. One need only be conscious of this remarkable beauty – the rugged mountains, pristine lakes, roaring seas, remarkable wildlife and rich forests – to understand the magnitude and critical level of importance in its preservation. "In all things of nature there is something marvelous."~Aristotle The great outdoors is "Free" medicine for the mind, body and soul. · The great outdoors "connects the spirit to nature" – it nourishes and feeds the soul with its intoxicating beauty. The oxygen we inhale in the great outdoors has reviving qualities, is healthy and pure, and keeps our spirits youthful. · The great outdoors clears the mind of everyday stresses, while giving us the ability to view life in its true perspective. · The great outdoors strengthens and tones the physical body, helping to keep disease at bay. · The great outdoors brings families closer together as they rally in joy at the prospect of hiking together, with pets in tow, on a glorious Saturday afternoon. · The great outdoors offers the outdoor participant the rare opportunity to be an observer of our precious wildlife in their natural habitat and hopefully instilling a newfound understanding and appreciation. · The great outdoors may even save a marriage or two as the couple reconnects through laughter or admiring the beauty of nature as it unfolds before them. · The great outdoors may help to instill values and respect in children, and get them off the computers every now and then. "Our task must be to free ourselves...by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature and its beauty."~Albert Einstein Now, it is up to us, to live up to the task as responsible stewards of the earth to protect our natural treasures, our natural heritage, and magnificent wildlife. Our public lands are continually challenged and stressed with increasing development and pollution pressures, and climate change posing the gravest risk of all. It is time to take bold and urgent action to protect our land, water and history for generations to come. As scientist estimate that 20-30% of species could become extinct by 2050 as a result of climate change, it is time to take the critical steps needed to protect habitat and help species in peril by making this a top priority. Dedicating long-term funding for natural resources adaptation strategies is one important step the Administration can take and the development of a national adaptation strategy that clearly delineates how natural resource agencies should practice climate-smart conservation. Seize the opportunity for a stronger and more united America by creating, expanding and better protecting America's shared outdoor spaces – protect wildlife habitat, clean up our rivers, expand our parks, conserve working farms and forests, create more trails and places for kids and adults alike to simply enjoy the great outdoors in this great country. As well as our wildlife, our prec

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

please dont ruin what natural beauty we have left, think of another way

I work for one of the government's largest land management agencies, but we are rapidly losing our ability to protect what's inside designated protected areas, due to losing habitat and connectivity outside of our boundaries. Increasing protection in these neighboring lands in these boundary areas, and/or in tact ecosystems will provide additional areas for wildlife and flora to continue to flourish. We can not allow our protected areas to become islands. When the research has already been accomplished, and we can articulate why an area is important, we need a support system to acquire or protect these lands.

It is vital that we all work together to protect and save the many important and beautiful ecosystems that we are so lucky to have here in the USA. They are important in so many ways, and it's pretty darn impossible to restore a natural landscape once it is degraded. Yes, development will continue as it must, but let's do it in a sensible way and not let greed and wrong intention guide us.

Dear America's Great Outdoors Initiative: The Administration needs to seriously take on the issue of protecting our "nation's lifelines" -- our rivers -- for this and future generations. In many communities, like my own, the publicly accessible portions of rivers are linear parks, open to all regardless of age, ability or income. Our local river, the Mokelumne, is used by hikers, swimmers, birders, wildflower watchers, young people courting, families picnicking, anglers, rock climbers, artists, parents teaching their kids about nature, cyclists and more. It provides a place of inspiration, re-creation, enjoyment and solace for our local public. And in this, it is not alone. One cannot know America without knowing rivers. One cannot understand our history, our literature or our culture without knowing what a river is. Yet our river, like so many others in the U.S., is threatened by yet another unneeded and poorly planned dam. The Administration needs to embrace the goals of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to balance the development of rivers with the protection of others for this and future generations. Supporting the grassroots effort to designate California's Mokelumne a National Wild and Scenic River would be an excellent place to start. See [www.savethemoke.com](http://www.savethemoke.com) Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Bristol Bay is a wetland home for bears, wolves, seals and whales, all drawn by salmon runs which support valuable commercial fisheries and indigenous people. Yet our American public lands and our rich heritage of wildlife, sustainable fishing and native peoples are about to be sold out to foreign mining companies, including Mitsubishi, Rio Tinto and Anglo American. After watching British Petroleum trash our Gulf, why are we so eager to let another batch of foreign multinationals trash sustainable fishing, pristine coastlines and public lands in Alaska? I grew up in Arizona, where the evidence left by hundred year old hard rock mining abounds. It was hard to take a hike in the woods around my home without stumbling across abandoned mine shafts. In some areas, slag heaps from old gold and copper mines covered acres of land, and were still leaching poisons into the watershed. In Jerome, where my cousins had a ranch, smelters spread pollution to such an extent, that the mine was forced to buy out local ranchers, because sustainable grazing land was now toxic. My cousins literally loaded their home onto trucks, and left the land their family had homesteaded more than a hundred years earlier, forced out by the cumulative impacts of mining. Miners came and extracted gold, silver and copper. After the mines closed, the damage remained. More than 100 years after the Arizona gold rush, the native people I knew, many of whose relatives had worked in the mines, still looked at gold with dread. They said it made non-Indians crazy. According to the Constitution, native tribes are sovereign people under the jurisdiction of the US government. Tribes which are stakeholders in Bristol Bay should be included in the oversight process for any possible mining permits, with full rights to raise questions and have their concerns addressed. According to NRDC, "a study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building). As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans are not willing to take. The true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife." The hundred year old mine tailings I grew up around were in desert country, where pollutants were relatively stable. Pebble Mine is proposed for a wetland. Mining in a wetland makes pollution instantly waterbourne. Why let foreign multinationals trash more American coastlines, wildlife habitat and sustainable industries? Congress needs to tighten all mining standards, and particularly Clean Water standards for sulfide mining. Yours,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The greed of the big foreign mining companies should be stopped. Pebble Mine is planned for and located at the headwaters of Bristol Bay, Alaska. All the rivers and streams in the area are salmon runs. They provide one-third of the world's wild salmon. It would take only 2% of copper tailings in the water to prevent the salmon from laying fertile eggs. More, and the salmon become contaminated. Picture a small child eating the toxic salmon. The toxicity effects the brain. By the time she is in the 6th grade she would not be able to read. She would not be able to do the math. Is this what the Federal Government wants? The big mining companies say they will not spill, the big oil companies have said the same, but they have daily or weekly spills. Luckily not all are like BP's Gulf spill, but they are toxic spills nevertheless. How can the big mining companies not spill? The area is in the Tundra. Water will continually go into the hole, become toxic and have to be pumped out again in order for them to work in there. Pumped out to where?? These greedy guys need to think again. The Alaskans living in the area are fisherman. They provide the Wild caught Alaskan Salmon to us. They can lose their livelihood! That one third of the world's wild salmon can be wiped out, or at least contaminated enough that the bears and eagles and humans who feed on them can become sick, is so strong a possibility you folks need to say NO to the pebble mine. It could wipe out a whole ecosystem. Have you looked into their past diggings in Africa? In Ireland? In Nevada? Take a look and talk to the people who have had to put up with the results. Please put a stop to Pebble Mine in Alaska. It's greed. Nothing else.

Dear Sir or Madam: Please stop the Pebble Mine from happening in Bristol Bay. This mine would bring terrible pollutants into this area that would destroy wildlife in a beautiful area that should be protected. Don't sacrifice this beauty of nature for the profit of a few. We need to protect these resources for our children's children. Don't be influenced by the needs of corporate greed. Thanks for your help.

I speak for my grandchildren...please protect the pristine parts of our world so that future generations can enjoy and be proud of our efforts to keep the earth from exploitation and despoiling for quick and easy profit. There will be no going back once we have destroyed the natural balance of nature. And regrets at that time will accomplish too little too late.

Please stop the Pebble Mine to save Bristol Bay. The public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to metallic sulfide mining. The government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting processes. There should be stricter standards for lage -scale metallic sulfide mining to protect water and wildlife. The two things human cannot live without are water and oxygen. Please protect the water of Bristol Bay and all those animals, plants and humans who live there.

I grew up in Alaska and have been able to enjoy it's wild beauty throughout my life. The proposed Pebble Mine is a horrible threat to the pristine wilderness of Alaska, especially the Bristol Bay area. Please don't let this catastrophic change take place--we don't want a "Gulf Oil Spill" in Alaska. Thank you



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a future Meteorologist, I would like to see a big change in air pollution and climate change. There should be laws made so that is mandatory. Keeping this planet healthy should be top priority. Our oceans and wildlife should be protected. Factories and other big companies should not be allowed to dispose of waste into the air. Nor should they run off waste into our oceans. It is killing our ocean and wildlife population and its harming our air; causing climate change. If we continue the way we are, future generations will not be able to fix what we have done. They also won't experience the beauty of Earth like past generations have. It is time to start now. AND MAKE IT MANDATORY. Everyone must help.

Dear Department of the Interior/relevant Obama administration official(s), I'm writing to voice my strong opposition to permitting Pebble Mine to go forward in Alaska. I am sure that proponents of this proposed mine will attempt to play down or dismiss the torrent of opposition to it as an ephemeral reaction to the BP disaster in the Gulf of Mexico. I assure you that, for me and everyone I know who feels similarly, that couldn't be farther from the truth. The idea that the clean water and extraordinary wildlife of Bristol Bay, and the indigenous people who depend on that wildlife to live, could be decimated for large-scale metallic sulfide mining of low-grade mineral deposits on public lands, made me physically sick even before we learned what can happen when exploitation of resources at any human or environmental cost is the prevailing ethos (or absence thereof). I, and millions like me, are horrified and angry that such a venal act can even be under review by this Administration. We veered between rage and resignation at the systematic dismemberment of hard-won environmental regulations in place prior to the Bush administration, thinking we just had to hold on until this President took office. Now, we ask you to live up to our expectations that you will do a cost-benefit analysis of this situation that is moral, adult, farsighted. Is the nation's need for hard-won, deep-dug copper and gold so dire that it justifies pollution, disfigurement and possible destruction of extraordinarily beautiful wildlife habitat? Are these low-grade minerals worth the havoc wreaked on the indigenous people who have made their living from this land for 11,000 years? Will this be so much as a blip on the national economy's radar? And even if the economic gain were significant, at what point do we draw the line on the devastation of fast-disappearing, near-pristine wilderness? Please -- however jejune it may sound to you -- please think of our children. Ask them whether they'd rather have a gold bracelet or another circuit board, and maybe a .000001% improvement in the GDP, or know that the salmon, the grizzlies and seals that depend on them, the whales who need so much clean water to survive and reproduce, will still be there in large and healthy numbers when your kids' own children arrive on this planet. Be wise. Thank you for your thoughtful attention.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As one who has visited the great wilderness of Alaska many times and the Bristol Bay area, I implore you to reconsider the Pebble Mine development or at the very least, provide strong oversight into this mining. I think all citizens of the US would agree, that Alaska is the last of this country's great wildernesses and any threat to this wilderness is a great concern to me. We cannot afford for the habitat to be endangered in this area. This area needs to be preserved for the citizens today and for the generations to come. Even though precautions may be taken, things go wrong and the effects are devastating. A single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. Thank you for your time,

African American youths are deprived of outdoor physical activity. Waterparks and recreational centers in Saint Louis inner city and St. Louis north county parks have will benefit all. Usage of waterparks will bring the community together, it will introduce young and old the vital skill of laughter and fun, survival and physical fitness. Please help us....Swimming programs is a vital and necessary skill. Upgrade the small recreational centers and programs. Eliminate charges to low income to participate in a swim program. Make mandatory in the schools as a curriculum.

Dear America's Great Outdoors, As a naturalized US citizen, I ask you humbly to carefully consider the consequences of the Pebble Mine to the Bristol Bay watershed. I am deeply grateful for the opportunities that the United States has afforded me and it pains me to see the complacency of my government and its current administration in the face of wealthy business interests. Once lost, the ecosystem in the Bristol Bay watershed can never be recovered and it is one of those beautiful places that make the United States special. Please do not bend to business interests and sell away something that is not yours to give. Please stop the Pebble Mine proposal once and for all. Protect that region for the benefit of future generations of Americans - not to mention this current generation! Thank you for your time.

Coming from south central Texas, you might wonder who I am concerned about a place as far away as Bristol Bay. It's because I live close to nature here on my ranch in a beautiful part of the country and wish to keep the heritage of natural beauty and unspoiled land and water for future generations. I have seen too much "sprawl" in my own state and as I have flown over this huge country of ours. With every trip, it becomes more painfully clear to me that there is very little that is still unspoiled. Bristol Bay is a fragile environment, and no mine can ever produce enough wealth to cover the cost to the environment there. Thank you for letting American speak out on environmental concerns. I stand with the Obama administration in protecting the environment.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I urge you to rethink the Pebble Mine situation. It threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Our public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources for future generations should be the top priority, not Corporate Profits! The Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed should have strong government oversight. The relationships between federal and tribal governments should be nurtured and strengthened. The standards for mineral development in wetlands and the Clean Water Act should be tighter. Our Public lands should be managed in a way that demonstrates good stewardship of these valuable resources. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully

America's great outdoors are incredibly valuable to us all for a variety of reasons and we have a great responsibility to be wise stewards of them for future generations. Locking up ever more land in wilderness should be carefully weighed with other uses. Wilderness designation immediately limits the uses allowed and therefore limits the number of people who can enjoy the area to those who have the leisure time, the monetary resources, and the physical ability to enjoy them. Here in Oregon, we enjoy some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring public lands in the nation. There are a few places that can be good candidates for additional protection from multiple uses, but there are a lot of places that single focus groups like Oregon Wild want to throw a wide loop around that do not really contribute to the experience of people who enjoy places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers. While Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, vast additional lands are functionally dedicated to limited human uses by other designations at many levels from Congressional action to USFS and BLM Resource Management Plans. Much of the wildlife that call our public lands homes coexist quite well with a variety of other uses of the land. Oregon Wild claims that millions of people enjoy these places for quiet recreation, but that is logically inconsistent. If anywhere near that number of people invaded wilderness areas, it would no longer be "quiet" recreation and the impacts of that many people concentrated on the trails and other limited locations suitable for foot or horse travel (including compaction and bodily waste) would be astronomical. Their greatly exaggerated numbers and consistent with their normal pattern of exaggeration and hyperbole on most issues related to natural resource management. Thank you for considering my comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to express my deep concern over creating inappropriate Wilderness and Monument designations. Locking the public out of public lands would actually disconnect people from the great outdoors. OHV recreation is the best way to get out deep into a wildlife area and away from the city. It is a family-oriented activity that parents can share with their children and teach them about wildlife. Learning about it in books and videos just isn't the same thing. Many citizens can't hike for very long. They might have a bad knee or back, might be out of shape, might have asthma, etc. OHV recreation lets these people still enjoy the wildlife areas. They can still share the experience with their families and don't get left behind. Wilderness access trails must remain open for these people in particular. Most people involved in OHV activities are often very responsible citizens and treat the areas with the utmost respect. As with any activity, you do get the occasional "idiot" that makes the rest look bad, but that is a rarity. The reality is, many members of the OHV community volunteer their time, money, and vehicles to maintain and preserve wilderness areas. After all, they go to the wilderness to enjoy it and want it to remain that way. Time and time again, I have witnessed fellow OHV members pulling together to repair fire-damaged areas (from lightning, etc.), remove fallen trees that block fire trails, repair washed-out trails, help with fuel reduction, remove trash, etc. They are a valuable asset to groups such as the Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service. These government-run groups are over-burdened, under-funded, and under-staffed. They need the help of the OHV community. Without it, the areas would not be properly maintained. Fire roads would be overgrown or blocked, and that certainly doesn't help the wildlife when the next fire comes along. You must keep access to the wilderness open for the public. It is actually better for both the citizens and the wildlife. Thank you for your valuable time,

hi Ago As we know from the BP disaster in the Gulf, we shouldn't trust corporations to monitor their own environmental quality. Basically they lie. To us, to the government, and to themselves. This is understandable. They are in business to make money, not to preserve ecosystems and such. The laws that allow and encourage this behavior are unfortunate but until they change, the last line of defense against bad ideas and bad corporate behavior is government agencies like yours. Please do whatever you can to stop development of large scale problems in the making like the proposed Pebble Mine. This includes stopping the opening up of more offshore oil drilling, drilling in the ANWR and other gems of nature (e.g. Yellowstone Park). Once these places are f'ed up, they are gone. Corporations can find other ways to make money. They have the ability to be clever and imaginative, but often have no incentive to behave that way. It is up to citizens like you, in your governmental role, to try to assure that the corporations innovate new and less destructive activities while promoting their business goals. good luck, have a good weekend too.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Will we ever learn? Mining operations are notorious toxic waste sites. All the economic benefits of the mining activity go to the mining company and all the economic burdens go to the taxpayer. The company wins; the public loses. This ignores the fact that an environmental village is raped, pillaged, and burned. On planet earth, everything is food for somebody else, be it plant or animal. When any living thing on the planet becomes extinct, whoever or whatever depended upon that for food is going to die out. And it is a chain reaction. No mother ship is coming to replenish planet earth. We need to stop consuming at such an irrational rate what is not going to be replaced. And we need to reign in our activities that cause death, damage, and destruction to all the plants and animals in the neighborhood of the activity. The Gulf of Mexico oil spillage disaster is a prime example of the callous attitude of large corporations in carrying out their mission to get theirs, and everybody else be damned. If the nuclear power industry had to pay the true cost of taking care of the nuclear waste they generate instead of off loading that responsibility to the government, ie., you and me, they would be bankrupt now. If you measure the activity in terms of dollars in and dollars out there is no positive generation of energy. America needs to lead the way in figuring out how to live in a sustainable way on this spaceship we call planet earth. Stop the Insanity; say no to the Pebble Mine, at least until they can demonstrate how they can do their operation without damaging our habitat. And that, they will not be able to do.

The proposed Bristol Bay pebble mine is another example of why the wild salmon are going extinct. Right when we discover their nutritional benefits, we are overfishing and killing them. Farmed fish has a lot less nutrition no doubt due to the Franken diet and even possibly the lack of time for the tissues to accumulate it the GE Franken fish are approved that grow twice as fast. Our food resources are not limitless and until people get that, we are headed towards major trouble in the future.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Decision Maker: Construction of the proposed Pebble Mine can't be allowed! If constructed, it would generate more than 10 billion tons of toxic waste, to be stored in the Bristol Bay area just 20 miles from an active fault line. And if constructed, it would irrevocably alter for worse Bristol Bay's clean waters. The wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life there would be 100% threatened. My greatest personal concern is that America's (and the world's) largest sockeye salmon run, and Alaska's largest Chinook run, could disappear if this proposed mega-mine is built. Currently, Bristol Bay generates between 10 and 30 million sockeye fish caught each year, with an average of 23 million, according to Greenpeace online. That's a lot of extremely healthy, wild fish! Numerous medical doctors of high reputation such as Dr. Andrew Weil, Dr. Nicholas Perricone, Dr. Christiane Northrup, and Dr. Joseph Hibbeln, recommend eating wild-caught salmon as part of a healthy diet and in order to prevent or treat a wide variety of diseases. And the American Heart Association recommends two 6-ounce servings of fatty fish per week to prevent heart disease! (Wild-caught salmon is, of course, an iconic "fatty" fish, with upwards of 1,000 mg of omega-3 fatty acids per serving and low in environmental contaminants.) I am a voter, and I voted for the Green Party in the last presidential election. Protecting Bristol Bay, however, is so important to me that I would gladly throw my vote, and urge others to do likewise, to now-president Obama in the 2012 presidential election IF he would only press the Environmental Protection Agency to use their authority to stop the Pebble Mine from being built. And the EPA has that authority under the Clean Water Act. What needs to happen is for the public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed to be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. We need affordable, sustainable wild fish to nourish America's citizenry--not dirt-cheap gold rings and copper bullet casings, with nothing but frankenfish for dinner! The federal government should closely oversee the permitting process and impact analysis for the Pebble Mine. The federal government should strengthen its relationship with relevant tribal governments. Standards for mineral development need to be tightened for wetlands. Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration!

I want my children and future generations to be able to enjoy and appreciate the wildlife as I have been able to, lets make this happen!

I walk to work using one of Nashville's green-ways. I've seen quite a bit of wild life there, and as Nashville becomes more crowded with malls, there is increasingly less open space for these animals to live. While Rand Paul may not miss a "hill or two," I will. Preserve what we have and add to it; don't continue the Bush practice of letting corporations loot our vanishing. wilderness

I am writing to urge you to protect Bristol Bay, Alaska by halting the deleterious effects of the Pebble Mine. It is imperative to our national security and well-being that we protect this biologically rich area. It provides jobs for local fishermen; it provides nutrition and medicine to citizens throughout America. Thank you,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I urge you to stop the owners of Pebble Mine from proceeding with their plan to engage in metallic sulfide mining in Alaska's Bristol Bay. Their mining activities would have irrevocable consequences to the salmon, wildlife, and subsistence way of life of people in the area. In addition, the Clean Water Act needs to be strengthened to insure greater protection from this type of mining. Thank you for consideration of my urgent appeal. --

Dear Mr. President, I have two young kids with whom my husband and I share our passion for the great outdoors. We surf, climb, hike, fish, like to travel to remote areas, and these are all things we want our kids to be able to teach and enjoy sharing with their kids. Because of this I am asking you to seize this opportunity to create, expand and better protect America's shared outdoors spaces. This includes parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness trails, wild and scenic rivers, and historic sites and monuments. Equally as important is to find new ways to support conservation of our farms, ranch lands and forests. Before the world is private and paved, before the only way to view "wild" animals is in a zoo-like setting, set some limits and better the world for our future and for the future of our children.

President Obama, Please SRIO the PEBBLE MINE and SAVE BRISTOL BAY. You have the power to do this and I'm counting on you.

As a committed conservationist, I am opposed to the Pebble Mine because of the damage that would be done to the pristine Bristol Bay and the multitudes of wildlife that depends on the Bay for survival. As time goes by, the human race is destroying anything and everything in its path for industry, economy, development, etc. There are certain places that must be saved from destructive projects like Pebble Mine and Bristol Bay is one of those places. I live in California, but I care about the planet as a whole. That is why I am writing to ask you to please save Bristol Bay from this destructive project.

No Pebble Mine. Thank you.

Everywhere I go, everywhere I look, people are telling me about all the natural resources we are wasting, how many polluted lakes, rivers and overrun wilderness areas they've seen. DOI oversees ALL of this destruction. The new world order folks are talking kill 30-80% of humanity, and YOU want to sell off more pristine nature? Make more species extinct? Foul our world further? A lot of folks who must not believe are going to be in retraining for a long time. You certainly aren't setting any kind of example of what humanity is. May your children and Grandchildren need Social Security and Medicaid.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The number of pristine places in our country continue to dwindle. Now the big corporations are working to reduce the number further. It is the usual profit is better than beauty. They want to dispoil Bristol Bay to further enrich their coffers. Is a bigger balance on the profit page better than wild salmon, our beautiful wildlife, and clean waters? Certainly not. Yet these people will fill the rivers with tailings. The forest will be destroyed to add get at the mimerals to enhance their profit. Of course, the corporate spokesmen say that they will take measures to protect the environment. Don't believe them. It never works. They say one thing and when they open their mines, they do something else. All you have to do is look at the oil shale mining in Alberta. The mining corporation has already contanimated the area and little is being done to stop it. Please do not let them even enter Bristol Bay.

Dear Decision-Makers: PLEASE stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay. STOP this disastrous mine, which would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife. Please act as stewards for our children and the planet. Sincerely--  
Kjersten Gmeiner, MD

Hi, I am an Australian citizen and I want you to stop the Pebble Mine. You would be endangering Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife. You have an absolute treasure in your hands. Please protect it, don't destroy it. All of this destruction of Mother Nature affects every single one of us globally!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Please do all that you can to save Bristol Bay from the Pebble Mine. Mining anywhere, and especially in such a pristine place as Bristol Bay, is an assault on our precious land. Bristol Bay must be left as it is to protect the wildlife there and to keep Alaska the wild and beautiful place that it is. Help keep what remains of our. Beautiful country beautiful and untouched. Thank you,

As a concerned American citizen, I am writing to express my strong feelings regarding the Pebble Mine development. This project endangers so much of what makes America great: clean waters, wildlife, forests - all of which are irreplaceable. This mine would endanger Bristol Bay and the surrounding habitat - an irreplaceable piece of America. I urge you to strengthen the federal government's oversight of the permitting process and to strengthen the restrictions around mining near wetlands, including restrictions in the Clean Water Act. Protect this beautiful and fragile public area from being lost to short-sighted private profiteering! The federal government should protect the interests of its citizens, not corporations! -- The only thing we have to fear, is fear itself. (and spiders....)



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I urge federal government agencies to do their utmost to preserve America's beauty and natural resources from greedy developers. We will never be able to turn back the clock if we are foolish enough to allow voracious politicians to destroy our heritage for pennies on the dollar, as they have done in the past. We must preserve our clean air and water to preserve life in any form. The West, Alaska, Hawaii, the Mississippi Gulf Valley, our mountaintops, and the New Orleans wetlands with their abilities to rejuvenate nature and human nature can never be returned to their pristine conditions after despoiling or giving away our natural treasures for horrific corporate short-term profits. Jobs that wreck Nature aren't worth the sacrifice to the country and its future; human ingenuity can and should create jobs that enervate and energize people to live lightly with Nature. No corporation or its profits is worth their tremendous rapaciousness to America or the world. Man has so ruined our climate and the planet, we may never be able to reclaim it. Let's not continue down our current path to natural and human devastation.

To Whomever Is Making Decisions In Regards To Alaska's Bristol Bay: I hope this letter will inspire to reconsider pebble mining in the precious wild lands of Bristol Bay. It would harmfully effect the ecosystem there in multiple & reactive ways. As we have witnessed the disaster in the Gulf of Mexico & the deaths & losses with coal mining; it is evident that more thought needs to be put into how & why we are still draining Earth's natural resources. Digging needs to stop while preserving & respecting nature needs to be a priority. There must be alternative materials that can be used rather than digging up our beautiful rocks & minerals. We as humans have evolved into such a sophisticated species; why can't we think of other sources with our advanced technologies & intelligence? We must compromise & stop greedily taking from our Earth. She is obviously growing weak from us taking so much from her. We need to find balance with kindness, compassion, & respect towards all living things on this planet. We humans are not the only inhabitants. Thank you for taking the time to read my message & I hope you can find it in your heart to reconsider how we do business. Kindest regards & much love,

The proposed Pebble Mine in the Bristol Bay region threatens the Bay's clean waters, it's salmon fishery, and the wildlife and native cultures that depend on those waters and fishery. Please ensure that the public lands in the region remain closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. The low-grade ore there can hardly be more valuable than a pristine environment, which provides a livliehood to the locate inhabitants and tremendous recreational opportunities to the rest of us. And be sure to consult with the local tribal governments, they are the people on the ground who would have to deal with the effects of toxic run-off from such mines. Tighten standards for mineral development in wetlands, and make sure that Clean Water Act standards are enforced. This can all be obviated if the mines are never approved in the first place.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I attended the July 17th Albuquerque, NM Listening Session on the President's America's Great Outdoors, but did not at that time leave my comments. Below please find my concerns and suggestions. Thank you so very much for hosting this session and listening to the public! The MEXICAN GRAY WOLVES, the most incredible part of the awe inspiring wild Nature, need: \* FULL Endangered Species protection (only 42 remaining in the wild) \* A permanent trapping ban on Public Lands in New Mexico (to keep the few wolves we have in the wild out of harms way; Arizona has the ban already!) \* A thorough FBI investigation on the recent systematic killings of the Mexican gray wolves (Trial and Prosecution of the criminal/s) I live in Albuquerque, but spend on average a weekend a month in the Gila & Apache National Forest, in the wolf country. This summer's wolf killings made me very concerned about the completely inadequate survival plan of the most endangered mammal in North America. And, the killings made me nervous about the safety of the citizens who like to spend time in the wilderness where such killings continue to take place. Here are my concerns: 1. What message are we--as a society--sending to our future generations, when the Mexican gray wolf is being gunned down by some derailed individual/s, and nothing is being done about it? In total contradiction with our attempt to get more youth reconnected with Nature (Nature Deficit Disorder conversation). 2. Human safety when this/these individuals are running free and able to get away with crime.

I am a physician and public health researcher with a focus on natural areas and green spaces. The scientific literature is very clear that access to nature is essential for health and well-being. On every measure, from childhood development to elderly functioning and longevity, access to nature is a fundamental human need. It provides the opportunity to create, maintain and restore positive physical and mental health. Please support the protection of our outdoor green spaces, so that future generations can continue to prosper in good health.

Absolutely NO to Pebble Mine or any mining or clear cutting in the watershed of Bristol Bay. It should be a top priority to put in place some kind of permanent land protection for this area to protect the pristine views, watershed, and clean waters of the bay that harbor wild salmon and other wildlife. The impact of large scale strip mining and leaching of run-off toxins into the waters would be very destructive to the environment of the area. The impacts would effect tribal communities, recreation, fishing jobs, food supply and wildlife habitat. A pristine ecosystem would be lost forever. Not only should this area be protected, but standards for mineral development in wetlands and large-scale metallic sulfide surface mining should be strenghtened under the clean water act to safeguard the environment.

I am writing to express my opposition to the Pebble Mine. This hard-rock, open-pit mine would be a disaster waiting to happen. The construction itself could adversely affect the nearly pristine ecosystem. A study of similar mines showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. The protection and preservation Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life should be our top priority.

As an American, I urge you to protect Bristol Bay, which serves as the habitat of innumerable wild animals. Pebble Mine threatens the Bay's waters and the wildlife who depend on them. Public lands should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Thank you for your consideration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'd like to express my concerns surrounding the proposed Pebble Mine near Bristol Bay in Alaska. It is high time that we began to see our roles as stewards of the environment rather than exploiters of the environment. We cannot continue with business as usual with the growing awareness of the decimation of increasing numbers of species on the planet. While a corporation could reap huge monetary benefits from the building and operation of the proposed mine, the resulting environmental degradation - and there will be if it's allowed to be operated - cannot be expressed in dollars. We must begin now to evaluate human activity not in terms of the benefit to a small number of people, but to the effect it will have on the planet we share with all living things. I say NO to Pebble Mine.

We come to Alaska every spring, and we do it to get away from the HELL that is clear cutting of trees, and digging of Sand Pits along our San Jacinto river. Please stop this Pebble Mine, because things will never be the same again!!! Thank you,

It is my understanding that the Obama administration finally wants to work to protect our nation's wild spaces (as opposed to the administration's quite disastrous environmental record to date). So I am writing to ask that you do the right thing to protect Bristol Bay by closing the public lands in this area to all large-scale metallic sulfide mining, and working to protect the (so far) clean waters of the Bay, the fish that live there, the wildlife that reside in these wild lands, the traditional subsistence ways of life of the native people here, and the recreation resources in this area. Needless to say, the Pebble Mine would threaten all of these, and the federal government should start NOW (1) to analyze the long-term impacts that this mine could have on the Bristol Bay watershed, (2) to create much better and more environmentally protective standards for mineral development in the wetlands, (3) to create more stringent Clean Water Act standards for this type of mining, and (4) to oversee the entire mine permitting process to be sure nothing is allowed that would have adverse environmental impacts. As a Native person, I would also ask that you work honorably with the tribal governments in this area, honoring native values and working to prevent any harm to traditional subsistence ways of life here. Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

For your consideration, I recently spent ten days traveling in Alaska and was impressed by how much the Alaskan people rely upon tourism and wildlife endeavors for their lively hoods. From Anchorage to Fairbanks and down to Homer and Prince William Sound I was glad to see that the environment was still vigorous and healthy enough to support many different small business interests. I had been in Alaska in 1973 and was overwhelmed by the beauty, but this time I could appreciate how this pristine environment supports so many peoples businesses and personal livelihoods. I think any concession towards a mine should weigh in the balance all of the effects that will impact on the Alaskans themselves as they will be there years after any mine is closed and deserve to have their interests protected.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I urge you to stop the Pebble Mine which would threaten Bristol Bay's clean water & fish & wildlife. Habitat needs protection as many species are endangered. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. The standards for mineral development in wetlands should be more strict. More public input should be accepted before any decisions are made. We only have one earth & it needs are help if we want future generations to be able to enjoy it with its pristine lands & wildlife. Thank you.

Seems like the oil industry just wants to cover the globe with false starts which permanently disturb the areas they drill. Let them use their astronomic profits to develop alternatives to drilling into the earth for petroleum. We have to face it and move on - oil is no longer the way ahead

Alaska's pristine wildlife environment of Bristol Bay must remain clean and undisturbed from toxic wastes that mining would surely bring if Pebble Mine is allowed to mine in and around this area. As an environmental artist, I am asking that you please do not support Pebble Mine or any mining in this important ecosystem which needs to remain free of toxic chemicals that mining would soon over take in it's dirty toxic path threatening this important wildlife ecosystem! Thank you,

Dear Sir, I urge you to please consider the impact that the Pebble Mine will have on the wild salmon, wildlife and the residents of the Bristol Bay area. The large scale of this endeavor, and the toxic waste byproducts of this mine that will harm this ecologically important area warrant a strenuous investigation and a further review of the permitting processes involved. In a year that has brought such evidence of man's impact on our environment with the Gulf disaster, I implore your department to put a halt to the destruction, before it's allowed to happen. We need more oversight, and less hindsight. Please do the right thing for this pristine area, and don't allow the Pebble Mine project to continue.

Think about the future and where we will be without the world of wildlife. We need preserves that are not polluted by humans. It is very short term thinking that money is the most important consideration in this world. Humans are better off in every aspect to have some natural wild areas and this Pebble Mine would be so detrimental to everyone. Please think about this and ask yourselves how you can best preserve life into the future. It is clear to me that the Pebble mine is a menace to all life.

Just wanted to voice my opposition to the proposed pebble mine that will threaten Bristol Bay. It is a fact that this kind of mining will pollute the water and harm the ecosystem in many ways. There is not adequate regulation in this industry - like many. It is time to build our economy and future jobs within the new greener industries - of which mining is not one. Will be following the discussion of this issue. Thanks for your consideration.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir, I am writing to say I am opposed to the Pebble Mine. This is too important an area to have it ruined by mining. In spite of the corporate line that keeps coming out, there is no guarantee that everything down stream won't be damaged. The truth is, that the mining company executives don't really care what happens as long as they make money and get bonuses and promotions. I was a stock broker for 18 years, so I know how the system works.

