

Response to Public Concern Report
Supplement to Appendix A of the FEIS

Final Environmental Impact Statement
Land Between The Lakes
National Recreation Area

December 2004

This report contains the public comments on the draft plan and EIS, along with the Forest Service's responses to the comments. Each public comment was considered, coded and grouped with similar comments, then summarized into Public Concerns. The Forest Service responded to each of the Public Concerns. The Public Concerns and Responses, and the original comments grouped with each concern, are documented in this report. A summary of comment responses can be found in Appendix A2 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

A total of 286 pieces of correspondence were received during the public comment period; these include responses from 238 individuals, 10 government agencies or elected officials, and 14 organizations.

Terms Used in This Report:

Public Concern: A statement that extracts a key concept from public comment and presents the matter as an action or decision to be made by the Forest Service, or a topic to be addressed in subsequent publications of the agency's proposal.

Response: In this report, a statement by the Forest Service that addresses the Public Concern.

Ltr#: The identification number for any document submitted during the comment period for the draft plan and/or draft EIS. The documents included mailed and faxed letters, emails, and forms.

Cmt#: The identification number for an individual comment within each submitted document. (One Ltr# may have multiple Cmt#s.)

Comment: A coherent segment of text that will stand alone as a suggestion, idea, request, or critique. One document may have multiple comments.

LBL Land and Resource Management Plan Response to Public Concern Supplement to Appendix A2 of the FEIS

Public Concern

The Forest Service should demonstrate and export innovative, efficient and effective management techniques that assist others in order to contribute to implementation of National Strategic Goals.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

189	23	Demonstrate and export widely innovative, efficient and effective management techniques that assist others. Support.
189	25	The accomplishments of the Land Between The Lakes National Recreation Area will contribute to implementation of National Strategic Goals. Support.

Response

The LBL Protection Act specifically calls upon the Forest Service to "authorize, research, test, and demonstrate innovative programs and cost-effective management of the Recreation Area." Strategic goals and objectives have been created in the Plan to support this part of our mission.

Public Concern

The Forest Service must reject the Land & Resource Management Draft Plan because it guided public comment away from non-preferred alternatives.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

265	45	By selecting for consideration only criteria that lead towards development of the Draft Plan, and the public comments, were led away from Alternative Z. Until that Alternative is given full comparison by means of all legitimate criteria, the Draft Plan, as it exists, is illegitimate and should be rejected.
-----	----	---

Response

The Forest Service repeatedly reminded the public that all alternatives, or parts of alternatives could potentially be selected. The identification of a preferred alternative and draft plan is part of the NEPA process however all alternatives were available for review by the public during the comment period.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Alternative Z.
Because Alternative Z better represents the concerns of the former residents and regional public;
Because Alternative Z best protects the environment;
Because Alternative Z provides a more appropriate supply of wilderness recreation to the rising demand;
Because Alternative Z best protects water quality around Turkey Bay;
Because Alternative Z best stimulates the local economy.

Response

We appreciate your interest in Land Between The Lakes. Thank you for your comments. The selected alternative "Y" incorporates scientific analysis and responds to the concerns of the public while meeting legal mandates. The selected alternative supports the mission of LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	5	It appears that Alternative Z would allow for continued use of the Turkey Bay OHV area with significantly less potential for sedimentation over the period of analysis.
226	7	Alternative "Z" puts emphasis on returning LBL to a more natural state. Are the benefits of this Alternative (reflected in rising demand for wilderness experiences) taken into account in the Net Present Value calculation of the DEIS? We understand that the LBL area is not classified as true "wilderness" by the Forest Service due to the numerous roads throughout the area that are used to provide access to cemeteries and other heritage sites. However, still, the research clearly shows the increasing demand for "wilderness-type" or "increasingly natural areas." That nothing in this region can qualify, but that LBL has the potential to approximate wilderness more closely, and on a larger scale, than anything else in the region ought to be an argument for Alternative Z. LBL is unique in the immediate region in that it will come as close to wilderness as anything in this region can. Since LBL can come close to providing these wild experiences, the research on wilderness and wilderness-type recreation should be used as a proxy while comparing the alternatives.
265	35	The land comprising LBL was taken by force in order to ensure that it would be protected from the economic forces that would lead to its inevitable development and resulting biological decline. Alternative Z is the only Alternative that takes this as its defining impetus.
214	1	Of the four alternatives, Alternative Z seems to be the way to go and would be closer to comments I've heard while working booths, etc. with Concept Zero. Many people do not know how LBL came to be. If asked if there should be a casino there, many people would probably be for it. However, given the whole story/history of the area, many people quickly change their minds. In my opinion, all signs of TVA should be removed, including all "businesses" that have been put in.

-
- 265 7 By providing no more than is necessary for the health and safety of the visitors, the commercial facilities that are found to be necessary inside LBL will stimulate the development of the surrounding region, as was originally intended, instead of competing and stifling development. This option (roughly captured by Alternative Z) would appear to provide a best case scenario for all interests involved, though it was NOT given adequate consideration in the Plan analysis. The decrease in management costs is not factored into Alternative Z so that an accurate comparison with the higher cost Alternatives X and Y can be made.
- 226 14 "Z" is the alternative preferred by a group that represents former residents of the LBL, who were promised that LBL would remain a wilderness. The DEIS does not address this issue, which is clearly a qualitative issue. Alternatives W, X, and Y, from the perspective of that group of former residents, has negative connotations: Breaking of promises, breaking of trust.
- 265 23 I have on numerous occasions requested visitation numbers for the "free days" at various facilities in LBL, but have been told that this data was not recorded. For a data-driven agency, this is remarkable. I have been told by management at LBL that, in fact, visitation did significantly increase (one LBLA volunteer used the term "dramatic increase") on days when no fees were charged. Again, I have to ask, which benefits the surrounding region most, charging fees and attracting a smaller number of wealthier people, or making LBL's natural wonders and Environmental Education/Outdoor Recreation available to a much larger percentage of the population? Factor in that the very population that is attracted by free access is the same population that 1) has no access to any similar experience provided by the private sector, 2) the DEIS states should be accommodated and not excluded and, again, the balance tips to Alternative Z.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should manage LBL as a National Forest, not as a preserve, demonstration area or experimental area.

Response

LBL will be managed as a National Recreation Area unit of the US Forest Service. This is clearly defined by the LBL Protection Act and the laws applicable to the Forest Service.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
-------------	-------------	----------------

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 146 | 11 | Remember that the LBL is now a National Forest, not a preserve, a demonstration area nor an experimental area. |
|-----|----|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should avoid demonstrations on sound business practices.
Because the government is not an authority on sound business practices;
Because the regional communities are better suited to provide this type of demonstration.

Response

There is no restriction on local communities conducting these demonstrations. The LBL Protection Act specifically calls upon the Forest Service to "authorize, research, test, and demonstrate innovative programs and cost-effective management of the Recreation Area." Partnership, support and collaboration with surrounding communities and business leaders is utilized and welcomed.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	23	LBL existed until the turn over to the USFS as a national demonstration area in environmental education and outdoor recreation. It was only under the management of Dr. Frank Holland (1975-1980 or so) that demonstrations related to resource management were redefined to include more focus on wildlife management demonstrations. It is appropriate for LBL to be a demonstration area, however, to lead the public to believe in any way that the United States government, or most of its contractors can bring a modicum of sound business practices in LBL, is quite a stretch. If you truly want to accomplish this, then open LBL to full-scale commercialization from business owners in the surrounding region that have a demonstrated track record of being capable of running a successful business and minimize government oversight and interference.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should manage LBL in accordance with its original mission.
Because it has thus failed to honor promises made to former residents;
Because this land has a unique culture and history that should not be lost;
Because former residents lost so much when TVA moved in.;
Because following this mission will ensure the land will remain wild and natural.

Response

The codified mission of LBL is clearly outlined in the carefully worded LBL Protection Act of 1998. The Forest Service is required to comply with this law. The history and culture of this special place is very important and as discussed in both the Plan and EIS, carefully considered in all decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

141	2	I strongly urge that the original intent of usage on LBL be protected out of respect for those landowners who lost ground between the rivers! Land between the lakes needs to remain one of the few remaining bastions of a bygone era, to allow this to be tainted in any other way would be a loss of National recognition as guardian of our rich past.
-----	---	--

-
- 221 4 This management [for old growth] regime would also be consistent with the promises made to former residents who lost their homes through condemnation, against their will, when LBL was created. These former residents were told that their homes, businesses, churches and farms had to be removed from the area so that it could be returned to a completely non-commercialized, wilderness area suitable as an outdoor recreation and environmental education center to serve a region which had little if any such areas.
- 17 4 Employ intelligent managers that carry out the policies and promises that were told to the relocated residents 50 years ago. Remember, good managers take nothing and make something out of it; TVA took something and made nothing out of it. Listen to what lifelong nearby residents say and want. After all, they are the ones they took it from.
- 272 1 It is clear from the executive and legislative history that the intent of the government when they took the extraordinary measures of removing people from their long held property against their will and desire was due to a justification that a high quality recreation area providing a unique resource that was at that time not being provided in the region must be one in which there is no human residence and no commercial activities of any kind, thus providing a unique experience of a complete uninhabited, uncommercialized area. By having such an area, which would be unique to this part of the country, it would then meet the "demonstration" clause of the TVA Act, which is the only justification ever provided for taking citizens' lands against their will. But, instead, counter to that overpowering moral and legal mandate, the government is allowing the same activities on the land that it used as justification for removing the residents. This is unacceptable.
- 9 3 We made a commitment to people who had their homes and farms taken to keep it this way and we should make the commitment to future generations.
- 272 5 Formalizing in the new management plan the promise given to the displaced inhabitants of LBL that the recreation area will remain an increasingly wild, natural area; a premier environmental education facility; and forever free to the public. The original promises and mission made to the former land owners as the fundamental reason for kicking off their land against their will should be honored.
- 217 8 "The intent of the LBL Protection Act was to insure LBL's future as a National Recreation Area. The Protection Act was intended to provide adequate federal funding for LBL and to codify in law the original mission and promise made to approximately 949 families who through eminent domain forfeited their homes, churches, businesses, and way of life in order that a National Recreation Area void of commercial development might be established." This intent should be the mission of the U.S. Forest Service, the current steward of this beloved land.
- 217 2 I feel very strongly that this land should be managed in a way that is consistent with the very creation of LBL.

