

USDA Forest Service
Attn: NFS – EMC Staff { Barbara Timberlake }
Stop Code 1104
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20250-1104

Copy to

Regional Forester
USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region
P.O. Box 21628
Juneau, AK 99801-1628

This letter is a notice of appeal filed pursuant to 36 CFR part 217, page 46 in the record of decision. By
C. Keith Campbell
Box 722
Seward, AK 99664
{907-224-5631}

The decision I am appealing is the preferred Alternative as described in the FEIS and the resulting Revised Forest Plan, including areas available for motorized and no motorized activities, with modifications as further described in the ROD, as stated on page 3 of the ROD.

The document in which the decision is contained is the Revised Land and Resource Management Plan Record of the Decision, R10 MB –4806. The date of the decision was May 31, 2002 and the deciding officer was Regional Forester Dennis E. Bschor.

There are several things in the plan that I object to, but the most objectionable is the closure of the Crescent/Carter Lake area to motorized usage, as well as many other areas in the Moose Pass / Cooper landing vicinity. These closures include the highway corridors stretching from the campground south of Moose pass to the summit lake area north of Moose Pass and the Russian Lake trail in Cooper Landing, all of which are illustrated on the Winter Motorized Recreation Access Map of the Chugach National Forest Map.

This with alternative was not in any of the plan that I can remember reviewing during the planning sessions. The public did not get a chance to comment on the areas closed. These areas were apparently added to the nonmotorized areas at the direction of local District Ranger Michael Kania. The fact that historically this area has been used by family's to Ice fish and use cabins in the winter, The use of snow machines and will no longer allow family's to use this area as the extremely steep trail can be skied by only the most advanced skier. In fact on the down trail one would need to be a champion down hill skier to navigate the trail. EIS Chapter 2-19.

The economic facts have been glossed over as to the loss of income to the local business and to the forest service itself. The rental income from winter rental of the cabins on Crescent Lake will most certainly be zero do the fact that the stove in the saddle cabin is fueled by fuel oil. What cross country skier in their right mind would carry five gallons of fuel up that trail. The only two solutions would be for the forest service to deliver fuel on snow machines to the cabin or convert the stove to wood use. That solution is not viable as all the wood within the area has been used over the years and that is why there is a petroleum fired stove in the cabin. The economic effects show a lack of analysis nor any recognition of the impacts that will occur to local businesses should these areas be closed to snow machine use. The record does not show that local businesses were contacted about the potential snow machine closures in this area. The true economic impact can not be assessed without input from those being impacted. A point of fact is that input from local governments was ignored. 36 CFR 219.21

The cabin use and the ice fishing opportunities were truly family friendly for the area. My family has used this area for 31 winters and as I get along in years I would not like for this pleasure to be foreclosed as it surely will be if this decision is allowed to stand. Lest any one think that my family and I are one dimensional, we also cross county ski. But this trail is beyond the capability of all but the most advanced skier.

The local users of the forest have tried to share with all users [ie] skiers by accepting shared times and dividing areas for use and never had very much conflict.

An alternative could include alternating weeks or months of use by each user group.

I object to my voice having the same weight as some one who never will use the forest. We who live in this area have no other place to recreate as we are surrounded by The Kenai Fjords National Park and the Chugach National forest. Private land is almost nonexistent in the part of the state. EIS 3-518

It is my understanding that traditional uses were not to be foreclosed in the adoption of new plans. This closure of these areas to traditional uses would be a violation of traditional usage of this area. Mechanized usage has been traditional since the days of the exploration of this area for a hydro- electric site for generating electricity for south central Alaska. The EIS Glossary 51 The Forest Service Manual {FSM 2326.1-6} defines traditional activities to include, but not limited to, recreation activities such as fishing, hunting, sightseeing, and hiking and no proof of pre- existing will be required in order to use a snow machine, motor boat, or airplane.

Thank you taking my comments into account as you reverse this decision to close this area to motorized activity.


C. Keith Campbell

10- 16- 2002