Dear Sirs, I know you are wrestling with the complicated issue of Pebble Mine in Alaska. I know you are pulled in two directions. I would urge you to look about you, to think what is becoming scarce, what is irreplaceable. I would urge you to protect the clean waters of Bristol Bay, the wild salmon, the wildlife and the traditional ways of life of the people who live there. If we lose those things, precious as they are, they will be gone. No amount of development is worth it at this point. We have developed as far as we can without ruining our planet. Please help protect this small bit of nature. Thank you,

These are my comments in connection with the proposed Pebble Mine 1. Grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales roam the area and depend on the healthy population of salmon. 2. Everything in the ecosystem is connected and damaging one part damages the other parts. 3. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. 4. If Bristol Bay is so special that the former Governor of Alaska named her daughter after it, then it should be special enough for us to guard, preserve and treasure.

Please stop this distructive mine send a message to America that you are willing to make the tough choices and set America on a sustainable future Thank You

Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean water, wild salmon, and the wildlife of the area. The Bristol Bay ecosystem supports valuable commercial fishing, indigenous people and a large wildlife population. The mine would destroy habitat, polute the waters, jeopardize the wild salmon and irreparably damage the ecosystem. The company is proposing to store the toxic waste generated by this mine just 20 miles from an active fault line. An earthquake would be a huge disaster. This mine is a mistake. The only people to benefit from it would be the foreign mining companies. Our top priorities should be the protection of habitat, the ecosystem, and the indigenous population.

Dear President Obama and Staff: I am asking you to do all that is in your power to stop the advancement of the Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay. Pristine wild areas are so rare--mines are not. It is known that one third of useable recyclable copper lies in our land fills, as do many other precious, useful metals. Please find a creative way to recycle these products and bypass the need for yet another ruinous mine to despoil the beautiful Earth we are so fortunate to live with. To build Pebble Mine is to ignore the rights of myriad wildlife and plants, for the poisonous run-off from tailings and processing will kill many small rivers, and all the creatures and plants that depend on them, and potentially ruin the eco-system of Briston Bay. It is a delicate web of life that sustains us, and every time we poison another place, we poison our thread in that web. Take care of it, do not sanction destruction. Be who you say you are: stand up against the interests of the corporate developers and protect the land for your children and your children's children.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The debate over this mine and its impact on the Bristol Bay setting has many elements which are too complicated for the layman to effectively measure. So I have to leave it to you in the federal government, you who are there to safeguard our environmental as well as our economic interests, to look after my citizen/consumer interests. I hope I can safely leave it to you to ensure that corporate profits don't drown your decisions

As stewards for future generations, we owe a duty to preserve the gift of our natural resources- allowing the mining operation would damage Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Again as stewards, public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting natural habitats and recreation resources for the use of current and future generations should be important goals for the government. Also, protecting this area could strengthen the not always strong relationship the federal government has with tribal governments. Given the recent BP issue, the federal government should provide stronger oversight of companies that could cause devastation to our natural resources and communities. Thank you for your consideration

Dear Sir: As a resident of Colorado Springs, I know first hand what mining can do to the landscape. When the miners have gone the land is too polluted to use for centuries and the landscape even when 'remediated" never is the same. We have an opportunity to prevent this from happening again. Please resist the effort to open this area up to mining.

I want the nation's children and their families to enjoy America's great outdoors. Please choose this moment to grow and better protect America's natural bounty: parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness, trails, wild and scenic rivers and historic sites and monuments are all legacy matters that require attention. The dramatic loss of farms, ranchlands and forests is dramatic and we must redress a process that will leave no heritage if left unchecked.

The Pebble Mine is another Gulf oil spill times 10. Mining companies are famous for their disregard of the environment...look at the Mesabi Range, the UP in Michigan, the Appalachian Mountain, the abandoned mine fields of the Sierra Nevada, and others. Pristine waters, the North Pacific fishery (especially wild salmon), wildlife, the topography, Native communities' cherished way of life...these are all imperiled by a mine at the head of Bristol Bay. Please...do not allow foreign interests with problematic reputations with regard to the environment to endanger a unique and precious piece of our world. Thank you for your consideration .

Dear Caretakers of the American Great Outdoors, I have never been to Bristol Bay. I have never been to Alaska. My idea of what these areas represent may be romanticized. I do hope to go there someday. I hope to see the complete beauty of our natural wilderness that still exists...a wilderness that we, as Americans, can be proud of...that we, as Americans, can share amongst ourselves, and with the rest of the world when they come to visit. In the meantime, I am concerned about the destruction that may be caused by the anticipated Pebble Mine. I am concerned about the damage to the delicate ecosystem that may be caused in that area, and ultimately, the effect this destruction may have on the rest of our world. Please help protect and maintain this beautiful wilderness, this invaluable ecosystem, by preventing the construction of the Pebble Mine which would cause destruction to the area. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

It does not take much thought to realize that destroying our environment will destroy us. Please take steps to strengthen regulations on mining and drilling and be sure they are enforced. Protect particularly fragile natural settings from any commercial exploitation. Access to clean air, a safe water supply and soil free from contaminants should be considered a fundamental right of all citizens.

We are writing you to ask that you please stop the Pebble mine and protect Bristol Bay. Thank you!

The shallow and cool waters of Bristol Bay are home to seals, whales and millions of salmon. The salmon runs support commercial fisheries, native Americans and wildlife such as grizzlies that depend on the salmon runs to fatten up for the winter. Protecting wildlife and the traditional lifestyle of the indigenous people should come before the gains to foreign mining companies. To reach the low-grade copper and gold deposits thousands and thousands of acres of pristine land will be demolished to get to the ore and tons of pollutants will be released in an area only twenty miles from an active fault line. This is a disaster waiting to happen. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. Tribal governments should be deeply involved in the decision-making and permitting processes. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tightened and stringent standards for large-scale sulfide mining must be implemented. Please don't let large business interests outweigh the pristine region of Bristol Bay and the fish and wildlife that are so important to the Alaskans in the region

That the word "art" should sit right in the middle of the word "earth" fascinates me. Human interference with Nature's original plan is sadly questionable at best. It will be important to have preserved it, fully stocked! Every single little link will be significant when we collectively realize the Earth requires some respect in order to provide us with a place to live. The more painting teaches me, the more evident this becomes." Bristol Bay is a unique environment with an ecosystem that can't be replaced or duplicated. I don't see what this mine has to offer that is worth more than having this earth to live on. It's pristine beauty is so quickly fading for no logical or beneficial reasons other than money to pay for more destruction. Please rethink the benefits of this project and for whom, certainly not the whole. Thank you for your time.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hello, I am writing to urge you to protect and save Bristol Bay from the disastrous Pebble Mine. America's beautiful public lands should be EXEMPT (and kept that way) from any commercial mining, or other commercial interests, that threaten to diminish its beauty, threaten its wildlife, and scar the earth forever. Public lands were put into a trust for all of us in this country and for all generations to come. We cannot allow such indiscriminate use of mining to destroy what we cherish and hold dear. And the actions of mining companies always do. They threaten wildlife, wetlands, watersheds, and the very being of what is a public land trust. No matter how many promises or written agreements are signed by mining companies, the result is always the same. You do not have to look too far into the recent news headlines to find horrible consequences from mining company disasters and the companies total lack of responsibilities for their actions. It is we, the people, who pay the price, often for generations to come. And it is the land, our environment, that pays the price in devastating effects from these senseless attempts to ravage the earth for more fossil fuels. We have the ability for so much green energy use and yet so little is done to harness it. How much longer do you think the earth will survive if we do not take control now and stop mining companies, such as Pebble Mine, from destroying land and habitat. Enough. I urge you to stop the Pebble Mine; in no part should it ever be allowed. And I would urge you to do the same for other mining interests that think they can over take public land and public opinion, and put, not just the land itself, but wildlife, the oceans, and all of us at risk. Thank you.

Dear Sirs, As a concerned citizen, I would like to voice my objection to the Pebble Mine project in the Bristol Bay area. I could explain my objections with a long e-mail but hopefully logic and care of our great outdoors in America will be enough to stop all the erosion of one of our most treasured assets. PLEASE SAVE BRISTOL BAY Regards

Dear Representatives of the great natural lands of our nation: please read W. S. Merwin's poem, "The Last One". Merwin is the present Poet Laureate of the U. S. and this allegorical poem is terrifying in its portrayal of our voracious appetite to eat up all our blessed territory and all its beings: Well they'd made up their minds to be everywhere because why not. Everywhere was theirs because they thought so. When will we give "standing" to the other life on this planet? When will we stop our disingenuous language about just how safe and environmentally benign all our mining, drilling, chopping, paving over is? I am writing to ask that those of you who decide, think about the destruction of the beautiful life--those creatures who have no "standing", no meaning past the tag of "resources". Think less about going along with those with the money, the power. It won't be long until we have destroyed so much that power and money will not feed our bodies and we will have lost our souls. If you go ahead and allow the Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay, each of you will be complicit in destroying the habitat and lives of wild salmon, the life of the clean waters, the trees, the other creatures who live there. Please stop Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay. With regards for your integrity.



## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Preservation means different things to different people. I came to Dillingham, Alaska, on the north shore of Nushagak Bay, in 1987, for a seasonal volunteer position with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. I never left. It was clear to me I was in an environment with natural animal populations that were abundant and healthy enough to support the people that lived here, and then some. Historically, indigenous peoples followed animal populations to survive, and some still do. The commercial demand for wild salmon, in particular, has led to, combined with Kvichak Bay to the east, the world's largest wild salmon fishery. Intense management has insured all five species of salmon have not only survived subsistence and commercial harvest levels, but in some cases have thrived. There is nothing here that doesn't have roots in salmon. They are the major player in ecosystem balance, and critical to the health of other fauna and even flora. Even introduced inhabitants like myself depend on them for food. Some of them spawn in the fresh water systems that the proposed Pebble Mine would destroy. I say the word "destroy" bluntly, as people as a whole know how some industries cannot help but destroy the environment. Mining is one of those industries. I choose to believe that most people do not want to see the planet systematically destroyed so they can enjoy luxury items (for example, I commute to my job via bicycle). Our motto should be sustainability, living within our means, sharing our planet, and policies and practices should reflect preservation, not destruction. Southwest Alaska, and all that depend on the salmon that are born and return to spawn and die here, must be preserved. There should not be a Pebble Mine. Sincerely (and looking forward to grilling salmon steaks this weekend)

The Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay would be TERRIBLE. Destroying the environment for living animals would be a tragedy. As Americans, we take for granted our pleasant living conditions and set our expectations high. At the same time, we often turn the other cheek when something like this occurs. The pebble mine would make animals suffer, lose their homes, die, and for what? A mine? Humanity needs to step up and speak for those without a voice. **DO NOT ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF PEBBLE MINE TO GO FORWARD.**

Bristol Bay is one the few pristine wild spaces left in our increasingly populated and polluted world, in which environmental degradation is out pacing preservation and renewal of the environment. The Pebble Mine will threaten the clean water of Bristol Bay, including the salmon runs and other wildlife. Our very lives depend on a diverse and healthy ecosystem. In a world with so few healthy, diverse ecosystems left, it is unspeakably important to protect Bristol Bay from the damage the Pebble Mine will wreak. We need greater government oversight of mining projects, and more stringent regulations. I am a 25-year-old who loves the natural beauty and wild spaces of the United States. I am honestly skeptical that if I have children, they will never be able to experience the beauty and splendor places like Bristol Bay, if the government does not step in now to protect it.

Please give serious thought to ending mining in the Bristol Bay area. There is too much at stake on both large and small scales, too much damage already, too much ignorance of future damage. I am sickened by the endless destruction of the natural world for the economic gain of the few. Exploitation of local cultures, local resources and local wildlife has been policy for too long. Turn it around. Turn it to good for all who will follow. Thank you for your consideration,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

, I write to ask you to protect Bristol Bay and it's wildlife and all the environment. Please stop any mining projects and in particular the Pebble mine projects. Too many species are at stake along with the pristine beauty of this landscape. Please protect Bristol Bay!

To Whom it Concerns: I would like to see the Bristol Bay's water remain clean for the sake of the wildlife, the wild salmon and other fish, and for the sake of the economic value this area provides simply for its beauty as a natural area. Such awesome beauty should be closed to the damning and damaging processes which come with large scale mining operations. Accordingly, please protect this area for the habitat and natural resources. Additionally, I wish the government would provide stronger oversight regarding the Pebble mine permitting process as well as with the analysis of the cumulative impacts associated with such mining processes to the Bristol Bay area. Due to the impact such large scale mining operations can have, I would also like to see more stringent Clean Water Act standards for all similar operations. Thank you for your consideration,

Salmon are being threatened in far too many ways, from water diversion in California rivers, to possible escape of genetically engineered double growth hormone fish. Public lands should provide a refuge for them, not yet another threat. The world needs salmon far more than it needs the Pebble Mine.

The Pebble Mine would endanger the entire Bristol Bay ecosystem. Please do not allow it.

Why do people have to destroy what God built? This bay is home to salmon and many other God made creatures. I'm not a fanatic but these places WERE made for a purpose. Is money more important than leaving areas like this bay alone? Sit down and think hard about it. I think you will come to realize the destruction it will cause. I thank you for listening to me and I'm sure MANY MANY more like me.

My wife and I were privileged to visit Bristol Bay in 2007 on a self- guided tour that included kayaking, hiking and wildlife viewing. We were so deeply touched by the incredible and unique beauty of the Bristol Bay area. We feel strongly that the proposed Pebble Mine will threaten the clean water and the salmon and the whales that depend on the area. Please see that Bristol Bay receives the protection that it deserves so that all of our children and grandchildren will be able to enjoy the area. Thank you.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir, I am very dismayed over the possibility of Pebble Mine. The clean waters of Bristol Bay provide habitat for wild salmon and other species, which in turn provides livelihood for fishing communities. Salmon spawn in the Bristol Bay watershed, and metallic sulfide mining would be disastrous to their future. If the streams and brooks encoded into the salmon's DNA are destroyed or polluted by development, the salmon will die out. The federal government should oversee the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of environmental impact on the watershed. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be much higher. The need for dialogue and relationship between the federal and tribal governments seems very great. One hopes the discussion will proceed with deep sensitivity to habitat, wildlife, and human beings. Bristol Bay is one of the earth's great treasures. Please save it for generations to come. Sincerely yours

To whom it may concern, I'm opposed to the proposed Pebble Mine development. This type of large scale mining would have an adverse effect on the immediate and surrounding environment for generations to come. Do we really want to leave this legacy. We need to strengthen your "clean water act" so this type of outrageous plundering of the land should never be an issue again. Please consider what ramifications this project will have for the future and I feel confident you will see the negatives far exceed any possible benefit that might result. Please pass on my thoughts and all other NRDC comments to the President and his Interior Secretary, as well as the appropriate committees. Thank you for your time. Regards

Dears Sirs, Day by day I see and read about more progress in resources to move our country forward in providing needed fuels and other things to enrich our lives. Along with this I also see the destruction that is happening to get to the goal of "progress" and "more money" for a select few. To rape our land, trees, animals, air, etc. is not always necessary but those that have no respect for natural resources and a stake in the profits don't seem to care. I feel that there are many people that would love to know what they can do to help stop the ravages. Please consider your families long after you are gone. Also consider what exactly you are going to say to the powers that be that are not of this Earth. Just an idea.

It's highly inappropriate to destroy/toxic pollute this spectacular unique wilderness area & violate Indigenous rights. Do your job-Protect Our Public lands, waters, wildlife, economy & health! You work for citizens, not industry! Your attention to this most urgent matter would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of all species. Thank you

Without air to breathe, water to drink and food to eat, we are all dead. Jobs, economy, civil rights, nothing will matter without a sustainable land base. Please do everything in your power to protect our and our fellow species' abilities to survive. Conservation is the ultimate health care action.

I am writing to urge in the strongest terms to put an immediate end to plans for the Pebble Mine that threatens Bristol Bay. Our poor planet is losing more and more habitat in the goal of exploiting the resources for economic gain. I have grandchildren, and I want for there to be a verdant and diversified world for them to grow up in. Public lands should provide habitat, subsistence for indigenous people and non-invasive recreation. Thank you,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Save Bristol Bay Block the Pebble mine If I have to explain why, I need to vote for someone else  
Thank you,

Please stop Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Most Americans are in favor of preserving life. Killing or even endangering salmon and other wildlife contradicts our support of life. Allowing Pebble Mine to advance puts more stock in minerals than life.

I am writing asking you to desist on the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Have you been there? If you had, as I have been, you would think more about the beauty, and how few places exist in our world that stir our hearts and imagination, where a deep breath is of clean air. And of course you know that fresh water will be a major concern for the people on our planet. And how about being nice for a change to Americans other than rich stockholders? I'm discouraged but there is always some hope that you will hear me. Thanks,

#### STOP TAKING OUR LAND

Bristol Bay's public lands represent critical habitat for salmon and other important wildlife, as well as provide traditional subsistence living inhabitants a home. It also offers world class fishing which brings tourist dollars to the local inhabitants. Altogether, the salmon and trout fisheries represent 75% of the jobs in this area of Alaska. It is too important of a natural resource to risk having it essentially destroyed by money-hungry mining interests. The majority of Alaskans oppose the destructive mine. This area should be closed to large-scale mining, especially metallic sulfide mining. The top priority here should be protecting the irreplaceable habitat, and subsistence and recreational resources. If our federal government does not provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of the impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed, no one will. Allowing this mine to be constructed will further divide federal and tribal governments, something that should never be allowed to happen. This is a perfect example of a situation where the needs of the many (those that live off of or otherwise make wise use of the land and water here) vastly outnumber the needs of the few rich and greedy (the mining interests). The existing standards for mineral development in wetlands, which shouldn't be allowed in the first place, should be tightened as a result of this planned assault on the environment. To prevent future situations where large-scale mining threatens to destroy public lands of this type, the Clean Water Act standards for large-scale mining should be tightened. There is too much at risk in Bristol Bay to allow this mine to go forward.

As a citizen of this beautiful country, I am writing to express my strongly held opinion that Bristol Bay is an environmental gem that in its natural state provides benefits to our nation far-exceeding any mineral resources it contains. We have exploited our environment in unsustainable ways too long--certainly long enough to see the error of our ways. Please make the protection of the public lands in Bristol Bay your highest priority. And please change the paradigm and maintain the highest standards of the Clean Water Act in that area. Thank you for your attention.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please halt the Pebble Mine project. I am 63 years old. The best memories of my life are trips across the U.S. with my parents visiting our National Parks and viewing the wildlife on pristine lands. My hope is that my grandchildren will have the opportunities that I had as a child. It is truly sad that we are destroying so many of the natural resources that the good Lord gave to us. Thanks for your consideration of my plea

I am writing as a concerned citizen to stop the proposed mine from being constructed at Bristol Bay. We have seen the destruction to the US Gulf of Mexico eco-system brought about by a once considered safe system of oil removal. Let us consider our other fragile eco-systems. The arctic wildlife that thrives near Bristol Bay would be endangered if a mine was to be constructed there. We need to protect what natural resources we have and not exploit animals' habitats for the simple purpose of extracting desirable minerals from the earth. Not only does this scheme endanger wild animals, but people as well. Let us be cautious in any plan that knowingly creates tons of toxic waste, and could even remotely effect the life surrounding it. If the mine does go forward, which I sincerely hope it does not, we need to consider tightening the standards in the Clean Water Act, and for mineral development in general. We cannot afford another large, or even small scale environmental disaster in our world. Let us instead, make headlines about putting the interests of our tender lands and the animals that inhabit them, above those of the corporate and commercial.

Please stop the Pebble Mine! The Bristol Bay is priceless and will sustain life indefinitely. Short-term riches, however great, must not take precedence over the resources that sustain lives over the long term-watershed, wild, sustainable salmon runs, other wildlife, the livelihoods of the native population, the irreplaceable beauty of this place. Allowing greed to supplant these values is unconscionable, one more manifestation of our tendency to put immediate self-interest ahead of every other value. Future generations will thank you for stopping this attempted devastation.

In the scheme of things the USA hasn't been around that long but we still act like we can do anything we want and clean up the after-effects sometime in the future. We aren't discovering new land and there's only so much we can do to the earth before we all pay the price of our lack of stewardship. There are some disasters that simply won't go away with time. We know that eco-systems are fragile. That the people, animals and fauna that depend on the watershed provided by Bristol Bay and tributaries are linked. We also know that no company willingly polices it's pollution levels if it means foregoing one penny of profit. Strict regulation by local and federal agencies has to be the rule of law. Additionally any company wanting water rights for any product with the word 'metallic' in it doesn't need to be drilling in an area as clean as Bristol Bay. The way I see it best of intentions hasn't worked so well with the oil industry why would it be any different for this operation? Must we continually be behind the curve on environmental damage? Shouldn't the safety of the American people, it's cultures and our natural resources be the overriding concern of any business wanting to work in our wilderness areas? Shouldn't it be the overriding concern of the government? If not, why?

I was upset to hear about Pebble Mine's selfish plan, which would ruin our precious water and wildlife. Bristol Bay needs to be protected, not threatened by Pebble Mine.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I have crisscrossed the world and learned quite a bit about the disastrous impact mines make everywhere. They are detrimental to the rivers, lakes, watersheds and bays and have a huge negative impact on wildlife and humans who live near-by when their ground water is being poisoned and their health ruined. The only winners are the corporations who benefit financially. We should be more mindful of our environment and do everything possible to protect it and if that can't be done adequately projects like these shouldn't be allowed to move ahead. thank you,

No ecosystem should be lost to a mine. Stop this project.

The Gulf of Mexico has already been defiled. We don't need to add Bristol Bay to the list of polluted waters. Please do not permit the Pebblemine to operate.

Dear Department of the Interior, I am writing to support the preservation of all natural habitat in the United States, and specifically Bristol Bay. I support the prevention of extractive industries from having access for conducting any business operations on these public lands. There is one exception: to open and operate a museum that describes the habitat destruction and public health dangers of the extraction techniques. Otherwise, these businesses should not be approved for any other purpose. The Pebble Mine directly threatens the health of the watershed in the Bristol Bay area. It is time the federal government, and that includes you, the DOI, stop allowing profiteering corporations from irresponsibly taking resources from the environment. In place of that behavior the DOI, and all related agencies, should begin giving more protection to the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. I support increased funding for enforcement of these standards, as well as reviewing and strengthening them to take into account new technologies, and a NEW attitude supporting public safety. It is time to lock arms with the EPA, and present a unified federal approach that is more sensitive to the needs of the local tribal people. If this means higher federal taxes, then so be it. We must all pay our fair share, but it must also come with having the ethical courage to SAY NO to corporate motives and interests. Your personal behavior on this issue will reveal what legacy you leave our children. I thank you for taking my opinion into consideration as you seek to turn public opinion into policy. So many other countries squandered their opportunity to preserve due to lack of foresight and ethical responsibility towards future generations. I hope my elected and appointed official's policy will preserve the United States' natural and cultural treasures.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We have the opportunity right now to stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. Thank you for your help in preventing the environmental disaster that Pebble Mine would be.

There are few places left on earth that are as untouched as Alaska's wilderness. Don't let it become a strip mine. We only have one earth. Not only would I like my grand kids to be able to experience nature as God made it, but once we have raped the entire earth... what will we do for energy then. There IS a better way... Please don't be "penny wise and pound foolish" with our earth!! Thank you

Dear Administration, We are all entrusted to care for our generous planet. It is not being faithful to strip her of her blessings and create destruction like pollution. Please hold our planet dearly. Protect the waters of Bristol Bay from companies like Pebble Mine Yours,

Dear Friends, Now is the time to save Bristol Bay. As you well know, it's easier to stop pollution from happening than it is to clean up a destroyed area. What happened in the Gulf should bring this truth home forcefully. The Pebble Mine is a clear and present danger to Bristol Bay, a beautiful, clean wildlife habitat. There should be no large scale metallic sulfide mining there at all, and the government should keep Pebble Mine on a very short leash, providing frequent inspections. Standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. And the government needs to work with tribal governments more closely as it regulates the industrial presence in the area. America, the Beautiful will not remain so unless we are all mindful of what we need to do to maintain pristine areas.

Please do not allow the poisoning of any more watersheds! Veto the Pebble Mine and protect Bristol Bay.

Wherever there are clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life, it is essential we keep this goodness and not destroy it. We humans must be good stewards of our Mother Earth for now and for the future. 46 years ago, I had one of my most special life experiences when I worked in Yellowstone National Park for two summers. What incredible foresight it was and still is to save this precious area for mankind to study, have, and enjoy, and how many millions of people and animals have benefitted from this incredible act of preservation. I beg you to keep this area pristine. I think it is as important to our future as you, President Obama, asking the minister in Florida not to burn the Koran.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to bring that mining this area will destroy the area as you can see at Bisbee AZ where the mining tailing have cause no end of problems and eye sore. I don't know how bad the water table in the area based on all the leaching of chemicals into the underground aquifer which can cause problem to the people in the future. This is one of the problems you must face if it is worth the destroying of the area for the mine or the natural resource that can come from farming and fishing is more worthwhile then a one time resource and after it is finished then there is nothing for the future. This decision you must make and I believe you should deny the permit to do mining as it really wouldn't help the economy in the long rung but to destroy it. You have to do a long term economic analysis of what the effect of this mining and also if you do how are going bring back the area the way it is before. So with all the problems you should turn down the permit as it will not accomplish anything in the long time in the area.

Dear Sir or Madam, I understand that the Administration has invited public comment on the preservation of America's wildest places in connection with National Wilderness Month. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the President and the Department of the Interior for all you have done to preserve wilderness and non-wilderness public lands for the enjoyment and benefit of all citizens. I would also like to register my opposition to permitting a large mining operation, like the Pebble Mine, to operate in an environmentally sensitive place like Bristol Bay. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be strictly protected to preserve natural habitat, subsistence fishing, and public recreation. It is entirely inappropriate to use such lands for mining -- unless the mined materials are essential to the national welfare -- and it is especially inappropriate to use the land to generate corporate profits. If such use cannot be prevented under existing laws, we need stronger laws to protect public lands from exploitation for profit. Meanwhile, the federal government must, at a minimum, provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and careful analysis of the cumulative effects of mining on the Bristol Bay watershed. Thank you for your consideration of my views.

Save Bristol Bay from mining and keep Alaska gloriously beautiful!

Wildlife in Arizona is threatened by AZ ballot Proposition 109. This proposition seeks an AZ Constitution amendment which would permit lawful public hunting and fishing as a preferred means of managing and controlling wildlife. If this proposition passes, the AZ State Legislature will control all recreational hunting. The National Rifle Association participated in crafting the wording of this proposition. In order to conserve our wildlife and respect the rational process of balancing the land used by people and wildlife, this proposition needs serious revision before it is voted on. We need national attention and help to block this proposition and revise it for further review.

Please protect the natural habitat of Bristol Bay and stop mining from threatening clean water and wildlife!! Concerned citizen,



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Protect the Kvichak and Nushagak watersheds and save Bristol Bay because there is no place like it in the world. Because there are people who depend on this river and its resources for their livelihood. Because gold mining is a dirty and unsustainable practice, Because it's the right thing to do for future generations to come. And if your still not convinced, see the film Red Gold. Thank you,

Planned mines like Pebble Mine caused substantial damage to ecosystems that never recover from them. Bristol Bay represents an important ecosystem for both native people, wildlife, fisheries and recreational industries, which could be significantly harmed by the mine, given the inadequate federal standards for wetland development and mining under the Clean Water Act. Arctic and subarctic ecosystems are especially vulnerable to damage, given the stress they are under due to the accelerated rate of climate change in polar regions. They need our protection more than ever.

Please save the Bristol Bay and stop the Pebble mine

I'm writing to express my great concern regarding the irreversible harm that could be caused to the natural splendor of Bristol Bay due to the proposed Pebble Mine. Alaska is our last wilderness frontier. It has already been damaged by the actions of our fossil fuel addictive ways. The Pebble Mine will devastate the surrounding wilderness, the magnificent wildlife, and Bristol Bay, itself. We need you as our leader and the overseer of our country's resources to stop the destructive practices of greedy corporations that choose not to look beyond the almighty profit. As Americans, we all need to change our thinking and actions regarding energy sources. Please be proactive in this matter. Be America's voice in protecting our last frontier. Lead us in the development of clean energy sources to preserve the natural wonders of our country for generations to come. Thank you,

The pristine watershed of Bristol Bay deserves our reverence, not a rape two miles long and two thousand feet deep. The Bush administration pursued a headlong rush to devastate the environment for the sake of corporate profits. At the moment, we see the end results of such policies most dramatically in the Gulf of Mexico, but wild lands all over our country have suffered. Let us reverse those environmentally disastrous policies, not continue them. Do not approve the Pebble Mine. All of my life my family has enjoyed respites of hiking, boating and camping on federal lands. Their deterioration has been sad. Let us not risk one of the remaining great tracts of wilderness for the sake of a mine that will do little for the vast majority of Americans.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Good afternoon, We are not experts on mining, nor do we understand all the intricacies of big business, but what we do know is that we love Alaska! We have been to Alaska four times and are always amazed at its wildness and beauty. The frontier that it represents in today's crowded, complicated world is exhilarating. What we are afraid of is that Bristol Bay – which is a place most Americans haven't even heard of – will become known only after some environmental disaster. Who had ever heard of Bligh Reef in Prince William Sound before the Exxon Valdez oil spill?! We were fortunate enough to visit Katmai National Park this past summer and got to watch the brown bears eating salmon in the Funnel River. It was awesome, and there are scenes like that all over the Alaska Peninsula. Can we really be promised that there won't be an accidental spill, leaching of toxic chemicals into the soil and rivers, or any other man-made ruinous accident? We need to be caretakers of our earth, not complete users. Please don't allow the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay, or anywhere else in Alaska. Let's not even take the chance.

Bristol Bay is worth protecting for many reasons, saving fishing grounds for future generations being at the top. Where does our insatiable greed for nonrenewable resources end? Please stop the Pebble Mine for my and other people's grandchildren.

Dear Administrator, As a lover of nature, I implore you to preserve pristine Alaska and stop the construction of Pebble Mine. It is not necessary to destroy nature--this mine is completely disastrous.

Why Save Bristol Bay? Close to 7 billion people live on planet earth. Each day thousands of square miles of natural, wild places throughout the world disappear forever. Satellite images allow us to see the clear cut forests, mountain tops removed, entire eco systems destroyed for tar sands, polluted water and stripped, dead land. The list goes on and on. Rarely do we see or read about all the wildlife that disappears along with these natural places. Mistakenly, many people assume that displaced wildlife can simply move to a new location, but that's not the case. Most displaced wildlife simply die off, disappearing forever from the face of the earth. Bristol Bay is one of our last, pristine wild places. Home of wild salmon and a multitude of wildlife. It's waters are pure and skies crystal blue. To jeopardize this heavenly place is short sighted and just plain wrong in every way. Public lands are everyone's land and should be preserved in their natural state for current and future generations, both to enjoy and improve quality of life. No man-made castle, tower or sky scraper could ever come close to nature's magnificence in it's natural state. We have all seen how the human footprint changes and destroys nature. Our footprint soon becomes a path, then a road, and then a city -- displacing and killing all God's creatures that live there. For these reasons and too many more to discuss in this letter, Bristol Bay must be preserved from mining of any kind. It's as simple as that. Very soon, our nation is going to have to get serious about clean energy like wind and solar or it will be too late. We only have one earth--and we better take care of it now by standing up for what's right one project at a time.

Please protect the public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed. We don't know what the cumulative effects will be, of this toxic mining. Protecting habitat should be a priority. Thanks,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If I asked you to name a kind of meat that is natural, healthy, uncontaminated, tasty, sustainable, essentially wild, and (why not?) tasty, what would come to your mind? For me, nothing meets these specs as well as Wild Alaskan Salmon. Anything that threatens the waters of Alaska threatens to spoil this unique resource. How can you possibly allow the Pebble Mine to introduce toxic chemicals in the name of extracting yet another NON-RENEWABLE resource, when that would threaten a unique and important RENEWABLE resource? And this is above and beyond the dangers this mine poses to the rest of this precious ecosystem... Please stop the Pebble Mine!

America's great outdoors have been fast disappearing across my lifetime. Once lost, this land is lost for immense lifetimes at best. So little is left to protect, and so much of it is distant from those of us who most need the getaway from noise, machines, development, erosion, pollution that characterizes what has been done to America. I feel that you have an uncompromizable responsibility to protect them for future generations. Along with wilderness protection comes the absolute necessity to cease fragmenting habitats of our remaining large animals, and the vital native pollinators. We must protect more Wilderness and quiet recreation opportunities, preserving more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanent protecting remaining old-growth forests. In nearby Oregon, places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development. Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, lagging far behind nearby states. California has vast population pressure on our wilderness here. The amount of wilderness is far insufficient to handle the heavy use. We need more. Because of the vital need to reverse global warming, we need to protect America's public lands from logging, and change course to healthy foot recreation and conservation of wildlife. It is past time we considered actualities - the need to preserve and live in harmony with the natural world. Political maneuvering has avoided this necessity, and brought great danger of extinction and global catastrophe. It is time for such compromise to end, and to take a stand for what remains, and to try unceasingly to restore our lands, seas, waters. We need far more wilderness sequestered from "harvest", development, or private gain at the expense of our future. We need to restore damaged areas, by establishing resorted wilderness protections to even lands that have been used and abused. Thank you for considering my comments.

Dear Sirs: We have not much time left to turn around our destructive ways. We are at the crossroads. Species are being eliminated at a brutal pace. Our turn will come soon, very soon, unless we change. You're up to bat. Regards,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear America's Great Outdoors, The first thing that I want to note, is that I am pleased we now have a month to celebrate Wilderness, perhaps America's greatest legacy and heritage. What I found sad, however, is that with over half of the federally designated wilderness being in Alaska, not one of your listening sessions will be held here. This is an especially important time to listen to the issues facing the outdoors in Alaska. The state and federal government continue to battle on divisive issues, rather than settling for what is important for all Americans. Alaska must recognize that when it became a state that it joined a union and that it cannot continue to make decisions only for its own best interest. We saw this with the State Board of Game's decision regarding the trapping of wolves outside of Denali National Park. I hope that the federal government will now become more involved with the Pebble Mine that threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, fishing industry and the jobs it provides, and traditional subsistence ways of life. We need stronger federal oversight of the permitting process and analysis of potential impacts. Our public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed need protection and should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority to truly honor our heritage over the short term gains of mining in the area. I understand that as a nation, we need to extract resources. However, we also need to think in the longterm. History and ecology has taught us how fragile wetland communities are. The standards for mineral development in wetlands should be more stringent, especially for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Let's make sure we celebrate one of the most amazing things that makes America unique. People from all over the world come to our wild areas, our national parks, and specifically Alaska to see, feel, and experience the vast, unotuched wild areas that are disappearing from so many other places. Let's hope that America continues to be the leader in preserving these places. That can only happen with sound decisions. Smiles,

The US has a lot of resources already at it's disposal. I hate to see us overdevelop our natural heritage when there are plainly other solutions. We are one of the few highly globalized nations who seem to simply not give a damn about who or what we interfere with. The federal government should be held accountable by the indiginous peoples to uphold certain standards of action involving their livelyhood. Deny the corporates!