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 26 | 2 | In order to preserve an accurate sense of the heritage of this area it is essential that the original intent of LBL and the promise made to the people remain recognized as vital components of what LBL is, how it came to be and what it shall be in the future. |
| 101 | 4 | Because the root of all these problems lies in the one clause in the LBL Protection Act, I also ask that the Protection Act be amended to remove all economic incentive for turning the "promise" into a "com-promise." I ask that the Protection Act be amended to provide a more concise statement of the original promise and the publicly stated intent that the obligations incurred by the government by using eminent domain against unwilling citizens be honored. |
| 216 | 1 | In the present planning process, your failure to acknowledge that there was an "Original Mission" which allowed LBL to be formed, and even more importantly, your lack of adherence to that mission in the proposed Land And Resource Management Plan is simply wrong and not morally or legally defensible. The FS should be sensitive to the culture and history of the LBL area. The FS should also recognize and acknowledge that there were promises made to justify the taking of the land for LBL; and that those promises should not be broken, but included as an integral part of the Management Plan. |
| 263 | 1 | The management plan is not a valid one, because it forsakes the former residents of Between the Rivers, their heirs, and all of the American people by violating rules of eminent domain. The right of Eminent Domain was used to acquire this land, for the written and unprecedented intent of ridding it of all commercial activities, and of excluding such activities there for all time. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not use the 1994 Natural Resource Management Plan for guidance in its current planning process. Because the NRMP is outdated; Because the NRMP uses open land species which are inappropriate for LBL.

Response

As described in the Planning Background Document and Draft Plan, this new plan is a revision of that document. There were many parts of the 1994 plan that were validated by the public as still applicable and appropriate, and several that needed change, and have been addressed by the new Plan. A science review involving regional experts, scientists, agency specialists and academia was conducted to validate our use of biological information. Site specific, local and regional research, literature and information has been considered.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 285 | 5 | Why are we using an outdated NRMP that contains evaluation species that are primarily 'open land' species? |
|-----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not use "cost effective" management techniques at LBL.
Because the original mission of LBL did not advocate such techniques.

Response

The LBL Protection Act specifically calls upon the Forest Service to "authorize, research, test, and demonstrate innovative programs and cost-effective management of the Recreation Area." The assistance of surrounding communities and business leaders is utilized and welcomed.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	21	You can't find the term "cost-effective" management of the Recreation Area anywhere in the statements made by President Kennedy at the inception of this project.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ensure unimpeded access to all cemeteries in LBL.
Because the Forest Service has no management authority regarding cemeteries and so must not close them; Because there is strong local support for cemetery access;
Because the government promised former residents access to their cemeteries;
Because many cemetery roads are in need of maintenance.

Response

Cemetery access is guaranteed in the LBL Protection Act. Each cemetery is treated on a case by case basis.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

247	7	Maintain all numbered roads and cemetery roads. Have a public hearing if a road is going to be closed.
49	3	A lot of the roads to the cemeteries are in bad shape, blocked off or in some cases closed. Why is this?
240	2	The Forest Service has no management authority regarding the cemeteries in LBL. There should be no gates or other restrictions to access to the cemeteries.
272	4	Restoring the original promise that families have unencumbered access to all cemeteries so they can visit, maintain, and use them.
265	1	As stated in numerous written and oral communications, and as supported by resolutions by local county governments and by the Kentucky State Legislature, we reject the Forest Service's right to "manage" or in any way regulate our use of our cemeteries. As has been made equally plain in other contexts, we also reject the right of the Forest Service to in any way impede access to a cemetery. A gated road is an impediment to access, regardless of whether or not a key is available during business hours.
246	8	Access to all cemeteries.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should work more closely with local communities. To give back to the public.

Response

The working relationships and partnerships with local communities are very important and as discussed in both the Plan and EIS, carefully considered in all decisions. The Forest Service welcomes the opportunity to do more in the future, and strategic goals and objectives have been identified in the Plan to support this part of our mission.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	34	Page 58: Outreach opportunities with the surrounding communities and school districts are also explored. This should be made mandatory and inserted into an employee's PPR for annual review and critique of their success, or lack thereof. Page 58: Formal education groups - educational objectives. These must be coordinated with the state Departments of Education and the local site based councils in the surrounding area to be successful.
189	19	Emphasize partnerships and cooperation with community, county, and state government agencies, private corporations and citizen groups, and other federal agencies. Support.
92	4	I feel that coordinated efforts in both KY and TN for LBL would serve the environment better.
10	6	There seems to be a need to work more with local government of TN & KY.
10	10	Find ways to give back to communities involved in formation of LBL to counties in KY & TN through school systems.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should be truthful.

Response

The Forest Service has been honest with the public and will continue to be in the future.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

31	1	Your plans for the future of LBL is as bogus as your organization. I thought TVA reigned supreme in their ability to open their mouths and spout lies, but I was wrong. The amazing thing is that the employees can do this with such a straight face!
29	2	Consider telling the truth.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not rely primarily on data and research compiled in-house.
Because it is not objective or accurate.

Response

The Forest Service attempts to use all available and pertinent data in making its decisions. Some of this data was collected by the Forest Service and some came from subject matter experts in their respective fields. Additional information was provided by the public as part of the scoping and comment processes and has been incorporated into our analyses.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

263	3	Data [for the plan] has been compiled mostly in-house, and is neither objective nor accurate. Based on information given at appreciative inquiries, FS employees have stepped into several roles as information suppliers, and many have been introduced as "experts" in various fields which have little connection to their education, experience and/or credentials.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider the preferences of the regional community as most important in LBL decisions.

Response

Various representatives from the regional community provided valuable input for consideration. All input was considered in developing the final plan. Thank you for your thoughts and we appreciate your comments

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

13	2	Visitors should not have any input and people whose families did not live in the LBL boundaries should be excluded from decision making. I feel like I was robbed of part of my heritage by TVA and those responsible for my not growing up knowing the area like I should have.
201	9	Page 1: Paragraph 6: "LBL has focused on providing a document..." You refer to "our preferences" and I can only assume this means the USFS preferences. Actually, the focus should be on the preferences of the impacted stakeholders in the western Kentucky and Tennessee region. Each decision made in this EIS must consider the direct impact on the businesses surrounding LBL and the economic feasibility of such decisions on these stakeholders. Further, it these decisions must accurately reflect any impacts on air and water quality.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not use economic drivers to select a management plan.
Because economic drivers only continue the failed policies of TVA;
Because economic biases taint the legitimacy of the plan.

Response

The identification of the selected alternative is part of the NEPA process and considers many different factors and a wide breadth of information. Decision criteria used came from the LBL Protection Act, Forest Service Strategic Plan and Mission, Planning Regulations, as well as national, regional and local concerns and issues. Economic considerations are an important part of this overall process but only one of the factors considered.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	36	Unfortunately, the evaluation of Alternatives was apparently influenced by smaller criteria, such as cashing in on the economic trends. This was what directly drove TVA's infamous change of management directions and the Forest Service is unabashedly offering only a continuation of that trend. That the public was so carefully directed away from Alternative Z; that Alternative Z was misrepresented via an evaluation in the DEIS that considered only select criteria while ignoring others; that the emphasis is on commercial logging for forest management, commercial farming for open lands management and high fee recreational options, all reflect an underlying bias that has tainted the Draft Plan to the point of its being illegitimate.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider habitat and recreational needs in choosing a management plan.
Because the current inventories and assessments are not legitimate.

Response

The Forest Service attempts to use all available and pertinent data in making its decisions. Some of this data was collected by the Forest Service and some came from subject matter experts in their respective fields. Additional information was provided by the public as part of the scoping and comment processes. The identification of the selected alternative is part of the NEPA process and considers many different factors and a wide breadth of information. Decision criteria used came from the LBL Protection Act, Forest Service Strategic Plan and Mission, Planning Regulations, as well as national, regional and local concerns and issues.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	33	Second, the long-term projected needs of the region, both for recreation and for under represented habitat, must be the criteria for choosing the direction in which natural resource management should take LBL. Merely claiming that an inventory exists and that a narrow slice of the recreational needs are being met does NOT serve as a legitimate assessment of the facts.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should conduct a more thorough cost-benefit analysis of its LRMP and maximize net benefits.

Because they are bound to do so by the National Forest Management Act;

To better represent the public benefits of forest management;

To better represent the public's recreation desires;

To determine local and regional economic impacts of proposed plans;

To determine the environmental costs of alternatives.

Response

A thorough and comprehensive cost analysis of the various plan options was accomplished following Forest Service protocol, documenting the expected impact and associated cost of each option. Additional information related to public benefits and passive use values was added between draft and final. The analysis can be found in the EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

226	5	(continued from comment 4) Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Ch. 3, p. 242, states in the paragraph about Direct, Indirect, and Cumulative Economic Effects: "The management of Land Between The Lakes has the potential to affect jobs and income within its area of influence. Employment and income estimates were determined by using the input-output model IMPLAN (Impact for Planning Analysis). Due to substitution effects from competing non-government sources, these jobs are characterized as being associated with local economic activity initiated by Forest Service programs and activities, rather than caused by these activities." Trying to understand what the difference is between "initiated" and "caused," we came to the conclusion that what this sentence means is the following: That if the Forest Service stops providing certain services at LBL, the surrounding communities will step in and provide them instead, with no net loss of incomes or jobs. This interpretation was confirmed by the following sentence in Chapter 3, p. 246: "Economically speaking, commodity-oriented alternatives have a greater role in producing impacts on the economy. However, substitutions may occur in certain sectors, such as those related to the timber program, where non-government owners could supply those entities the timber demanded in this local economy. Therefore, there would likely be no loss of jobs or income from a reduced federal timber program." Taking this into account, we suggest that the employment and labor income figures for alternative "Z" be reconsidered. It is Alternative "Z" that reflects a greater reduction in Forest Service activities than other alternatives. It should therefore be analyzed which of these services, besides timber, are likely to be substituted by the private sector, and therefore will not lead to the lower numbers for employment and labor income that the DEIS displays.
-----	---	--

-
- 226 11 (continued from comment 10) Or, Forest Service managers could have used benefit transfer and discussed studies done on passive use values in the region. The concept of passive use value may sound terribly abstract, but in fact, people regularly manifest passive use values by donating money to such entities as The Nature Conservancy to protect parcels of land that they will likely never visit. Passive use values are generally measured through contingent valuation surveys that elicit households' willingness to pay. Damage to passive use values is one of the non-market economic costs federal agencies must address to ensure that decisions are being made in a manner that maximizes net public benefits. For example, the Department of the Interior includes passive use values in its procedures for valuing natural resource damages under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (Kopp and Smith, 1993).
- 226 10 (continued from comment 9) A qualitative analysis of Net Present Value of the management alternatives could proceed in the following way: First Step: The difference between the quantifiable Net Present Values of Alternative Z and Alternative Y (which has the highest Net Present Value of all the alternatives) is \$375,128. Second Step: Is the increased quantifiable benefit of "Y" compared to "Z" likely to outweigh the increased passive use value associated with "Z"? Here, managers could qualitatively describe these passive use values. In the case of the different alternatives in the DEIS, managers could have compared and contrasted the different alternatives' passive use values in the same way. For example, perhaps Alternative Y has a higher net present value in qualitative terms, but in Alternative Z, the people of the region and in other parts of the United States will be better off because they know that under this alternative forests will not be logged, wild places not replaced by commercial development, and therefore sensitive wildlife that thrive in wild places will be better off. Therefore, Alternative Z has a higher actual net present value.
- 226 9 (continued from comment 8) There is reason to assume that an inclusion of qualitative considerations in the net present valuations could lead to much higher Net Present Value for Alternative Z than currently assumed in Table 3.4.7.H, to a degree that Z may become the preferred alternative) It is likely that Alternative "Z" has a much higher passive use value (existence, option, and bequest value) associated with it than the other alternatives. Alternative Z is about reduced intervention into natural processes. Research into the demand for and supply of wilderness (Cordell, H. Ken, 1999, Loomis, Bonetti, Echohawk, 1999, p. 374) comes to the conclusion that a review of the literature on passive use values, such as existence and, bequest values, provided by wilderness protection suggests that the nonrecreation benefits of Wilderness are larger in percentage terms and in the aggregate than the recreation use benefits of wilderness. Accurate assessment of the benefits of wilderness management and designation requires inclusion of these benefits. Otherwise, benefits of Wilderness are underestimated by at least 50 percent.

-
- 226 12 (continued from comment 11) (Haefele et al., 1992), conducted a CV mail survey of North Carolina households regarding their annual willingness to pay (WTP) to protect: (1) spruce- fir forests along the roads and trails in the Southern Appalachian Mountains; and (2) all spruce-fir forests in the Southern Appalachian Mountains. Program (1) represented about one-third of forest area in program (2). They found total economic values (TEV) of \$73 (in 2001) for program 1 and \$124 (in \$2001) for program 2. Respondents were also asked to decompose these total values into use(recreation) and nonuse components. In each case, over 80 percent (\$58 and \$90, respectively) of the total value was attributed to nonuse motives (existence and bequest)...(Reaves et al., 1999) used a CV survey to evaluate household WTP for protecting old-growth long-leaf pine habitats for the red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) in the 250,000 acre Francis Marion National Forest in South Carolina. ...Respondents were asked for their individual annual WTP for two different protection programs (1) acreage suitable for 50 percent survival probability for the RCW (current conditions), and (2) acreage suitable for 99 percent survival probability for the RCW (improved conditions). While the study produced a number of value estimates...we focus here a conservative value estimate. As such, the mean annual WTP for South Carolina residents for restoration of oldgrowth pine forests sufficient to improve RCW survival probability from 50 percent to 99 percent was \$8.38 per person (in 2001). They argue that the values elicited would be almost entirely comprised of nonuse motivations. These studies may not be "perfectly scientific," however, just as the Forest Service relied on "professional expertise and judgment" to come up with predictions for growth in visitation under the two preferred alternatives, they could also use this judgment to compare and contrast qualitative differences between alternatives.
- 226 8 The Net Present Value calculation of Ch. 3. 4.7 of the DEIS does not include a systematic qualitative analysis of passive and other non-monetary values, even though it states that such a qualitative analysis is necessary, as the quotes from the document below indicate. The DEIS states in Ch. 3, p. 247, that "...The NFMA regulations define net public benefits as: "An expression used to signify the overall long-term value to the nation of all outputs and positive effects (benefits) less all associated inputs and negative effects (costs) whether they can be quantitatively valued or not. Net public benefits are measured by both quantitative and qualitative criteria, rather than a single measure or index [36 CFR 219.3]." A qualitative analysis that is integrated with the quantitative one is especially important if there is reason to believe that qualitative aspects, such as passive use values, may differ between the alternatives, or, as in the case of LBL, that people are holding values that are "highly personal and subjective in nature" that differ between alternatives.

-
- 226 4 In order for the Forest Service experts in Atlanta to use IMPLAN, they must rely on the LBL to give them forecasts on how each alternative will grow or decrease visitation to the area. We were given a table with numbers that supposedly was used as a basis for IMPLAN. When we asked how the LBL arrived at their conclusions in this table, which state a decrease for most uses under Alternative "Z", we were told "professional judgment and expertise." Being that Forest Service managers seem to have a bias toward developing the area, and respond to budgetary incentives and other institutional biases, we feel that this protocol is too subjective and leaves the entire analysis open to a bias in the direction of development. The table that we reviewed does not clarify the assumptions that have gone into it. Estimated uses are dependent on two components: Supply and Demand. When supply of certain LBL-related services (availability of campgrounds, trailheads, fishing docks, wildlife viewing opportunities etc.) is reduced, this may lead to a reduction in the number of visitors. Are the reductions in resource output for Alternative Z in this table based on the assumption of a reduced supply of such services? While it may be reasonable to assume that some visitors will stay away if certain services are reduced, such a view disregards other aspects of the demand side. ...The demand for "wild recreation" is on the rise. This demand will not be manifest in increased visitor numbers until there is an increased supply of wild areas. ...it is likely that those visitors that stay away because they have a demand for "developed" recreation, will be replaced by visitors that have a preference for "wild" recreation. Loomis, Bonetti, Echohawk, (in: Cordell, 1999, p. 374) state that there is a statistically significant positive influence of additional Wilderness acreage on recreation use. Taking into account this increased demand for "wild recreation" do those #'s...for Alt Z make sense?
- 226 3 (continued from comment 2) Do the figures representing the PV Costs include estimates of environmental costs associated with each alternative? Environmental impacts are detailed in Chapter 3 (soil erosion, air pollution from controlled burning ..), and there are differences among the alternatives. If environmental costs are not included in the PV Costs, then they should be considered qualitatively. The agency uses a model to determine the effects of their management decisions on the local economy. This model is called IMPLAN, and was sold by the Forest Service to a private firm in Minnesota. When we asked for a copy of IMPLAN so that we could understand the basic assumptions and underlying tenets of the model, we were told that since the software was privately owned, we were only able to purchase a copy. The price of IMPLAN makes it prohibitively expensive for us as lay people to purchase. Therefore, we are essentially blocked out of truly understanding the process the Forest Service economists use to arrive at their economic impact numbers. When we pointed out that we therefore could not say we truly understood neither the process nor the conclusions, a Forest Service employee told us "it wasn't the Forest Service's fault that we didn't understand regional economic input-output modeling. Maybe we should take a course." The Forest Service has taken the attitude of "trust us, we're the experts." Being that this DEIS is supposed to be a tool for the public to understand and participate in the forest's long term planning, we find this response unacceptable. The Forest Service should make clear in the document itself the assumptions that are included in the model.

-
- 226 2 (continued from comment 1) In Chapter 3, in a paragraph entitled "Present Net Value of the Alternatives" Table 3.4.7H shows the estimated benefits, costs and present net value (PNV) of alternatives W, X, Y, and Z. The benefits include market values and non-market estimated values. It is not revealed in the DEIS what percentage of the Present Value of Benefits is based on market values, and what percentage is based on non-market values, and exactly what market and non-market values are taken into account. It is also not clear what the non-market values are based on. The only hint as to the source of the numbers is: "And for those non-market resources that have Forest Service estimated values from research (recreation), we have presented values in the present net value calculations." (Ch. 3, p. 248) For the public to be able to make meaningful comments and to question the accuracy of the information presented in the DEIS, it is important that there is transparency regarding assumptions that were made in arriving at Benefits and Costs and what information was used to arrive at these numbers.
- 226 1 There doesn't seem to be any discussion of costs and budgetary implications of management alternatives W, X, Y, and Z. The only indication of the costs of the different management alternatives is in Table 3.4.7.H: Cumulative Decadal Present Values of Costs and Benefits. In this table, the present value costs of alternatives W, X and Y mysteriously all add up to the same amount: \$163,269, while Alternative Z has a present value cost of \$133,120. There is no discussion in the Draft EIS of what goes into these cost calculations. Therefore, we can only speculate that lower PV Costs for Alternative Z might be associated with lower budgetary impact. If that is true, Alternative Z should be a preferred alternative, given this statement in the Summary Chapter: Summary of Draft Plan and DEIS p. 7: "Through sound fiscal practices, improved efficiencies and adaptive processes, LBL should be expected to operate at a lower appropriated budget level in the future. This may require that some current activities or facilities be consolidated. The public will be actively involved in implementation of such changes." The public needs budget information in order to determine what is the best fiscal alternative. We suggest a discussion of the amount of user fees, including timber sale receipts and recreation fees, that would be required under each alternative, the congressional appropriations to run the programs, and whether or not they would differ by alternative, where the user fees and appropriations go and what programs they fund, etc.
- 221 2 The FS is bound by NFMA regulations to choose the alternative which maximizes net public benefit. In order to do this, the agency must, under the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA), determine the relative values of the various resources on LBL in relation to other local, regional, and national private and public lands and resources.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should employ a multiple-use philosophy in decisionmaking.
To maintain a healthy forest;
Because Alternatives X and Y do not represent multiple-use concepts.

Response

The Alternatives presented comply with all applicable laws and represent variations of multiple use management. The mission of LBL is much more specific than other National Forest units given that LBL is a National Recreation Area and must comply with the prescriptive and careful wording of the LBL Protection Act.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 227 | 7 | The TN Div. of Forestry's main concern is that LBL maintain a healthy vigorously growing forest. We feel that using multiple-use concepts will achieve this objective. |
| 265 | 17 | LBL is touted as a multiple use recreation area, yet Alternatives X and Y obviously cater to those segments of the population who can and will pay more, and to those activities that involve higher cost. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should include public debate and public opinion in its analysis of management plan options, and not ignore comments.
Because many opinions offered were disregarded;
Because there is a need to improve public relations between area residents and the government.