Please help keep America special by protecting more Wilderness and quiet recreation opportunities, preserving more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanently protecting remaining old-growth forests. Here in Oregon, we enjoy some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring public lands in the nation. But places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development. Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, lagging far behind our neighbors. For the wildlife that call our public lands homes and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance. Thank you for considering my comments.

Stop destrucing the pebble mines. Its so sad to see just majectc beauty be destroyed by man.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Official, I urge you to do all that you can to save and protect Bristol Bay and the waters, wildlife, lands and habitat that would be threatened and damaged by Pebble Mine. Metallic sulfide mining should be prohibited in an area such as this. Thank you for your work and efforts in this important matter .

Bristol Bay and the remaining wilderness is too precious to dig up! Mankind does not need another mine. The sole purpose of this endeavor is for wealth - we have to learn money and the environment aren't in the same plane, i.e. air we breathe and coins we buy things with. Leave whats left of the environment - to future generations!!

Please consider what is best for our environment and its future and the future of our children. Please do not continue with the mining plans. Thank you,

I appreciate the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. It is inspiring to see the President make conservation of America's treasured outdoor places a national priority. Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development and climate change. We need presidential leadership now more than ever to protect our wilderness quality lands so that future generations may also enjoy them. Please make wilderness protection a central component of the President's policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President, and I urge that this be done. Expanding America's wilderness preservation system is the best way to protect wildlife, watersheds and recreational opportunities.

Dear Obama Administration officials: As you consider ways to preserve America's open spaces and natural beauties, I respectfully ask that you provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process near Alaska's Bristol Bay. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life, and so the area should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Instead, the government's priority for this area should be protection of habitat, subsistence resources, and recreational opportunities. More generally, we can preserve our open spaces and natural wonders by improving relationships between federal and tribal governments, tightening the standards for mineral development in wetlands, and increasing the requirements under the Clean Water Act for allowing large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Regards-

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

As a former resident of Alaska, I would like to express my opposition to the Pebble Mine in Alaska. The mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. The standards for mineral development in wetlands should be tighter and the Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. I believe public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large scale mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. Additionally relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Best Regards,

Hi, I am writing to request that everything possible be done to protect this wild place. Remember, irreparable damage has been done all over this earth to capture a few "pebbles". The rewards are fleeting and the final results are devastating. In the end I'm afraid man-kind will find, too late, that obtaining "the pebbles" wasn't worth the sacrifice. Ask the people and the pelicans in the Gulf! Respectfully yours,

Please do not destroy the incredible resources of Bristol Bay for a stupid mine that will destroy something that cannot be replaced. It is difficult to think that this is even an issue in the 21st century. No Mine period. There is no way to make it safe for the environment and the mine itself is not important enough to justify it. Save Bristol Bay not just for today but forever. Thank you,

Hello, To be concise- DO NOT PERMIT IT. It will, as we know from long history, become an unrecoverable disaster. And, for what- more fast money for the owners. As always, at the end they will declare bankruptcy and walk away from their promises leaving devastation and ruin of this part of magnificent America and nature. So many of our values rest upon this kind of action to NOT do the easy expedient thing and think only short term. Please have some greater integrity and not bow to the temptations of the influence of the corporate money that so sways those of our government so frequently these days. Think BIG and LONG term, not the reverse and not about the money. Do the right thing- start a new trend by doing so. Thank you.

Alaska's Bristol Bay is an important pristine wildlife sanctuary. It provides a clean refuge for threatened western salmon while protecting the native Alaskan's subsistence lifestyle. These features make Bristol Bay incompatible with the proposed large-scale pebble mine using large-scale sulfide mining techniques. The Bay should be closed to these mining activities and be preserved as a protected wildlife habitat and native Alaskan sanctuary. The Federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed with a bias towards wilderness preservation.

Greetings, I am writing to plead with you to help preserve the natural beauty and resources of Bristol Bay. The bay is home to wild salmon and other irreplaceable wildlife which we must learn to sustain, not poison. Mining is an extremely dirty and harmful business and it has no place in delicate ecosystems. Please do what you can to work with tribal authorities to investigate the environmental impact of Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay and the traditional ways of the native peoples, and determine the most earth-friendly methods of preserving the bay's treasures for the present and the future. Best Regards,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

stop the Pebble Mine and save Bristol Bay.

Dear Obama Administration: Please do not let Bristol Bay be ruined by allowing the Pebble Mine. The Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government must provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process, and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments would benefit greatly from being strengthened. Standards for mineral development in wetlands must be tighter, and Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining must be more stringent. Please consider these facts and this logic in deciding to save and protect our few remaining natural places. Thank you.

I am submitting my comments ahead of your September 30 deadline with regard to mining in Bristol Bay watershed. Bristol Bay must be saved from the ravages of the disastrous mining operation known as Pebble Mine. The mine would effectively destroy, for all time, the beauty of Bristol Bay's wildlands, clean waters, life of the salmon runs, natural habitat of wildlife native to the area, subsistence living traditions, and the serenity offered by natural areas which should not be systematically destroyed one by one. The public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be off limits to large-scale metallic sulfide mining, and priority must be given to protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources. The government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine, the first step being a thorough analysis of cumulative impacts to this pristine area known as Bristol Bay watershed. Going forward with the plan would undermine tribal and government relationships, wetlands development standards, and current laws and standards for permitting or excluding mineral and other development in wetlands. Once destroyed, this beautiful area could never recover. Thank you for your time and attention.

Department of the Interior I would like to be counted as a voice against allowing the Pebble Mine to use its destructive mining practices in the environs of Bristol Bay. The indigenous people and the wildlife of the bay, not to mention the beauty of the area, must NOT be left at the mercy of this heavy-polluting process. Whatever it was, we can do without it more easily than we can recreate habitat, a broken subsistence economy, and the recreational value that are all under threat if this mining project goes forward. Thank you for your attention.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I grew up in the Bronx- so my experience with the great outdoors didn't extend much past a playground near my apartment building, and my experience with wildlife was limited to the Bronx Zoo. But, after living for four years in upstate New York and spending every summer in Ithaca, I really became the person I am today. Whether it was walking along a path in one of the many gorge trails nearby, swimming in a stream fed by a waterfall, picking blueberries in my friend's backyard or even going out onto Cayuga lake to do research- I really fell in love with our natural world. I can't imagine living in a world where you don't get to have those experiences. In our society we spend so much time indoors and on concrete- it's even more important to protect our last natural stands. The AGO initiative is our opportunity to make sure our National Parks don't fall into disrepair; that they have the resources to be as vibrant in fifty years as they were fifty years ago; that even kids growing up in the Bronx have the opportunity to spend a long weekend outside. This fall, our leaders in Washington should fulfill the promise of our national parks and fully fund the National Park Service budget and the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

The Department of the Interior has an opportunity to do something heroic for the planet. The Department of the Interior can stop mineral mining that will undoubtedly be destructive to the ecology of Bristol Bay with its clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence life of its native peoples. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine shows that 85% of them pollute nearby waters. As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams, waste that could pollute and poison pristine water. Please prove to the American people that the Department of Interior can provide strong and objective oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and careful analysis of the cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. When you have done so, I believe you will decide not to allow this mine. The possibility of an accident there would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk environmentalists like me are not willing to take. I hope the Department of Interior is also not willing to take such a fool-hardy risk.

please permanently protect bristol bay, our wildlife & world matter! thank you,

To America's Great Outdoors: Please record my opposition to the Pebble Mine proposal. Bristol Bay would be despoiled if the mine proposal is activated. It is too valuable an outdoor resource to undergo that fate. The watersheds that contribute to the bay should be closed to mining. Furthermore, the government must provide strict criteria for any kind of large-scale mining, and there must be vigorous monitoring for any projects which might be approved. Any other approach is an invitation to abuse of the criteria and destruction of the resources involved. For example, the Clean Water Act provides for the possibility of imposing strict standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Such standards can, and should, be imposed and should involve broad public input. Thank you for considering my views.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

For the past 25 years I have experience the beauty of the lakes, rivers , mountains and fishing in the Bristol Bay area. Three generations of my family have traveled to King Salmon to fish ever year. I cannot believe anyone would allow an open pit mine in an area that has the world's largest sockeye run. The major problem with the proposed open-pit mines is how they will contain the tons of waste to find gold. Stop and think about the problem with storing tons of waste forever. They will never be able to contain the ground water pollution which will expose the surrounding land, and wildlife to deadly conditions. Please think again, when they are gone we will have large toxic lakes that cannot be used. The area will have a 2 mile wide and 2,000 feet deep pit without life. And forever we will live in fear that the Billions of tons of waste will not harm our land and water. Common sense should tell us that this is wrong. The only reason for this posed mine is money. If we look at the past, mining companies come and go, they leave toxic waste behind and NEVER clean-up before they leave. How can anyone tell us that they will remove tons of toxic waste. They can't , they only tell us they will store it there forever. Please do not allow any open-pit mining in this area. Thank you

Pebble Mine should not be allowed because of the damage it will do to the wilflife and environment. Pebble Mine threatens Bristo Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wilflife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. Please consider what is important to us citizens. There has already been too much distruction of our environment through mining and we must preserve our pristine habitat in the Bristol Bay area. Thank you,

I'm writing to ask the US government to have to good sense to put a halt on plans to open Bristol Bay in Alaska to mining. Though the financial temptation might be great, we cannot risk polluting some of America's last true wilderness. The proposed mine is projected to generate billions of tons of waste and would pollute the pristine waters nearby, killing off native species and forever altering our relationship with the land and those who live and make their living there. We have a duty not just to our environment and its habitats, but to our fellow humans as well, to prevent this land from being destroyed in this way. The mine might last a few years, but the destruction it would leave behind would be irreparable. Thank you. -- "Today's problems cannot be solved if we still think the way we thought when we created them." - Albert Einstein

I am strongly opposed to the proposed Bristol Bay Pebble Mine. Please do not allow this mine to begin operations ever! The location of the mine is in sensitive wildlife habitat and would do great damage even under the best of circumstances. The bounty from the natural habitat as it is today is much more valuable than any revenue or profit obtained from the proposed mine. Do not permit the proposed mine! Thank you. Respectfully Submitted,

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

HEY WEBMASTER -- I NEED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE. HOW LONG DOES IT TAKE SOMEONE THERE TO ANSWER MY EMAILS AND HELP ME? DO YOU ANSWER CITIZEN'S EMAIL, OR JUST TAKE MY TAX DOLLARS AND SIT ON YOUR BUTT? DO I HAVE TO CALL KEN SALAZAR'S OFFICE TO COMPLAIN ABOUT YOU? FYI, HE'S MY FORMER SENATOR AND HIS OFFICE \*\*\*WILL\*\*\* TAKE MY COMPLAINT SERIOUSLY AS TO THE HORRIBLE AND LAZY JOB SOMEONE AT <http://ideas.usda.gov> IS DOING WITH THIS WEB SITE. Dear Webmaster, I CANNOT post my comment to the forum at <http://ideas.usda.gov/> (the full URL below.) I've tried three times and yet only half (or less) of my comment gets posted. In addition NO OPTION IS PROVIDED TO EDIT OR DELETE COMMENTS AFTER POSTING. YOU ALSO HAVE NO INSTRUCTIONS OR INFO (ZERO, ZIP, NADA) ON POSTING COMMENTS, TROUBLESHOOTING, POSTING REQUIREMENTS, CHARACTER LIMITS, ETC. This is extremely frustrating and has been a total waste of my time and efforts. Mine is both a comment and an open letter to the PRESIDENT, and it is meaningless if your stupid forum truncates, misrepresents, or otherwise mangles my attempt to make an educated comment and contribution. Now I have two (or maybe three) partially completed comments posted that do not say what I intended to fully say. PLEASE FIX THIS AND IMPROVE THE INTERFACE TO ALLOW POST-COMMENT EDITING. (How's that for an idea?)  
<http://ideas.usda.gov/ago/ideas.nsf/0/F5B7C870571DC680862577AD00498B6F?OpenDocument>

Hello, My sister and brother in law make their living fishing off Bristol Bay in the village of Ekuk. My wife and I went to visit them at their fish site and help fish for 6 tides. The experience was eye-opening, and fantastic. We met Alaskans of all stripes, natives, old-timers, and newcomers. All benefited from the bounty of the Bristol Bay fishery. The fish are phenomenal. It is beyond comprehension that anyone would consider placing this priceless fishery at risk, but clearly those who shortsightedly favor developing the Pebble Mine are doing just that. Once an ecosystem like Bristol Bay is compromised it can never return to its pristine, bountiful state. Please tighten wetlands protections in the regulation of mineral development. Please ensure that oversight of the Pebble Mine licensing process takes into account cumulative impacts on the Bristol Bay watershed. Please strengthen the Clean Water Act for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Please stop the Pebble Mine and preserve the Bristol Bay fishery for generations to come.

I am writing to let you know that I believe there should be no mining at Bristol Bay. The proposed mine threatens the purity of water and land, and destroys the well being of native people as well as animal and plant species. The degradation of the planet through reckless extraction of resources needs to be halted, now. Public lands should be used for the well being of all, not the profit of a corporation at the expense of activities like outdoor recreation and preservation of habitat and native ways of life. I urge you to support strong clean water policies, strict evaluation of the impact of this mine, and to strengthen policies which protect wetlands from the effects of mining. Thank you,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I applaud the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. It is inspiring to see the President make conservation of America's treasured outdoor places a national priority. Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development and climate change. We need presidential leadership now more than ever to protect our wilderness quality lands so that future generations may also enjoy them. I'm asking the President to please make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President, and I urge that this be done. Expanding America's wilderness preservation system is the best way to protect wildlife, watersheds and recreational opportunities. Again, I want to thank the Obama Administration for taking the initiative to protect America's Great Outdoors. I look forward to seeing the president use this opportunity to establish a new and substantial legacy of wilderness conservation, one that can stand as a visible and enduring accomplishment of his presidency.

America's Great Outdoors, I have been visiting Alaska since 1983. In my view, it is one of the most beautiful places on earth, deserving of our protection for future generations. The Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay is a really bad idea. I went to college with a gold miner who is now notorious for poisoning Canadian wilderness with toxic mining practices. Once pristine lands like these are contaminated, their legacy lives on in misery and blight. Let's stop this disaster before it happens, and keep Bristol Bay clean and safe for wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life. Say no to the pebble mine.

To Whom it may concern, Years from now, when the last of God's greatest gifts to this planet and the humans who inhabit it, has been destroyed by pollution and construction, and disrespect for it's fragility, we will know who could have stopped it! PLEASE, for the Love of God, put sanity over greed this one time at least! Thank You,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sir/Madam The future of our wonderful wilderness looks terribly grim with all of the mining and oil companies being given carte blanche to lay waste, pollute and destroy nature's fragile balances. We deserve better of an administration than to have it sell off what few of the wilderness areas are remaining. This administration has become gluttonous in its desire to destroy the wildlife and its habitat. It is a no-win situation if it continues in this manner. All the areas now about to be destroyed will not allow much additional time before resources run dry. Leave these refuges of beauty with the wildlife that God created and think laterally about the situation. Limit population increase, make it more expensive for people to waste rather than save resources, stop all the building in the cities from leaving on the lights 24 hours a day, limit packaging of food, cut back on air conditioning, make more public transport available and make it more difficult and expensive to run a private car. These are the ways to provide for a future. Shooting wolves in the national parks, destroying the habitats and food sources of wildlife and other ghastly policies will do nothing except enrich shareholders and corrupt politicians. Pebble Mine is a perfect example of this misguided policy and will doom yet more of the wilderness without any lasting gains. Yours,

As an American citizen I have been very concerned about the onslaught against wetlands and other wild areas which support wildlife and are important natural places for Americans to appreciate. The mining at Pebble Bay would be disastrous for these values and would be one more misjudgment regarding preserving critical natural resources. Let's not ruin everything in the pursuit of resources. Our children have a future and we must preserve vital and special planetary wonders.

Sirs, There is quite a bit of media coverage about the Pebble Mine Project in Alaska. Since this would affect Bristol Bay I would just like to add my own thoughts to the governmental review procedures. There are several streams in Alaska that were blocked around 1900 during the gold rush. They were subsequently reopened during the 1950's. The salmon have never come back. The wildlife biologists have discovered that once these fish are interrupted for a certain number of years they cannot recover. The Pebble project would undoubtedly affect the acidity or PH of the entire bay. This is all it takes to ruin salmon spawning. Secondly this mine is proposed for its copper content. There is a vast quantity of copper in our landfills. Copper generally does not rust and it can be recovered with no environmental effects and it is shallower and far more easily refined. Instead of mining it from Bristol Bay it could be taken from Freshkills New York City at a far lower cost. We have ruined many runs of salmon in this country and there are still 38 species on the verge of extinction. I recommend that we protect all remaining runs.

It isn't just that Pebble Mine will Destroy Bristol Bay no matter how careful they are, it is that every little bit of the ecosystem that we destroy effects the rest of the ecosystem and each day we destroy a little bit more and one day we are going to look up and say, "Whoops there isn't any more". It is all attached. The chemicals that go into Bristol Bay will end up in our back yards and the chemicals we put on our backyards will end up in Bristol Bay some day. We have to quit saying, "Well just one more time. It will be ok."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In Washington state we have seen the results of being careless with salmon runs and clean water. Let's all learn from this and not make a tragic mistake again.

I am writing to strongly urge you to reject Pebble Mine and protect Bristol Bay with its clean waters, wild salmon, and other wildlife. The mine threatens all of these along with traditional, sustainable ways of life. In fact, the federal government should strengthen its relationship with tribal governments rather than ignore their interests. Overall, public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Instead, the top priority should be protecting habitat, subsistence living, and sustainable recreation. The federal government needs to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. You must also tighten standards for mineral development in wetlands and make Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining more stringent. Again, please protect Bristol Bay and all the life it supports from the devastation of Pebble Mine.

It is vital that the Pebble Mine project not go forward as planned. Pebble Mine seriously threatens Bristol Bays waters, wildlife, and salmon. Clear Water Act standards are not stringent enough for metallic sulfide mining. There needs to be a much closer working relationship between the federal government and the tribal government. Please do not allow this project to go forward. A very concerned citizen

To Whom It May Concern There should be no mining in Pebble Mine. It is in the Bristol Bay watershed. Protection of Bristol Bay is much more important than short term gain from mining. Please do the right thing

Folks, I am writing this email in response to the disastrous possibility of the Pebble Creek Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay region. I visit this area each year in search of the monster rainbows this area sports. Yes, I am a consumptive user of the outdoors and wish to voice my opinion on this proposal. I think there are places to mine, and this is not one of them. This mine will affect so much of our national heritage, that it has to be stopped, right now! I am not normal against this sort of thing, but I think this is a bad idea all the way around. Thanks for your time,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

We applaud the Obama Administration's conservation leadership embodied in the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. It is inspiring to see the President make conservation of America's treasured outdoor places a national priority. Our natural resources are threatened by pressures like expanding population, unguided development and climate change. We need presidential leadership now more than ever to protect our wilderness quality lands so that future generations may also enjoy them. We're asking the President to please make wilderness protection a central component of his policy emerging from the America's Great Outdoors Initiative. The President has the authority to facilitate better cooperation among the federal public land agencies and Congress to identify eligible landscapes and protect them as wilderness. Currently, the U.S. Forest Service uses overly restrictive criteria in determining their recommendations for lands that should be designated wilderness. Worse, the Bureau of Land Management is bound by a directive from the previous administration to cease all wilderness assessments. Both constraints can be lifted by direction of the President, and I urge that this be done. Expanding America's wilderness preservation system is the best way to protect wildlife, watersheds and recreational opportunities. Again, thanks to the Obama Administration for taking the initiative to protect America's Great Outdoors. We look forward to seeing the president use this opportunity to establish a new and substantial legacy of wilderness conservation, one that can stand as a visible and enduring accomplishment of his presidency. Peace!

I am very concerned about the America's treatment of our outdoors. In particular, I worry about our wetlands in South Louisiana, and the damage being done by policies and actions along the entire Mississippi River watershed. I want the next generation to be able to enjoy my part of the country and the fruits of our wetlands -- the nurseries to the Gulf of Mexico. I urge leaders in Washington to expand protection and conserve America's wetlands and outdoor spaces. Thank you

The Pebble Mine project in Bristol Bay, Alaska must never be approved. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, and wildlife. This pristine environment must not be sacrificed for greed! Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority! Do not approve this project under any circumstances! Too much of our Alaskan heritage is already under threat.

Dear Obama Administration Officials, What we don't have in the USA is enough protected, unspoiled wilderness areas. We are a large country but only protect roughly 4% of it as wilderness. That is not only short-sighted, but a reflection of a mentality that views nature as only as a commodity. Some of greatest poets--Emerson, Thoreau, etc--regarded nature as the embodiment of God. I don't view carving up some of the last of our unspoiled wilderness and replacing it with a mining operation as an improvement. I'm tired of seeing what man can do to a wilderness and somehow viewing it as an "improvement" and would like to see more of what nature can do on her own in creating beautiful wilderness areas like Bristol Bay. I strongly oppose this mining operation. Please let Bristol Bay continue to remain pristine. Our future generations will thank you. I would also like to say that I am against strip mining of any kind. We can't lose beautiful mountains like those in West Virginia and other areas to strip mining.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Sir/madam, The proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay would threaten the environmental stability of the region, devastate the wildlife there, and the livelihood of the native population. Man's greed for natural resources should not make us short-sighted, and destroy the very environment we live in and which sustains us. I hope your administration will take steps to ensure the stability and security of this environment and its flora and fauna.

Dear America's Great Outdoors and the Obama administration, Please do not allow metal mining in Alaska's Bristol Bay. The Pebble Mine is dangerous to wildlife, and we don't have much of wildlife left. The mining would pollute the water and make life untenable for the helpless creatures there, the bears, whales, salmon, birds. This would happen even if the mine operated normally. With an accident, the damage would be unthinkable. There are few places that we have not damaged. Let's keep this one the way it should be. Let's do the right thing this time. Please stop Pebble Mine and the actions of the Bush administration.

the government needs to protect the natural areas including the animals, birds etc that inhabit these areas. once a species is extinct it cannot be brought back. greed, big business have been in control to long. we destroy precious creatures, plants, trees and even insects in the name of progress and in the long run in danger our own survival ( ie: global warming ). one of my biggest concerns are the wild mustangs, cougars and polar bears. there is still way to much poverty and people being paid to much ( politicians, sports and ceo's ). not all of these can be solved by government but it would be nice to see a start made. bickering between the elected officials of this country should be lowered all so.

Why is it that you folks WE THE STUPID PEOPLE elect do things most of us think is just plain stupid? This Pebble Mine business for instance. Here we have a perfectly clean environs,net, Bristol Bay, and big business is going to run you dunderheads in another big chase and circle, all for the sake of of risking metallic sulfides if and when this mine operation goes into effect. Oh, don't get me wrong. I know how you're going to vote on this matter, just like you folks always vote - weak, though with a diluted compromise. So, why not grow a pair and do the right thing for a change: close down that operation and open up your minds for a change. Otherwise, you know damn well you're going to create another environ,entail hazard and shrug your shoulders saying words to the effect, "Gee, never thought that would happen. Those mine officials even told me everything would work out just fine." Come on people in power - wake up and listen to the wisdom that says "What harm do to this planet, its environment, you also end up doing to yourself."



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sirs: I have major concerns with the proposed Pebble Mine project. Let me start by saying that I am generally for a cooperative private enterprise/public interest policy. In most cases I would prefer that the federal government stay out of the private sector, unless there is a compelling public interest at stake. For example, I generally support most oil drilling project unless it can be clearly shown that there is likely damage to the environment. I greatly appreciate the natural environment and have enjoyed outdoor recreation most of my life - I believe we must be good steward of the creation with which we have been entrusted. The Pebble Mine project appears to be a clear and imminent catastrophe just waiting to happen. The rare treasure of western Alaska is a jewel to be protected. There appears to be so little benefit from this project compared to the great peril it presents to the environment and the economic welfare of the whole region. I would encourage the federal government to do all that it can to halt the project. Thank you.

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Obama Administration and relevant agencies: Alaska's Bristol Bay is another spectacular example of treasured wilderness that should be protected from large scale degradation. The natural beauty and teeming wildlife of this great region would be forever impacted by the destruction brought by a project such as the Pebble Mine. The traditional fishing patterns of Alaskan native peoples in this area would also be severely affected. Doubtlessly, the area also contains non-renewable archaeological and other historical sites. While impacts to these resources might be somewhat mitigated through careful pre-construction measures, the loss of timeless landscape, old growth forests, and marine environments are not. These effects will last for generations, as they are likely to in the Gulf of Mexico and elsewhere. The need for another ugly and massively destructive project such as the Pebble Mine is difficult to understand. The beauty of the Bristol Bay ecosystem is far more valuable, and the entire watershed should be closed to metallic sulfide mining. We need to protect Bristol Bay and other places like it by prohibiting permits for needless, destructive developments of all types. We also need to strengthen the standards represented in the Clean Water Act, and to enhance the relationship between the federal government and native councils, particularly in matters as damaging to the environment as the proposed Pebble Mine. Please keep the Pebble Mine out of treasured wilderness such as Bristol Bay, and direct them instead to areas that have already been irrevocably marred.

Please save the Bristol Bay area from becoming another cesspool of toxic waste. I visited this area about 10 years ago, and it still leaves a strong impression on my mind when I think back to the natural beauty of the area, and the friendly, easy-going ways of its inhabitants. This is a place where many different types of people and animals depend on. From the whales to the salmon, to the fishermen to the native cultures who fish the sea and the rivers. There are too many issues at stake here, way more than just drilling and mining and ravaging a pristine area for some precious minerals. This needs to be rethought, and the Pebble Mining corp. needs to find another area to do their mining. Where so many people and animals aren't dependent on this environment, and so many livelihoods aren't at stake. Mining is not renewable, and once that hole has been dug, it will be very difficult to ever recover what once was... Thanks for listening



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Pebble Mine clearly threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional ways of life of the people living along its shores. Please prevent the opening of this mine. Thank you,

There are many environmental problems associated with mining, particularly mining sulfide ores. Most of the material mined is not processed for the ore, it is treated as waste and placed in piles that are more than double the volume of the space they occupied prior to mining. This "waste" material contains sulfide ore, just not in high enough concentrations to profitably extract the targeted metal(s). Sulfide ores exposed to the atmosphere, and moisture, rapidly break down giving rise to toxic pollutants that leach into the groundwaters and/or run off into the streams. When those water resources are contaminated by mine wastes, their ability to provide habitat for food fish is reduced or destroyed. Bristol Bay and its tributary streams are critically important for food fish (both for sustenance and commercial purposes), and contamination of them from mining would be disastrous for all who depend on the fish. For that reason, any mining development in the Bristol Bay watershed should be rigorous in protecting the environment from the detrimental effects of mining. Note that even the most carefully planned measures to protect the environment are entirely dependent on the mining personnel to ensure that all measures are scrupulously followed. However, the mining company is in the business to make as much money as possible, which is another way of saying that they will tend to put resources into activities that have the highest rate of metal production per dollar invested, and spend as little as possible on activities which don't. Unfortunately, environmental protection is something that costs money, and doesn't produce any metallic benefit. So, unless you leave the fox to guard the hen house, any environmental protection plan needs effective oversight by another party. This oversight should be paid by the permitting agency, using funds supplied by the mine. I think, if the true cost of effectively protecting the Bristol Bay and its tributaries from environmental damage resulting from mining is considered, the owners of the Pebble Mine claims will find it in their best financial interest to seek minerals in other areas where environmental values are considerably less than they are in Bristol Bay. I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

I am writing this note this evening to express how concerned I am over the proposed Pebble Creek Gold mine. I want our Government to take the long view, of the environmental damage, impact to the economy through the destruction of salmon stocks and the fouling of our waters. The history of mining in this country is very clear...the companies make huge profits, and the citizens are left with what remains...generally a damaged environment and an unpaid bill. Government should take the lead to look for sustainable growth, without unpaid environmental bills as the result. Please stop the Pebble Mine project. very respectfully,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Sirs, I am writing to you in reference to the proposed Pebble Mine on Bristol Bay, Alaska. As you may know, Trout Unlimited is a nationwide, non-profit organization and the individual chapters are completely volunteer. T.U.'s mission is to conserve, protect and restore our natural cold-water resources. Areas such as Bristol Bay and its eco-system are constantly being threatened by development and big business across our nation. It is important that we preserve unique natural resources such as Bristol Bay and instill stringent legislation to protect these fragile areas. All considered, once this is allowed to happen, there will be no turning back, no restoration. In Connecticut, we once had some of the largest Salmon runs in the world, now we have none. Restoration efforts have been taking place for over thirty years and we still have no return runs of salmon. If the Pebble Mine is allowed, the last large consistent salmon run in the world will be decimated forever. Please do not allow this to occur. I implore you to stop this while it is still stoppable and to instill strong legislation to protect this and other similar unique, fragile eco-systems from destruction due to greed and certainly not by necessity.

Mr. President and Mr. Secretary, After reading hundreds of the comments on America's Great Outdoors, it is clear that there is great diversity of opinion and high emotion on both sides of the environment issue. It is also clear to me that if the health of our public lands and wildlife habitat is up to credulous and ill-informed public opinion, there is no hope for our once great natural endowment. As a prime example... who, in possession of his mental faculties, authorized the open pit Pebble Gold Mine in Bristol Bay, Alaska?! The Guns and OHV Crowd is fired up at the "threat of Left Wing radical Environmentalists taking over their country." They are furious at the notion of introducing Environmental Sustainability studies into public education, asserting that it is THEIR job to teach their children environmental values, as if Sustainability were a Belief. And they have been conditioned to accept as gospel that America's greatness is synonymous with our aggressive ethnocentrism, and our unregulated freedom to exploit natural resources, whether on U.S. soil or that of other nations, regardless of the harmful cost to living species and their habitat. The Responsibility to Preserve and Protect the Commonwealth is delegated by The People to elected and appointed government officials, who have taken an oath to do so. Their mandate is to sustainably manage the Commonwealth for the benefit of All Americans, not to give equal weight to the demands of All Claimants, nor to Average the results of public polls, such as America's Great Outdoors, and let that Average dictate public policy. No, to Preserve and Protect the Resources held in Common by the People of this country will necessarily require moderating and regulating those uses that devalue and contravene the quality of the Commonwealth, or restrict responsible and respectful access to it by The People. This responsibility is the mandate of the Secretary of the Interior. And he and the President, and the Congress will be held accountable, at the Polls and in the Courts, for proper implementation of wholesome, sustainable regulatory policies.

Bristol Bay and also other Alaskan wilderness area, including the arctic ocean, are far too important for the environment, climate and as habitat for endangered species and should not be destroyed by any mining and drilling activities. Besides that, mining activities will destroy livelihood of native Alaskans who depend on salmon fishing. please do what is right for us now and later!

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

Bristol Bay, one of our last great wild ecological areas, is too valuable to destroy by commercial mining! How far do we go in the name of the all mighty dollar?! We have forfeited far too many of our lands and waterways already. Enough is enough!! NO MORE WILDERNESS DEVELOPMENT!

There is nothing I am more passionate about than preserving our natural resources and protecting the environment. I feel strongly about being nature's advocate and voice and am therefore speaking out against the Pebble Mine which threatens Bristol Bay. Large-scale metallic sulfide mining will impact public lands in the Bristol Bay negatively and needs to be offset with tighter Clean Water Act standards and stricter federal government oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process. We, as responsible earth stewards, need to respect Bristol Bay's amazing wildlands and wildlife and contribute to their protection. I urge you to make stopping the Pebble Mine and saving Bristol Bay a priority and, as a result, leave a lasting legacy for future generations so that they might enjoy nature's beauty and inspiration. Sincerely yours

Allowing mining in Bristol Bay makes about as much sense as giving a logging company the rights to cut down the Giant Redwoods in California. The damage to the wildlife and the environment of this area would be so extreme that no dollar amount could ever repair the loss to this world. Our natural resources are being depleted for the GREED of these mining, logging and oil companies...IT HAS TO STOP and BRISTOL BAY and PEBBLE MINE is an excellent place to say NO.....NO MINING...NO LOGGING....NO OIL DRILLING !!!!!!!!!!!!!!! KEEP OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND WILD LIFE SAFE AND PROTECTED....ITS HERE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS AND ITS OUR OBLIGATION TO KEEP THIS PROTECTED AND SAFE FROM THE GREED OF THIS WORLD !!!!!

Dear sirs/madams: One of our nation's most precious assets are the natural wonders that we have set aside for present and future generations. One of those precious wonders is the Bristol Bay watershed which is now being threatened by the proposal of large-scale mining, notably the Pebble Mine project. The permanent and uncorrectable damage that such a mine would wreak on this resource is incalculable. Not only would it poison the water supplies of the whole area, it would also damage the enormous watershed that is so critical to the health, welfare and survival of the wildlife, trees, and plant life of that area. It would also change forever the traditional subsistence ways of life that are still practiced in that part of our nation. Please do all in your power to stop the Pebble Mine project NOW. At the same time, every effort should be made to strengthen and tighten the standards for mineral development, especially in wetlands such as Bristol Bay. The Clean Water Act also needs to be strengthened, especially its standards related to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Thank you for your time. And Please Help stop the Pebble Mine Project.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hello!! I would like to be able to take a moment to express my concern on the possibility of a mining adventure to take place near the Bristol Bay in our beautiful state of Alaska. Today with the changing needs of the world. We must start to see that we can preserve the unspoiled areas of nature in the raw (the way it was designed to be forever). We can but all safe guards in place to protect it, but we have seen lately and in the past, that safe guards can fail, with the loss of the area that was to be protected. Once lost it can never be replaced or brought back to the way it was meant to be. Therefore I'am asking that this mining project be omitted in the sake of unspoiled nature. Thanking you for your time.