Response

The Forest Service has conducted an extensive public involvement process that has been very effective. Its Advisory Board, whose mission is to help advise the Forest Service on public participation in this planning effort has been very active in designing and validating these processes. All input, from all sources, has been considered in making decisions related to the final plan. The plan is a strategic document that does not make specific, tactical or policy related decisions. Comments directed at that level of management may not be visible at the strategic plan level but they have been considered as possible examples to consider in development of strategies. If they did not violate applicable laws, all comments were reviewed and considered. The goal to continue to develop positive working relationships with local communities is part of the final plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 214 | 6 | I hope that comments for this will be taken seriously instead of including what you want to hear and leaving out the rest. We've had enough of the lying to the public and just being told what we want to hear then turning around and doing as the management pleases. The attitude towards the government in the area is not real great. . . this is an opportunity for the Forest Service to heal some of the wounds from the past instead of making new ones. |
|-----|---|--|

-
- 265 14 It is obvious that the public opinion was overwhelmingly against commercial development inside LBL. This is reflected in recorded comments from the public meetings (though the Forest Service records often appear to water down the actual comments), and in Forest Service documents from surveys conducted inside LBL. It is also reflected in the more than 30,000 signatures asking for the removal of existing commercial facilities. Though this is a significant percentage of the local population, we were told that such petitions are not given consideration. I would like it to be included in the record that the petition exists, that we still have the signatures in our possession, and are able to present them for review at any time.
- 226 15 Disregard for Alternative W and Alternative Z. The DEIS clearly states that the Forest Service is NOT open to considering it. It seems disingenuous to claim that "you can still comment on Z, if you really want to, but we are really only interested in comments on X and Y." Combined with the economic impact analysis that artificially dismisses Z, this seems to clearly channel the public into consideration of only X and Y. If the bulk of the comments will not be based on a true consideration of all alternatives, or at least misrepresentation, then this seems to invalidate the process.
- 265 6 The DEIS lists Native American Tribes that were consulted during the development of the Plan. The absence of organizations representing the interests of those who were forcibly removed for the LBL project is painfully obvious. No legitimate claim that our cultural concerns were addressed can be made when we were not given formal recognition. On this basis alone, the Draft Plan is incomplete and should be revised accordingly.
- 192 1 After looking at your plan I was disappointed to see that several items I brought up were not found anywhere. Why do you ask for comments and ignore comments? If your mind is made up, just do what you are goin to due and don't waste my time. If not maybe it was oversite.
- 201 19 Page 5: Concerns the public raised during the planning process are not addressed in the Plan. These concerns have been forwarded to LBL management for further consideration. -- This is simply not acceptable. Until you can come to a consensus and resolve these public issues, discuss those resolutions in this document for the public to see and integrate your decision making processes it is not plausible that you can proceed forward with a strategic plan of action. Simply, you will not have any buy-in from the stakeholders that brought these concerns to the USFS. If these concerns are not addressed in this plan, the stakeholders will have to revert to carrying them to their federally elected representatives for resolution.
- 201 20 The TVA [NRMP] alternatives were soundly rejected by the stakeholders and continued pressing of these alternatives and subsequent actions is what led to the public revolt of TVA operations. The public continues to raise objections to the commercialization and it continues to be ignored by the USFS. There is no need to reanalyze alternatives that were soundly rejected. Yet, there is reason to analyze as required by law a "No Action Alternative".

Public Concern

The Forest Service should more clearly and quickly communicate information to the public.
Because the website is very confusing.

Response

Thank you for your comments. The Plan and FEIS were edited to clarify and improve the usability of the documents.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 237 | 35 | We also complain about how long it took for the FS to get information to David Nickell in response to his questions about this - information that we were also waiting to obtain. This didn't give us a proper opportunity to respond, and the information supplied was less than high quality. |
| 196 | 3 | A lot of what you guys were trying to tell me I could not understand. |
| 145 | 1 | I would first like to begin by saying that the website is very confusing regarding the proposals. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should refine its public information sessions structures.
Because there was little room for input at such meetings;
Because there were too few meetings in appropriate areas.

Response

The public information sessions were offered to assist people in understanding how to provide input during the public comment phase. Comments could be provided in numerous ways for public convenience. We appreciate your thoughts.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 217 | 1 | I was quite surprised to find that the recent "public information sessions" focused on telling people "how to comment" on the FS preferred plan, and were formatted in such a way that there was no room for input from those in attendance. I would like to believe that this federal agency will recognize citizen's comments regardless of format or content. |
| 265 | 11 | This [confusion about alternatives] was greatly exacerbated by the small number of meetings and the inability of the public to engage in question and answer sessions. That meetings were not held in some of the areas with the largest concentrations of users clearly served to stifle public input into the Plan proposal. One must wonder if the intention was to avoid the anticipated public input, since there can be no doubt which side of the development issue it would have been on. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should update monitoring done by TVA on forests and environmental impact analyses.
To ensure legitimacy for a management plan;
Because information has changed in the last decade.

Response

The Forest Service attempts to use all available and pertinent data in making its decisions. Some of this data was collected by the Forest Service and some came from subject matter experts in their respective fields. Additional information was provided by the public as part of the scoping and comment processes. A number of existing studies were updated and utilized. A science review was conducted to validate our use of that information and identify other data sources.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 281 | 1 | Environmental impact analysis completed in association with TV A's plan is now more than ten years old. The EIS should describe the process used by the Forest Service to validate that environmental analysis completed in association with the Natural Resources Management Plan is still relevant and accurate (not stale). At a minimum, the EIS should reevaluate impacts of actions proposed in the TVA plan on those issues that are now better understood than they were in 1994. |
| 265 | 32 | There is no accurate inventory of LBL's forest. Before any Plan can be legitimately put into place for LBL, it must first be known what actually exists in LBL, and what it's condition is. TVA did leave an inventory of the forest, but it is very limited, and often just inaccurate. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should clarify whether the Heritage Resources Management Plan is NEPA-compliant.

Response

The plan and EIS have been re-edited to clarify strategic issues. The HRMP is a separate reference document.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 281 | 2 | The plan states that the Heritage Resources Management Plan (HRMP) is incorporated by reference. It does not state if the HRMP was prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). If not, the impacts of the actions proposed under of the HRMP must be evaluated as part of this EIS. |
|-----|---|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should analyze commitments made to former residents in its analysis of management plan alternatives. Because former commitments are never mentioned in the Draft Plan or DEIS; Because considering former commitments would drive the public towards alternatives other than the agency's preferred.

Response

The mission of LBL is clearly outlined in the carefully worded LBL Protection Act. The Forest Service is required to comply with this and all applicable laws. The history and culture of this special place and the reserved rights of former residents are very important and as discussed in both the Plan and EIS, carefully considered in all decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 265 | 9 | Had the public been informed that Alternative W was not a possibility, Alternative Z keeps the commitments and the Promise, while Alternatives X and Y violate the Promise, I do not believe there would be any doubt as to the outcome. There can be no doubt that if the Plan had contained references to the commitments and the original intentions of LBL's management in the analysis of the Alternatives, Alternative Z could not have been summarily dismissed and would have almost certainly have been the preferred option under any legitimate analysis that factored in the qualitative values-as required by law. That no such reference was made, and Alternative Z was summarily dismissed while all factors that would have proven both its desirability and viability were excluded from the comparison of the Alternatives reveals a bias on the part of the Forest Service toward development and away from the commitments and Promise. There is simply no other way to explain how an issue that has been at the center of the heated LBL debate for years could garner no mention at all in either the Proposed Plan or the DEIS. |
| 265 | 5 | A proper analysis of LBL as a TCP would impact how the Alternatives are perceived, and thus how the "preferred" Alternative is designated. It is clear from the Forest Service rules that qualitative values, such as a public that perceives the managing agency to be honorable in upholding commitments and respecting cultural rights, are to be utilized in a comparison of the Alternatives. That Alternative Z does move towards upholding the commitments while X and Y abandon them is not factored into the DEIS. In fact, the Promise and commitments are never mentioned, although perfunctory statements about respecting the continuing needs of the "former residents" are added. How much value should a proper analysis of the alternatives place on the good will of those who are most committed to the land? How much value should be placed on the clear public objection to the developments inside LBL? These questions are not addressed in the DEIS even though they are surely vital components for the future of LBL. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should have completed a more careful public analysis of Alternative Z.

Because independent evaluation suggests the public was misguided in the economic analysis of alternatives;

Because Alternative Z was too easily dismissed.

Response

The Forest Service has reviewed and revised the socio-economic section of the DEIS based on this and other comments received. The analyses have been revised for all alternatives. All alternatives were fairly treated in the drafts using standard planning processes. New information has been incorporated.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 265 | 39 | Had a careful analysis considering the current state of LBL's natural resources, and the data leading to projected trends, been given legitimate consideration, Alternative Z would have been much less easily dismissed-and potentially emerged as the most beneficial option. |
| 265 | 13 | The Management Plan gives a polite gesture towards acknowledging the original mission and the Promise, without ever naming it, with Alternative Z. This Alternative is then summarily dismissed and the public is left with the impression that the only Alternatives being considered are X and Y, which differ only in how the mission and Promise will be abandoned. This decision is apparently based on an economic analysis of the Alternatives and their impact on the region, and public input from the initial round of public meetings. An independent evaluation of the economic analysis of the Alternatives is underway, but is not yet complete. Early indications are that the analysis was based on false assumptions, faulty data, and the careful exclusion of variables that would have added weight to the no development Alternative. The result is that the public was misguided when asked to comment on the Alternatives. Claiming Alternative Z is likely to have a negative economic impact on the region and X and Y will have positive impacts, when indications are that a proper analysis would show the opposite to be true should be enough to invalidate the scoping process. The public should be informed of alternative funding options that could enhance Environmental Education and recreation opportunities under Alternative Z, the economic benefits that could clearly come from private investors not having competition from within LBL, the advantages of not treating visitors to a public land as if they were customers in a business environment, and the detrimental aspects of Alternatives X and Y -which are never mentioned. In summary, the entire proposed Plan appears to be based on a biased, or at very least inaccurate, economic analysis. More details of the economic analysis will be contained in the supplemental document to be submitted by our economic consultant. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should manage LBL's natural resources in the context of the broader region.
Because there are species and communities lacking throughout the region.

Response

The Forest Service attempts to use all available and pertinent data in making its decisions. Some of this data was collected by the Forest Service and some came from subject matter experts in their respective fields. Additional information was provided by the public as part of the scoping and comment processes. A number of existing studies were updated and utilized. A science review involving regional experts, scientists, agency specialists and academia was conducted to validate our use of that information and identify additional data sources. Site specific, local and regional research, literature and information has been considered.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 265 | 29 | LBL's natural resources should be managed in the context of the broader region and a scientific analysis of what is most lacking and what is most rapidly disappearing there. Though there is mention of such a regional context, there is no indication that this was actually done. |
| 265 | 34 | Any legitimate analysis of the Alternatives should have taken into account the facts about the state of the region's biological systems and habitats, AND to what extent LBL is capable of providing what it is impossible to provide on private lands. Including such criteria in consideration of the Alternatives would have added even more weight to Alternative Z, but this was not done. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better analyze the open lands data in the EIS.
Because the data for open lands is less developed than for cultivated lands;
Because the DEIS doesn't address all open land types;
To ensure interior forest bird species' health.

Response

Refer to Desired Condition discussion and program goals for Open Lands in the LRMP. Acres of native grasses and its restoration is displayed in the FEIS. 75 acres will be converted annually to native grasses under the preferred alternative. Cultivated cover community types are discussed in Chapter 3, FEIS and acres displayed in the tables. Croplands and wildlife plantings benefit wildlife while providing low cost wildlife habitat. "Some" (not all) cultivated lands are include in the optimal benchmark for sustaining diversity because of Native American cultivation. Barren and prairie systems and their existence at LBL is discussed in Chapter 3, FEIS, Historical Perspective. Fragmentation and interior birds are discussed in Chapter 3, FEIS, Forest Interior Bird Habitat and represented by the MIS species in effects by alternative. The grassland component of woodlands has been clarified in the FEIS and Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 221 17 While there could be a justification for managing a small amount of edge openlands to maintain a high quality openland habitat, this should be based on the existing ecological community onsite currently. If a site has good openland community plants and animals, and is situated in a location that would minimize fragmentation impacts, then we could see justification for managing the land in a sustainable, low impact manner to maintain this community. We cannot support a pre-determined, geographically distributed openlands system just to maintain habitat diversity. This will decrease regional biodiversity in the long run due to habitat fragmentation and does not properly consider the availability of such lands elsewhere in the region and nation.
- 45 7 The parts of the Draft Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement that concern me most are those related to open lands and interior forest birds. I was pleased to see that open lands can be reallocated to more appropriate site types in the future, but it appears that only 600-800 acres of native grasses will be added under alternatives X or Y. Surely if there is to be an emphasis on trying to recreate conditions more like those found at LBL prior to European settlement, there should be more of an effort to restore barrens on appropriate site types rather than maintaining the relatively large acreages of hay fields and croplands that currently exist, whether they are reallocated or not. I didn't find any justification for maintaining those land use practices other than a brief statement on page 195 of the DEIS that suggested that because Native Americans cultivated some land on flat, fertile riparian sites that cropland is included as a benchmark. I still have a hard time understanding why thousands of acres of cropland and hayfields are needed within the LBL landscape to provide watchable wildlife experiences. It seems there must be other ways to provide those kinds of opportunities that would have less detrimental effects on forest-breeding bird populations.
- 45 8 This part of the DEIS that addresses open lands seems very poorly developed compared to the sections that deal with other habitat types. For example, on page 126 there are descriptions of grassland cover community types that include everything from native grasslands to hayfields to mowed rights-of ways. Then cultivated cover types are broken into cropland, wildlife plantings and wood openings. Yet, in table 3.2.5A on page 127, the cover community types are broken out by xeric and dry site types, but it only totals to about 2400 acres. Where are the rest of the 7,500+ acres of open land community cover types addressed? From there, the next set of tables only talk about the amount of "grassland" on different sites types under the various alternatives, but don't separate hayfields from native grasses from wildlife openings, etc. Those different kinds of "grasslands" function very differently in their ability to support healthy pops of birds of conservation concern. Will only 1200-1400 acres of native grass really come as a result of this plan? Will the majority of the rest be in hayfields, crops, and other non-native grass-forb mixes? That needs to be made more explicit.

-
- 45 10 Also, with regards to the relationship between cropland, wildlife openings, etc. and the discussion of interior forest birds, on page 145 the DEIS implies that because the acreages of cultivated lands is small relative to the overall percentage of forest cover, that interior forest birds won't suffer reduced rates of predation and parasitism as a result. Yet, it fails to mention the work that Dave Buehler's student Richard Miles did at LBL in the early 1990s showing that it was apparent that reproductive success of forest songbirds was significantly impaired by cowbird parasitism (citation below). The abstract states "Cowbirds were more abundant at forest-opening edges than at interior forest point ($P > 0.05$) Forest opening size (ha), average height of the vegetation in the opening, and the number of potential cowbird foraging locations within 2 km of the opening were the best predictors of the presence of nest parasitism presence/absence in forest openings" Opening size and number of foraging sites within 2 km were positively correlated with parasitism and vegetation height was negatively associated.
- 45 11 In addition to that work at LBL, a few more recent papers also show that cropland interspersed in a forested landscape can have very negative affects on nest success even in areas where the 70-80% threshold of forest cover is met across a large landscape. I think the reason that wasn't picked up in the Robinson et. al. paper published in Science in 1995 is because their study sites that were surrounded by large expanses of forest cover were in the Missouri Ozarks where there is very little cropland. Clearcuts do not seem to have the same negative impacts, and probably some amount of the early successional forest in the landscape is good as the DEIS mentions. One last comment on the interior bird section of the DEIS. . .it postulates that because LBL is largely surrounded by lakes that the influx of cowbirds and nest predators from surrounding private lands are impeded. The literature shows that cowbirds can easily fly miles from foraging and roost areas to host sites and back each day and I think it's equally plausible that you could have greater than average densities of predators at LBL because their dispersal from the peninsula is made harder due to the lakes.

265 42 It is claimed that open lands are a vital component of the biological processes and the habitat of the LBL. If this is true, then surely the conversion of these fields from soybeans, corn, fescue, Johnson grass and seresca lespedeza to native grasses is the only proper course. To what extent such fields are even desirable, despite our emotional and cultural connection to them, should be tempered by the study in the Forest Service's possession that prior to the first settlements by Europeans, the peninsula between the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers was almost exclusively hardwood forest. The clearing for fields came later. The land between the two rivers was NOT part of the Barrens. In short, if the open lands are a desirable condition in biological terms, and indicated as a need in the context of the larger biological region beyond LBL's boundaries, then make that argument. Educate and inform the public based on the actual scientific principles. DO NOT base the goal of "wildlife viewing areas" and "Oak-Grassland" habitats on the false claim that it represents a restoration of the natural condition of the land prior to settlement. The history of this land and its people is already distorted enough. By basing the goals on what is demonstrably a false assertion the Forest Service is left open to the accusation of merely seeking another excuse for commercial thinning. Unless the goal is based on demonstrable facts and sound reasoning, it is difficult to believe otherwise. That the proposed projects are in the Coalins area must also be considered as we re-evaluate the TCP status of the land.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do further socioeconomic analysis and environmental analysis on the LRMP.
Because while the private sector can provide developed areas for recreation, it cannot provide large blocks of mature forest;
Because there is no clarity on market versus non-market value in the DEIS;
Because only environmentally damaging activities are deemed economically positive in the DEIS.

Response

The Forest Service has reviewed and revised the socio-economic section of the DEIS based on this and other comments received. The analyses have been revised for all alternatives. The value of forests and role of the private sector outside of LBL have been carefully considered.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

237 33 Then, there is no attempt to try and properly incorporate this plan [Heritage Resource Plan] into the overall management plan. How are these management activities prescribed in the plan going to impact the cultural aspects of the LBL area? How does this interact and interplay with "the Promise" and the suffering of the former residents? Having some "Heritage Plan," that is incomplete and not properly promulgated standing alone off to the side while this issue of the cultural and heritage values of the area are brewing. It isn't a rational planning method.

-
- 237 34 We have serious concerns about the economic analysis in the plan and EIS. This analysis, with little or no supporting data, makes conclusory assertions about which alternatives provide a "positive" or "negative" overall economic impact. Of course, the alternatives that tout development, fees, logging, farming, and other unsustainable, extractive industries, are determined to be an economic positive, while the fundamentally "green magnet" alternative of area preservation is deemed to be an economic negative. In Chapter 3, in a paragraph entitled "Present Net Value of the Alternatives" Table 3.4.7H shows the estimated benefits, costs and present net value (PNV) of alternatives W, X, Y, and Z. The benefits include market values and non-market estimated values. It is not revealed in the DEIS what percentage of the Present Value of Benefits is based on market values, and what percentage is based on non-market values, and exactly what market and non-market values are taken into account. It is also not clear what the nonmarket values are based on. The only hint as to the source of the numbers is:"and for those non-market resources that have Forest Service estimated values from research (recreation), we have presented values in the present net value calculations." (Ch. 3, p. 248). We're especially interested in how the FS valued so-called "non-market" values and what values were included? For example, was carbon storage and watershed protection given considerable non-market value? How was long term degradation of the habitat and soil that logging, chemicals, and other disturbances would bring, calculated into the economic formula. None of that is clear in the draft EIS.
- 201 27 Page 33: New, mission-appropriate recreational facilities that specifically meet the strategic objectives of the gateway communities may be constructed if the project level NEPA and operating budgets support their creation. If such facilities are proposed I must have socioeconomic impact analysis and environmental analysis to assess the validity of such development. You are on shaky ground if you expect me or any stakeholder in this process to give you a carte blanche pass on this statement. Further, if you insist on leaving this statement in this document you must spell out what the gateway strategic strategies are to allow the reader to determine if there is congruency in your decision making process.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do further analysis of the socioeconomic impacts of the plan on the local community.
 Because this region has a lower than average income level;
 Because local communities are impacted by the need for amenities of LBL visitors.

Response

The Forest Service has reviewed and revised the socio-economic section of the DEIS based on this and other comments received. The analyses have been revised for all alternatives. The value of services needed and provided both within and outside of LBL have been carefully considered. Part of the codified mission of LBL is to stimulate surrounding communities, which includes consideration of the local income levels. This has been an important consideration throughout the planning process and has been clarified even more so in the final documents.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 265 16 The DEIS points out that this region has a lower than average income level and that steps must be taken to ensure that disadvantaged populations are not excluded by fees. I can find no indication that this was considered in the comparison of Alternatives. The DEIS indicates the need to provide commercial (though it does not use that hot button word) amenities in order to increase the length of stay of the visitors. The same document also indicates that the average length of stay at LBL is already substantially longer than the average length of stay at other Forest Service facilities. Such "amenities" increase the expense of visiting LBL - a land that the visitors own - thus targeting the high end visitors and tailoring LBL increasingly to their unique desires. If the cost-benefit analysis in the DEIS had been properly done it would have factored in the effect of excluding the disadvantaged populations. It does not do this, and arrives at a conclusion consistent with the bias towards development as a result. That this is in the same document that acknowledges a lower than average income level for this region and stresses the need to assure no exclusion is remarkable. Would a proper analysis that considers qualitative as well as ALL quantitative factors favor a plan that caters to the wealthy and excludes the population it says must be taken into account? Which has the most positive impact on the region in qualitative and quantitative terms, to encourage longer stays and higher spending rates from the few; or to encourage visitation by a larger percentage of the population, many of whom have no access to the outdoors, much less a truly backcountry environment, except on public lands?
- 263 4 Marketing information is broad, subjective, and inaccurate. For instance, the FS has "proven" that providing commercial services within the park will result in longer stays, which will result in more profit in the surrounding region. I am not a statistician but I believe I could find some flaws in this equation, as can various shopkeepers in the Grand Rivers area. Profiting from campers requires a steady stream of people making their relatively small purchase of forgotten or perishable items. If such items are available at the campground, why would visitors leave to make purchases in the surrounding area?
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use factual data in its studies and documents.