We need clean water and safe fish & wildlife to eat. It doesn't get any more simple than that, does it? Polution has already cost us dearly when others have not thought ahead. Do not make another mistake that will not only cost us the environment, but the taxpayers will have to pay again when we have to clean up the mess later. Millions of taxpayer dollars are being spent currently in Oregon to clean up old mine areas that are still polluting our rivers. Do the right thing now. Thanks in advance

I am tired of hearing of our great, beautiful country being over-ran and destroyed for our own personal comforts, it's time we as human beings step up and realize we are directly affecting millions of life forms everywhere, and we are directly responsible for millions of deaths. If these animals were human, we would all be on trial for genocide, but it is human nature to put ourselves above everything else, all I am asking is for respect. Respect for the world around us that gives us sustenance, without it, there would be...nothing. Pebble Mine is nothing but a nuisance, all the recent global issues involving mines should be all that is needed to show why another mine should not be created, it's time we move on, find less destructive ways to keep our comforts and harvest what we think we need in life, not for us now, but for future generations; no one knows how much time we have before our destruction is irreversible, and I don't think anybody wants to wait until that point. 30 years ago when we realized our Ozone was rapidly depleting, the laws were erected to stop it, but with our current environmental issues, no one is in a hurry to jump, when these issues could be substantially more devastating than any we have ever faced before. I plead for some consideration that all us "green freaks" might have a leg to stand on, that we might be on to something, I am not asking for things to change overnight, I am just asking you to ponder the idea that our world is taking a turn for the worst unless everyone, not just America, steps up to the plate and starts refining the ways we all live. We are all connected more than anyone realizes, we are all neighbors in the grand spectrum of things, please do not add to our problems by creating yet another one, please leave Alaska beautiful, it's the least urbanized area I know of in this country, and it deserves to stay that way! Thanks for hearing me out on this matter,

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hello. I am writing to you to urge you to oppose Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. The cool, shallow waters of Bristol Bay are surrounded by a verdant cushion of tundra, crisscrossed by swift rivers and dotted with lakes large and small. Grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales roam this nearly untouched ecosystem, all drawn by the same lure: tens of millions of thrashing salmon, charging upstream to spawn. Huge salmon runs are the linchpin of this glorious wilderness, supporting valuable commercial fisheries, indigenous people and a vast array of wildlife. Yet the whole system could come crashing down if giant mining interests get their way. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building). As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. Please oppose Pebble Mine. Thank you for your time.

Dear Important People, Americans have so stupidly allowed our waterways to be contaminated. Please do not allow Pebble Mine to contaminate Bristol Bay. Thank you.

I'm doing all I can to try to save this vast planet, being only one person. I need your help! I'm most concerned about the mining that threatens our Alaskan wilderness and the waters of Bristol Bay. Please consider what destruction to public lands, water and wildlife can be caused by mining. Our federal government needs to step in to protect Bristol Bay by providing strong monitoring of Pebble Mine, as well as strengthen our relationship between the tribal and federal governments. Please, please take my concerns into consideration. OUR PLANET DEPENDS ON US.

Our National Parks are a gift from wise Americans who went before us who had foresight and wisdom. Please continue that legacy. There are environmental issues, esthetic points, and just plain common sense that are involved when considering the protection and upkeep of our National Parks. I am sure that others will remark on these very poignantly. I would like to say this. These parks spiritual places for our national family. They are places of wilderness, openness, quiet, and inspiration. These are challenging times. There are so many problems that seem too big to solve--that we have no answers to and/or do not have the resources to meet. I believe it is vital to our national psyche to know that our government can at least preserve this legacy. If our government can not come together on this issue and move forward rightly, successfully, immediately...I believe it will lose the last shred of hope Americans have that democracy works...that our government is capable...that America can't even preserve its own natural resources. Please show us you can keep our National Parks in tact. Thank you for considering my comments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Having traveled through Yellowstone National Park and the surrounding area for over 30 years we know it is an ecosystem to both enjoy and protect. Having a vacation home 15 miles from the west entrance to the Park we feel privileged to spend several months in the area, including winters. Use of low emission snowmobiles by responsible individual drivers should be allowed. Before the requirement of having to go with a guided group, friends, my wife, and I enjoyed touring the Park three times; staying overnight at the Snow Lodge at Old Faithful. We can not do this under the current regulations unless we pay for the guide to stay overnight. Please do not allow a few careless riders deprive others of enjoying the Park in the winter. While we are supporters of several environmental groups in the area, we are NOT in agreement with banning snowmobiles from Yellowstone. Please, allow responsible visitors to enjoy the wonders and beauty of Yellowstone in the winter without the requirement of being with a guide. Alternate Plan: Individual snowmobilers would complete training workshops, up to four hours, and successfully pass a test. In addition, the individuals would understand and agree to severe penalties and/or fines for violations.

Dear Secretary Salazar and Department of the Interior: I recently spent 3 weeks traveling in Alaska and was overwhelmed by the beauty of the small amount of the state I was able to visit. I was also struck by how fragile the environment in Alaska is. I've lived in Colorado all my life and am aware of how fragile environment is, especially in our mountains. There are scars all over our mountains from metal mining in our past, although it did not threaten wildlife species. Knowing its destruction of fragile environment, I cannot imagine the destruction mining heavy metals and risking contamination by the chemicals involved in mining might cause in Bristol Bay, Alaska, threatening wildlife and Salmon and the traditional Native Subsistence Fishing. Every place I traveled in Alaska I saw bumper stickers on various vehicles to Stop the Pebble Mine. I absolutely agree with that sentiment. I know that Climate Change is causing destruction of habitat, and I don't know how much impact we can truly have on that although we must try. Not mining in Bristol Bay is a positive action that we know can protect vital wildlife habitat. Do we truly need to be mining Gold there and risking destruction? Please give every consideration to blocking Mining in Bristol Bay. Thank you for your consideration.

Everytime I hear about plans to start a new copper or gold mine I literally cringe. These mines are toxic to the area where they are and often to a wider area due to the chemicals used in dissolving the minerals. The mining companies always claim that they can do this while protecting the environment but so far I don't think that they have been able to....usually effluent leaks into underground acquifers and spreads across the land and into the surrounding lakes and bays etc. AND like the oil mine in the Gulf of Mexico there isn't any proven method of clean up afterwards.....Then the Federal government and the taxpayers end up paying for some kind of remediation....after the fish, birds and mammals have been killed off. This area is an important recreation and tourist area in Alaska where not only can you go fishing for trophy salmon but you can also fly in and watch the brown bears catch the salmon for themselves. This to me is a very rare opportunity...not found in more than one or two other places in Alaska and nowhere else in the world. Why would we want to destroy this unique place for any amount of gold-- which after all is not in short supply or necessary to maintain our lives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

If we don't protect what we have now we'll go down in the history books for all the wrong reasons. Our grandchildren will never forgive us.

Dear decision maker, I have traveled to Alaska on four separate occasions and am a practicing field biologist, I would like to submit comments on the proposed mining in the Bristol Bay watershed. As a Colorado resident I am all too aware of mining's impacts on native species and natural communities. In the case of Bristol Bay, the Pebble Mine has the potential to wreak havoc on one of the richest habitats in our nation. In addition, the mine would seriously threaten the viability of subsistence peoples whose livelihood depend upon healthy lands and waters. I have been closely watching the specter of this plan develop over the years and am horrified at its momentum and potential for harm. Whatever riches may be gleaned from the relatively short lifetime of this development is not worth the damage that will remain behind in perpetuity. The pristine nature of the Bristol Bay watershed will never be the same if the mine is approved. The federal government must honor its responsibilities and provide strong oversight of the process, closely regulate air and water standards, keep a special eye on wetlands, and honor the rights of traditional people. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments ...

Hello, When all of the true costs and benefits are tallied, there can be no doubt that we must do everything possible to protect, preserve and restore as many of the few remaining wild places as possible. Industry and individuals have been stealing from the environment by not paying the true costs as long as they have been able to do so. Any valid scientific study would support this. Thank you for focusing attention on this most important issue. Regards,

Sorry, but we should be doing much much more to get solar and wind and geothermal and ocean energy, whatever, but we need to keep our wild areas free.....and untouched by human hands.....it's about time we realize they are almost all gone.....but we need people in power who understand how fragile our ecosystem really is...instead of just plowing ahead (see oil rigs offshore.....no real protection for us, the ocean, the inhabitants of said ocean) and destroying what you can never recover in your lifetime....and when you are gone, no one else will pick it up to try and restore it..you know that. please keep these big monster projects away from our pristine lands.... look at brazil..as the weather changes due the forests being ripped down hundreds of acres a day..... oops..... on your watch you need to keep our fabulous green areas green. period. thanks for listening,

Why would we not save this beautiful place, haven't we destroyed enough of our planet IT IS TIME TO CHANGE the old ways of thinking has got to end, look were it has got us global warming ,extinction of animals. Destroying this place should not even be an option .please help make a change



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Perhaps I fail to understand what the term "Public Lands" designates, but I have always believed that it meant lands set aside for the public good. Since when have these lands become available to the obscenely wealthy few, who exploit them for their own personal gain? Why must we allow these huge corporations to destroy our national birthright? Since when did it become acceptable for our governments (federal and state) to "pimp" these territories for the personal profit of the few, with no regard for the ecological after effects of this exploitation? This has to stop! We are destroying our own environment

We have a lot of questions for the Interior Department. Okay, haven't we learned that we can't blindly trust "Industry's" reassurances that they can prevent devastation from occurring because of the latest, greatest technologies?? Worked well for B.P., Transocean, and Halibuton, didn't it?? I mean, really!! An open-pit mine at the headwaters of the largest salmon fishery left in the U.S.A.?? You do know there was a regime change in D.C. in '08, don't you?? Are you really considering granting permits for the largest open-pit mine in North America?? To companies that have already had 45+ water-use violations, IN JUST THEIR EXPLORATORY PHASE?!? When the fish are gone, they're gone-- do you remember assurances from the power companies how fish ladders were going to save the salmon on the Columbia River?? Lot's of questions....here's one more: Besides writing you, is there anything else we can do to prevent this from happening??

It is pretty simple.....Public lands mean just that, PUBLIC, as in the land belongs to the American people. For some reason that is always overlooked. In speaking for myself I am speaking for others. We don't want polluters from large corporations defiling our PUBLIC lands. For far to long that has been "business as usual" and the Obama administration needs to step up to the plate and do what is right. Did you know the "NO" is a complete sentence???? Use it..... Thank you,

Please stop the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Our marine life suffers throughout the seven seas. Whales and dolphins are under attack for frivolous entertainment and cheap food sources. We are the last generation that will regularly eat a wild caught food. AND NOW another threat to our marine life: Pebble Mine in pristine Bristol Bay. Shame on you for killing off more animals and fish in the name of GREED. Penalties for violating the Clean Water Act should be devastatingly high.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I would like to comment on the proposed Pebble Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay. My step-son is a fly fishing guide in the Bristol Bay area, so I have seen and heard much about this area. It is truly one of the finest places on earth, home to many thriving species of fish and wildlife. Its pristine landscapes are not only stunning, but a national treasure. The natural landscape and incredible wildlife habitat are also the basis for a local industry based on fishing and recreation. The damage from a mining operation like that proposed by the Pebble Mine would be too horrible to imagine. I work for a natural resources consulting company and have seen the damage that even minor disturbances to wetlands can cause. Also, I want this mine proposal to be taken off the table. Because I don't think that is a likely outcome politically, then I want to urge the federal government to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and the most stringent analysis possible of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Anything less is unacceptable. As we have seen in the Gulf of Mexico, assurances by large corporations that nothing will go wrong and that measures are in place to prevent damage are clearly unfounded and an insult to all the citizens of the United States who care about the environment. For the opportunity to comment. Please protect Bristol Bay!

Although my family hikes, camps and fishes in wilderness areas of the nearby Rockies, I would like to draw attention to a place I've never visited. In Alaska, where my children were born, a proposed mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Hard rock mining has a terrible record. Water resources are polluted 85 percent of the time. I'm lucky to live near beautiful places that are protected, and hope to help protect more in the future. Please help draw attention to the threat to the wonderful Bristol Bay. E.

I am against this disastrous mine, which would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife.

Decision Maker: This This Pebble Mine is not needed and will hurt the local economy. This area has always been dependent upon its pristine natural environment.

I have serious concerns about the Pebble Mine: Please - don't ruin this great natural resource! .

The human population is very high, and our activities have major consequences. We cannot afford to make more poor decisions which lead to catastrophic consequences. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, the wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Therefore, . Protecting habitat and traditional subsistence should be the top priority. The federal government needs to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. With this in mind, for considering my comments,

One clear way we can do this is to protect the Bristol Bay watershed. To me it is vital that Pebble Mine is not allowed to proceed in Bristol Bay because it will threaten Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To Whom This May Concern: As I look at our country's natural resources that not only feed our mouths but also our souls, I zero in on Bristol Bay as number one. Now there is talk of opening the area to mining. This is a terrible idea which we will come to endlessly regret if implemented. This mine would threaten the Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional ways of life. Other points are that public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large scale metallic sulfide mining. Opening this mine would be a great disaster. The United States need to be the leader in reevaluating its policies concerning the environment and be the leader it is meant to be in this respect.

! One suggestion I have is to protect the Bristol Bay, in Alaska. The Pebble Mine project threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.. Doing so ensures protection for the habitat, subsistence and recreation resources there. It's unconscionable that Native American well fare is still largely unconsidered in this day and age. There are times it is not worth the long-term impact. Corporations focus on short-term monetary goals and care little to nothing for long-term impacts of their greed.

. : Each action that Humanity takes for has consequences. We are a Chain of Life and Consciousness. The Human Being is the eldest brother to the sub-human kingdoms. We should be responsible for what happens in the environment for they are the environment. We will not survive as a species if we do not take care of them. Air, Water, Earth, is shared by all. Even if you do wrong in one part of the Planet as we are One Life, one Humanity, one World, it affects the whole. The individualistic man that is greedy because he has not group consciousness yet is wanting to make money by buying and selling what is common to all. As top priority, we need to protect the habitat, this is our responsibility, and public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large scale metallic sulfide mining. We will run out of species very soon if we continue with this poisoning process that is affecting worldwide for we share all the elements. Poisons run throughout all water, air, and earth. Correct clean Water Act standards should be fixed thinking in next generations to come. Correct Human Relations should be strengthened between Federal and Tribal Governments. Tribes know this Earth is one Life. We cannot stand loose standards in the greedy mineral development. We should share all natural resources, they do not belong to one rich company. We are attempting to the health of the Planet and it is not reversible.

i am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay.

I am writing to express my concern over the Pebble Mine and the preservation of Bristol Bay. The Federal Government should give priority to the protection of the environment that each one of us needs in order to live a healthy life. Large-scale metallic sulfide mining permitting and Clean Water Act standards should be more stringent in order to help accomplish this goal. If we do not protect our most precious asset, our natural environment, not only are we hurting ourselves, but future generations as well. Please consider carefully what you will leave to your grandchildren and theirs as well.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I'm writing you about the Pebble Mine project. I am deeply concerned about this project threatening Bristol Bay's clean waters, salmon and wildlife as well as traditional ways of life held by tribe of those who already live in the area. I ask that public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. It's very imperative to strengthen the relationships between federal and tribal governments as well so that all work together harmoniously. We need to have greater standards for mineral development in wetland areas and standards for a Clean Water Act for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be stronger as well.

The American people will welcome strong and inspired leadership towards solid long term goals, one of which should be the preservation of our environment. The permitting process for the Pebble Mine offers an excellent opportunity to demonstrate that our government has a clear view of the likely project impacts, will provide definitive oversight of the process and the analysis of cumulative impacts on the Bristol Bay watershed, and will not allow the mine to proceed without sufficient safeguards and restrictions. This project clearly poses major long term threats to water quality, fisheries, and wildlife as well as traditional ways of life, in what is currently a relatively pristine environment. Large scale metallic sulfide mining should not be allowed on our public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed. Standards for mineral development in wetlands and Clean Water must be made as stringent as possible. The pressures to facilitate short term profits must be resisted. As in all of these cases, "Once gone, gone forever" We need to do better, particularly on projects as significant as the Pebble Mine.

Pebble Mine is a great threat to Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. We need to preserve all of wild America that remains!

Do we really need another pebble mine! Is this Sulfide mine so important, that the waters at Bristol Bay are polluted, the wild life poisoned from debris. Our "Clean Water Act" standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent! Public lands in this Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. We need to protect this habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permit process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed.

,I have taken previous action online to try to block the creation of Pebble Mine because of the ways in which it will negatively affect Bristol Bay. It is now time to personally address an email to help stop the passing of any bill or law that would permit this disastrous mine to become a reality. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. It is also urgent that Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining be more stringent. I feel very strongly about this and other developments that endanger our lands, water and food sources, and the conservation of our wild-lands. I hope you will take the time to read this message and note my vote.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

U. S. Department of the Interior Officer: Your comment deadline is Sept. 30 for submitting a rationale for eradicating Pebble Mine. We submit our comment below. Please take note of it and count it. We are writing to demand immediate action to stop the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay in Alaska at the urging of executive director of the NRDC in an email earlier today. This mine cannot go through. We are former residents of the state of Alaska and we have lived in San Jose, California since 1997. Prior to that in Fairbanks, Alaska where we were working residents for the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner. The salmon fishing industry is of paramount importance to Alaska fisherman and its industry at large. The largest salmon runs in the world - and the best fished environmentally - are in Alaska and within Bristol Bay. What are you doing approving Pebble Mine in this place at headwaters? It is a very crazy idea. We don't want farmed salmon if that is what you are thinking would replace this. As far as the American people, some are unaware of the real risk. Take this mine out. It is a bad idea. For these reasons - that are also those of Lehman's of the NRDC today - we ask you to reconsider: 1.) Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. 2.) Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. 3.) The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. 4.) Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. 5.)6.) Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent for your interest.

It is the function of the federal government to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Such impacts, in their entirety, should never accumulate to the point that they alter or compromise the current level of life in Bristol Bay. In addition, , as well as the standards for mineral development in wetlands.I would ask that their advance for your thoughtful consideration of this matter.

, When I visited Alaska in 2005 I was absolutely floored by its beauty, grandeur, and stunning landscapes. It hurts me to think that the Pebble Mine project will actually happen. This will DEVASTATE the ecosystems of Bristol Bay.

I am writing to add my comments concerning America's Great Outdoors program. I want to strongly state that the Pebble Mine in Alaska threatens Bristol Bay and its clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. If we are going to protect we must start with this mine which threatens a whole ecosystem..for government agencies in this area.If this project goes ahead, and it shouldn't, the federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analyze the cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. From what I understand, standards for mineral development in wetlands are weak and should be tighter and Please add my comments to the official record.

Here are my comments about the Pebble Mine proposal and permitting request: I urge you to NOT grant a permit for the proposed Pebble Mine in Alaska unless a full analysis of the cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed has been completed and shows benign impact.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Greetings Government Official- Some places on earth need our protection as they are exceptionally beautiful, are important habitat for declining wilderness species, and provide incredible recreational opportunities; Bristol Bay is one of these locations. Here are some important considerations in addition to keeping this place protected as a important natural asset to this nation. These lands belong to us for our long term use, not for the short term gain of mineral extraction, as the damage done can never be mitigated.

I am writing to ask that you stop the Pebble Mine. Proceeding with this project threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. If not, the region will never recover from the effects of toxic mining. It's time to prioritize the environment over profits. Loopholes and "free passes" should be eliminated and oversight strengthened so that future disasters like the BP oil spill don't happen again. with the emphasis placed on preservation of fragile areas rather than maximum extraction for maximum profits. The Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should also be more stringent. and native peoples given a say in how the land is protected and used. A renewed focus should be given to alternatives to some of the materials we have come to depend on in order to replace slash and burn tactics with sustainable practices.

: I hope you will consider protecting Bristol Bay from mining by mega-corporations. It will destroy the clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life that exist there. I believe that.

We should strengthen standards for mineral development in wetlands

the us govt and politicians are non responsive to what the american public wants. You can also refer to our SaveBioGems web page about  
<<http://www.nrdconline.org/site/R?i=R5DyUVGpI2WMOhoxmg6cNA..>> Bristol Bay if you want more information.

We are writing to express our concern about the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay.

I spent 6 years of my life at the university of montana with my major thesis advisor, former chief of the forest service under clinton ... I am appalled at the lack of science being applied in general to our nations land management practices ... this is yet another example of the wrong extraction in the wrong environment ...I have grave concerns about the Pebble mine for the following reasons and I have added some ancillary thoughts as well. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large- scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. -

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This disastrous mine would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife and it must be stopped.

The waters of Bristol Bay are surrounded by tundra, crisscrossed by swift rivers and dotted with lakes large and small. Grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales roam this nearly untouched ecosystem. Huge salmon runs are the linchpin of this glorious wilderness, supporting valuable commercial fisheries, indigenous people and a vast array of wildlife. It is my understanding that mining companies are eyeing low-grade gold and copper deposits on pristine land in the Bristol Bay watershed in an area known as Pebble and that the only way to extract this ore is through destructive and pollution-producing hard-rock mining. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide. As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. A Pebble Mine would threaten Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. from mining activities that would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife. Please keep mining out of this pristine area.

To Department of the Interior: Please use all your powers to stop another environmental disaster. The Pebble Bay mine is a disaster waiting to happen and you can prevent it. Pebble Bay is too important environmentally to risk with an ill conceived mining project. The mine cannot operate without causing irreparable damage to the environment. Please put a stop to it now before we have another accident like the BP mine in the gulf that the project sponsors told us could not happen. They lied then, and the Pebble Mine sponsors are lying now. Don't believe them. Stop the mine NOW.

Administration I am writing as a citizen of our beautiful country asking that we protect our wild natural resources for the long term rather than giving into short term corporate interests yielding limited results and with enormous long-term destruction as the cost. The situation with the proposed Pebble Mine in the Bristol Bay is an example of just what I am very concerned about... Please review the situation and my comments with great care. We are talking about our national future and the world that we leave to our children and our true care for the planet.

Why more destruction of our planet just for the financial benefit of one or two already obscenely rich people? Clean Water Act standards for metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent. The benefits the Pebble Mine could bring to a few corporations are not worth the wholesale destruction this mine will wreck on Bristol Bay and its inhabitants. Although it is not located in a populated area like Louisiana the destruction will be much more severe and longer lasting than the Deepwater Horizon explosion. And despite the industry's lies there will be major accidents and constant pollution from that mine. Create a few hundred jobs for a few dozen years by destroying the thousands of years old way of life and existence of several thousand people? Please do not allow Bristol Bay to be polluted.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

,I would like to express my concern and opposition to allowing Pebble Mine to operate in the Bristol Bay area. I agree with Presidents George Bush, Sr., and Clinton that this area should be protected from mineral acquisition. Salmon runs will be at risk, as well as surrounding wetlands and other pristine habitat.

, I am writing to express my concern about the potential development of the Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay. Our public lands should be left undeveloped and unexploited, not given away for exploitation to the highest bidder. Please help to protect our cherished wildlands and outdoor spaces such as this and stop the development of this mine.

My reason for writing is to beg you to stop Pebble Mine! It is a travesty that this potential project is even being discussed. It's been well documented that the mine would threaten Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. The mine, planned by companies Northern Dynasty and Anglo American, would be the biggest mine in North America, with an estimated footprint of 30 square miles. Based on current projections, the mine would generate 7-8 billion tons of mine waste. The tailings waste would be stored in a seismically active area behind earthen dams. Any project supported by Sarah Palin can only spell disaster for the environment! The following are more reasons for stopping this mine: since they will bear the brunt of this disaster, if it's allowed to proceed. For the reasons stated above, this project should be stopped immediately. Leading jewelry retailers have also expressed their opposition to the mine, recognizing that the Bristol Bay watershed is an ecosystem of international significance and that much of the area is designated a Fishery Reserve. Many have now signed the Bristol Bay Pledge to show their support for protection of the Bristol Bay watershed. These include: Tiffany & Co. Ben Bridge Jeweler Helzberg Diamonds Leber Jeweler Caro Jewellery Fortunoff Brilliant Earth Blakes Fine Jewelry Goldsmiths Beaverbrooks Mappin & Webb Watches of Switzerland Fifi Bijoux April Doubleday JewelMak Commemorative Brands Hacker Jewelers Herff Jones Birks and Mayors McTeigue & McClelland Jostens Blair Lauren Brown Toby Pomeroy Reflective Images Michaels Jewelers Open Source Minerals CRED Jewellery Real Jewels Fair Trade in Gems and Jewelry Alberto Parada Ingle & Rhode Security Jewelers Zale Corporation For the reasons stated above Pebble Mine must be stopped!

. I understand a decision is being made soon on the Bristol Bay area of Alaska. Please don't let short term gains outweigh the long term impact for this area. Your decision will affect our children, grand children and all of our future generations. Please decline the Pebble Mine's request.

Nature is never out of balance. The question is will the balance of nature include man if we destroy beyond repair, the environment that has allowed us to thrive up to this point in time. Modern science is still in its relative infancy. Nobody really knows what the outcome of man's modifications to the earth's surface will be. Destroying or endangering the balance of nature in the few remaining wild places could leave us without the resources to go back to a balance of nature that includes man. Block this disastrous mine. The Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, and traditional subsistence ways of life.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

My governmental representatives, for your good efforts to manage our public lands for the benefit of all Americans, those living now and those in the future. I would like for you to please consider the best use of the area around Bristol Bay. We Americans have so little of the vast lands left for preservation for future generations, that we had when our ancestors first arrived in the 15th and 16th centuries. If we allow our public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed to be used for large-scale metallic sulfide mining, there will certainly be short-term gain; but that environment will be changed irreparably for perhaps thousands of years to come. Protecting our animal and plant habitats, and providing for subsistence and recreation resources should be as much of a concern for us as a nation as gaining some temporary wealth through extracting non-renewable resources from the land. In my humble opinion, our federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. In particular, with thoughtfulness about the long-term benefits to local people, not just immediate opportunities for wealth for big corporations, so as to protect our wildlife, whose home territories are shrinking. I might never get to visit these wild places, but I consider the animals and plants living there to be as much fellow citizens of our great country as my next-door neighbors, here in Dallas, Texas. Furthermore, our , since it is becoming more and more apparent that this country's most precious resource, water, is now something of an endangered species. If we continue to allow big companies to cause irreversible harm to our nation's water supply, through pollution of the soil and the water reservoirs, should we also expect them to supply our drinking water in the future? Folks, the actions you take today are going to affect our way of life for generations and generations to come. Please do the right thing for our children and grandchildren, and for all our non-human co-habitants. Please bring a halt to the mindless development of our pristine wilderness areas for short-term profits.

There are a million different reasons to protect the pristine natural landscape in Bristol Bay, but below are some specifics on why the Pebble Mine needs to be stopped: Natural beauty is quickly fading from our planet, and we need to take every opportunity to keep what we have left as clean and natural as possible. --

We all are empowered to do right action or wrong. It is wrong action when we do things, due to greed, which cause harm to others sharing our planet, which have no voice and no power to stop us. In typical fashion, what we do to harm and kill fish, wildlife and animals we share the planet with, eventually ends up hurting us as well. We have a great opportunity in front of us, to do right action and If we do not stop it, this mine will endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wild lands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife . Let us be moved by what is good for the future generations of all living things sharing the planet and not by dollars gained today at their expense.

For the above mentioned reasons, I am against the Pebble Mine.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am concerned about a recent plan to open a pebble mine in Bristol Bay. I believe that environmental conservation is not an option but an imperative. As a society, the time is now to act to preserve the health and well-being of our nation's wealth which is based on our ability to breathe fresh air and drink clean water. Sacrificing the last of our wild places which help to maintain our environmental balance is not in our best interests.

, Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To those this should concern, Please stop any and all forward motion concerning Pebble Mine. This mine will be a disastrous move against the ecosystem in that important and pristine area. Too many creatures, some of them already struggling to survive to ever constricting habitat, would be severely impacted and possibly devastated by the large-scale metallic sulfide mining that Pebble Mine would implement. Regardless of what the mining company and its experts will tell you, there is no way this mine can exist without poisoning and degrading the ecosystem it would exist in. No unbiased scientist can tell you truthfully that this mine can co-exist in such a pristine habitat without leaking dangerous chemicals into the environment. Not to mention there is no possibility of denying the severe impact that a massive pit mine will have on the area. Even if the mining of the gold that this mine would seek to rip from the earth did not require the use of dangerous chemicals, the very process of mining itself is essentially a rape of the environment, There is no way to successfully mine on a large-scale like this without seriously impacting the habitat geologically. This kind of mining will disfigure the very face of the land where it operates. Mining typically has a severe impact on things like erosion and thus the loss of crucial topsoil in areas effected by the erosion. Not to mention, I don't see how any human being with an appreciation of natural beauty could look at this region and want to erect a large-scale metallic sulfide mine or any mine at all. Mines destroy the area they are in and it takes decades and even centuries for the area to recover. And what is this all for? Gold? A precious metal used primarily to make jewelry. A metal that is largely about image, prestige and materialism. I'm not sure there could be a worse justification for the damage this mine will cause to the Bristol Bay area. This mine is for the purpose of making money for the sake of money. It's greed. The ore taken from the ground isn't a necessity, it's almost solely for the purpose of vanity. And for this the Pebble Mine will possibly eradicate species already walking a tightrope to other man-made pressures? Please, no. Furthermore, in general and in all cases concerning mining: The federal government should provide strong oversight of the mining permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the habitat that the mine would be located in and/or around. And in the Bristol Bay case, In closing, I am pleading with those with the power to halt this mine, to do so. Please do not let this pristine and vital habitat be decimated by a mine that will do nothing but rape the land and pollute its wetlands. A large reason for myself and many others voting for the Obama administration was its stance on environmental issues. Please show us that we were justified in that trust and do the right thing.

Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be Enough destruction for the sake of pure unadulterated greed has occurred. It's time we started saving those resources we have left. You could be a leader and innovator in these efforts. Please do it.

To Whom This May Concern: Pebble Mine is clearly threatening Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. It seems obvious that public lands in this watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. . Strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process must be provided, as well as analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Moreover, , and the Please keep this kind of commercial mining away from our shrinking resources.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

:Bristol Bay is one of the few true ecological treasures left in North America. The Pebble Mine will most likely change that reality forever if the wrong choices are made at this point. Please consider these points carefully: It is imperative that the following facts be given priority in deciding the fate of Bristol Bay: The Bristol Bay watershed is one of the world's most productive wild Chinook salmon fisheries, and is critical to the survival of Alaska's eagles, brown bears (Alaska's grizzlies), and seals, as well as native Alaskan communities. For more than 30 years this vital watershed, which is surrounded by protected areas, has been closed to mineral extraction. But last year the Bureau of Land Management, under direction of the Bush administration, proposed a Resource Management Plan that would open up 1.1 million acres of this unspoiled wilderness to hard rock mining, putting subsistence and commercial fishing activities, as well as wildlife, at risk. The Management Plan is particularly problematic because the land is adjacent to the proposed site of the controversial Pebble Mine which, as one of the world's largest gold and copper mines generating over 9 billions tons of waste, would pose a risk to the entire Bristol Bay ecosystem. You know the dismal record of hard rock mining. A survey over 40 years shows nearby water resources are polluted 85 percent of the time. Earlier this year the State of the Salmon conference concluded that Bristol Bay's salmon fishery was a globally significant resource and top conservation priority. Yet the region is now at risk of being permanently transformed if hard rock mining resource extraction commences here with potentially devastating impacts on the fishery. Secretary Salazar has said he will abide by your recommendation. I'm sure you would not want to be the one who reversed three decades of sensible protections in favor of an ill-advised, ill-informed Resource Management Plan from the Bush administration, which failed to set aside enough Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and also failed to designate enough Wild and Scenic Rivers. Therefore I urge you to reconsider the Bush plan that favors short-term mineral development over long-term land management and direct BLM to prepare a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement that reflects the exceptional value of the lands and waters of Bristol Bay. Working to maintain the current withdrawal of public land from federal appropriation until adequate safeguards are put in place, BLM will fulfill its obligation to this public land. Until you and your team devise a better plan, please act now to retain the existing protections for the Bristol Bay watershed. The health of these public lands and waters, and the wildlife, native cultures and industry they sustain, are depending on you.

I want my legacy to the next generation to be one of thoughtful, respectful, protective consideration of our natural places. I hope you will agree that greed, exploitation, and pollution are not the values we choose to pass on to our children.

STOPPING Pebble Mine. And the government also needs stricter standards to regulate large scale metallic-sulfide mining. This is a dangerous business and we cannot afford to pollute another healthy water body, We have done enough damage already.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

TO ALL CONCERNED: Keep Bristol Bay (a nearly untouched ecosystem rich with interdependent life, that includes us in the tapestry) safe from mining. Why? Bristol Bay is a working ecosystem of clean waters, supporting both HUMANS already there (both traditional subsistence, and commercial fisheries), and wildlife such as salmon, whales, seals, grizzlies, wolves. Consider just the SALMON! Bristol Bay supports tens of millions of them arriving there to spawn. The Threat: 1) foreign mining companies after gold/copper on our pristine land, Pebble. Hard-rock mining tears up the million acres/plus to get at it. 2) studies show that 85% of previous such mines polluted the surrounding waters. 3) the WASTE (formerly pristine, fecund landscape) would come to 9 billion tons, held back by massive earthen dams -- 20 miles from an active earthquake fault. THINK ABOUT THIS!!! We live in an Eco-SYSTEM, and our lives are dependent on the Whole. You destroy our environment, our literal home, and you'll find out "you can't eat money." The fish and wildlife cannot withstand such a huge development throughout. ONE ACCIDENT (and just think "Gulf" and "BP" before you deny such a possibility) would compound the destruction beyond calculation.

I oppose the development of Pebble Mine near Bristol Bay in Alaska.

We have a great opportunity right now to advance our campaign to You've already taken several online actions to help block this disastrous mine, which would endanger Bristol Bay's spectacular wildlands, world-class salmon runs and other outstanding wildlife. Now, committed activists like you have a rare chance to do even more. The Obama Administration is inviting input from across America on how to protect our nation's most cherished wildlands and other outdoor spaces. Please take a few minutes right now and tell administration officials -- in your own words -- why they should . The deadline for submitting your message is September 30. I know this action involves more than the usual click of a mouse, but I'm sure you'll agree it's time well spent for the sake of stopping the Pebble Mine. A thoughtful and personal message from someone like you can make a big difference! Here's how to do it: Visit the America's Great Outdoors <[http://www.nrdonline.org/site/R?i=k1KBl46evvPf015\\_7wFvPg..](http://www.nrdonline.org/site/R?i=k1KBl46evvPf015_7wFvPg..)> website and register to participate. Then, explore the Ideas page: <<http://www.nrdonline.org/site/R?i=HWzHwOvpjNANBPhiER111A..>> Post your own idea. Vote to "promote" ideas that call for protecting Bristol Bay. Please keep these talking points in mind as you write: You can also refer to our SaveBioGems web page about Bristol Bay <<http://www.nrdonline.org/site/R?i=Oz7lf1UCrgwn-At6T0y-HA..>> if you want more information. After you've submitted your message, would you do one last quick thing? Please send me an email letting me know you took this special action for Bristol Bay. Any time you can devote to making your voice heard in this process will be time well spent! for all you have done to help

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing to share my opinion about the threat the Pebble Mine poses to Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. I strongly believe that I also believe that, because without them, we will soon have no more wetlands, and most people either scientifically or innately realize that that would be a disaster for the global ecosystem. I strongly believe that the in order to protect our water. Please take this into consideration and do not allow the Pebble Mine access to Bristol Bay.

Pebble Mine is a potentially disastrous threat to the health of the Bristol Bay ecosystem. It threatens the clean waters, wild salmon, and wildlife. Public lands should be closed to metallic sulfide mining and the protection of habitat should be of utmost importance. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the permitting process to properly analyze the cumulative impact. Standards for clean water and wetland protection need to be strictly adhered to.

I am writing to your administration officials in order to express concern for Bristol Bay and to stop Pebble Mine. A great deal of harm is done by this mine and mining procedures. The environmental impact is at stake, along with many other important issues.

It has become clear that , as protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be a top priority. The federal government needs to provide stronger oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Ultimately, so that we can save this precious resource.

I believe that protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be your top priority. In addition, Please ask the EPA to assess this and propose meaningful standards. Lastly, and such lands should be given all protections possible.

, We've all experienced, all too recently - with the reach of devastation in the Gulf, how devastating it can be to our natural environment when we place money over Mother Nature. Our resources are extremely limited here on Planet Earth and the areas that we have that are considered "pristine" are even less so. We must do everything we can within our power to protect the most sacred natural habitats that we have for future generations, and not allow them to be pillaged in the name of profits. As we begin to find our way out of this recession, it allows us to make a break from the old way of business. It provides us an opportunity for us to claim that we will no longer allow our children and our children's children to receive a Planet that "used to be" so beautiful but now is nothing more than toxic. The true impact on our ecosystem will be much more calamitous than can be expected if Pebble Mine is allowed to move forward. History has proved time and again that when left to self regulation and oversight companies fail to do so properly. When profit margins are the key success metric for a company all else becomes "risk management" I implore you to truly understand the impact that allowing this project forward will mean for our country. It is within your ability to make sure that we create a future that is full of life and beauty not metallic sulfide.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Why isn't it obvious to everyone that we need to stop ruining our earth for a greedy few. We have enough of everything already. - - - - - Please be aware of the horrifying waste it would generate. As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. - A single accident here would be disastrous. The construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk Americans and especially Alaskans are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. Please stop the mining and the drilling!!!!!!!!!!

I am writing today in regards to the proposed Pebble Mine project in Bristol Bay. Please take the health of Bristol Bay into consideration, before allowing this project to proceed. There are many reasons why the construction of Pebble Mine should not move forward. The federal government should strengthen standards for mineral development in wetlands and Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. I hope you will take my concerns into consideration, and not let the Pebble Mine project go forward.

Greetings, I am writing to request your action to save the pristine Bristol Bay, AK and thoroughly review and revise the permits for the Pebble Mine.

PLEASE STOP THIS GROUP FROM DESTROYING ONE MORE PART OF THE ECOSYSTEMS WE DEPEND ON FOR SUSTENANCE. WE HAVE GONE SO FAR ASTRAY IN OUR NEED TO RESPECT NATURE. MUCH OF THE DESTRUCTION WE HAVE WROUGHT IS IRREVERSIBLE, AS WELL AS INEXCUSABLE. of this matter.

Folks Many years ago I worked at Bristol Bay Lodge in Aleknagik, Alaska. Several times, though I was a humble houskeeper, I got the chance to fly over the surrounding wilderness. I can only say that the pristine nature and wildlife of this region are of far more importance any else. They are resource that must preserved for all time for the future citizens of America. It is simply a "no brainer." No Pebble Mine. In the words of the Beatles, "let it be." But not only that. Water is a resource that is far more important than gold. We need to preserve unpolluted sources of water, both fresh and salt. Polluted waters mean poisoned fish and wildlife, a toxic menace that eventually works its way into the human food source. I appreciate your reading my comments.

I would like to comment on the Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay. I believe I believe .I believe .I believe I believe I believe the I believe

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am writing to you to implore you to from a mining disaster. We have already ruined our Gulf Coast line with a massive oil spill. We cannot afford to leave our children a ruined country. The destruction that will occur is unthinkable. As you know Bristol Bay area is a treasure drawing many forms of wildlife, that require our protection to their habitat such as: grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales spawning salmon which are the linchpin of this glorious wilderness, supporting valuable commercial fisheries, indigenous people and a vast array of wildlife. Yet the whole system could come crashing down if giant mining interests get their way. The only way these foreign mining companies can get at the rich gold and copper deposits located in this pristine area that we the United State people have preserved, is to extract this ore through destructive and pollution-producing hard-rock mining. At risk is over 1 million acres of public land. This land should be preserved for our children and grandchildren. What kind of a legacy are we leaving exchanging dollars for natural resources that once gone will never come back? I tell you this beautiful piece of natural beauty must remain in its natural glory. It is our duty as human beings protecting the earth to be excellent sheppard's of this treasure. I implore you to use your conscience and protect this natural wonder that we the people of the United States have inherited. Think about it, do we want pristine areas with animals in their natural habitat roaming free? Or an open-pit mine that would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building)? As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A proposed a single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans and United States citizens all over the country are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. I live in New England and feel strongly we need to protect this area. It is our duty. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. The Pebble Mine proposal threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. The government should enact the following guidelines immediately to protect this area: Can the Obama administration really afford to leave a legacy of destruction of our natural resources? Or will the administration take the right course to saving our beautiful land by protecting Bristol Bay from ruin. I implore you to act on behalf of our children and all the living creatures of Bristol Bay to stop the Pebble Mine development.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Please do not allow the Pebble Mine to come into existence. A study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building). As proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste held behind a series of massive earthen dams -- all of them taller than China's Three Gorges Dam and located just 20 miles from an active fault line. A single accident here would be disastrous. But even the construction and operation of the mine could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem. It's a risk most local Alaskans are not willing to take -- the true gold of this region, they say, is its fish and wildlife. We have seen the effects of lax permitting processes and the disasters that have ensued. Please take these items into account when the Pebble Mine is discussed.

,We have finite Natural Resources and diminishing areas of undeveloped land on this planet. We cannot and in good conscience should not continue to cave to business interests. Once gone our wild places are never to return. I know of nowhere on this planet or in mankind's history where business or government has taken what it wants and not left destruction in its wake. As a species we are incapable of using only what we need and allowing nature to keep our ecosystems in balance. We are the only species on our planet that takes more than we need because of greed or a hunger for power. If we do not apply some self control we will destroy this world. One of our government leader's roles is to create and enforce this type of control., and any connections between those making the rules and those benefiting in any way from allowing business to spread onto our remaining undeveloped lands should be forbidden. We cannot trust industry to police itself. Please think globally and look to repercussions at least three generations into the future when deciding to allow drilling, mining, excavating, or any other ventures that create natural disturbances. Our world is not renewable and must be protected from us.

People, I am writing you our of a deeply felt and profound concern for the integrity of Pebble Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life.

To Whom it May Concern: I am writing to you today to try to dissuade you from making a huge mistake. This type of mining is a disaster for the wildlife and the ecosystem and we should be protecting habitat - not destroying it. The people that live in and around the Bristol Bay watershed are threatened - not only their health but the health of the ecosystem that provides for them. How many wetlands need to be destroyed before the standards for mineral development are deemed inappropriate? For once, can we not let \$\$ be the deciding factor in a project? Could you be concerned with the health and welfare of a nation and a planet? I hope that you can do so today when making decisions about this man-made catastrophe. There is bound to be much suffering if you go through with this project.

Please protect Alaska's Bristol Bay from a Bush-era mining proposal, which would expose 1.1 million acres of Alaska's wilderness to the devastating effects of hard rock mining and drilling.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

: I am writing because I am concerned about how the Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. .. Tighter standards should be established for mineral development in wetlands.

Administration I am a member of the Natural Resource Defense Council and have been advised that the Administration is taking comments on how to protect our nation's most cherished wildlands. I have chosen to write about protecting Bristol Bay and stopping the Pebble Mine that is planned to be built there and requesting Congress give the Clean Energy Act another try. Building a Pebble Mine in the Bristol Bay will threaten the clean water, wild salmon and many species of wildlife. I don't understand why it needs to be built there? Aren't there other flatlands or deserts that this Pebble Mine can be built upon? It just doesn't make any sense to me that an area so pristine and beautiful is even being considered for such a plan. The tribal governments views should be taken into consideration and the relationships between the federal and tribal governments should be strengthened not strained. Haven't we learned enough from the BP oil spill? Once these precious lands and waters are destroyed there is no getting them back. Also, please keep oil companies out of the polar bears habitat. After the November elections, please have Congress go back to work on passing the Clean Energy Act. The Green Movement will save this economy, in the long-run it will help reduce the deficit, eventually reduce our dependence on foreign oil and the threats to our National Security that come along with it, and keep America as the leader in the world.

I am writing to urge you to stop Pebble Mine from destroying the wildlife Eden of Bristol Bay. I am originally from Alaska, and the destruction that could fall upon my home if Pebble Mine is allowed to happen could be catastrophic. There are not many wildlife refuges left, and it is our job to protect them from such hazards. If the salmon are negatively impacted by this mine, what is to come of the grizzlies, wolves, seals and whales who roam this nearly untouched ecosystem, all drawn by those very salmon? And what of the native people whose lively hood also depend on them? Huge salmon runs are the linchpin of this glorious wilderness, supporting valuable commercial fisheries, indigenous people and a vast array of wildlife. The construction and operation of the mine itself could disrupt salmon migration and jeopardize the larger ecosystem, let alone what could happen if there were an accident. Plus a study of mines similar to the proposed Pebble mine showed that 85 percent of them polluted nearby waters. At Pebble, a proposed open-pit mine would be 2 miles wide (enough to line up nine of the world's longest cruise ships end-to-end) and 2,000 feet deep (enough to engulf the Empire State Building). Does that sound like something that belongs in a wildlife refuge? And as proposed, the mine would generate more than 9 billion tons of waste. For all those reasons . Our planet deserves better than that. Dr. Seuss once wrote, "UNLESS someone like you cares a whole awful lot, nothing is going to get better. It's not." Well I am that someone. And I urge you to be that someone as well.

I'm writing you today to preserve our biogems. Please do what you can to value what we have before it is sacrificed for something fleeting and temporary like corporate greed. There are millions of souls that will be our children that will come to this world. What kind of world are we leaving them? All that glitters is not gold. Not all that wander are lost. To move freely you must be deeply rooted within. ~ Faerie Wisdom ~

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Bristol Bay is a unique and pristine area which has supported sustainable lifestyles for generations. The Pebble Mine would wreak havoc on this fragile ecosystem. Please consider the following points: Mining interests and the corporations that control them need stringent oversight by the government, for their only priorities are exploitation and profit. It is becoming increasingly evident that the protection and preservation of our environment is the most essential, the most vital, priority.

Administrators, I'm taking a moment to write to you to add my voice to those speaking up for Bristol Bay and for those who cannot speak for themselves, the very Life of and the area itself. Now more than ever it is time to step up and act as Leaders vs shills for commercial interests. The evidence is in, that way of life is and will ultimately destroy all life. That's no way to run a Democracy. For while Democracy is admired for the personal freedoms it protects, it is less than dust if it stands on no foundation. That foundation is Life itself. Part of what it means to evolve as a species especially as humans is our intelligence and abilities to steward the gifts, those very vital foundations that Life affords us; our Natural Resources, for without them, nothing lives, let alone thrives. As we go forward into this next millenia, our actions, our applied intelligence as an organized whole will determine our very fate on this beautiful Earth. Will we survive as a Nation, an example of ever expanding, applied intelligence? Or will we rapidly decline in the already predictable slide towards utter decay and demise? You tell me. It is this question, which will be answered by your actions from now on, beginning now, by saving Bristol Bay from all private interests, preserving it for the greater good and foundational strength our our Nation, based upon an understanding, applied intelligence and unwavering determination to thrive that doing so will answer. Please protect us all now and into the future and stop the Pebble Mine, .

I would like to comment on our nation's need to protect Alaska's Bristol Bay from strip mining. I've been to Alaska with my family, and we were impressed with its natural beauty, abundant wildlife, and also the fragility of its Arctic ecosystems. Alaska's natural environment is already threatened by climate change more dramatic than what we're experiencing in my home state of PA. Though I've never been to Bristol Bay, I feel strongly that it must be protected for future generations of Alaskans and Americans to enjoy and appreciate. As the permitting process proceeds, the federal government should provide strong oversight of the cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed, so that the decision-makers can weigh the costs and benefits of mining vs. protecting this gem long-term.

No question then that our government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed, tightening , making more stringent rules governing clean water standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining and development and forging stronger relationships between federal and tribal governments.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

: As a member of NRDC and as a citizen concerned about the environment, let me say at the outset that I strongly object to the proposed Pebble Mine at Bristol Bay. This mine is a threat to these pristine waters, wild salmon, wildlife and the natives' traditional subsistence way of life. It is my belief that: The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble mine permitting process and cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. It is short sighted and selfish for those with the power to do so to ravage a pristine area for short term gain. I hope you can be convinced to reconsider.

, I am writing to oppose the Pebble Mine and express my concern for the damage it will cause to Bristol Bay. I am an avid fly fisher with a great love of the outdoors, and also have a degree in anthropology and archaeology. Our wild places are slowly but surely being destroyed, and once gone can never be recovered. Similarly, traditional ways of life and cultural diversity is being lost at an alarming rate. I believe allowing the Pebble Mine would be both an environmental and cultural disaster – it will negatively impact the health of the Bay and its wildlife, as well as destroy the ability of the local people to carry on their current way of life. Mining is not only damaging to the ecosystem, but mines are an eyesore that will prevent tourists and other visitors from wanting to visit what is now a spectacularly beautiful, scenic, pristine, vibrant and living place. The Mine will have a negative impact on the salmon, who are already under threat throughout their range. This impact will also harm the other wildlife around the Bay that relies on the salmon for sustenance. All of these actions will serve to protect this rare and beautiful place for future generations. It will also send a message that we care about the environment and things beyond financial gain. Wild places are necessary, both for the health of our planet and for the mental health of our citizens. Please do the right thing and protect the wild places we still have left, including Bristol Bay.

, As a citizen of the both the United States and planet Earth, I wish for my voice to be heard for the welfare of the people and animals of the planet. The current prospect of The Clean Water Act and Clean Air Act standards for any act of resource extraction in water or by land should be more stringent. It's time to return to the country our fore fathers' dreamed, believed and created, a democratic nation. Money is paper, People are power. We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity Please consider Pebble Mine's threat to the justice, tranquility and welfare of our posterity in Britol Bay's region.

Please consider the dire impacts that allowing a disastrous mine in Bristol Bay... Now is the time for Relationships between federal and tribal governments to be strengthened & to improve both the standards for mineral development in wetlands & Clean Water for large-scale metallic sulfide mining. After all protecting this now, with benefit the local community & wildlife now for generations to come, whereas allowing it will leave a legacy of distruction & pollution for many more generations. While the local community & wildlife suffers, a few rich distant shareholders will benefit without having to live with the consequences of their actions.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

, The following are reasons why Pebble Mine would have a disastrous impact on the Bristol Bay ecosystem and what should be done about it. 1.) Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. 2.) Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should be the top priority. 3.) The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. 6.) Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent.

America's Great Outdoors, Bristol Bay is a national and environmental treasure. I can't believe the Pebble Mine has gotten as far along as it has. You cannot have "safe" metallic sulfide mining any more than you can have safe cyanide mining or safe deep water drilling or safe nuclear power plants. Every one of these disastrous types of projects is a ticking time bomb. Just look at the history of various giant conglomerates which care only about corporate profits and nothing about indigenous human and wild populations. We cannot allow metallic sulfide mining at Pebble to kill more of our precious ocean environment than BP and assorted criminal organizations have already done. Our poor earth has sustained incredible damage from unprincipled, environmentally destructive practices. At a minimum: Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to metallic sulfide mining. It is unconscionable to allow big corporations to stomp on indigenous rights, placing environmental protection above corporate profits. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be vastly more stringent or better, prohibit it.

I am an American citizen who loves our country and its treasured wildlands and wildlife resources. As I read the news, too often I am left with the feeling that our Government Agencies are more on the side of business and developers than they are intent on protecting our natural resources from destruction. The mandate of our Government Agencies should as a priority be the preservation of our land, seas and the wildlife that live there for future generations. - Specifically, just now the Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence way of life. - Public lands in the Bristol Way watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic sulfide mining. . - The federal government should provide strong oversight of the process which might permit such a venture as the Pebble Mine. The federal government should be much more stringent before considering permits and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. - The relationship between federal and tribal governments should be strengthened. - The federal government should strengthen the standards for mineral development in wetlands and should make them tighter. - - The federal government should also be much less generous in issuing permits to special interest groups, such as ranchers or all-terrain-vehicles, which lets them use our public lands. The American Voter voted for change. The change should be for the protection of the interests of the American Citizen and future generations

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Watershed of Bristol Bay is NOT a safe place for mining or other industrial activity. Key reason why the Pebble Mine must NOT be allowed include: The federal government has to provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permit review process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay watershed. Relationships between federal and tribal governments need to be strengthened. Standards for mineral development in wetlands, and Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining must be applied at their most stringent level, considering the sensitivity of the Bristol Bay eco-system, including its wild salmon.

I am appealing to you to curb the mining and other development interests in Alaska that threaten its environment and wildlife. I have been fortunate enough to visit some of the beautiful spaces in this great state and hope it can be preserved for the enjoyment of my grandchildren. The Pebble Mine threatens that future. It also threatens the well-being of tribal interests in the Bristol Bay area. As a resident of our most densely-populated state I know first hand how uncurbed development can wreak havoc on an environment and how difficult it is to repair what has been damaged. The time for prevention is before the damage is done.

Alaska is home to some of our country's most spectacular wild places, and we need to protect them for the enjoyment of all Americans. Once such place is Bristol Bay. Commercial interests such as the proposed Pebble Mine threaten to do irreparable damage to Bristol Bay.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Obama Administration, It is a shame that the modern primary environmental statutory legacy of the U.S. lies with the republican administration of Richard Nixon. Historically, Teddy Roosevelt was the father of our National Park System. Even George W. Bush established the world's largest marine sanctuary. When will the democrats make history? It is important that we don't waste any time finding ways to protect our wild lands and wildlife. We have so many beautiful lands that need our help. Once they're damaged by abuse it is very hard if not impossible to fix them. A good example is the Gulf of Mexico and the Gulf Coast after the oil spill this year. Much of the marsh has died and will continue to die. The habitat for the wildlife and the protection for cities like New Orleans will be gone. The economic impact could be devastating. Once the land disappears into the Gulf there is no way to bring it back. Any additional drilling should be halted and strict oversight of the present drilling should be a top priority. Another area that demands immediate attention is the Bristol Bay in Alaska. At this time many people are fighting to keep out the Pebble Mine, proposed to be the the world's largest gold and copper mine. Opening up this unspoiled wilderness to hard rock mining would generate 9 billions tons of waste and pose a risk to the entire Bristol Bay ecosystem. This mine will harm the clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife, recreation and traditional subsistence ways of life of the native people. The and the The government must do a thorough environmental impact study which will reveal the devastation this mine will cause. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should never be used to drill for oil or gas. There must be somewhere on earth that is left alone for the wildlife and free from the footprint of the oil and gas industry. The Ivory-billed woodpecker, America's largest woodpecker, is probably gone forever because of the practice of over-logging their habitat. In the Sept. 2010 issue of the Smithsonian magazine: James Tanner an ornithologist who studied and recorded photographs of the Ivory-bill in 1938 in a large virgin forest in northeast Louisiana called the Singer Tract wrote in a 1942 article in The Wilson Bulletin, " 'there is little doubt but that complete logging of the {Singer} tract will cause the end of the Ivorybills there'. The tract was indeed completely logged, and an ivory-bill sighting there in 1944 remains the last uncontested observation anywhere in the United States." The practice of fracking by the gas industry must be given a complete evaluation by the EPA. According to many people the water in their wells was polluted by gas and other chemicals used in the fracking process after the gas companies started extracting gas on their land or nearby. It has the possibility of polluting the water and killing wildlife in streams and rivers all over the United States not to mention polluting the drinking water of millions of people. More Americans die each year from coal ash pollution related diseases than died on 9/11, but where is the equivalent outrage? The mercury from coal ash pollutes many of our lake and streams. The mountain top removal common in West Virginia must be stopped. It not only harms the beauty of the mountain, it pollutes the streams and rivers nearby. If you can't drink the water and you can't breathe the air, there is no way to live a decent life. There must be someone telling the companies responsible for all this pollution that they can't have it all, that there are limits to what they can take from the environment and what pollution they can produce. The only one with the ability to do that is our Federal Government. We are asking you to help to save our wild lands, wildlife and ourselves.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

To those of you in charge of the Mine Project: Do you “get” it now? for giving me this opportunity to voice my opinion against the Mine. Now get busy and get outta there. There is probably something else you can do today right?

Green energy and resources are the future. There is no bridge that needs to be built between now and the future – the future is NOW. If it isn't renewable – why do it? Just to ruin another area so a tiny few can make Millions/Billions with the Excuse that it creates a miniscule amount of jobs. Look forward – forget the rhetoric.

All of these -- and the the culture of devastation of our natural treasure that has steadily been taking place in the last twenty years, which has undone the culture of preservation our pioneer forefathers began, several giving their entire careers to the projects, is beyond me. There is no need. Every day scientists discover new ways from what we didn't know before. I talked with a fellow fifteen years ago whose company has a method for mining, leaving the ground above virgin and useable. Wonders are possible. We will learn soon we'd better stop denuding the land or else. As for using space, don't get me started! So wrong headed. Empire is what that is about. In the meantime, our own government is willing to blindly proceed in Bristol Bay, eradicating its wildlife, cruelly, disrupting the human inhabitants' culture and livelihoods once again. Where have we come? No where. I'm seventy eight and I weary. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources, should be top priority. Federal and tribal governments relationships must be strengthened and Native welfare must be prime. Standards for mineral development in wetlands must be stringent. In fact, we need all wetlands preserved in perpetuity. If not, we imperil ourselves. Is anyone listening to the scientists? If you go ahead despite us, the Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining must be totally stringent. I believe we don't need mining. We are sophisticated. We have gone beyond it, Yet, in a rush as always, we want the simple way so we may rush ahead to the next mistakes, the cheaper ways, to our loss..

Please know that I oppose the Pebble Mine and urge you to take action to protect Bristol Bay by opposing the mine as well.

: I hope that you will be able to understand: Pebble mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and Traditional subsistence ways of life. Further- I hope you will be able to understand that: Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large-scale metallic Sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence and recreation resources should Be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine Permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts to the Bristol Bay water- Shed. Clean Water Act standards for large-scale metallic sulfide mining should be More stringent. Please use your influence to bring about good solutions for the above areas of concern.

I write to you to express my concerns about the Pebble Mine and how it will detrimentally affect Bristol Bay, a cherished wildland, and how we must do a better job in protecting it and other cherishes wildlands and outdoor spaces: Please make my comment a part of the public record and put into action my comments.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I seek your courage and support in opposing the foreign corporation based Pebble Mine project. There are so few wilderness jewels left in the world. These places have a value all their own, and yet we persist in destroying them. We attempt to put safeguards in place to prevent ecological disasters, but history has shown us that they fail again and again. Their failures result in destruction to the environment, death to wildlife, financial disasters, and a toll on human welfare. Consider that the Pebble Mine will be at the headwaters that feed Bristol Bay, one of the largest fisheries in the world. Besides the destruction that will be done to the area just to get to the mine site and build the mine, consider that the failure of the retention pools will destroy the rivers that feed Bristol Bay. This will result in the loss of a billion dollar fishing industry and destroy a subsistence way of life to the native people. Mr. President do what is right and stop this project.

I would like to express my concern about Bristol Bay and Pebble Mine.

Generally, I would like for our government to strengthen environmental protections across the board. We should stop clear cutting our forests. We should stop mountain top removal coal mining. We should dramatically increase fuel efficiency standards, and dramatically increase research and development of solar, wind, and other renewable energy resources. We should stop subsidizing the nuclear, oil, and coal industries. We should move away from nuclear power, oil and gas development, and coal mining, period. If we continue to destroy our natural world, we are going to run out of clean air and water and we are all going to die. Preservation of our natural world should be our top priority. Destroying and polluting these very special places, like this Pebble Mine would do, should not even be considered...

I am writing today to urge against Pebble Mine being allowed to operate in Bristol Bay. Pebble Mine threatens Bristol Bay's clean waters, wild salmon, wildlife and traditional subsistence ways of life. Public lands in the Bristol Bay watershed should be closed to large scale metallic sulfide mining. Protecting habitat, subsistence, and recreation resources should be the top priority. The federal government should provide strong oversight of the Pebble Mine permitting process and analysis of cumulative impacts of the Bristol Bay watershed. I also believe Clean Water Act standards for large scale metallic sulfide mining should be more stringent.

I am writing to express my concern with the Pebble Mine project and to support the preservation of Bristol Bay. Mining is inherently dangerous and destructive, and mining companies wreak destruction on public land and leave the taxpayers to clean up and pay for the mess they leave behind. We depend on government agencies to look after our interests when Big Energy tries to harm our public resources, and this is a time when your help is essential. In order to protect Bristol Bay and similar natural resources, and Big Energy cannot be trusted to carry out its operations unsupervised on public land. The public interest must be protected. I am counting on you to do just that.

I urge you to please protect Bristol Bay.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In general, National Parks are perhaps the greatest invention of the United States, but we are ignoring them. The funding necessary to properly upkeep and staff the Parks is minimal, yet it is not done. It is a shame.

I understand that someone from an urban environment may find it difficult to appreciate the value in preserving our natural environments. Having grown up in the Yellowstone Valley, I have first hand knowledge of that value.

It is a place close to my heart as I've often been in that area. The land and all its creatures need spaces in which to just BE, and that helps us humans to just BE as well. As we face global climate change, protecting these connections will only become vitally important. They allow us to breathe!

The National Park Service is supposed to be the agency that protects and preserves the national parks, but Congress won't fund the agency. And hence, we have volunteer groups that work in the parks to maintain trails and help with many other tasks. I believe that representatives from the Departments of Interior and Agriculture should evaluate the parks that have the most to lose, ecologically and make those a priority. Yellowstone National Park has some of the most unique features of any place in the world, including the wildlife.

Not allowing the BLM/ State of WY to sell off valuable land to Oil & Gas Companies. As we face global climate change, protecting these connections will only become more important, in keeping the emissions from the gas wells on a stricter regulation.-There definitely should be an Air Quality Fund as well. It all goes hand in hand in protecting the beautiful landscape of Yellowstone, the quality of life for both humans and the wildlife. Especially the wildlife, as this was their home first.

If we want to save our environment we must engage the man on the street in the awareness and love of the Great American Outdoors. He/she must know and be aware of it. Unfortunately too many Americans aren't. The Outdoors beyond the walk to the car is a blank, an unknown hostile place that has nothing of any use to their lives.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Dear Pres. Obama, I live in Wyoming, the state that has coal, uranium, oil, coalbed methane, natural gas---you name it and a state that supports you very little..sorry to say but we all know why....the Democratic Party used to behalf of our state legislature, but not now...Sen. Alan Simpson will attest to that...I recall him supporting early protection of the environment with Land Use Planning, The Siting Act and strengthening the state Environmental Quality Act (late 60's and 70's) Yellowstone is of course one of the most precious places on the planet...there must be more stress to protect it and the larger surrounding large region of GYNP. Kids of today are missing way to much by using their computers for everything...especially texting...they will not learn to communicate thoughtful, critical observations because they are not forced to put the damn things away and look at nature. I am an artist, and former art teacher and know that nature's beauty is not appreciated, protected, and used for thoughtful and visual comtemplations as it should be. Moving from Kansas to Wyoming in 1960 (to teach art) I later developed into an environmentalist/political activist. My 41 year old daughter in CO is the same. A rock climber, skier, backpacker etc but at this time forced to return to college because of losing an excellent job in Paonia, Co. We all must work to get off the gross diets that are bringing this country's health to its knees. We must stop taking kids everywhere...they must walk, observe, see, smell, feel, and learn independence without texting every second of their spare time. There is one place that must be protected more completely and that is the Red Desert in Wy. and Co. I encourage you to contact Biodiversity Conservation Alliance and arrange a tour with \_\_\_\_\_, Laramie, Wy. Thanks for reading this environmental sermon. support the Obama Administration's America's Great Outdoors Initiative.

The Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem should be a top priority within the initiative. Yellowstone & Teton NP's, the 7 national forests and two wildlife refuges make up one of the largest unfragmented wildlands left in the temperate zone in the world. This is a world heritage site that deserves special protection. Thank you for your consideration.

I DO NOT support the Obama Administration's America's Great Outdoors Initiative. I believe that representatives from the Departments of Interior and Agriculture should leave the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem as is. - As the world's first national park, Yellowstone should be a priority area to be left alone by the Administration. Efforts to develop strategies to reconnect people to nature and conserve our treasured landscapes should not be a priority of the government. We do not face global climate change and the efforts to protect these connections will only become more lies to the American people. - For America's Great Outdoors to be successful, the Administration must listen to all people and not just the GYC and Sierra Club.

This isn't a time of great appreciation for the outdoors in our country. There will be a time when we have more appreciation for nature, and we need to act now so that when we finally appreciate what we have it isn't too late.

I worked in Yellowstone for 5 summers. I was there the first summer that we registered over a million visitors. That was back in the early '60's. With the population of the U.S. now almost double what it was then, the need to preserve those parks and wilderness areas is more important than ever!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I am an Alaskan, and I am writing to you today to express my opinion of the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay in Alaska. I do not support the establishment of a mine of any kind in the area around Bristol Bay and I am asking you today to, please not allow the plans for the Pebble Mine to continue. As an American it is one of my top priorities to protect ecosystems and natural resources that we are so lucky to have across our nation. Growing up in Alaska I have been blessed to be surrounded by pristine wildlife areas and undeveloped land. These areas are important for our enjoyment, the livelihood of Alaskans, and most importantly for the functioning of global ecosystems. I have fished, both commercially and for recreation since I was a child and I have family who commercial fish currently in Bristol Bay. I am asking you today, to protect Bristol Bay and to refuse to allow the building of the Pebble Mine. I do not believe that there is any clean way to do this type of mining. This project has no public benefit for Alaskans or for Americans. The project will benefit a few already rich executives, and no matter what they say, it means that many (including many Alaska Natives) will lose their livelihood. I also would like to protect the salmon populations for the sake of the salmon. They are an important species in the ecosystem there and deserve to remain. of the US government and especially the EPA. This is a chance to strengthen the relationship between the Alaskan Native Tribal corporations and the Government. This is a chance to take the write stance on environmental policy and reverse some of the damage done by the Bush Administration. Please increase the standards for mineral development in wetlands. Please do this for me, everyone my age and younger, for our children.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I'm writing to you today to express my opinion of the proposed Pebble Mine in Bristol Bay in Alaska. I do not support the establishment of a mine of any kind in the area around Bristol Bay and I am asking you today to not allow the plans for the Pebble Mine to continue. As an American it is one of my top priorities to protect ecosystems and natural resources that we are so lucky to have across our nation. These include, but are not limited to, Bristol Bay, the Tongass National Forest and the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. I have been happy to see over the past years that Alaska can successfully manage a fishing industry in a place like Bristol Bay that doesn't overwhelm the Salmon population, but also supports the jobs of many, including many Alaska Natives. As a Minnesotan, I have been lucky enough to eat a great deal of Salmon fished in Bristol Bay. I love to have a source of food that is ecologically sustainable, incredibly healthy and delicious. I like supporting friends who fish there and send me frozen fish to Minnesota. As a visiting resident of Alaska for the past 5 months, I was able to witness firsthand the beauty of that area and also of the challenges for many Alaska Natives. I would like to live in Alaska again and I someday hope to spend summers fishing for salmon in Bristol Bay. I am asking you today, to protect Bristol Bay and to refuse to allow the building of the Pebble Mine. I do not believe that there is any clean way to do this type of mining. This project has no public benefit for Alaskans for Americans. It is so a few people can get rich, and no matter what they say, it means that many (including many Alaska Natives) will lose their livelihood. I also would like to protect the salmon populations for the sake of the salmon. They are an important species in the ecosystem there and deserve to remain. of the US government and especially the EPA. This is a chance to strengthen the relationship between the Alaskan Native Tribal corporations and the Government. This is a chance to take the write stance on environmental policy and reverse some of the damage done by the Bush Administration. Please increase the standards for mineral development in wetlands. Please do this for me, everyone my age and younger, for our children.

**\*\*At issue are the hundreds of lease's on the public lands adjoining this national treasure.**

**\*\*While the original purpose of establishing this special place is its scenic grandeur, it is the spectacle of its wildlife that draws the millions of people here.and to end conflicting grazing leases as they come due.**

This is not our planet, we are borrowing it from our children and generations beyond.

Our precious lands are disappearing at alarming rates and pristine areas such as Yellowstone must be given top priority.

Go try to ride a bike in a Wilderness Area. See how free you are then. Guess what? Even though my bike is more environmentally friendly than a horse, it's not allowed!

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Environmental Education courses are not part of the US Public School Curriculums by and large now. Funding would have to come from Progressive School Boards who see the benefits and value of these types of courses and replace existing courses like Global Technology Curriculum that are so watered down they have little value. The value of a strong science based curriculum that would be part of an Environmental Education course would be significant. Private Foundations exist that would fund the development of these curricula. I know because I am working with a Private Foundation and a local school board to develop a Renewable Energy Curriculum which has environmental education elements in it.

The "sustainable" part of the current land requirements is lawyer speak (very subjective) and is being used to keep ORV use out of all the public lands near where I live. Land managers say our existing trails are not "sustainable" and close them and prevent any new areas from being introduced because they are not "sustainable".