Because economists have discredited visitor counts promoted by TVA;

Because there are Native Americans in this region, though statistics in the DEIS show 0%.

Response

The Forest Service attempts to use all available and pertinent data in making its decisions. Some of this data was collected by the Forest Service and some came from subject matter experts in their respective fields. Additional information was provided by the public as part of the scoping and comment processes. A number of existing studies and data sources were updated and utilized. Site specific, local and regional research, literature and information has been considered.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- 201 25 [Page 13] Your statistics showing 0% Native Americans in the states you list for the "region" is suspect since there are known Native Americans in each of those states. Please double check this data and explain it.

-
- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 180 | 4 | The myth of "2 million visitors" to the LBL promoted by TVA, was punctured by an economist with Midwest Research years ago. It would be better to project future income, visitors, and total use of the Land Between The Lakes by the public on a factual basis. |
| 201 | 24 | LBL has always double and triple counted its attendance. I know and you know that your proclamations of two million plus people are actually visitor incidents, where one person is counted numerous times at various locations in LBL and not actually two million actual people to this project. The only way that you can get an accurate count on visitation is to have gates through which people enter and you count each person coming through in each vehicle and document that vehicle so that it is not counted more than once. If you will look in your library at LBL you will find such a study was conducted in the decade of the 1970s by the Recreation Department, which was under the direction of Richard Cottrell, a former USFS employee who was at the time a TVA employee. The numbers of actual people attending were significantly less than TVA wish to admit and the study was shelved. However, it is to my knowledge the only accurate visitation study for a limited period of time ever conducted at LBL. To continue to promote and market your inaccurate figures and to base your budgeting, planning and evaluations on these figures is to lead you down a false path forward. |
| 265 | 22 | The Forest Service made use of survey results and visitation data accumulated under contract during TVA's tenure. A review of the data reveals several devastating flaws, some of which were drawn out in a LBL Advisory Board meeting. Board members [commented] outside the meeting that it looked to them like visitation actually dropped after TVA's development's were added. This observation was in line with the anecdotal observations of business owners in the surrounding communities who once ran thriving tourism businesses but are now struggling due to a decline in overall visitors, from their perspectives, and competition from within LBL. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should evaluate cumulative impacts in the Environmental Impact Study.
To comply with NEPA.

Response

The final plan and DEIS have been re-edited to improve all of its analyses in compliance with NFMA and NEPA, including the cumulative effects section.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 281 4 The EIS is effectively a programmatic EIS, which is provided for by NEPA and CEQ regulations. As such, it should evaluate its proposed programs (or "policies") in consideration of other programs and policies that are in effect or proposed within the area of potential effect (that is, it should evaluate cumulative impacts). For example, the EIS identifies the "market area" for recreational use of LBL to be 100 linear miles. How will the proposed policies interact with the policies of the states and other land managers in the area? What is the demand for recreation opportunities as described in the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans of Kentucky, Tennessee, and other states within the market area? How will the policies proposed in the LRMP support the statewide policies? Will the policies help satisfy demonstrated demand? Or, will the policies address the esoteric needs of a limited population of recreationists, or simply add to a supply of facilities that already exceeds recreation demand?
- 281 3 Objective 2b states that visitation to Land Between the Lakes will be increased by fifteen percent by the end of 2015. However, the plan provides no evidence of the land's capacity to support this additional use. Neither does the EIS evaluate the impacts that will be created by these additional people. It is reasonable to assume that LBL will need to construct or modify facilities to accommodate the additional use. The Forest Service is reminded that NEPA requires cumulative impact analysis, which would include impacts that would evolve from reasonably foreseeable actions.
- 281 5 The EIS is almost devoid of meaningful analysis of cumulative impacts. Council on Environmental Quality Regulations require that impact analysis includes a discussion of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions. This analysis must be presented regardless of what entity proposed or implemented the related actions. For example, what will be the cumulative impact on the plan on wildlife, forest canopy, etc., when the impacts are added to those created by the planned reconstruction of Highway 68/80 through the recreation area? Both Fort Donelson National Battlefield and the Tennessee National Wildlife Refuge have revisions of their management plans on the horizon. How will the proposed LBL plan integrate with these plans in a regional setting? What might be the cumulative impacts of actions proposed under the various plans?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consolidate its activities and facilities.
To lower its budget.

Response

Thank you for your comment. This has been incorporated into the vision for future management.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- 201 28 The only way that LBL can operate at a lower appropriated budget is to expand its commercial services and compete with the outside sector. I oppose this approach. I support consolidation of activities and facilities to achieve this approach and I support the public being involved in these decisions at a higher level than they have been in the past.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not waste money.

Response

Thank you for your comment.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 49 | 2 | Money - The Forest Service gets 11 million dollars a year for up-keep. I bet a lot of that is wasted on other things. |
| 163 | 3 | It is time for the government (and their taxpayer supported contractors) to get out of the business of trying to be in business. Simply, they have no track record of being successful in balancing their budgets or effectively running commercial operations. I have yet to see any government agency at any level that can compete effectively with the private sector. |
| 192 | 5 | I would like to see what happens with all of the money you collect. As part of this plan, I would like to see "the books" for say the last three years, or since you took over LBL from TVA. Where does the money come from and where does it go. This would give us a better sense of what is going on. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should spend money on safety-related concerns.

Response

Identified safety concerns are the number one priority for funding consideration.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 84 | 2 | Please consider this request [safety of the horse and rider] when deciding the use of the funds. |
|----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should seek grant funding for non-native species management and research.
Because it is less expensive to seek these monies than to monitor contract farming and logging;
Because management of non-native species is less harmful to the landscape;
Because this approach provides an environmental education opportunity.

Response

The Forest Service actively seeks and uses alternative funding. Vegetation management is addressed in the strategies of the plan and supported by analysis in the EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265 44 Such [non-native species mgnt] research and demonstrations incorporated into the management goals of LBL would bring grant money. The costs incurred by seeking research grants from university and government agencies and non-profit organizations would surely be less than the costs of monitoring contract farming and logging operations; and would result in far less damage to the landscape while enhancing the EE programs. Such comparisons were not included in the analysis done in the DEIS. Having done so would have added still more weight to Alternative Z. Concept Zero provided the Forest Service with a series of funding alternatives during the very early stages of the planning process. Such options as research grants, a trust fund for EE, and others were not given mention in the DEIS. I can find no evidence that such options were even considered. We provided examples of public lands that do use such funding options, have very active EE programs and NO commercial developments inside their boundaries. Such places as the Smokey Mountains have an obvious positive effect on the economy of their surrounding regions.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should fund and staff more camps and Environmental Education areas.
To acquaint youth with the natural world.

Response

The analysis of supply and demand indicates that LBL EE facilities currently exceed demand. It is not feasible to provide additional resources that are similar when existing programs and facilities are not being used to capacity.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

146 8 Fund and staff camps and areas such as the Nature Center to acquaint youngsters with the natural world.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should open guard houses and charge a fee to all entering cars.
To raise money.

Response

The Forest Service is prohibited from charging an entrance fee as clearly outlined in the carefully worded LBL Protection Act. The Forest Service is required to comply with this and all applicable laws.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

243 4 If you need to raise money open up the guard houses and charge one dollar for every car that enters.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use taxes and timber sales (not fees) to fund programs.
Because the public pays too much already.

Response

The Forest Service will use timber sale receipts in the future added to the mix of funding currently received from Congressional appropriations plus fees. Congressional funding and timber sale receipts do not cover all operating and maintenance costs.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

17	3	I think yourself, myself, and everyone else pays enough taxes to keep our recreational areas A-#1. The sale of timber alone, for the last 40 years, should have paid for all programs. We don't want to pay additional service fees above our normal taxes.
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should improve personnel development and customer service.

Response

Thank you for your comment.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	29	Page 34: "Recruitment and personal development to develop a customer service approach" - I wholeheartedly support this approach to develop your personnel and develop a "customer service" minded approach.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide more volunteer opportunities. To provide meaningful opportunities for service to people; To expand services.

Response

The Forest Service currently coordinates more than 100,000 hours per year of volunteer time to support LBL and it's customers.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

36	4	Volunteer Assoc. to help provide additional/supplemental work force to expand services.
5	10	An inclusion of more extensive use of volunteerism as a part of the overall management and maintenance plan. Again, this could be done within the more informal policy arena rather than specifically dictated by a management plan.
87	7	The LRMP should make provisions for the organization of Volunteer Groups (similar to The Bugle Corps) to support all of the major LBL "attractions" such as Trails, Wranglers, Planetarium, Nature Station, major Campgrounds, Turkey Bay OHV, etc.
3	3	Interns, like long ago, coming for all seasons' activities. One of the memories our daughter has, back in 70's, 80's were all the activities provided, not just summer.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make a number of editorial changes to the LRMP and EIS.

Response

The draft plan and DEIS have been edited to address this concern.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 270 8 I think the table 3.2.8H needs a little more clarification. It would help to understand how the planning team defines generalists and associates. The way the table flowed was a bit confusing. I think it could easily be remedied
- 201 10 Page 2: What does "more visibility" mean as it relates to the environmental education programs? Page 3: "Dispersed facilities" - what does this mean specifically? I have no basis from which to assess or comment on the gateway communities' economic development without a better definition and an understanding of the gateway strategies. Where does the reader find these strategies? Page 10: Please cite sources of data used in such charts as the LBL current visitors chart. Also, you should define your age parameters: what constitutes a "mature" adult; a "young" adult? Page 10: Define the titles related to local, regional and national market segments. What is the geographic definition of "local and regional"? Does national include Hawaii and Alaska? Page 11: Because of its observatory, LBL is one of the few remote areas in the east with minimal light pollution, which offers darker skies for optimum viewing. " This is illogical and poor writing. The "observatory" has no relation to why LBL is one of the few remote areas with minimal light pollution! Page 12: Woodlands Nature Center. Are these facilities regularly inspected by state and federal officials responsible for ensuring the health and well being of captive animals? Where are the permits issued to the USFS allowing these animals to be kept in captivity available for the public to review? Is the USFS a member of the national associations responsible for the ethical, appropriate handling and health and well being of captive species? If so, what are the associations does the USFS belong to? These should be listed in the document.
- 201 12 (cont from cmt no. 11) Page 21: Please check the spelling of "Prior." I believe the family's name was "Pryor" and that is who the creek is named for. Page 22: Please articulate and explain what efforts are underway to coordinate with the KFWRA and the TWRA as it relates to endangered species management; deer and turkey management; and subsequently what changes you propose to make in deer and turkey hunting, or any other hunting activities at LBL as the result of the property now being managed by the USFS. Page 22: Twelve of the bird species. List these twelve species. Page 22: Currently six evaluation species are considered... List these six evaluation species. Page 23: Please explain what is meant by influencing the built environment. Page 23: Please explain what is meant and intended by Maintenance Levels 5 through 1 and be specific in helping the reader understand what this maintenance impacts. In other words, educate and inform your reader. Page 24: The 1994 NRMP contains eight chapters ... it appears .. This plan overlooked the primary purpose of LBL since there was not a chapter specifically devoted to recreation or environmental education. Not obvious and didn't provide necessary management direction. Can you explain to the public in very specific language what the USFS intentions are for the strategic development of these two areas of public interest? Page 24: If you are going to cite the National Visitor Use Monitoring Study please specifically cite it and give references as to where it can be found. Page 26: "Environmental education is an integrated program targeted at helping individuals. .. " What about groups? The original intention of this program was to expose school groups to environmental education. Page 29: "...and the start of Grant's Civil War career, which eventually led to the White House." Why is it in the document?

-
- 189 24 Restore and maintain healthy forests. Reword to say: Restore and actively manage forests to maintain healthy and desired conditions.
- 201 13 (cont from cmt no. 12)Page 30: "The Forest Service is legally obliged under the LBL Protection Act to"maintain an inventory of and ensure access to cemeteries within the Recreation Area for purposes of burial, visitation and maintenance. All the cemeteries are marked with signs and some also have interpretive signs." This would be an excellent opportunity in this paragraph to reassure the reader that you intend to do just that. Page 31: "Both sessions were well attended... " 27 participants and 31 participants - state the facts and let the reader draw their own conclusions about whether or not these meetings" were well attended." Page 32: "\$600 million tourism industry... " cite your source and references. Page 32: "Within its mission and resource capabilities, LBL will support regional and community strategies. Existing regional partnerships will be maintained and enhanced, and new ones developed." Please explain to the public what you mean by regional and community strategies and list some of these partnerships and how you will maintain or expand on them. Also, clearly articulate and explain what you mean by a "regional partnership." Page 32: "The visiting public will find that public servants they encounter exhibit positive 'customer service' and hospitality attitudes. " Very commendable. What is the incentive for a government employee to exhibit such behavior? Or a better question is, what happens if they don't? Page 32: Define "dispersed opportunities" and "diversity of opportunities. "
- 201 14 (cont from cmt no. 13)Page 32: "Vegetation will be managed to support recreation, scenery, wildlife and forest health objectives, but not for timber production. This means there will be some timber removal. " Does this mean you will do "selective" timber removal or no clearcutting or as you prefer to call it even-aged management? Does this mean that existing timber removal contracts will be cancelled or not renewed? Does this mean that the USFS, which nationwide seems determined to sell as much timber as possible, at least that is the perception, will not be selling timber at LBL and retaining the revenues? Page 33: "Use of herbicides will be reduced and aerial application used rarely, if ever." I commend you for this decision. I would like for you to explain how you will alert the public to aerial application when it is to be used. Also, where will the public be able to view the MSDS sheets for any herbicides that may be used in public areas where they, their children or their pets might be exposed. Page 33: "The rich history of the area and the sacrifice of former residents will be sensitively respected. " Please explain specifically how you expect to do this. Page 33: "Outreach to underrepresented populations will be a priority." Please explain how specifically you will do this.

-
- 201 15 (cont from cmt no. 14) Page 33: "Proven business principles and practices will be used to determine lifecycle costs and appropriately distribute costs only to specialized users." Does this mean that specialized users i.e. horse riders, A TV users, jet skiers will "pay as they go?" What expertise will you bring in to provide you these "proven business principles" and "life cycle costs?" Page 33: "...an exporter of the innovation ... "How do you propose to do this? Page 33: "Testing non-traditional approaches with potential benefits will be encouraged." Specifically give examples of these non-traditional approaches. And discussion should be held in this document as to how these non-traditional approaches will impact the environment and local economy. Page 33: "As a stimulus to the future development of the surrounding area, LBL must support and complement the gateway communities. It must accomplish these things by collaborating with citizens and providing an outstanding recreation area. Through sound fiscal practices, improved efficiencies and adaptive processes, LBL should be expected to operate at a lower appropriated budget. Specifically, how and what do you propose to do to make the operation complementary to these gateway communities? Page 34: "There is an expectation..." This entire paragraph is hyperbole and an EIS or other government document is not the place for it. Page 35: "The Area Supervisor will strive to ... "No, the Area Supervisor "will" "striving" is not acceptable just as "trying" is not - only "doing" is acceptable. Page 35: Strategic Goal 2. How do you propose to do this? Page 37: Semi-primitive motorized. What is this specifically? Page 40: "...such as group selection cuts..." Please define more clearly what you are talking about. Page 41: "solid disturbances and mowing on most open lands..." Please cite the USDA regulations that you are complying with on this.
- 201 11 (cont from cmt no. 10) Page 12: The Homeplace. This facility is inanimate and I don't believe a inanimate object can "host" such things as log homes, barns, etc. Recommend changing this to "features" such attractions as: et.al. Page 12: Compensated volunteers. Please explain what "compensations" are given to people who "volunteer." Also, describe how "volunteers" are recruited. Page 13: Connecting the two 'takes' - should be lakes. Page 13: A third of the two million visitors to LBL are tourists staying in the local or regional areas. You must cite references when you make such broad and sweeping statements. What studies has the USFS done to validate this? How many are day visitors that drive from distances to get there? How many come on busses? How many come as professional groups? Page 13: Other than a few small factories, the predominantly rural areas surrounding LBL are virtually void of significant industry or other employment opportunities for the average skilled worker. If you are going to make this statement you must define precisely what you mean by the "predominantly rural areas" since you have significant industry for the "blue-collar" workers in Calvert City in Marshall County; Hopkinsville and Fort Campbell in Christian County; and Paducah in McCracken County. You must more clearly define "regional" since I don't believe you can validate that a region consists of all the counties in the states of Illinois, Missouri and Indiana, Ohio. Page 19: Recent regional water quality assessments have not shown problems in LBL waters? You must cite a reference if you are going to make this statement and you must clearly define LBL waters. Page 20: Explain what a Biosphere Reserve Core Area is and under whose control it is: the USFS, the USFWS, the states, the United Nation's?

-
- 189 26 The LBL Land and Resource Management Plan will remain effective and usable. Please specify duration of Plan and if it will be amended during that time to address concerns that arise.
- 159 3 Section 1.2, Proposed Action, page 11. The LRMP adds public use, recreation and environmental education activities and their impacts which were not covered in the original NRMP. The original NRMP only proposed actions involving wildlife and forest management. Therefore, alternatives X, Y, and Z add recreation and environmental education activities and their impacts to natural resource management activities. Thus it might be more correct to state that the proposed new LRMP revises and supplements the original LRMP to include public use activities. Recreation Opportunities, page 24. As noted...it may be helpful to explain that the LRMP includes public use, recreation, and environmental education activities which were not covered in the original TVA NRMP. The original NRMP only proposed actions involving wildlife and forest management.
- 201 16 (cont from cmt no. 15) Page 42: "...many species of wildlife ... are rare and declining ... "Please clearly state which species you are referencing and examples. Page 45: "... The emphasis of the Biosphere Reserve Program..." What role did the public have in making the decision that public land would be placed into this program? Explain exactly what this designation means. Is this part of a United Nation's program? If so, explain what role the UN might have as it relates to this area? Page 48: Where possible, existing corridors would be expanded to add... Will TVA spray and use herbicides on their utility ROW's or will any of the regional cooperatives be permitted to spray these ROWs? Where does the public get MSDS sheets to assess the chemicals used? Page 52: "Constructed facilities will almost always be visually subordinate to the land. " Please explain precisely what you mean by this statement. Page 59: "All wildfires will be extinguished at these sites. " Does this mean they will not be extinguished at other sites? Page 60: There is no mention of Golden Eagles or Fallow deer as a unique species of wildlife for viewing. Page 63: "... The Recreation Opportunity Spectrum..." Please articulate and define, cite source and references and give examples.
- 224 4 Plan, Pg. 8&9, last paragraph - "Following the establishment of the ... Lake Barkley reservoir in 1959..." The historical information dates the beginning of land acquisition as well as construction to 1957. The project was complete in 1966.

201	17	<p>(cont from cmt no. 16) Page 64: Table 2.2 - Performance History. Please cite source. Page 67: Define and explain the terms xeric and mesic sites. Page 69: "Design management activities to minimize air pollution originating at LBL ..." This statement also is not consistent with the need being expressed by the USFS to do prescribed burns. Page 70: Biosphere Reserve Management. Please explain what you mean by international cooperative programs. Page 70: "...cooperative relationships ..." Are you proposing to make LBL subject to the Kyoto Treaty? Page 75: Strategic Goal 8. What are the national goals? Cite and reference them. Page 77: How will your three to five year strategic directions be communicated to the public? Page 78: Spell out acronyms: MIS, TES and then use the acronym Page 78: Strategic Goal 8. Please explain to the reader how and who set these National Strategic Goals. If LBL is to comply with them, who does the assessment? Page 79: How will you actively seek public comment and input on the assessment of your project-level implementation and effectiveness? Page 83: How do you determine 330 feet; 150 tree; and 200 feet in items 29, 20, 31? Please cite references or regulations. Page 83: Item 34. How do you know that access to cemeteries will meet or exceed the type that existed when it became federal property? If you have an inventory available to compare the existing conditions against please cite this reference. Is this reference readily available to the public? Page 85: Visual Quality Zone. VQZ. Please define and cite reference as to how this is determine and the criteria for such zones. I realize you have these definitions in a "Glossary," however, words and terms such as this can better educate the public when you bring them out in set aside text boxes or side bars.</p>
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should address its intentions for the hunting program in the LRMP.
To make the plan comprehensive.

Response

Hunting programs have been better highlighted in the final plan and EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	37	A detailed discussion of what the USFS proposes to do or not do to the hunting program as it exists is required in this document if it is to be a comprehensive Land and Resource Management Plan.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should change the LRMP.
To fulfill the original mission;
To reach its potential in the region and the nation.

Response

The mission of LBL is clearly outlined in the carefully worded LBL Protection Act. The Forest Service is required to comply with this law. The regional role of LBL is very important and as discussed in both the Plan and EIS, and carefully considered in all decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

221	24	LBL has the potential to be a great asset for our region and for the nation. The current proposal does not fulfill that potential, and breaks the promise made to former residents. For the reasons stated above, the FS should change their plan for LBL consistent with these comments.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make the EIS more user-friendly and better demonstrate the differences between alternatives.