The idea posted is based on the false premise that use and conservation are mutually exclusive. The truth is, effective conservation requires some amount of use. For forest managers to actively manage lands some access is necessary. There are only roads on half or one percent of the lands. I think we are already doing an excellent job of conservation. We already have 120 million plus acres dedicated to Wilderness protections. We are doing a very good job of conservation already. It is painfully clear to me that the "less informed" are actually the environmentalists. Comments supporting climate change—a false science recently completely debunked—is one example. The notion that OHV users' sole purpose in life is to destroy the lands they recreate on is another example. The idea that OHVs are polluting the lands and chasing the wildlife is yet another unsubstantiated "feel good" claim. If you environmentalists would just be honest about the problems you would find that your selfish desires are the driving force behind this conflict.

I know how much I need to have quiet at times. I decided one day to sit outside and listen to what the wild has to listen to from AM to PM, well, didn't realize how much noise all around there was, and we live out in country sort of, lots of woods, can't enjoy all of nature this way, we want and need quiet time for sleep and peace of mind and find ways to have that if possible. WHAT can animals do to have any quiet? This really upset me and hope anything that can help on noise in certain places can be reached to help these animals.

Yes, I agree with the idea Families and Friends actively together in the Great Outdoors. I think that sounds awesome. Heavy industry and farming causes far more harm to our country. Also, people that think all genetically modified foods are bad are crazy! Almost all the food Americans have been eating since like 20 years ago or so is genetically modified. It saves far more lives than most people realize. It also helps to slow down the farming of new land growth overall in developed countries.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

There is a demand that far exceeds the financial resources available to voluntarily enhance and permanently preserve private working ranches. A fundamental goal of the Initiative should be to increase the funding available for voluntary conservation easements held by third-parties. There are ranchers across the west who have placed their ranch under a conservation easement, preventing development and fragmentation of vast open spaces in perpetuity. The ecological and economic values of these ranches today are ensured for future generations, while the long term stewardship remains the responsibility of the rancher, who also continues to pay property and other relevant taxes. There is a long list of ranchers who are willing to permanently preserve their ranches and we urge that the Initiative provide additional funding for the voluntary acquisition of conservation easements on private working ranches in strategic places.

In addition, this initiative should place a significant focus on voluntary natural resource stewardship enhancement opportunities on private working lands. Both the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Partners Program and the Natural Resources Conservation Service Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP) are key examples of successful programs that cost-share voluntarily with private individuals to improve natural resources. Presently, both programs lack adequate funding to meet the demand. This initiative should bolster programs that have proven to be successful and where landowner demand outstrips program availability, in order to improve the nation's natural resources.

A long-standing challenge to our partnership's overall mission is the estate tax. The Rangeland Coalition supports permanent, targeted reform of the estate tax in ways that both preserve private working ranches and reward commitments to lasting rangeland conservation. We believe an important means of helping meet the goals of this Initiative would be to support permanent and targeted reform of the estate tax, assisting in the preservation of large intact ranches that support a diversity of native plant and wildlife species. In California, the estate tax is one of the leading causes of the breakup and loss of family-owned ranching operations. California ranching families faced with estate tax debts are often left with no choice but to liquidate assets or sell significant portions of their property.

A long standing challenge to implementing voluntary conservation on the ground is the need to obtain permits from various local, state and federal agencies to complete the projects. The Initiative should support interagency collaboration to improve the regulatory atmosphere for voluntary conservation projects. For example, efforts to create programmatic permits and streamlined permitting amongst agencies for voluntary restoration and enhancement projects should continue in the future. Partners in the Rangeland Coalition are aware that ranchers seeking to implement voluntary habitat restoration projects face a complex regulatory process. Our partnership supports opportunities to help ranchers complete environmentally beneficial projects on an expedited process, while still preserving the integrity of the environmental regulatory program.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In short, our partnership sees financial constraints and particular program requirements that hinder additional on the ground voluntary enhancement and preservation on private working ranches. We encourage the Initiative to solicit and support stakeholder input in improving the effectiveness and efficiency of current programs and the allocation of additional funding to voluntary conservation programs. In addition, outreach and education about the outdoors and agriculture--in particular the public benefits produced by private working lands--is an important element to include in the Initiative, targeting the general public, agency staff and elected officials.

regarding the e-mail from Ken Salazar, just don't shut out off-road vehicles from any more access and we will be just fine.

Hello, Thank you for your interest in America's Great Outdoors. While I appreciate your comment and would welcome it elsewhere on the AGO site, it's not germane to the Terms of Participation. Please feel free to re-post to a more appropriate place. -----Original Message----- Sent: Thursday, February 17, 2011 11:37 AM One of the things that drives me crazy as a hunter and hiker in Montana, is the overgrazing on Forest Service lands. Specifically, the Custer National Forest-Ashland District. I understand that many individual ranchers get permits to run cattle there, but the Forest Service must not have any enforcement people because the amount of cattle trails and shrubbery destroyed is sad. I, personally, have a major problem with private companies using public resources to make private profit, whether its mining or ranching. Does it create jobs? Yes, most likely, but when the minerals or timber has been harvested, what is the public left with? Bare public land...with the monies from such activities going to the hands of the few, rather than for the 'good of all Americans' which was the intent of designating lands as public inholdings. I could blather more about this, but my ranting isn't solving anything, so instead I would offer a suggestion to look into how public resource money is 'spread' around. My guess is you'll find large companies own the majority leases and are exploiting public land for the gain of very few. In my opinion, that isn't why those lands were set aside. I guess I thought those resources were to be sold and the money would come back to, I don't know, the general fund or something. The materials would directly help America bring in more money for the government rather than for lining the pockets of private companies that only have thier best interest in mind. Not the lands....



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Hello again, One way to ensure that our wilderness regions and our wildlife will remain safe is to become aware of the forces in this Government of ours that because of their corrupt ideologies, and their pandering to powerful special interest groups would deny future generations of Americans from enjoying a legacy of still pristine Wildlands and Forested areas home to our wonderful wild fauna and flora, that they should be able to enjoy! Irrespective of which portion of the political spectrum people align themselves with, we need to make them aware of what we stand to lose if special interest groups, with greed and vile motivations, are not countered and checked by those of us who want America the Beautiful to remain that way; and not just be a passing slogan. Special interest groups have had far too much influence and historically have gained too much vocal and influential power, which they abuse! Examples are the cattlemen and shepherders lobbies, which are anti-predator, and our environmentally naive President ignorantly appointed Ken Salazar to be Sec'y of The Interior. This man has been and still is in the palm of the corrupt cattlemen's lobby and deliberately removed the gray wolf prematurely, from the protections of the Endangered Species Act, throwing their protections away and allowing over 1800 wolves to be poisoned, trapped and shot in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem. As a former livestock veterinarian, I have had the dubious distinction of having had to lock horns with the cattlemen's lobby members and also the infamous Animal Services sub-division of the U.S.Dept. of Agriculture. Animal Services (originally known as Animal Damage Control) originated in 1931 and they are nothing more than lackeys to the cattle and sheepmen. Since when do these two groups deign to speak for all Americans, when they run their livestock for a pittance per animal and degrade our Public Lands; and then have the temerity to demand removal of all predatory mammals from these Public Lands?? This is America not 16th Century feudal Europe! Animal Services is funded by Your Tax dollars! Other politicians that have vile records with respect to Wildlife and the Environment are people such as Sarah Palin, who upon becoming governor of Alaska, immediately set out to have the Board of Game issue orders to kill all the wolves in the Yukon Charley grid of Alaska, where AK. adjoins the Canadian - Yukon Territory. All 85 wolves were killed by gunners in Helicopters and the Canadians who had radio-collared many of these wolves were very irate; as these wolves were under study by their biologists; and also were very habituated to human presence. The killing of these wolves is in addition to aerial killing wolves over 80% of Alaska; where wolves have never had any protection at all; and are also subjected to year round leghold trapping and wire snaring that also kills non target species of wildlife! Adding to Palin's infamous career is the fact that she openly endorses the formation of the Pebble Mine, a project thought up by European multi billionaires, to extract gold and copper from a mine in Alaska that would have a manmade above surface ten mile square pool of extremely toxic waste poisons such as cyanide, chromium and other extremely dangerous chemicals that can and will leach into the surrounding wildlands, as well as imperil the very important Salmon Fishery at the mouth of Bristol Bay! Many thousands of Alaskan fishermen depend upon that extremely valuable salmon fishery for their livelihoods, and they are seething with discontent over this proposal endorsed by Sarah Palin. The loss of wildlife would be catastrophic, since the headquarters of the site for the Pebble Mine, is very rich with mammals such as brown and black bears, wolves, the rare wolverine, caribou, moose, Sitka deer, to name just a few and very rich with bird life as well. . PLease think about that!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

he US Forest Service is about to unlawfully destroy a historical cabin built in 1901 by Bill Timms, 40 miles NE of Yellow Pine, Idaho. Bill Timms was a historical figure at the start of the 20th century. He was a prospector, assayer and postman in the former town of Roosevelt, Idaho. Roosevelt was named after then president Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt, Idaho was a prospering mining town with more than 10,000 residents until a landslide turned the town into a lake in 1909. In May of that year, the landslide blocked Monumental Creek just below town and backed the creek over the town. Today, you can still see remnants of 100+ year old buildings just below the water. Most buildings were inundated by the flooding, however a few remained above the water line. Only one structure remains fully intact, that which was built by Bill Timms and is currently lived in, maintained by Jack Walker. Bill Timm died in 1963. The USFS falsely claims he then built a cabin in 1969. Bill Timm was 93 years old at his time of death in 1963. If the USFS account is correct, a 99 year old ghost built the cabin and it should be preserved as the first case of a ghost building a cabin by paranormal activity! The USFS has been at war with Jack Walker for more than 40 years attempting to destroy Bill Timms cabin. In the latest turn of events, the criminal organization we call the USFS has unlawfully falsified the historical report of Bill Timms' Cabin and has suggested eviction of Jack Walker and the destruction of said cabin. Your help is needed to stop the USFS from violating federal law and illegally burning down this historical structure. Please call the Payette National Forest and tell them NOT to burn Bill Timm's cabin, an important piece of history!! Once this 110 year old well preserved piece of history is destroyed, it will be gone forever.

There is a lot of buzz in the hunting and fishing communities that this task you are taking on is nothing more than a smoke screen to buy public lands and then prohibit certain activities (such as hunting and fishing) once the lands are open to the public. Can you comment on this?

Hi, I recently read in Appalachian Trail Conservancy's magazine that AGO was to issue a report of its findings on Nov. 15. A review of websites and Facebook pages (there seem to be many of them) are all virtually silent on the report. As someone who attended the NH listening session and has followed this issue closely, I'd like to know the new deadline for the report. I realize that it's a different political environment than it was when this effort began, but I believe AGO needs full transparency if it is to be credible. To not be in dialog regarding findings and reports, even if they are to be delayed a number of months, is a disservice to the thousands of individuals who gave their time, thoughts, and support to this worthy cause. Thanks.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I live in the middle of a huge forest beetle kill area. This epidemic has damaged our forests by killing our trees and may result in erosion of our soil. This serious national issue also poses danger to the thousands of individuals that are active in our forests camping, hiking, skiing, and sight seeing. Though there may not be too much we can do to stop the beetle devastation, I wonder everyday why we cannot devise a plan to provide Americans that are out-of-work the opportunity to work at clearing the dead trees from our forest. There are millions of acres of forest that are damaged by this problem. It could be that many Americans will appreciate the opportunity to earn a living during this tough economic time and will welcome the chance to help make a meaningful contribution to our forest environment. I'm not suggesting a clear cut or unnecessary roads to be built in our national forest, but more of a well-managed effort to restore our forest while engaging Americans in need.

Dear Mr Ken Salazar, Great outdoors with no wild horses and burros, no mountain lion etc. , is it still great outdoors ??? \_\_\_\_\_

I support the America's Great Outdoors initiative and commend President Obama and his Administration for recognizing that we need to protect our natural world to ensure our health and that of future generations. I hope the Administration will immediately implement the recommendations outlined in its Great Outdoors report. This initiative is important to the people of Tennessee because:

- \* It can help ensure clean water supplies, support jobs in tourism and recreation, save working farms and ranches, and preserve the special places where our community goes hunting, fishing or just to enjoy nature.
- \* It is driven by communities and encourages local people to recommend the best ways to save their lands, waters and coastlines.
- \* It is aimed at preserving whole natural places, including entire forests, mountain ranges, migratory corridors and rivers.

I urge the Administration to take action now on this initiative. Key first steps would be full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund <<http://www.nature.org/initiatives/protectedareas/support/art30842.html>> , a permanent extension of conservation easement tax incentives, and support for other government programs that protect our local lands and waters.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

AGO, I am curious about your apparent concern for the environment. Please enlighten me. If the US government was seriously concerned about the environment why would it: A) allow a criminal organization (BP) to control the clean up of the nations largest oil spill? B) allow BP to dump thousands of gallons of Corexit into the ocean, set turtles on fire, cut bird heads off, deny clean up workers the right to wear protective equipment and talk to the media? C) leave 400 million barrels of oil to sit in the gulf for 6 months and then not clean it up? Did I miss the story in the media stating that skimmers from Norway, Germany and Iceland were allowed to assist in the clean up? D) allow 400 million barrels of oil to stay in the gulf where it could be carried to all areas of the ocean and travel the rivers of the US that serve as the drinking water supply for millions of citizens? E) allow the chemicals used to extract natural gas to be dumped into the water supply of millions of citizens as well as state parks? F) why was the natural gas industry exempted from the clean water act? G) why was a former employee of Monsanto put in control of the new food safety division when it is common knowledge that GMO's are harmful to all living things? H) why are GMO's allowed to pass through the US food system without labeling? I) why does the US military continue to dump thousands of tons of barium and aluminum into US airways? If you argue that this isn't true then why are people all over the country finding barium and aluminum in their water using basic water tests? The US government has the one of the worse records for recognizing environmental safety hazards and in fact does more to harm natural ecosystems. It is the tendency of the US government to take life ( see 3 wars being fought in three separate countries), destroy the environment ( see nefarious ties to dirty corporations like Monsanto, BP, Halliburton etc. and above) and pass the burden of pain onto the American taxpayer. This latest initiative looks to be more of the same. The politicians are financially aligned with the corporations to make money at any cost and the average citizen pays for the blunders that ensue. I don't expect an honest and informed response to the above questions because the tactic of a deceiver is to respond with rhetoric or not at all. But go ahead. Surprise me. One Of The Growing Numbers Of Sheep Who's Eyes Cannot Be Covered With Wool

Ducks Unlimited, in partnership with the federal and state agencies, numerous NGOs and private landowners, including the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, have worked to curb habitat losses in the Prairie Pothole Region to ensure the future of migratory birds and related natural resource conservation opportunities. Despite these efforts, the native grasslands and wetlands of this cultural and ecological treasure continue to disappear faster than they can be conserved.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

. Some time ago in the history of mankind, humans lost harmony with nature. The people of this Earth (or at least the majority) have forgotten the nature of existence. This planet does not belong to us, we belong to it. We've been selfish and greedy for far too long, and during this eleventh hour the ignorance must cease before it's too late. We must federalize sustainability NOW. I live in Myrtle Beach, SC, and I cannot even pay this city to send recycling trucks to my neighborhood. If the government doesn't take the declarative initiative to change this country for the better, (a policy the president we elected campaigned on), then how else will the ignorance stop? I love America, it has given me my life and happiness, but frankly our lack of appreciation for this planet, and our lust for ourselves, is utterly humiliating. How can we travel to foreign countries and boast of our strength and honor, when we have none back home? It is time Washington. There are more than 7.5 billion people on this planet, and it consistently rises. Frankly, there is no more room on this planet for the ignorant and the selfish. We must take decisive action and we must take it immediately. What are we waiting for? All of environmental science tells us of the urgency, and still we twiddle our thumbs and throw trash out of our car windows. We have the opportunity to literally create a brand new world here in America, and if the rest of the world has a sense of good being like I know All truly do in their hearts, they will listen to our example. Whatever happened to honor? What happened to respect? What happened to love? This nation is divided for all of the wrong reasons. Unite it for the right ones. God bless America.

Dear President Obama: America's great outdoors are special to us all and we have a great responsibility to protect them for future generations. We can help keep America special by protecting more Wilderness and quiet recreation opportunities, preserving more habitat and connectivity for wildlife, and permanent protecting remaining old-growth forests. Here in Oregon, we enjoy some of the most beautiful and awe-inspiring public lands in the nation. But places like the Wild Rogue River, the wildlands surrounding Crater Lake National Park, and the Siskiyou Wild Rivers are at risk from logging, mining, and other harmful development. Oregon has protected only 4% of our land as Wilderness, lagging far behind our neighbors. For the wildlife that call our public lands homes and for the millions who enjoy these places for quiet recreation, it is time to correct this Wilderness imbalance.

One of the principal barriers to effective and efficient conservation of fish and wild life species is the lack of dedicated funding for the full array of fish and wildlife. For nearly three century, the Pittman-Robertson Act and later the Dingell Johnson Act have provided critical quarters of a funding for states to conserve game species. These Acts have successfully brought back wild turkeys, striped bass, elk and many other species . However, they do not directly address the needs of over 90% of the nation 's fish and wildlife that are not hunted or fished.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Therefore, I am forwarding a copy of my prepared remarks directly to you. The purpose for doing so is to once again bring to your attention that there is opposition in Maine to the environmental lobby that is attempting to shut down our forest products industry through various "conservation" schemes and some who are still trying to create a federally-funded Maine Woods National Park that will take the core of Maine's working forests out of production and kill jobs. You have been contacted before in a March 18, 2010 letter regarding a Maine-based effort called the Great Maine Forest Initiative and its proposed tie-in to the federal Treasured Landscapes Initiative (Interior) and the All Lands Initiative (Agriculture).

Millinocket has a paper mill that is currently on indefinite shutdown and the community has been working hard to develop new economic development opportunities and jobs in the area. Our current growth industry is outdoor tourism, although we also are maintaining a solid forest products industry in our geographic area.

This initiative and its components such as the Treasured Landscapes and All Lands Initiatives are viewed by the extreme environmental lobby as their newest piggy bank to finance themselves and to effectively bring private ownership of Maine's forests and thousands of jobs to an end by controlling these private lands through restrictive conservation easements that freeze in place current uses and generally prevent the development of new opportunities, such as the ATV trails mentioned earlier. Freezing in place today's status quo via conservation easements is to sentence the Maine forest products industry to no future growth by socializing our private forests and ceding control to the environmentalists who seek to shut down this critical Maine industry.

Conservation easements have become a trendy growth industry for those who seek further control over privately owned land. These easements end economic growth, block or restrict public access, and cost taxpayers huge sums of money for no public benefit or gain. These easements are in perpetuity. No one has a crystal ball to know what our needs will be in 25, 50, or 100 years. Easements placed today could have terrible impacts in the future as times and priorities change. The Town of Millinocket is not willing to support such efforts that could bring such great hardship to our State, our major industry, and our people based on the shallow promises of certain environmentalists that they are here to help us. History clearly demonstrates that they are not.

Nighttime satellite photos of the United States show a great dark void where the woods of Maine are located and it is the largest uninhabited area east of the Mississippi River. It is dark because it is a privately owned working forest. Environmentalist plans to "preserve" it are not necessary as the landowners themselves keep it this way because they make their livings there.

While some of the environmentalists adamantly deny it, we believe that these efforts are intended in the long-term to create a 3.2 million acre Maine Woods National Park that would eliminate the core of Maine's most productive forest land. This newest initiative presents them yet one more financial opportunity to realize this goal. Millinocket rejects the park, the key political leaders of Maine reject it, and the people of Maine reject it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Given these major challenges that face us, taxpayers would be much better served by a program that enhances the various uses of the Maine forests. Recreational activities continue to be a major part of our economic base. Federal monies used to enhance these opportunities through grants for things such as publicly funded multi-use trail development can help Maine, especially when done in working partnership with Maine's private sector. Conservation easements that impose a status quo and stop any consideration of growth take us in exactly the opposite direction of where Maine needs to be. While there may be specific, limited land parcels that are worthy of purchase, landscape scale conservation easements are simply not necessary and are, in fact, a direct threat to our economic well-being and future.

On behalf of the Town of Millinocket, I urge you to reject the use of America's Great Outdoor Initiative and its related funding programs to economically lock down our State's major industry and destroy our economy in the process. Rather, use these funds to directly enhance recreational opportunities and forest practices that actually encourage people to partake in outdoor activities, create jobs, and improve our economy.

My personal concerns are in regard to our Great Salt Lake and surrounding wetlands. While the Lake and more specifically certain areas such as the Bear River Bay are currently threatened I believe it is important to manage the Lake and surrounding wetlands in a way that will preserve and protect this international and local treasure for the enjoyment of both humans and the water birds that live there.

The wetlands surrounding the Lake are currently in their worst condition in history. I am concerned that even though Forestry Fire and State Lands (FFSL) receives millions of dollars every year from leases and royalties by allowing extraction of minerals and/or harvesting of brine shrimp from our sovereign lands, the money is tied up in some sort of bureaucratic red tape and therefore not spent to protect and repair the wetlands and Lake. Even though the Department of Wildlife Resources currently spends \$200,000.00 per year inside the Waterfowl Management Area's on various Phragmites control; the vast majority of Utah's marshlands lie outside the dikes on state sovereign lands administered by the FFSL. There are several options to deal with the Phragmites issue and restore the lost wetlands such as aerial spraying of glyphosates to affected areas; burning; or allowing cattle grazing in areas of concern. There must be a long term plan to deal with the Phragmites problem and sources of funding must be made available.

Overdevelopment of Great Salt Lake sovereign lands by industries which are currently found in the North Ann, Bear River Bay and Stansbury Bay for mineral extraction ponds as well as causeways and dikes is unsustainable for long-term use and will have an increasing detrimental effect on the Great Salt Lake. Issues such as Great Salt Lake Minerals plan to expand their evaporation ponds an additional 91,000-acres seems to be an unreasonable request for an already exhausted Lake. The effect of mineral and salt removal needs to be analyzed to determine the effects on the salt balance in the Lake. The impact of additional evaporation ponds that would be widespread throughout the Lake and it would disrupt the shallow sheetwater and water flow that ducks, geese and other shorebirds require to live. Proposals such as these could over time destroy the Lake's natural ebb and flow.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Water quantity and quality are both very important to the Great Salt Lake Ecosystem and surrounding wetlands. Water treatment facilities are important to the health of the public; however, they must be required to control the levels of phosphates and nitrates prior to water entering these wetland areas and eventually the Lake. Currently the lack of controls and monitoring of phosphates, nitrates and other chemicals released into the water is objectionable. Regular water monitoring for phosphate levels in these areas will alleviate the negative impact on the native and migratory species that inhabit these bodies of water.

The quantity of water is lacking in the Great Salt Lake at this time and it is extremely important to prevent further diversions of water to take place. A sustainable water now which provides for Antelope Island to actually be an "island" and Farmington Bay and other bays to have a viable level of water will prevent them from becoming a dust bowl. If these Bays' s become too dry it continues to impact the already poor air quality along the Wasatch Front.

As you know, many Americans are hurting from the impacts of a great recession brought on by failed economic and regulatory policies and greed. In my home state of Virginia, neighbors have lost their jobs, their businesses, their homes and in some cases families have been torn asunder. Some are running out of unemployment compensation and sadly, some feel life is no longer worth living.

Sadly, the promise of LWCF being an equal partnership between the states and the federal government has been lost over the past several years. But it can and should be rediscovered and can become a hallmark of your administration.

There are those who believe they can make better decisions about how outdoor recreation and conservation funding can be spent than the local and state governments who now compete for Stateside Assistance grants from LWCF. That kind of thinking is what drives wedges and creates silos that minimize partnership and collaboration.

We are deeply concerned about reducing our dependence on fossil fuels while increasing our security and commitment to renewable energy and green jobs, and we are anxious to see comprehensive energy and climate policy finally put in place a system to regulate and limit carbon emissions. As the legislative battles continue, we must not lose track of our country's valuable natural resources in the bargaining process. We therefore ask for your continued support to safeguard our precious public lands and water resources by providing full and dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), including special protections for key lands and waterways now threatened by development and climate change.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund was established in 1965 to protect America's Great Outdoors by using oil revenues to fund the conservation of natural resources. However, the Fund has yet to receive sufficient appropriations in any year, and without these funds it cannot fulfill its potential for our communities, families, and environment. Full funding for the LWCF was included in the Consolidated Land, Energy, and Aquatic (CLEAR) Act, which passed in the House of Representatives in July, and in companion legislation pending in the U.S. Senate. We hope you will advocate for continued inclusion of full funding for the LWCF as these bills move forward.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

With increased awareness of the hazards of fossil fuel extraction, it is clear that full and consistent funding for programs like the LWCF and increased support through that Fund for the creation of new parks and monuments to protect vulnerable landscapes are two critical steps that your Administration can take to help us do just that. Even as we work toward passage of comprehensive climate legislation, we can take meaningful steps to protect our natural resources through full funding for programs like the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Large, intact and functioning ecosystems, healthy fish and wildlife populations, and public access to natural landscapes are vital to our nation's quality of life and economic well-being. Important wildlife movement corridors and crucial wildlife habitats within these landscapes are critical to maintaining healthy lands.

As states have primary trust and legal obligations to manage and conserve wildlife in the United States, it is imperative that states generate and maintain landscape-scale wildlife information. Western states must, however, work closely with federal agencies that have management authority over much of the public land in the region. The Department of the Interior (DOI), in particular, is launching a number of similar wildlife mapping efforts, including Landscape Conservation Cooperatives and Rapid Eco-Regional Assessments. These initiatives are well intended yet need to be well coordinated both within the DOI and with the state DSSs so that the public can be confident that governmental landscape-scale mapping tools provide consistent and complementary information. Furthermore, for the states to fully develop and maintain their wildlife DSSs over time, additional non-state resources will be required. Devoting federal resources to the states for this purpose would be an efficient use of these dollars as GIS-based state wildlife data that is available, current and compatible across the states, assist federal mapping efforts and lead to consistent public information on wildlife from both levels of government.

For programs such as this to be truly effective, the Administration and Congress must give these agencies the resources they need to deliver. The National Wildlife Refuge System, 150 million acres of the world's premier system of lands devoted to wildlife suffers from 44% funding shortfall, and the President's budget request for FY 2011 would make it even worse. In order to fully realize the potential for on the ground conservation, these agencies must be fully funded; coordinated, comprehensive and effective landscape conservation simply can't happen when the FWS and NWRS are starved for adequate staffing and resources.

A comprehensive vision for "America's Great Outdoors" must include the NWRS and it will be essential to address fundamental FWS funding shortages and operations and maintenance backlogs - over \$3.6 billion for the Refuge System alone. Addressing this issue will be essential to achieving the promise of that vision.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Collaborative conservation, however, will not be sufficient to address all of the difficult issues that the nation confronts in managing our natural resources. When collaborative initiatives succeed, it is often against the backdrop of pending litigation or legislation or some other threat, such as a possible endangered species listing. And collaborative efforts take quite a bit of time and resources, which may not always be available. The Washington County legislation in Utah, for example, involved more than five years of tough ongoing negotiations, while the Nine Mile Canyon agreement was reached with the threat of costly litigation looming. This is not to denigrate the various grassroots initiatives that are underway across the West and elsewhere, but it is to inject a note of cautious realism about this approach. The tougher the issue, or the larger the affected landscape, or the more intransigent the parties, the more difficult it will be to achieve meaningful conservation results in a reasonable time frame, if any consensus can be achieved at all.

Simply put, not all conservation challenges can be effectively resolved through local dialogue and cooperation. President Teddy Roosevelt, recognizing how polarized the various parties were during his tenure in the White House, used bold executive actions to accomplish his most memorable conservation achievements: the creation of 24 new forest reserves, which are now vital parts of the national forest system; the creation of the first wildlife refuge, followed by several others; designation of the Grand Canyon National Monument to protect this iconic landscape; and the establishment of several other important national monuments. If the Obama administration is serious about its conservation legacy and promoting landscape scale conservation, then I urge you to include bold executive action as one of the potential AGO strategies. In this era of ultra-contentious, hard-ball politics, it will not be possible to appease all of the competing factions involved in our public land and resource debates. Roosevelt recognized this hard political reality, the Obama administration should do the same, while pursuing collaborative solutions for those issues or landscapes that lend themselves to this approach.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Most importantly, given the conservation challenges that lie ahead in the 21st century, I urge the AGO initiative to promote landscape-scale conservation strategies that will enable LIS to address effectively climate change, biodiversity loss, and other ecological stressors. One way to promote landscape scale conservation is to ensure the federal land management agencies coordinate their planning, in decision making efforts, both among themselves and with the states, local governments, Tribes, and other landowners. At the federal level, either by regulation or Executive Order, the President could require the land management agencies to prepare an Interagency Coordination Statement as part of their land use plans or NEPA documents, which would require prior notification to other agencies potentially affected by any upcoming agency action. An opportunity to comment on the action, and a requirement that the action agency respond specifically to any identified concerns, including whether any feasible alternatives are available to avoid potential harm. Such an approach would help to emphasize the need for better coordination, ensure that landscape level concerns are identified, and that alternatives are fully considered. A similar approach might be developed to address related concerns from the states, local governments, tribes, and private landowners. While such an approach would not solve all of the problems inherent in planning and managing at a landscape scale, it would ensure that shared ecological concerns were identified and addressed before any irreversible actions were taken. Too often, under the current NEPA regime, these types of shared concerns are either not highlighted or simply not addressed, undermining any notion of landscape scale conservation.

Another vitally important landscape conservation measure that AGO should consider is employing executive authority to protect sensitive places and special ecosystems. Just as President Roosevelt used the Antiquities Act to protect the Grand Canyon, President Obama should exercise the same authority to protect special, sensitive places (treasured landscapes), as identified through the AGO listening sessions. President Clinton made effective use of the Antiquities Act during his time in office, and though many of his 23 new national monuments were criticized at the time, Congress has now legitimized his BLM-managed national monuments by creating the National Landscape Conservation System. Whenever presidents have acted under the Antiquities Act, their actions have initially been criticized, but without such actions we would not have the same national park system that we do today, and the nation would be poorer for it. Given this, one such national monument designation that merits consideration is a "Canyonlands National Monument" in southeastern Utah to "complete" Canyonlands National Park by extending its boundaries to the edge of the geologic basin that forms its natural boundaries. Such a designation would ensure protection against oil and gas development within the Canyonlands basin and enable the Park Service to control presently out-of-control off road vehicle activities that are severely degrading this fragile desert landscape. Beyond the Antiquities Act, the administration should consider using its withdrawal powers to protect other sensitive places from ill-advised industrial development, as in the case of uranium mining claims on the perimeter of Grand Canyon National Park.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I also suggest that the administration consider designing and establishing new National Restoration Areas to restore damaged landscapes for their future conservation value. The major eastern national parks, including Great Smoky Mountains, Shenandoah, and Mammoth Cave, were established on badly depleted lands that had been timbered and farmed. Once restored, these parks have become vitally important wilderness redoubts and recreational settings for a major segment of the American populace. The same is true for the eastern, southern, and Midwestern national forests, 1110st of which were acquired by the federal government under the Weeks Act and then gradually restored to their present condition, which provides important wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities for citizens living in these areas. In the West and elsewhere, we have abused landscapes that could be restored to a near-natural condition and that could offer the same habitat, recreational, and open space values to future generations, whether as national parks, forests, or wildlife refuges. This proposed National Restoration Area strategy is admittedly long term in nature, but our grandchildren will surely thank this generation for having such foresight, just as we are indebted to our forebears for their foresight in restoring some of our most precious landscapes.

Finally, the Obama administration should support expansion of the national park system. National parks are widely recognized by the American public and readily accessible to most people. They constitute a wonderful resource for introducing the general public, which is increasingly urban and removed from nature, to the wonders and challenges of the outdoors. They also provide excellent recreational opportunities, which could help address childhood obesity and other fitness challenges. And unlike the other public lands, the national parks have an educational component through the National Park Service's highly regarded interpretive programs, which can help visitors to learn about the natural world and to gain a new appreciation for nature conservation. By combining an educational and recreational mission, the national parks are a setting where diverse segments of this nation's population can be connected with the natural world around them and provided an opportunity to become directly engaged in conservation and restoration work. In this vein, consideration should be given to expanding the Park Service's "national significance" criteria for assessing whether an area might qualify for national park designation; one additional factor that should be included in the criteria is the possibility of restoring damaged sites for future inclusion in the national park system.

"America's Great Outdoors" should advocate increased funding and innovative efforts to protect our land and water. We can revitalize local economies and create American jobs by protecting water resources, sustaining parks and forests and providing places for outdoor recreation and tourism.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

At the homegrown listening session in Phoenix roughly sixty Arizonans came together and identified the lack of funding for conservation programs such as the LWCF, including a lack of agency staff positions, as well as a general lack of education and awareness programs that involve youth, families, and diverse constituencies, as the major challenges and obstacles to achieving conservation goals and reconnecting people with nature. Attendees felt programs to get people out into nature – volunteering, doing service projects, and enjoying outings – are the most effective ways to reconnect people to the outdoors and encourage their stewardship. Programs such as Sierra Club's Inner City Outings were specifically called out.

Local farmers also attended the listening session, as did AmeriCorps members. They called for an increase in programs supporting urban agriculture in Northern Memphis and efforts to get youth to connect to the outdoors with hands-on farming options. Attendees noted the possibility of connecting Wolf River work to farming, as the family farmers near I-240 about an eight-acre lake and the Wolf River. Other session participants lauded the successful efforts in Tennessee, Arkansas, and Kentucky that connect science curriculum to hands-on water care, using physics, chemistry, and biology to assess river health and problems. Session participants stayed afterward, building new connections based on the shared ideas and visions for regional greenways and blueways.

All Americans deserve to enjoy our great outdoors, but far too many individuals do not have adequate access to clean, safe parks and natural spaces. For many Americans, their first real experience with the outdoors and the natural world is a creek, stream, river, or lake. It's no wonder since virtually all Americans live within a mile of such waters. Sadly, too many communities, large and small, have turned their backs on their rivers and many are no longer accessible, enjoyable, or even safe for people to discover our natural world. Fortunately, rivers are resilient and with some care and commitment, are able to bounce back. A federal commitment from a variety of different fronts is necessary to provide access to new constituencies who have a need and desire to experience the outdoors on their hometown rivers, which are most often the natural asset nearest to their community. The great opportunity here is that not only are rivers and streams desirable places to recreate, but establishing urban parks and restoring riverfronts also provide direct economic, public health and community safety benefits.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Numerous anecdotes and studies demonstrate that communities from Chattanooga, TN to Portland, OR have rediscovered their rivers have enjoyed significant benefits by attracting new businesses, retaining populations, and enhancing property values. By strategically locating and developing open spaces, places like Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Toledo, Ohio, and Chicago, Illinois are able to significantly reduce their level of polluted storm water run-off. In places like Tulsa, Oklahoma and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, people have been able to move frequently flooded properties out of harm's way to higher ground and reclaim those abandoned lands for public spaces that also more effectively and cheaply manage flooding. Those same lands provide a tremendous resource for the community year round and serve as entry points for people to discover America's outdoors. After devastating flooding in 1965, the City of Denver launched efforts to clean and improve the South Platte River and Cherry Creek, establishing 150 miles of hiker and bicycle trails, boat launches, whitewater chutes, and parks. Throughout the country, citizens are also discovering their streams, rivers, and lakes through volunteer efforts and programs like the National River Clean-up™. Clean-ups provide a fantastic opportunity to introduce citizens to the outdoors and create new stewards in the process.

2. Leverage existing programs to build "green infrastructure" Meeting our nation's water resource needs is something that has been traditionally accomplished through pipes, plants, levees, and dams. We spend billions of dollars each year building, maintaining, and operating this "grey" water infrastructure to meet our growing needs, but communities throughout the country are beginning to embrace a new path. By investing in approaches that rely upon natural landscapes – e.g. wetlands, floodplains, forests – communities can maintain clean water, ensure adequate water supplies, and manage floods, by developing parks and other green spaces. There are numerous federal programs that help fund water infrastructure that can and should be shaped and leveraged to not only meet those water management goals but can be used to purchase and develop parks and open spaces for communities around the nation.

3. Restore Rivers by Fostering Volunteerism Millions of tons of trash end up in our nation's rivers and streams every year and while this debris may not pose the greatest threat to our nation's rivers, it does represent the most visible. One of the most frequent and easiest ways to introduce and engage citizens with the outdoors and environmental stewardship is through river and stream clean-ups. This was clearly evidenced by testimony from several listening sessions, including St. Louis. America's Great Outdoors should fund a grant program to better facilitate and foster these efforts nation wide. A commitment of \$11 million annually to the River Clean-up Program will result in 2,000 river clean-ups each year, and lead to the removal of more than 20 million pounds of trash. Full program funding will provide each clean up with \$5,000 for expenses, and also provide an additional \$1 million dollars for a river clean-up director and staff.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

4. Urban Waters Initiative EPA's Urban Waters Initiative should be used to better connect people to their rivers in urban areas. Clean and safe water directly relates to well being. According to a recent Gallup-Healthways Well-Being Index survey residents living in the top 10 metro areas for access to clean and safe water are 8 percentage points more likely to be satisfied with their city or area as a place to live, and more than 10 points more likely to say their city is "getting better" than are those living in the bottom 10 metro areas for access to quality water. While the Administration has focused on smart growth issues in cities, access to clean water should also be a priority. Increasing funding for river access and increasing urban green infrastructure will provide multiple benefits to city-dwellers including improved public health, reduced air pollution, increased access to green space, reduced local flooding and clean water.

Establish a National Blueways Initiative Blueways (a.k.a. blue trails or water trails) are an innovative, locally-driven way to connect people with rivers and riverside lands. Across the country participants in the listening sessions highlighted the blueways on their hometown river and called for the establishment of a national blueways initiative. A blueway is a dedicated stretch of river that enjoys special clean water safeguards and is a destination for fishing, boating, and other recreation. Blueways, like hiking trails, help people discover rivers and provide a connection between both urban and rural communities and the outdoors. Blueways provide a fun and exciting way to get youth outdoors and are economic drivers benefiting local businesses and the quality of life.

Establishment of a national Blueways Initiative would improve regional and landscape level conservation through development of partnerships across all levels of government, non-profit organizations, and private landowners. Expanding on the National Trails System model, the national Blueways Program would emphasize the connection of communities and America's treasured landscapes, and require plans and strategies for protecting these areas and enhancing connections.<sup>1</sup> The initiative would provide for trail-wide coordination and management of lands owned by government and private entities along Blueways.

USFWS Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program – Through voluntary agreements the Partners program provides expert technical assistance and cost-share incentives directly to private landowners to restore fish and wildlife habitats. Any privately-owned land is potentially eligible for restoration. Most participants are individual private landowners. For purposes of this program, "privately-owned" means land not owned by a State or the Federal Government. Benefits for the landowner include fulfilling habitat conservation goals on the land by working one-on-one in partnership with the local Service biologist; and for the species, restoring the important habitats on private lands that may result in the recovery of Federal trust species.

NRCS Conservation Programs – NRCS is a leader in working with farmers and rural communities to restore and protect water resources. These include numerous place based efforts such as the Mississippi River and Chesapeake Bay, Conservation Technical Assistance Programs, Environmental Improvement Programs, Stewardship Programs, Water Resources Programs, Easement Programs, and Community Assistance Programs.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

America's Great Outdoors provides an opportunity for us to re-examine our conservation history and to re-invest the nation in the open spaces, wilderness areas, national parks, waterways, wildlife refuges and city parks that make up our natural heritage. This will not happen without leadership and bold action. Collaborative efforts to engage communities and local leaders must be pro-active and directed toward tangible conservation outcomes. The Greater Yellowstone Coalition views America's Great Outdoors as a vehicle to work collaboratively at a large landscape scale to address and overcome the new set of challenges that confronts the region's communities and wild places.

Launch a new, world-class climate science facility located in the Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem that can provide the research capacity, resources and guidance that land managers will need to monitor and safeguard this region in the face of global climate change.

For 45 years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has provided critical dollars for enhancing and protecting public lands, wildlife habitat and recreational opportunities. Since the L WCF has only once been funded to the full level authorized by Congress, and recent appropriations have been at record lows, a proposed increase in the fund, derived from royalties from offshore drilling, shouldn't go unnoticed or unappreciated.

To create a lasting legacy from a focus on America's Great Outdoors, the Administration must consider how to strengthen a movement that comes from the grassroots of America's rural communities, embraces problem-solving over partisanship through collaboration with diverse interests, and yields economies that are centered around the conservation and restoration of thriving populations of wildlife, functional ecosystems, and valuable ecosystem services.

Many past conservation initiatives have focused on small islands of protectionism while the vast fabric of the western social, economic and ecological landscape are sidelined (and deteriorate). Through the America's Great Outdoors Initiative, the Administration has the opportunity to address what one of this nation's greatest devotees of natural places – Wallace Stegner – asked for decades ago: to build a society that would match our scenery. The models, tools, experience and leadership are in place to achieve this today – the opportunity is for the federal government to invest in them to secure a lasting American Great Outdoors.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The undersigned participants in the Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition appreciate this Administration's willingness and effort to reach out to citizens to solicit guidance for its America's Great Outdoors Initiative. We believe that the natural resources, recreation opportunities, communities, and cultural values of the rural West are valuable to the Nation as a whole for the goods and services, knowledge, and skills they provide. Our shared vision is one in which working, interconnected public and private landscapes provide multiple value streams to rural communities themselves, and society at-large, and are part of the solution to our greatest 21st century challenges (including sustainable provision of natural resources, climate change, loss of ecological capital, uniting citizens across political divides, etc.). Communities involved in the stewardship of public and private lands play a vital role in protecting robust ecological functionality and biodiversity, producing food, fiber, fuel and other raw materials, providing aesthetic value and recreation opportunities, and supporting the cultural and economic underpinning of rural America.

The key to protecting biodiversity and ecological resilience is to invest in rural communities and landscapes across our nation. The RVCC includes many place-based collaborative conservation initiatives that are charting a new course for rural communities, one which can supply urban areas with local sustainable goods, provide land stewardship services, and promote sustainable recreation and education opportunities that strengthen the connection between American society and the land. This transition is not just about rural communities providing goods and services to urban centers. Rural communities are also positioned to transform their own economies, create local markets, and become healthier, more economically resilient, and maintain the critical tie to the land that is central to culture (including tribal peoples, ranchers, commercial fishermen, etc.). America's Great Outdoors Initiative must recognize the need and value of a stewardship economy to strengthen rural communities.

The resource management paradigm in the West is transforming. Over the last 15 years we have seen strides in collaboration, the advent of community-based organizations that strike a balance between conservation and sustainable utilization, and the development of new rural enterprises, contracting mechanisms, and markets that support both healthy ecosystems and local economies. After decades of polarization that harmed ecosystems, rural economies and the fabric of local communities, leaders from rural communities across the western United States are showing that rural people have the energy and creativity to develop locally crafted solutions that provide resilient, long-term jobs based on good stewardship of the natural environment.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

While specific additions to our nation's wilderness, parks, and protected area systems may be warranted, the vast majority of western landscapes need help transitioning successfully from the old economies of extraction to new economies of stewardship. The real opportunity at hand in 2010 is to develop a comprehensive system that will yield sustainable resource economies across the landscape, restore and conserve the ecological resources of working landscapes, and heal the social polarization that has too often resulted from resource management disputes. What is needed is a determination to change the broad social, economic and ecological system operating on the land. Only a focus on the working landscape can align diverse strands of the American society to work together for common interest, at a scale that is ecologically and economically meaningful.

We see potential for the most success and the greatest opportunity to galvanize diverse Americans and leverage our natural assets by supporting collaborative community-based efforts that represent the best of small rural entrepreneurs and land managers, skilled non-profit organizations, and the federal government all working together to transform our rural economy and landscape. As the Administration considers an array of options to reconnect citizens to America's Great Outdoors, we urge you to support and invest in the ecological, social, and economic resiliency of rural communities and working landscapes in the West. Far from an obligation, it is the only real opportunity to create systemic improvement for our resources, our economy, and our people.

In the West, the federal government owns over 54 percent of the land (ranging from approximately 29 percent of the land in Montana to approximately 85 percent of Nevada's land base). Rural communities with natural resource based economies, especially those in public landscapes, have endured boom and bust cycles for decades, following the country's alternating impulses to exploit or protect its natural resources. These communities are a part of the solution to environmental challenges. However, they continue to experience instability, including high rates of poverty, unemployment, and overall economic decline, and consequently, the infrastructure to participate in a green economy is seriously diminished.<sup>1</sup> Social and economic challenges are mirrored and often exacerbated by pervasive ecological challenges, including; catastrophic wild land fire, diminished and degraded water supplies, overstocked and diseased forests, the spread of invasive and noxious species, habitat fragmentation and conversion, and species decline, among others.

Rural communities are leading the charge to address the myriad challenges that face their communities and the conservation challenges of the Nation. There are literally hundreds of examples of projects, programs, and organizations involved in this new era of restoration and stewardship. We know that in the communities where we live and work, our efforts and innovative solutions are beginning to have an effect. Rather than list each group, we have chosen to highlight what we believe to be the most significant characteristics shared by these nonfederal approaches. Although there is no set formula for success, there are a number of general commonalities.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

**Power sharing:** Shared decision-making power is vital to a healthy and democratic system of management and stewardship. Decision-making processes that recognize social, economic, and political inequity and strive to balance and improve these disparities bring communities together, rather than pit them against themselves and each other.

**Triple bottom line commitment:** Use of integrated approaches that address ecological conservation and restoration, local natural resource-based economic development, and healthy communities and strong social fabric.

**Business and market strategies:** A business and markets orientation – driven by local expertise – that finds a role for federal conservation investments as a complement to broader business models or economic development plans that combine public and private capital and “sweat equity” for lowest cost, highest value outcomes and long-term, sustainable revenue streams.

**An “all-lands” approach:** Developing solutions that work across landscapes, from public land forests, to higher elevation private forests, to the ranges and valley bottomlands managed (whether on public or private land) by ranchers and farmers. Effective management and policy recognizes and addresses the social, economic, and ecological connections between private and public lands that share ecological process and span the forest, range, farm, and aquatic systems that characterize the West.

The role of non-federal entities in conservation and stewardship in the American West cannot be overstated. There are many types of entities that are filling important intermediary roles that neither government nor the private sector can fulfill on their own. The movement of community-based conservation and stewardship that is redefining the West is being built largely by the will and capacity of community, or place-based organizations, and by regional organizations. These intermediary institutions complement one another and ensure that our conservation strategies can go deep into the communities and landscapes we care about, but also spread, aggregate, and regionalize the practices and approaches that emerge from local efforts.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

In the past 15 years, we have seen the success of locally-based groups that occupy the space between diverse stakeholders, civic groups, businesses, private landowners, rural citizens, and government agencies. We refer to these groups as community-based organizations (CBOs). They have been essential to the successful implementation of both private land conservation efforts by landowners and the collaborative management of federal lands, and have also excelled at harmonizing conservation objectives with local economic needs. CBOs play social, ecological, and technical/financial roles, including: providing critical support to collaborative structures and institutions that assemble diverse interests and viewpoints, and facilitate toward common ground; serving as a buffer and conduit between landowners and federal and state agencies (as well as other outside resources) – in many areas there is significant mistrust of government agencies and CBOs can serve as a trusted go between; serving to “re-aggregate” the landscape by coordinating and aligning multiple landowners (including government agencies) to achieve landscape scale impacts, particularly in fragmented landscapes; providing skilled resources and staffing to help local landowners, businesses, and contractors understand and work with state and federal conservation programs, and successfully meet the requirements (proposals, bids, contracts, etc.) necessary to capture and utilize funding; adding value to federal program delivery by integrating federal programs into a broader economic and environmental strategies supported by local communities; and, reaching ecologically and economically significant scales and impacts by intergrating public and private lands at a whole watershed scale that effectively bridges the “silos” imposed by agency missions.

To support and leverage the work of CBOs and rural small businesses, we must also promote the regional organizations and networks that convene multiple local efforts, help to disseminate lessons learned, and accelerate innovation diffusion. These networks are integral to scaling-up place-based efforts. Regional organizations can be based in urban or rural areas and work across multiple sectors, communities, counties or states. Regional organizations play many roles at different times in the process of implementing community-based conservation and economic development strategies. Regional organizations provide improved access to technical expertise, tools, and philanthropic communities. They build and bring political clout to promote solutions, and connect rural non-profits and entrepreneurs to wider networks, markets, and opportunities. Roles include: helping to catalyze and build local organizations in places lacking this capacity, as well as strengthening existing groups; providing bridge staffing, facilitation, and technical support in communities that are rebuilding institutional and social capacity; serving as liaison between local efforts and federal officials by providing the venues and forums to initiate and build relationships when they are absent and/or frayed; reaching out to distant stakeholder groups and interests that have traditionally been at odds with local efforts and assisting with reframing and building common ground; documenting and communicating trends and issues that affect multiple communities to improve policies and procedures, including providing vital data collection, mapping, and analysis; organizing multiple communities to work together to promote shared vision and solutions; and promoting peer-to-peer learning and adoption of best practices.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Natural resource management functions, renewable energy development, conservation-oriented forestry or agriculture and other businesses can provide high quality, living wage employment protecting, restoring, and stewarding the environment. They include jobs that restore and maintain ecosystem functions and services, such as clean air, clean water, and forest and rangeland health and biodiversity, as well as those that reduce energy, material, and water consumption, and move us toward a low carbon economy. The promotion of rural green businesses can help local economies recover by expanding value-added businesses and industries, and creating living-wage jobs that have positive multiplier effects in rural communities (economic activities that maintain and enhance essential local businesses, such as hardware stores, sawmills, feed stores, and by extension, schools and hospitals). For-profit enterprises play the vital role of providing: service and stewardship work on public and private lands; entrepreneurial skills, training and employment opportunities; capital assets needed for conservation work; equipment necessary to perform land management objectives; processing and manufacturing facilities to create wood and agricultural products to provide building materials, food, and energy; ability to take demonstration projects to scale and profitability; and, market-driven revenue streams that reduce long-term dependence on public funds.

Integrated community-scaled biomass utilization strategies can offset the costs of forest restoration and hazardous fuel reduction activities while contributing to rural economies, energy independence, and carbon emission reductions. The following programs represent a comprehensive approach to encouraging efficient, community scaled biomass utilization strategies across the nation. It is critical that Congress fund all of these programs as each fulfills a different need for support, planning, and implementation of broad biomass utilization and climate change planning strategies.

Develop a coordinated National Conservation Strategy'- Articulating a common vision and strategy for protecting American biodiversity, ecosystem services, and cultural and historic resources, based on a comprehensive assessment of protected and threatened resources, would help set common goals and roles among federal agencies and private partners. Using new tools provided by Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (Lees), inventory and monitoring programs, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service should lead this integrated effort on public and private lands.

Promote Landscape Conservation - The Department of the Interior should lead landscape conservation approaches to conserve and restore fish and wildlife and ecosystem services by promoting inter-agency cooperation, partnerships with states, communities and nonprofits. Identify Important Geographies that are under immediate threat from development and climate change, and that enjoy strong local support, such as the Everglades, Chesapeake Bay, Lower Mississippi, Great Lakes, Southern Texas, and the Mojave Desert as America's Great Outdoors - Treasured Landscapes.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The work we are doing is representative of the challenges and opportunities we all face in metro areas across the country in creating healthy recreation opportunities on our public lands. We would like to share our best practices and aspirations with you to create a world class urban forest that meets the challenges of limited open space in a community that suffers from high rates of asthma, diabetes and obesity.

Our nation faces great challenges in sustaining traditions of conservation of our lands and waters and in combating lifestyles which have caused skyrocketing rates of obesity and stress. Happily, the America's Great Outdoors Initiative provides a forum for discussing creative means to combine energies and resources to combat all of these challenges in a sustainable way, connecting more people to the Great Outdoors, making them both healthier and more committed to safeguarding this treasured legacy.

Implementing the Action Plan is a key emphasis of several Federal Agencies, with many other federal agencies actively engaged through a federal caucus, and continues to be a priority of State and Tribal Agencies as well as private industry, making it a potentially key player that stands in place and ready to help move the AGO initiative forward. While it is certainly recognized that these are financially difficult times across the country, the Action Plan is an already existing plan and framework working for the betterment of our Nation's Aquatic Habitats, which are the life blood of our natural world.

Just as the buildings at CC are important to our history, so too are buildings all across the United States. It takes dedicated hard work and funding to maintain such meaningful places, and in these difficult economic times many of them are in danger of being lost.

If we want our children to view history as more than dry names and dates to be memorized for an exam, if we want them to be able to "walk into the past," then we need to preserve those places that are important to us as individuals and as a nation. We want to preserve our Alma Mater; wouldn't it be wonderful if we could preserve the places that tell the story of who we are as a people?

The Endangered Species Act listing of the Atlantic Salmon. Last year the US Fish and Wildlife Service listed the Atlantic Salmon as endangered on the Penobscot River. Lincoln Paper and Tissue along with the State of Maine, commented in opposition to this listing. The State believes their Standards are protective of all fish species including salmon. The Service will likely be involved in all municipal and industrial waste water discharge licensing. A direct concern to us is that in similar situations in the western US the Service has requested impact studies which have cost millions of dollars.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The need to support biomass burning for the inclusion of renewable energy and carbon neutrality.

Biomass carbon neutrality is a widely accepted principle used to differentiate biomass-derived carbon from fossil fuel derived carbon due to its role in the global carbon cycle. It reflects the fact that biomass-derived carbon is part of a relatively rapid natural cycle that, when in balance, neither adds nor subtracts carbon to/from the atmosphere, whereas fossil fuel-derived carbon is not part of such a rapid cycle.

Failure to recognize the carbon neutrality of biomass will be disruptive to national climate and renewable energy strategies and result in harmful environmental and economic impacts. Policies that treat biomass-derived CO<sub>2</sub> identically to fossil-fuel derived CO<sub>2</sub> will be particularly harmful.

There are three major obstacles that continue to impede recreation, conservation and reconnecting people to the outdoors in the Chesapeake watershed:

1. Lack of public access to the Bay and its tributaries,
2. Great need for additional resources and tools for land conservation,
3. Shortage of both formal and informal environmental education policies and programs.

Over the years we have learned that citizen involvement with and commitment to the health of the Chesapeake and its tributaries is greatly affected by personal contact with the Bay and its environs and by educational experiences. But discovering the Bay is a challenge for most citizens, and particularly our youth.

Despite improvements, still today less than two percent of the Bay's shoreline and its tidal tributaries is open to the public, and recreational experiences at these access sites is often limited to those who have boats. Because of high land values and high population densities, providing increased recreational access to the Bay's shorelines for swimming, fishing, camping and hiking, among other outdoor activities, is a major challenge. Likewise, there are 3 million K-12 students in the Chesapeake Watershed, but only a very small percentage of those students have the opportunity to participate in meaningful outdoor watershed educational experiences through their schools.

To make our lands and wildlife more resilient in the face of climate change America's Great Outdoors must focus on reducing targeted stressors such as mineral development, logging, and overgrazing; protecting core areas and corridors to allow species to migrate and adapt as the climate changes; and insist that all federal agencies with land and water management responsibilities coordinate with their state and local counterparts to develop and implement ecosystem wide climate smart management programs.

Lack of public access to the outdoors close to where people live.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Limitations at the municipal level. Many municipal officials don't understand or value the importance of greenways and open space to community prosperity and sustainability. Most municipalities do not have the resources to invest in trails, parks and open space and do not want to take on the maintenance burden.

Lack of incentives and funding for inter-municipal trail planning and building to create regional trail networks.

Transportation planning and funding is too focused on automotive travel and not inclusive enough of pedestrian/bike paths.

Insufficient funding for land conservation.

We oppose wilderness and similar designations that isolate the land by employing a "hands off" management approach. Areas designated as such have proven unsuccessful as evidenced by the catastrophic pine beetle infestations in Black Hills wilderness areas and those in other forests across America. Such practices have not "protected" the land, but rather created a situation that invites disease and fire.

The NEPA process is good in theory. However it is expensive, slow and can not adapt to rapidly changing situations (eg. natural disasters such as fires, tornados, floods, etc.)

Expanding federal ownership of land is inappropriate and can not work in a broad conservation plan. The Federal government should not seek to obtain ownership of private lands for any purpose. Our federal government cannot financially manage the land it currently owns. Many land management agencies have huge backlogs just to repair and maintain what they have. Conservation funds should be used to improve forest health and infrastructure, not to acquire more land.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Administered by the National Park Service (NPS), the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF) provides vital financial resources for a variety of important preservation organizations and programs that form the foundation of our nation's historic preservation system, including funding State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPOs), Tribal Historic Preservation Offices (THPOs), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Save America's Treasures. Inadequate funding for HPF also limits the matching grants that are available from SHPOs, THPOs, and HBCUs and reduces support for preservation activities such as planning, survey, inventory, project review and public education. However, not since its inception in 1976 has the Historic Preservation Fund received full funding to carry out the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act. In fact, since 2001, appropriations have declined from \$94 million to less than \$80 million. Thus, we strongly recommend that the administration put the HPF on an equal footing with the Land and Water Conservation fund, both of which support the protection of our irreplaceable natural and cultural resources, by fully funding the HPF at its authorized level of \$150 million per year.

Threats to such sites has led the National Trust to include 24 different national park units on the list of America's 11 Most Endangered Historic Places (11 Most) since the program began in 1988. The need for maintenance and repair of historic structures has reached crisis levels in many parks, including Valley Forge National Historical Park and Mesa Verde National Park, both of which are included on past 11 Most lists.

Under the NPS Organic Act, these historic and cultural places must be managed and left "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Unfortunately, many historic properties in our national parks are being destroyed by a lack of agency funding and, sometimes, by a lack of will and priority to protect them. For example, 46 percent of historic buildings and structures located in national parks are in fair or poor condition and funds should be allocated for repair and maintenance before they are lost. We support a Cultural Resource Challenge to elevate the importance of cultural resources planning, maintenance and protection within the National Parks and the historic preservation and cultural resource programs within the Department of Interior and the National Park Service.



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Our federal public lands contain historic and cultural resources that are estimated to be in the billions, many of which—such as those in southeastern Utah—attract thousands of visitors each year. However, the vast majority of those lands have not been systematically inventoried for historic and cultural resources, so the location and condition of the resources remains unknown. As a result, development projects are frequently targeted for areas containing significant cultural resources, creating conflicts between development and historic preservation that could have been alleviated through better information and planning. National Historic Trails (NHTs) provide clear examples of the negative implications of this for connecting people with the outdoors. Trail corridors provide a fantastic combination of outdoor recreation and education opportunities and can be havens for native plant and animal species. One hundred communities of 50,000 or more people, including many large cities, lie along NHTs so the trails can directly connect inner-city youth and adults with outdoor travel and education. However, none of the NHTs have been completely inventoried and mapped and agencies do not consistently manage and protect trails from the physical and visual impacts of development. As a result, these great links between cultural and nature, city and country, are slowly being erased. We recommend that funding to survey historic and cultural resources on public lands be significantly increased.

Cultural resources and whole landscapes under BLM management are increasingly endangered by potentially destructive activities such as unregulated and inappropriate recreation, inadvertent visitor damage and even looting. A notable example of the need for increased inventory and greater protection is demonstrated by BLM's Monticello Field Office, located in southeastern Utah's San Juan County. For more than 12,000 years, generations of families from Paleo-Indian big game hunters to Mormon settlers traveled to the area and, in particular, to the archaeologically rich, roughly 476,000-acre cultural landscape of Cedar Mesa. Their stories are now buried among Cedar Mesa's estimated 100,000 prehistoric and historic sites—an archaeological record that rivals that of nearby Mesa Verde National Park. San Juan County has seen an estimated 30 percent annual increase in national and international visitors since at least 2006, but BLM has little money to educate visitors about proper site etiquette, no cyclical maintenance money to repair, stabilize and interpret heavily visited sites, and only one law enforcement officer to patrol the entire 1.8 million-acre field office, of which Cedar Mesa is only a part. In FY 2008, the Monticello Field Office received just \$86,000 for its cultural resources program—an average of only 4.6 cents per acre. As a result, many sites are being "loved to death," with visitors taking surface artifacts and damaging walls and rock art. In its 2004 Preserve America report, BLM asserted that it manages "the largest, most diverse, and scientifically most important body of cultural resources of any Federal land managing agency," yet BLM receives the least amount of cultural resources money per acre of any federal agency. Many of these resources are not contained in the National Landscape Conservation System and therefore do not received increased financial resources for their inventory or preservation. We recommend an increase in base funding for BLM's Cultural Resources Subactivity 1050 account by \$7 million each year from FY 2011 through FY2015 for permanent annual base funding of \$50.6 million.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

NPS has the authority to work with local governments but no means to create incentives for local governments to work across city, county and state lines, especially when local governments are competing with one another to increase their tax bases. For example, Wilderness Battlefield is a part of the Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania National Military Park in Virginia and stretches across three counties. The Wilderness Battlefield is threatened with a 53-acre Wal-Mart Supercenter and adjacent retail development within its historic boundaries. The Wal-mart is sited on land that is designated by Congress as part of the official battlefield yet it is unprotected. NPS should provide financial incentives for local governments to work with the agency to best preserve cultural resources for the long-term and avoid shortsighted ad hoc planning, especially in areas experiencing rapid growth. NPS must preserve the setting and context of military parks and battlefields—especially Civil War battlefields in the mid-Atlantic region but also battlefields from the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812—before they become isolated small patches of green surrounded by urbanization and sprawl.

These incredible landscapes and the fish and wildlife that inhabit the area are at substantial risk on numerous fronts, but perhaps none more so than the grassland and wetland communities of the

Prairie Pothole Region of North Dakota, South Dakota and Montana. The proposed Dakota Grassland Conservation Area offers hope, and if implemented, assurance that the region's worldclass fish and wildlife resources will remain abundant for future generations to enjoy.

We face unprecedented challenges such as climate change and must ensure that we employ science-based management practices. As demonstrated in the Gulf Coast oil spill, if we don't have data and

information, we cannot make informed decisions on how to strategically conserve our natural resources for generations to come. The bird conservation community has monitoring programs in place, some of which have operated for decades some of which have an extensive citizen science component. By expanding and strengthening these existing programs and identifying critical new programs, we can efficiently extend environmental quality monitoring while involving more Americans in conservation.

Our government spends ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS of our taxpayer money on sodium cyanide and other deadly poisons to kill predators in the wild to protect the cattle industry, a commercial venture. That is over \$60 thousand dollars to kill each "predator." Not only is this fiscally irresponsible, but an inhumane, brutal and extremely cruel way to die. It upsets the balance of nature and overlooks the basic fact that we need predators to restore that balance.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

That money is desperately needed for many wildlife conservation programs based on valid science, not distorted by special interest groups for their own benefit. Biological diversity must be maintained at all costs. For example, our wild horses, who are legally designated wildlife, used to run free in our country, are in crisis, and in danger of disappearing from the landscape forever. Consider that it only costs \$25 plus expenses for one contraceptive shot-PZP-per year per wild mare, and the millions of dollars spent on cruel and unnecessary roundups, plus all the wasted taxpayer dollars used, incarcerating wild horses who are cramped into holding pens, then eliminating this senseless poisoning program would provide more than ample money to care for these priceless mustangs, and programs for all the other wildlife in danger ... there would even be ample money to buy back public lands, where they used to roam freely, and would provide safe sanctuary for our wild horses, who are without question, a national treasure. In addition this highly effective contraceptive program, which can be done on horseback, from multi-terrain vehicles, or from helicopters would provide hundreds of well paying jobs for returning vets or unemployed Americans. The science is there, but PZP has not been effectively used by our government. This must not be overlooked, in favor of wasting taxpayer dollars on cruel roundups and holding pens which solve nothing, and are an irrational and illogical "solution" to a so called problem that was created to accommodate a commercial industry.

My second concern is that this most revered mammal on the American continent, the 33,000 wild horses we have left, are headed for extinction because of mismanagement and because 4.5 million cattle on public lands are given precedence. The BLM, The Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and persons involved in the Cattle Industry, etc., etc., have failed to protect and preserve wild horse habitat, have decimated their herds, have caused thousands of unnecessary deaths, and have systematically done everything in their power to rid the American landscape of these proud and noble beings. There must be accountability and there must be drastic changes in the leadership in all these government agencies, and anyone in these agencies who are ranchers, who own slaughterhouses, or are in any way involved in the cattle industry, (which is HIGHLY subsidized), and are benefiting from it monetarily, **SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED IN THOSE AGENCIES BECAUSE OF A CONFLICT OF INTEREST. THEY SHOULD BE REMOVED OR RECUSE THEMSELVES.**

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

The government's policy to keep conducting cruel and unnecessary roundups where, horses are terrified and break legs, mares miscarry as they are running, newborn colts die from running their tender hooves literally, and those who survive the frightening roundup are separated from their herd, is an American TRAGEDY. (NO OBSERVERS ARE ALLOWED TO MONITOR OR MAKE REPORTS OR FILM THESE ROUNDUPS. THERE ARE NO STATISTICS AVAILABLE REPORTING HOW MANY HAVE TO BE EUTHANIZED FROM EACH ROUNDUP, AND UNDER WHAT CIRCUMSTANCES, AND WHO DECIDES, AND HOW ARE THEY EUTHANIZED, HUMANELY, OR JUST SHOT TO DEATH IN FRONT OF ALL THE OTHER HORSES?) Observation must be allowed, and there must be access to film the roundups and make reports to the public who have a right to know that crimes against nature are being committed in our name using OUR taxpayer dollars .. (When mares miscarry, as they are terrified and funning, does the Forest Service or the BLM go back and rescue the newborn and reunite it with its' mother or is it just left to die in the dirt? And what about the mare hemorrhaging after such a traumatic birth-does the Forest Service or BLM immediately provide veterinary care?) If the American public could view films of these roundups from beginning to end there would be immediate and enormous public outcry all across this land, and I believe they would end. THERE MUST BE FULL DISCLOSURE. Anything less is a travesty.

In conclusion, our wild horses are in peril, because of reckless, unrestricted government policies which are out of control.. We need to recognize that they are an integral part of our culture. If anything defines the American spirit-it is our wild horses. If they become extinct in our country which is the present agenda, (concealed from the public), it will be considered by most Americans a theft of one of their most precious creatures-the wild horse. Wild horses are a huge resource for green tourism, for hikers, for artists, for cinematographers, wildlife photographers, researchers, and tourists from all over the world. This hasn't been exploited or developed yet and the markets are there.

The efforts of AGO are needed in these landscapes because both are threatened by unprecedented levels of development and fragmentation. More than 80 percent of the 26 million-acre Northern Forest remains unprotected. The Green Mountain National Forest is projected to see increased housing density on 500,000 acres within ten miles of its boundary-an area larger than the entire national forest itself The Connecticut River watershed ranked among the twenty most threatened watersheds nationally in the Forests on the Edge report issued by the U.S. Forest Service in 2005.

There are plenty of taxes collected via vehicle registration fees and other sources which are designated for expanding areas for off road vehicle use which wind up funding other projects. This is most unfair.

My area of the world used to be farmland, forests and fields and is now becoming one big urban sprawl of subdivisions and mini malls. Please do something to stop this so that these actions don't eventually take over our county and national forest areas also. We're running out of green space, so please do something to bring it back.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

. The world is getting smaller everyday. We need to save what we can before there isn't any left.

. Our health and sustained livelihoods depend on these spaces. Thank you.

. Don't let our country turn into India or a land of concrete and destruction. Keep America beautiful.

. We don't fully yet understand why we need to keep these things around, but we won't be around to figure out why we did if we don't.

I live in southern Maine and as people buy up land around us it becomes more important that we have access to land owned by the Federal Government and that we continue to support non-profits such as the Kittery Land Trust, Rachel Carson Preserve and make sure town/states continue to care for state parks such as Fort Foster, Fort McClary, etc. Having this land available allows me and my family to walk, take bike rides, talk about nature and GET EXERCISE. We need to make it as easy as possible for all Americans to be able to get out and enjoy the outdoors to stay fit. Among many other factors, not having outdoor space available or not being familiar with what to do outdoors (I hear that is now the case although I grew up climbing trees and spending every afternoon after school playing outdoors) is a leading cause of obesity in our country. And that, we definitely can't afford.

Dear Folks, i thank you for the opportunity to engage in conversation regarding the great outdoors initiative. when i visited the "discussion" site, i was unable to access the discussion portion. i also noticed, that according to the little topic icons on the right margin, the largest voiced opinions on this issue were from folks who want to use offroad vehicles and keep the mountains or other natural areas from being protected. i had the opportunity to visit the listening session held at occidental college in los angeles in the spring. the greatest number of people at that meeting seemed to have a great variety of interests. my prejudice is toward protection of the environment and encouragement of understanding of and participation in nature. as a docent at my local county natural area, i see people hungry for open natural space. on weekends we have people of all stripe, age, income, background come and visit.

CHALLENGE: i see people needing work. i noticed that our san gabriel mountains were badly burned( one third of the angeles national forest was burned. while there is some natural recovery in a burned forest, there is the issue of access, as the national forest in seventy percent of our los angeles county public open space. I read in a website for tree people, how they wanted volunteers to help remediate the forest, using a grant or partnering with boeing corporation. this is all very nice for tree people, but boeing is a military government contractor, which receives taxpayer dollars.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

what federal government can do : same as above to employ folks to rebuild destroyed structures, access roads and or trails, remediation as needed for the forest, challenge: we have limited access to the national forest. we have a transportation system which needs to be available more hours to more people to more places. we have manufacturers out of work what works: let our stimulus package help folks to make buses or trains (running clean?) and train operators to run longer hours here. let appropriate local state and federal agencies partner with local manufacturers to improve public transportation. let same as above agencies partner with local private public interest agencies to help train folks to run improved public transport system to open space.

challenge: need local easily accessed parks along urban corridors of los angeles and san gabriel rivers what the federal government can do: declare the "emerald necklace" to be a special essential area, create a chain of local riverside parks including employment of park groomers/hosts, naturalists/ interpreters, and/or rangers along the river corridors in partnership with appropriate local public and private agencies

i had the great privilege to be present at the listening session for the great outdoors initiative at occidental college this past summer. i would like to submit my feelings and ideas, in the words of others who give good form to some of my thoughts. challenges: San Gabriel Valley and other los angeles county residents have traditionally suffered from limited access to open space as well as high diabetes and obesity rates. Federal support for a San Gabriel Mountains National Recreation Area will expand healthy recreational opportunities for our families along the San Gabriel and Los Angeles Rivers and in the San Gabriel Mountains. How the Federal Government Can Help/Tools: Provide Transit to Trails program to take inner city children on fun, educational and healthy trips to mountains, rivers, beaches and other natural open space throughout the nation for low or at no cost, compared to the benefits. Transit to trails would enrich their education about land, water, wildlife and cultural history and emphasize the importance of physical activity and healthy eating for lifelong health.

challenges: People of color do not enjoy equal access to recreational and natural space resources. i.e., Latinos are 50% of population, but only 11% of visitors to Angeles National Forest. 25% of population are Asian, but Asians are less than 5% of Angeles Forest visitors. African Americans comprise only 1% of National Forest visitors and 0% of wilderness visitors.

challenges: there are not enough toilets, garbage cans, rangers, especially bilingual ones along the heavily-used areas of the san gabriel river (and los angeles river). I would like the Administration to help find solutions, like forming the San Gabriel River National Recreation Area.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

How the federal Government can help/tools: In order to improve access for all the campaign for america's great outdoors can provide green jobs forthrough Civilian Conservation Corps Style jobs for youth of color and low income that would also improve parks, recreation, the . environment. This program could provide work in this time of severe unemployment. challenges: Of the local native ecosystems, Coastal Sage Scrub is one of the most endangered on the planet. There are lands in the San Gabriel Mountains/ Watershed worthy of Wilderness Protection and rivers that deserve the designation "wild and scenic." "Wilderness" is a designation that protects "undeveloped" land from development. Wild and Scenic" designation protects rivers from damming and development. The federal government can help protect the san gabriel mountains and watershed by designating more areas like the San Gabriel and Sheep Mountain Wilderness(es).

challenges: provide more park cultural historical sites that preserve the stories and resources of diverse people for this and future generations. more sites should facilitate an experience that weave the stories of diverse people faithfully, completely and accurately. how the federal government can help: The National Park Service and the Forest Service should provide leadership for protection and interpretation of diverse sites. Park and heritage should stimulate and provide a greater understanding of, and dialogue on, civil rights, democracy, unvarnished history. these are lessons learned form best practice examples like Manzanar National Historic Site.

I am asking you to seize this opportunity to find new ways to support reasonable management of our public lands. I'm not particularly fond of Wilderness or National Parks. Both have too many rules. But finding a balanced approach to manage the land in a sustainable way is definitely a priority. My personal priority is protecting wolves from trophy hunting. There is no reasonable argument for killing wolves. I would support any measure to provide fair compensation to farmers that lose animals to wolf predation, but killing the wolves is not the answer. Another personal priority is keeping federal land open to dogs, preferably off-leash. My dog is part of my family, and it's not reasonable to restrict dogs on public land. Dogs only become problematic when they are cooped up and on leash. Allowing dogs to run free and get plenty of exercise enables them to act appropriately in every situation. (You could probably say the same thing about humans, but...) I also believe that mountain biking & snow kiting have been over-regulated by power zealous federal employees. These activities should be perfectly acceptable in both wilderness areas and national parks. Well, that's my two cents for now. As a very liberal outdoor-loving athlete and dog owner, i beg you to find a balance between the stupid hippies and the stupid hunters. Neither side is rational. There are reasonable solutions to every dispute. Thank you! I think that you are doing an exceptionally good job as President.

Jackson, WY



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

What is the basis for this family" connection to atv riding? I can understand DINKs riding together. But I can't understand why a mother with an infant would ride a motorcycle which is the most dangerous form of transportation on a per trip basis (Flying is the second most dangerous per trip.) Why would a parent send their inexperienced child out on a motorcycle the most dangerous form of transportation? In these times of unemployment foreclosures and outrageous health care and education expenses how many families can afford multiple atv's uniforms and safety equipment trailers and pickups? Why do we so rarely see women on atv's let alone families? DINK: Double Income No Kids. "

Protect 24 million acres from OHV restrictions

OHV user HAVE HAD ACCESS TO THE PARKS AND SHOULD CONTINUE TO!

The United States already has enough restricted wilderness. We need a new classification for the lands we want to preserve so we can use the lands to their fullest potential. We need to be able to log, and mine, the forest to get more jobs without the ECO TERR. suing the gov. every time they turn around, that would allow for more roads for OHV use, and bring in more revenue for the gov. and which will lower taxes for the rest of us.

The national forests are already used for mining, drilling, and logging, that's part of the problem. Some of this is ok. I think we have surpassed the amount of development that should be allowed in our forests.

Here are some facts and figures. There are enough roads in our national forests to go around the Earth 17 times. There are approximately 60,000 miles of illegal roads. 50% of our national forests are open to logging, mining, and drilling. These activities are fine, do we really want them in every area. Should some things be preserved for the good of people and animals. These are areas that provide clean water, air and recreation. Don't forget, development is also allowed in almost every other area outside of national forests. Do you have facts to support the continued destruction of our remaining wild areas or is the pursuit of the all mighty dollar your only argument? You would think after a long history of environmental dilapidation that we would learn a lesson.

I have been offroading for over 50 years. I raised my family (2 girls, 2 boys) on motorcycles riding in the mountains, desert, and MX tracks. My family and I love the outdoors. We enjoy it by camping, hiking, mountain biking, motocross, and off-roading. The kids have turned out to enjoy the outdoors as much as I do. I believe that most responsible people enjoy and care for our great outdoor areas. As with most things, it only takes a few misfits to completely mess up the opportunities of others. Too bad we (the people) can't get honest people in our government to run this country, as it was meant to be run, by the people!



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

This is a LOCAL issue. Is it at all appropriate for this site? If you think getting national attention is going to HELP your cause, caveat emptor, somebody a thousand miles from you WILL impose rules that make no sense and you will lose big time. The western forests are a complete disaster because the east and west coast enviro wackos think they know what is best for everybody, regardless if they have ever been to your area, or ever intend to.

How much land do these roads actually cover in our forests? The manipulation of numbers goes both ways. In terms of acreage, roads cover 0.5% of the national forests. Your numbers seem to suggest that we have built freeways through the forests and they are being raped and pillaged. How is that possible if only 0.5% of the land is actually covered by roads? You continually ignore the simple fact that while 50% of forest lands are ELIGIBLE for logging, mining, and drilling, only a small fraction of a percent, again, is actually used as you suggest. There are over 100 million acres of land in the Wilderness program today, enough land to cover the entire state of California. Isn't it rather ignorant to suggest we haven't set aside enough land yet? You also need to factor in National Parks and the 99% of USFS and BLM lands that are being preserved already. At some point the scale tips and all of the land you want for no uses becomes a serious burden. A long history of environmental dilapidation" What flavor of Kool-Aid are they serving these days?"

A road impacts a large area. I agree that access is important. Roadless areas are also important. They are excellent habitat for big game animals and provide some of the cleanest rivers and lakes for fish. They also provide clean water and air for people. Not to mention recreation. These areas benefit people and animals. Do we really need to drill in every valley. You obviously want more development in our national forests, I think there should be less. I have always believed these areas should be for the preservation of wildlife and wild land, not more areas for development. What is no uses". The only thing not allowed in wilderness is motorized vehicles. How does that make it no uses. What has become a burden is the large cost of maintaining the enormous amount of roads in national forests. People saw years ago that areas were worth preserving. These areas have become some of our most treasured assets. I like when confronted with the facts some want to call it manipulation of the numbers. Facts are facts. If 2% of the lower 48 states is a lot to keep out of the hands of developers to you \_\_\_ maybe you should stay away from the Kool-Aid. "

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

I wonder if you have any original thoughts anymore? Your response reads exactly like all of your responses here. "A road impacts a large area" What exactly does that mean? What facts do you have to substantiate that claim? Certainly the Environmental Impact Studies done by the USFS and BLM land managers do not support that contention in any way. I NEVER said I wanted more development. What I see is some development on BLM lands. I do not see oil rigs on USFS land and I see a lot more USFS land than the vast majority of people on a daily basis. You have been fed a lie and the lie is there is some big push to destroy forests and wildlife. "No Uses" pretty self explanatory isn't it? The ONLY thing you can do with a Wilderness designation is walk in/out or ride a horse in/out. Please put some numbers to your claim of this large cost and burden to maintain roads. You do understand that the bulk of the roads serve a purpose such as fire mitigation and access to water sources. These roads are rather necessary don't you think? In my area the roads used for OHV's have been adopted by the counties and are maintained by the counties and volunteer trail groups. There is NO COST TO YOU for this. 2% refers to the total landmass of the United States hardly a relevant starting point. That claim lacks credibility because 100% of the land is not suitable or eligible for protection. It would be more relevant and HONEST to start with USFS lands in which case we are closing in on HALF of that land being off limits to anyone but hikers and horseback riders. That sure seems excessive to me."

My responses read the same because the same issues keep coming back. A road impacts a large area means more and more development in the area once a road is constructed. If there is so little development in our national forests and 50% are available for this purpose, I don't see why you have any issue at all. There should be plenty of area available, according to your own contention. Your facts are wrong on wilderness. Besides motorized/mechanical vehicles, almost the same things are allowed. One of my first comments was access is important. If you were unaware of the large cost to the government on road maintenance to the huge amount of roads in national forests, sorry to break the news to you. Here is a fact you are totally wrong on. 20% of USFS land is designated wilderness. I don't know how you came up with 50%. So let's be relevant and HONEST.

## Discussion Question 2

### *Written & Online Comments*

*(cont.)*

I'll parse this to answer your questions... My responses read the same because the same issues keep coming back. A road impacts a large area means more and more development in the area once a road is constructed. " That simply is not true. Just because there is a road does not mean there is more development. The vast majority of these roads in the forest have absolutely no development around them. As I mentioned many of the roads are there for fire mitigation and water source access with recreation being yet another use for the road. In none of those cases does additional development occur. What facts are you basing this claim on? "If there is so little development in our national forests and 50% are available for this purpose I don't see why you have any issue at all. There should be plenty of area available according to your own contention." Right now there is plenty of land available for all uses. What I do not want to see are further unnecessary closures. I believe I have been quite clear and consistent on that point. I have an issue with those who think we need more land closed to all uses except hiking and horseback riding again I think I clearly stated this. "Your facts are wrong on wilderness. Besides motorized/mechanical vehicles almost the same things are allowed." That is a huge ALMOST THE SAME. In fact many things are not allowed inside Wilderness designations. Now land managers must hike in to maintain trails this adds great expense to the care of these areas more than it costs to maintain OHV roads for sure. Fighting fires via mechanized equipment is banned as well. To say that eliminating OHV use is just a small component is simply an ignorant statement. Millions of taxpaying US citizens are banned from using their OHV's on PUBLIC land. This is no small issue as you should be able to glean for the subject matter on this site. "One of my first comments was access is important. If you were unaware of the large cost to the government on road maintenance to the huge amount of roads in national forests sorry to break the news to you." What exactly does it cost Steven no free pass on this. You and a few others use this as a point of contention all the time. The numbers should be published since it is a govt agency and public land. How much do we spend to maintain the roads you claim are so expensive? You completely ignored my comment on the county's controlling hundreds of miles of roads in the forest and funding their maintenance at the behest of the local citizenry. "Here is a fact you are totally wrong on. 20% of USFS land is designated wilderness. I don't know how you came up with 50%. So let's be relevant and HONEST." We both missed it the number is 33% of USFS land. What that does not account for however is the land not in Wilderness but closed to motorized vehicles. There are not good stats on that number but from looking at my forest maps there is easily 50% of USFS land closed to motorized vehicles which is the same net effect. So you think access is important one hand but support 50% or more of USFS lands being closed to motorized users. I'm not sure how that stance lends you any credibility."

You just can't stay on topic can you? The OHV vs hikers fight is not present in this idea, take that fight elsewhere. This comment from \_\_\_ is patently ABSURD Man has enough area to play on while wildlife has very little left to survive on." Maybe in your urban neighborhood this is true but it is nothing short of a lie when you consider the vast open lands east of the Mississippi and west of California. We have so much wildlife I am sure we would be happy to ship you some. Please get to work immediately renovating your back yard."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

You ask me to bring facts when you bring no facts. Once a road is constructed, logging, mining and drilling seem to follow. Not to mention houses or cabins. These activities are fine, we should have area without them, also. Here is one of your statements about wilderness "Fighting fires via mechanized equipment is banned as well." Is this based on a fact. From what I read you are 100% wrong. As OHV use increases and the population grows more regulation is inevitable. How are citizens banned from using their OHVs on public land. Just because you can't ride on every bit of public land? Part of the problem is some view wilderness as only for hikers and horseback riding. I don't do either of these and I am still an advocate of wilderness. Some areas in my view are more important than what recreation we are able to carry out. Wild beauty is a deeply held American value. From what I have read the deferred maintenance on USFS roads is \$8.4 billion. Do you have facts to refute this? Or do you get a pass on that? If some roads are maintained by local citizens that's fine. I think that is an important piece to having access. Remember I said access is important. According to the USFS website 20% of USFS land is designated wilderness. How are you getting to 33%? Again you ask me to take my time to find facts for you when you make statements with no or misleading facts. Yes I think access is important. I also think some areas should be left roadless. If that makes me less credible to you then so be it. How credible are you when so many points you bring up are so easily proven wrong."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

OK so when a road is built in the forest, the best you can do is to state that development seems" to follow. So that tells me you have no way to verify this claim you just "feel" it is so. I would LOVE to see you drive a firetruck in to a Wilderness designation. It is going to be pretty tricky though since these areas are roadless. Citizens are banned from operating ohv's in wilderness areas what kind of semantics are you going to try next to say this is not keeping taxpayers out of the forest. Only a precious few are able to hike these areas. Let's continue to feed the elitists that plan ought to work out just swell as long as you are one of them. The most recent report regarding budget proposals for the USFS claim \$3 billion in deferred maint. The total budget for construction and maint is about \$500 million. The deferred catagory is a bit of a joke. This is nothing more than a ploy by politicians to fleece the public for more money. I would think you of all people would support deferred maint because the ultimate result of that is fewer roads in the forest. So YES I have facts to refute that. If we are going to discuss areas closed to motorized recreation the numbers get fuzzy fast. You are correct I was wrong 20% of USFS land. However that does not include USFS lands otherwise closed to motorized recreation which should be added to the Wilderness designations as the result is the same closed to motorized users. You would also have to start factoring in BLM Park Service Fish and Wildlife all who manage public lands including Wilderness designations and motorized closures. In the end you have 756 Wilderness designations totalling at least 109 million acres of PUBLIC land. That is larger than the state of California or the entire country of Iraq. The point is when will it be enough? That is a tremendous amount of land open exclusively to hikers. I guess we come to an impass because you consider no use of the land a good alternative. I want to know what you are saving the land for? Who is enjoying the land God created for us the elite few? I think that is wrong you think it is a good thing I think your stance is absurd. Use of lands does NOT equate to destruction of lands or wildlife that is a seriously flawed premis Steven. 590000 acres of public lands managed by the USFS are roadless again at what point is it enough for you? I have also been able to prove most of your points incorrect. Depends on how you want to spin it. How many times have you tried to argue that only 2% of the US landmass is Wilderness and how incredibly irrelevant is that point Steven. I want to know how much more you think should be closed to motorized use? When will it be enough for you? Do you intend to continue advocating more and more closesures to responsible tax paying forest users based on your opinion of what is a good use and what is not? Please stop trying to impose your flawed veiws on the rest of us. Yours lie in a seriously small minority. Expect to see the pendulum swing back coming to a forest near you soon."

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Here is a good example of how a road brings more development. Since I seem to be the only one who needs to have any facts to substantiate my comments. The road to the north slope of Alaska was built to service the pipeline. Now they want to expand oil development to a wildlife refuge. That's more development and is an example that is one very evident to anyone. How does wilderness only benefit the elitists? I would say it's just the opposite. Wilderness benefits people and wildlife. A lot of other areas that allow more development allow rich elitists to gain huge profits from development while the common people gain nothing. Your facts to refute the high cost of road maintenance in national forests seem to prove my point that road maintenance has a high cost. I am for fewer roads in national forests. The latest thing I read says there will be less roads because of the cost. 50% of wilderness designation is in Alaska. That means an area the size of Wisconsin is the amount of wilderness in the lower 48. Remember, let's be relevant and HONEST. Who uses wilderness? Hunters, fishermen, campers. Your favorite, hikers and horseback riders. Anyone else who enjoys clean water and air. God created this land for everyone and wildlife. Not just OHV users. I think your stance is absurd. We should bring our development to every corner of our country. I say we have enough areas to develop. As we expand more and more, some needs to be set aside. How exactly did you prove my point wrong? 2% of the lower 48 is the amount of wilderness designation we have. Facts are facts. I stand by that number. Because you don't like the fact does not mean they are not facts. There is no spin on that number. It is what it is. One thing I learned using this site is there are a good number of people who feel the same as I do. I'm not sure who is in the minority. I am not one who wants to close OHVs out of the forest. I have also said access is important. I think there should be plenty room for activities like OHVs. You don't really know what I do in my spare time. I do support leaving areas that are currently roadless without new roads. I also support wilderness. These are important. Because my views are not the same as yours does not mean mine are flawed. You shouldn't impose your views on the rest of us, either. Do you intend to continue advocating more and more roads, impacting responsible taxpaying forest users, based on your opinion of what is a good use and what is not. Just keep in mind there are people like me who believe in my views just as much as you believe in yours.

I am in support of responsible reasonable ORV access. We already have millions of acres of land in the US that is designated Wilderness and is there for those who want solitude. There is no reason to further restrict millions more acres of land as Wilderness and further restrict access to only foot traffic. What is the percentage of hikers who access our public lands compared to the other users? I don't know the percentage, but would think it's less than 15% of the total population. So is it fair to deny everyone else access? I am an avid hiker, mountain bike rider, and a dirt bike rider. I consider myself a conservationist and think our public lands should be used, but not abused. I have encountered hikers, mt. bike riders and horseback riders on trails designated for dirt bikes and everyone gets along well and shares. There is no reason that similar users cannot share some trails. This is not to say that everything should be open to motorized access and as previously stated, we have millions of acres of land designated as Wilderness and National Parks that is off limits, as it should be. Please think of others, not just yourself. Have respect for our land and its local inhabitants and other people you encounter. The beauty and joy that our public lands offer should be accessible to all of us to enjoy in our own way.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

How about posting this Idea: Non-OHV and OHV groups work together to identify and cultivate positive relationships" I organized the most successful beach "Coastal Cleanup Day" site in my county for three years straight--staffed almost 100% by OHV volunteers. Coastal Cleanup Day is a big environmentalist thing so how come off-road volunteers are #1 here for three years in a row? Because OHV groups are pro-environment that's why!"

I'm gonna jump in here for a quick comment- I think a lot of motorized users are a bit extreme" sometimes after seeing so much land closed so quickly (it IS happening and is pretty tough to absorb here in the west). I respect the opinion of others but at the same time if that opinion is based upon ignorance well that should be noted. For instance you may be right that the lower 48 has 2% of total land protected as wilderness but I would bet that 2% only includes directly designated wilderness and national parks which would not be truly fair - many other forms of de-facto wilderness have been created by multiple agencies: wilderness study areas areas of critical habitat etc which are for the most part withdrawn for OHV recreation. One frustrating part of these de-facto designations is that in many cases OHV recreation has been taking place for many years and the agencies own EIS show little or no long term damage (talking motorcycle singletrack trails here especially in Colorado and UT) So when you add these other (de-facto) areas up then you compare it against a truly valid measuring point - such as available public lands that number is MUCH larger than 2% (don't want to speculate too much but at least 20 times that). In my own area we have approx. 225000 acres of national forest and 8 miles of legal singletrack for dirt bikes. We used to have probably 250 miles plus most of which were designated mountain bike only in the last two decades; the rest were closed. There are two wilderness areas multiple areas of critical habitat a watershed that is totally closed to people... In my area I'd guess 10% of total land is designated as wilderness but the total land closed to OHV use is likely more like 90-95%. Ninety five percent for no valid reason (as shown in the FS' own EIS) is a tough pill to swallow and begins to feel an awful lot like the "King's Land" as my buddy calls it. I'll give you a final point to ponder: America's Red Rock's Wilderness Act would designate 44% of the total land area of Emery County UT as wilderness; area that was settled grazed for 100 years before OHV travel began taking place; an area that used to have hundreds of miles of trails and now has about 100; an area who's economy is based upon OHV use. The proposal was made by a New Yorker not a Utahan with no local input at all. We loose so many trails so many areas and it's easy to over-generalize and perhaps exaggerate a bit.."

Let's not forget about Americas STATE Parks. State Parks hold more lands and historical resources in trust and are visited by more guests than the National Park System. To check out the latest from YOUR State Park, click on the following link to see one of the many ways State Parks are actively seeking youth participation. { <a href=http://americasstateparks.org/youth\_ambassador\_application.html" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } "

We have oil spills nearly every day, many are small and most never make the news but they still kill wildlife, destroy habitat and entire ecosystems and that is the truth. Sadly I have come to expect this type of ignorance from uneducated or uncaring (or both) people like you but do your really want your stupidity in print for all to read?



## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Why do you feel the need to justify your use of public lands, the public lands belong to everybody they dont belong to special interest groups. Our mid term elections speke volumes on how the average American feels about the people that manage public lands and public business, cant wait for the next election so we can continue to make a change" in the right direction. Its sad so many think the tax payers work for them we dont they work for us it wont be long and these people and their special interest groups will be purged from the system and the PUBLIC will regain its access to PUBLIC LANDS."

At the core of this issue is that most of the current forest road system was not developed for recreation but for timber. Roads are in the wrong places, don't have the pull-offs needed -- and are way beyond the capabilities of the Forest Service to maintain. As a result, we face safety, access and environmental problems. The agency is dong a good job of addressing the challenges, but we -- forest recreation advocates -- need to demand that the Congress address the cost side of the issue. Many of the roads critical to forest recreation site access are NOT aided by funds from federal motorfuel taxes. And they should be.

I also respect the opinion of others and agree that if an opinion is based on ignorance, it should be noted. I have said there should be plenty of room for OHVs. My conversation was to also show the importance of wilderness. One thing that is a fact is the more OHVs there are, the more regulation there will be. I agree that years ago, before the activity was so popular, there probably were more places to ride. I don't want to speculate too much either, but my estimation is in my area 95% of the public land is open to OHVs. We had an area the DNR wanted to preserve the wild character of. Some things they did was closed some roads (there was an over abundance) and restricted OHV use. The area still has a wild character and it has been years that we have been visiting the area to camp and hunt. This area will hopefully remain intact for generations to come. Also, as a side note, we rode three wheelers in the area when these restrictions came about. I'm not for or against the Red Rock Wilderness Act, but it was originally proposed by a Utah representative, who asked others to continue his work after he left. I know that and I'm not from Utah or New York. So I also agree with your statement that it is easy to over-generalize and exaggerate a bit for some.



## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

Here is a great example of what I been talking about go here and look at the pictures { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14678&position=2&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Complaining about the tracks now look at the whole picture see those rocks and bluffs in the background they are products of hundreds of millions of years of erosion now these people are complaining about a OHV accelerating that erosion by maybe 100 years? And if a OHV never had been on that same lands how could you tell? And if the land erodes away whats the problem? If the erosion is a problem whats being done to prevent it in areas closed by OHV's. See what happens when some dope smoking hippy perceives their is a problem. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/images/content/photos/large\_13909.jpg" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Look at that picture tracks in the sand now look and think about the BIG picture where did the sand come from? The sand that you see the tracks is a product of MILLIONS of erosion of the sand stone and the tracks are hurting? Notice the text "ORV damage " then no explanation of the "damage" typical left wing scare tacit sad so many fall for this brainwashing { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14677&position=4&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Look at that picture complaining about tracks look at the damage to the mountain in the back ground whats being done to stop it from eroding away why in another 500 million or so years it will be completely worn away. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=23098&position=6&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Yeah and? whats your point I have hundreds of pictures of OHV's making a water crossing like how to imply the guy on the motor cycle is doing something wrong how do we know that water crossing was made on public lands? "A new breed of ORVs can even climb near-vertical walls" Yeah so the problem is your anti social and want the rest of the world to be anti social too or you have other uses for those rocks what were you doing with those rocks before the ORV tried to climb them is their a shortage of rocks I dont know about is the rocks going to go extinct? { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14671&position=7&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } And the problem is? In this next photo I see billions of years or mother nature eroding away sand stone by not allowing ORV's to drive through it will preserve that eroded mess another 50 years? Come back in 1000 years I bet you wont be able to tell the difference. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14674&position=8&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Here is a classic at its best "An eroded streambank in Tenmile Canyon." hey STUPID you know what created the "stream" erosion created it go back and look at that same area after a real big rain that implied damage you took a picture of will be gone and if its not gone the problem is? 50 more lbs of dirt in a stream that has millions of tons of dirt already in it? Or let me guess muddy water just like after each natural rain. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=23100&position=9&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Whats the problem here read the anti social comment below the picture { <a

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

[Link](http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=23099&position=10&AlbumID=5821) } Another classic look at those black tire marks those tire marks have me puking blood just worrying about them every day of my life before the tire marks you were using that section of the rock that is probably 20feet wide and 15 feet long for what? Now their is black tire marks on that 300 square feet of rock in a park that has billions of square feet of rock the real problem is your anti social and just cant stand to see Americans using public property. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14669&position=11&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link } This problem they complain about lasted what 8 hrs in one day of the 15 billion year history of the earth haha guy has taken too many hits off his bong again another example of anti social behavior. { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14668&position=12&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link } Look at this guy driving up the canyon that was created by erosion { <a href="http://www.suwa.org/site/PhotoAlbumUser?view=UserPhotoDetail&PhotoID=14683&position=14&AlbumID=5821" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link } I could go on for days giving examples but I think you get the idea of the stupid that is happening with the LEFT wing environmentalist. "

Civil war battlefields are a link to our past. They should be saved at all costs!

It was Ronald Reagan who said the federal government has a duty to protect our natural resources from damage due to industrial development. Stop the OHV industry from destroying All the American Wilderness.

I am afraid that your reply displays quite a bit of ignorance. I live just a couple hours away from where those photos were taken, I have spent a lot of time in that area. One rainstorm, or one windstorm, both of which are common, erases those tracks leaving no trace. Mother nature is much more resilient than you give her credit for. The suggestion that OHV's making stream crossings is the cause for a decline in fish populations is completely unsubstantiated. All of the photos were taken in designated OHV areas as well, there is no destruction in any of those photos. Very few OHV users have an urge to destroy, what a ridiculous fallacy you put forth. Why would you tell such lies?

As an older rockhound, I would like to see Restrictive Speed Limitations placed on all new and used OHV that have a gross weight of under 3,500 lbs. If a quad, ATV or dirt bike can't travel faster than 25 mph the outlaws riders" would decrease in number and be easier for Law Enforcement to catch. Also the fines for off trail use of OHV on public lands should be very impressive in size or OHV seizure."

## Discussion Question 2

### **Written & Online Comments**

**(cont.)**

OHV Landscape disfiguration" The land looks disfigured before OHV's You could listen to \_\_\_ who seems to have first hand knowledge of this area but I strongly suggest you personally go investigate this for yourself see that is the problem and the whole point of my posting links to those pictures all you bleeding heart left wing dope smoking hippys will buy anything thats negative about OHVs without thought blindly follow stupid down the losing path for your type its probably a good thing when they lock up wilderness areas you would probably kill yourself trying to enjoy it.. Hows that omnibus public lands bill doing looks like nobody is buying that load of BS either cant wait for the NEXT election then we will see some real "change" GOD bless Merry Christmas. "

The death of the omnibus is a HUGE victory for opponents of new Wilderness designations. They tried to revive it yesterday but thankfully they all went home where they can do less harm to our country. It will be years before the liberal special interest has the numbers to submit land grabs of that size again. One small victory for common sense land use policy.

U.S. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) has dropped his effort to pass a massive omnibus public lands bill that would have restricted responsible off-highway vehicle (OHV) access to thousands of acres of public land. Cant wait for the next election so we can have some real change maybe appoint several hundred OHV czars to run the national parks that czar crapola the current admin has pulled could be used in our favor.

Keep all OHVs on trails and roads. Stop the ecological disaster. Biological soil crusts (BSC) in desert areas are easily destroyed by compressional disturbances. Soil Compaction due to recreational activities such as off-trail OHV use. Keep all OHVs on trails and roads. Do No Harm. OHV causes the Destruction of scenic beauty, Destruction of animal habit, Soil erosion, drainage disruption and dust creation, Soil Compaction causes the inhibiting of native plant growth and is a disturbance to local wild animals. Keep all OHVs on trails and roads. Save the environment you came to enjoy.

Great idea, this should be imposed on hiking trails as well. Evidence of hikers cutting switchbacks would result in closing the trail. Oh way, not so practical after all..

In many cases wildfires have devastated our overgrown public lands I have not studied this, but I would think mother nature could take care of herself. She's been at it a fairly long time. &gt;&gt; Private property owners ... are better stewards Private lands in small quantities (relatively) to live and for some uses is very useful, but I don't think that is what is being talked about here. At a large scale, selling proportional to dollars rather than to bodies could very well be unconstitutional and very inequitable to future generations (especially if the parents were not very wealthy). Private lands sold to the highest bidder would have the obvious problems of rule of law being set by very few human beings -- maybe by only one -- from the hundreds of millions of Americans. There is a clear misrepresentation of interests of the public. Each person would not get land on a per capita basis despite all of us being equal citizen and human being partners/co-owners. Such sales would almost surely be at micropennies on the dollar of its worth to the entirety of the US population.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

Landscape wide planning for public lands helps reduce some of the threat described by tragedy of the commons". This becomes more significant for areas near large human populations."

Those who want to privatize, raise your hands if you agree that it should be split evenly on a per capita basis and taking into account all the humans that will live in the US over the centuries? Since when does having more money make you deserve having significant exclusive rights to any more of the land beyond your own modest space for living? If we partition all the land so each person gets some and we reserve for future generations, then those that want to traverse or use for extended periods anything beyond their fair share allotment can pay a small rent to all who own such a lot. In practice, to promote general well-being and order, a large chunk will always have to be available to significant public use. A right to access land is greater than a right to buy, trade, and amass private-access land. That is, a right to life is greater than a right to exclusive-use property. At least the essence of this view is stapled across the Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, the basis of many major religions, etc.

I'm a Disabled American Veteran and the only way I can see a lot of the terrain and scenery in our great country is via an OHV. Ban or no ban, outlaws will destroy the scenery whereas the ban will simply keep law abiding citizens from enjoying America's beautiful scenery. Not all of us who ride are rude and we don't much care for the rude one's either.

Now a tax on your health insurance so you can pay for the people that work at places like walmart that has no health insurance. Its sad when you take land you got for free, the land is paid for, open it up into a park and still lose money, they need to privatize these public parks and let them be run like a business so they are profitable then start giving tax cuts to the tax payers. \$4 billion a day the U.S. government must pay merely on the interest charges for the debt. â€œFour billion dollars a day then you have some bleeding heart wanting to make the government bigger and spend even more money. Just think what good you could have done spending 4 billion dollars a day on anything but interest payments to a communist country. These pro tax advocates need to wake up.

Please share with us the details of this damage" your telling us about also please in great detail tell us the facts you have about how dangerous they are. We need to verify this "damage" right now it just reads like emotions gone wild. I am glad your worried about OHVs being injured what are your feelings about the 49000 + Americans including children that are killed in automobile accidents each year? Thanks"

The whole planet earth is one big ball of erosion can you please show me this erosion thing your having a issue with. OHV foot print on planet earth is not even measurable yet for some reason its a issue, well then lets see it.

## Discussion Question 2

### ***Written & Online Comments***

***(cont.)***

No doubt you have facts and proof to back up your claims in this Idea" I tried researching this and could not find the info that supports your wild claims you have made. If you please can you provide the details so I can continue my research. Not sure how people can promote a "Idea" based on what appears at this point to be fiction I have to admit it reads well and might be plausible but I am not easily fooled I need to see documentation that backs up the statement made here. Details please. 1. damage to water quality 2.damage to wildlife habitat 3.damage to conflicting uses like dispersed recreation and restoration 4.where the roads were costing way more that the trees would ever be worth. 5.Miners pay almost nothing for mining claims and never clean up their messes. Were all on the edges of our seats here. "

these vehicles do a heckuva lot of damage" Please show us this damage you claim I also want to see the extent of the damage others claim wildlife is causing. "

A sheriffs office is investigating if some of the actions in the Bureau of Land Management's wild horse roundup are animal abuse. { <a href=http://www.mynews4.com/story.php?id=37409&amp;n=122" rel="nofollow" target="\_blank">Link</a> } Someone on a OHV drives by a wild horse and its considered harassment. Another failed government program at its best making the same mistakes over and over and over wasting more tax payers money again and again and again. Lets ask them to do more for us were too dumb to make decisions ourselves we need someone in Washington to run it for us. I am no expert but I think you could simply build a corral where they feed and water one that has many gates once a month drop some food in the middle of the corral (chum them up) get them use to eating meeting their when the population gets too high then dump a bunch of food then close the gates. I know my idea cuts out the good ole boy network with the helicopter charging the tax payer millions of dollars to round them up but thats just too bad. "