Response

The draft plan and DEIS have been edited to address this concern.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	3	A well-written EIS should do as much to educate and inform the reader as it does to comply with the process. This document is lacking in that regard. Since this is an EIS (opening statement under Comments of your plan), you are required to fully identify and explain all alternatives including a "No Action" alternative. I see no tables or charts that compare the various alternatives and am greatly concerned that the alternative of "No Action" is not even discussed or adequately considered. This must be corrected for the document to be effective in its intent. This document needs a well defined and graphically displayed "meat-ball chart" for the reader to better compare, assess, and understand the various proposed actions and conditions of these proposals. The document needs a "cross walk" that will allow a commenter to find the answers to the specific questions and issues in the final document.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add to the LRMP an objective prioritizing monitoring of impaired water bodies. To protect water quality.

Response

The draft plan has been edited to address this concern.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	9	Specific to the monitoring plan, EPA recommends inclusion of an objective in Strategic Goal #4 (Page 78) to prioritize monitoring in the vicinity of impaired water bodies and to determine the effectiveness of riparian buffers in protecting water quality.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should re-write standard # 17 in the LRMP.

Response

The standard has been completely rewritten.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	7	In addition to the water quality standards included in Part 3 of the Draft LRMP, EPA recommends the following rewrite of Forestwide Standard #17 (Page 81): "No herbicide is aerially applied within 200 horizontal feet, nor ground-applied within 100 horizontal feet, of lakes, wetlands, or perennial or intermittent springs and streams. No herbicide is applied within 100 horizontal feet of any public or domestic water source. Exceptions to this Standard are limited to situations where selective treatments (e.g., to control undesirable native or non-native plant species) that require the use of herbicides approved for use in or adjacent to aquatic ecosystems are necessary within the buffer zone, and when such action is required to prevent significant environmental change. Buffers must be clearly marked before treatments so applicators can see and avoid them."
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add a forestwide standard regarding activities affecting water quality.
To protect soil and water.

Response

The standards have been carefully reviewed, edited, and amended. Soil and water considerations drove many of those changes.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	10	EPA also recommends adoption of the following forestwide standard for clarification of water quality protection responsibilities: "Resource management activities that may affect soil and/or water quality must follow the applicable State's (Kentucky or Tennessee) Rules and Regulations for Water Quality Control and Best Management Practices for Forestry (BMPs) as a minimum to achieve soil and water quality objectives. When Forest Plan standards exceed State BMPs or water quality standards, Forest Plan standards shall take precedence."
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose a combination of Alternatives Y & Z.
To best balance public concerns;
To provide recreation and environmental education;
To provide appropriate vegetation management;
To ensure continued designation of special use areas.

Response

Thank you for your comments. The selected alternative incorporates scientific analysis and responds to the concerns of the public while meeting legal mandates. The Selected Alternative supports the mission of LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	11	EPA has no objections to this project. EPA recommends adoption of elements of Alternatives Y and Z as the preferred alternative. If the preferred alternative contains elements of different alternatives, EPA recommends inclusion of a separate "hybrid" alternative in the Final EIS that would more accurately depict the environmental impacts of the selected alternative.
-----	----	--

279 1 Based on our review of the Draft EIS, EPA recommends adoption of elements of Alternatives Y and Z as the preferred alternative. It appears that a hybrid alternative containing elements of these two alternatives adequately balances the issues and public concerns identified during the public involvement process: to provide recreation and environmental education, appropriate vegetation management, and continued designation of special use areas.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose only one preferred alternative. Because having two preferred alternatives makes it difficult for the public to understand what the Forest Service's plans for LBL are; Because having two preferred alternatives makes meaningful comments difficult to provide, contrary to the requirement of the law.

Response

Thank you for your comments. We appreciate your time to look over the alternatives and provide comments. The use of two "preferred" alternatives to the Recreation issue allowed the public a better opportunity to comment on each as a possibility while offering the FS more views on these very complex issue treatments.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	10	By having two "preferred" Alternatives, rather than one clearly defined proposal, it is difficult to know what the Forest Service has in mind. This makes it extremely difficult to provide meaningful and informed comments. This is contrary to the requirement of the law and to the purpose of including the public. It is still very unclear to me what LBL would look like under the Draft Plan. Surely, this does not fulfill the spirit of the NEPA requirements for seeking public involvement.
221	1	As an initial matter, the draft plan is not organized like any other forest plan, and is hard to follow and understand. Making things worse is the fact that the FS has not chosen a preferred alternative, but instead has picked two preferred alternatives, making it very difficult to know what the FS is proposing. Not knowing exactly what the FS is proposing makes it almost impossible to comment on what the impacts are from these vague actions.
205	25	The FS has not chosen a preferred alternative, but instead has picked two preferred alternatives, making it very difficult to know what the FS is proposing. This makes it almost impossible to comment on what the impacts are from these vague actions.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose a combination of Alternatives W & Z.
To best meet public preferences.

Response

Thank you for your comments.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

226 13 In 1998, Patti Freeman of Utah State University was hired by the TVA to do "Land Between the Lakes Visitor Profile Study Final Report." In this report, Ms. Freeman reported on comments received by the TVA staff from visitors over a one-year period. This includes, "Visitors were asked to indicate desired capital improvements, services, or special events that LBL could provide in the future. The most common responses were: " Do not commercialize LBL," and "Keep it as it is." Beyond that, no clear pattern for preferred projects was indicated, but frequent response related to a desire for more amenities such as a place to buy gas, snacks, bait, etc., better road maintenance, better campground maintenance, and more lighting on the boat ramps. In addition, visitors were asked what LBL could provide to increase the length of their visit to LBL. The most common response was, "Nothing, we like it as it is." Even though the basis for the economic analysis in the DEIS came from this study, the DEIS never mentions the qualitative descriptions received by Ms. Freeman. This indicates that the desired alternative probably lies somewhere between Alternatives W and Z.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider the increasing demand and decreasing availability of land used for wilderness recreation in choosing an alternative for the LRMP.

Because the demand for wilderness recreation is growing more than proportionately;
Because the DEIS fails to address this factor in valuing the alternatives.

Response

The option for a "Wilderness" designation was explored. There is not an area in LBL that meets the criteria for "Wilderness" designation.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 226 6 Morton, Peter (1994, *The Living Landscape*, The Wilderness Society, p. 41) states that the demand for wild recreation is growing more than proportionately. It is characterized by interest in more natural settings. A study related to the geographically close Southern Appalachian area comes to the following conclusions: According to Forest Service RPA data, projections for future wilderness use on national forests throughout the South indicate an increase in use of 150 percent by the year 2005. This rate is more than double the rate expected for the nation as a whole. According to Dr. Peter A. Morton (Morton, Peter, 1994), future wilderness use can be estimated for the next planning period by multiplying the average use by an index of the projected increase for the Southern Region. Projected wilderness use is then divided by a wilderness recreation carrying capacity coefficient to provide a rough estimate of the minimum number of wild acres needed to supply wilderness-type creation in the future. The results indicate that current wilderness use exceeds the carrying capacity and that the supply of wilderness-like recreation opportunities in the Southern Appalachian national forests must be greatly expanded. The need for more wild areas will have to be addressed as new forest plans are developed. Loomis, Bonetti and Echohawk, in the article on Demand for and Supply of Wilderness (Cordell, H. Ken, 1999, *Outdoor Recreation in American Life: A National Assessment of Demand and Supply Trends*, p.374) concludes: "recreation use of both USDA FS and NPS Wilderness areas is expected to increase in the future. Visitor use of Wilderness areas on national forests are forecast to grow between 0.5 percent and one percent each year for the next 50 years. If current trends continue, NPS Wilderness areas will see substantially increased visitor demand." The LBL-DEIS fails to take into account the scarcity of wilderness in the region while valuing the different alternatives.
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose a combination of Alternatives X & Y.
 To allow for necessary resource management;
 To best enrich environmental education, recreation, natural resource management and research.

Response

We appreciate your interest in Land Between The Lakes. Thank you for your comments.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 189 | 1 | As a whole, The KY Chapter Wildlife Society supports integration of Alternatives X and Y specified within the Draft Land and Resource Management Plan for Land Between the Lakes. The Chapter does not support Alternatives W or Z as they do not provide sufficient direction or allow for necessary management of LBL's resources. |
| 269 | 2 | I support the dispersed recreational use plan outlined in plan Y but would like to see an additional EEC built as outlined in plan X. Education of the public is paramount for gaining support for good quality forest and habitat management. |

283	3	I'd prefer a blend of Alternatives X & Y, with a focus on facility based recreation but with primitive camping allowed at Turkey Bay & two Nature View Demonstration Areas.
233	1	You professional folks have done a great job in preparing this plan. I vote for X and Y as the most feasible management approaches. LBL should continue and improve on a program of intergrating conservation education, recreation, and natural resources management. The uniqueness of a working demonstration will be of great value to Federal, state, and private lands throughout the nation and even to natural resources in other countries. Research and documentation should be a part the demonstration.
235	1	I favor a combination of Alt X and Alt Y.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose the "No Change" Alternative (W).
 Because it provides for the best use of Turkey Bay OHV Area and Wranglers Campground;
 Because it best represents the original mission;
 Because LBL is unique and enjoyable as is.

Response

We appreciate your interest in Land Between The Lakes. Thank you for your comments. "Y" is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

37	1	I prefer Alternative W. This is the only alternative consistent with the purpose for which the land was taken from the original residents, and it has served the area well.
35	6	Man has never and can never improve upon nature! Option W - No Change!
34	1	I believe that LBL should essentially remain in its present state.
222	12	I'd almost err on the side of "no change", which I understand is Alternative W.
165	1	Why change anything? There is over 180,000 acres of LBL and if that is not enough land to satisfy most people then something is wrong with these people.
121	6	I choose "no change" Alternative W.
49	1	My thoughts on this; Leave the place and it's current services like they are. This is the only place like it in this world.
120	3	I love the peace and beauty of LBL as it is today. I choose alternative W-no change.

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 271 | 1 | [Alternative] (W) I vote for leaving it the way it is, I have both off road motorcycles that me, my son and friends use on Turkey Bay, which is a lot of fun and I also have horses and we come to Wrangler Camp when we can get in. |
| 261 | 1 | You're already delving into the original mission of LBL...We're asking that you "leave well enough alone" and call off what appears to be your intent to completely change the direction of LBL. |
| 92 | 1 | I would like to support the current programs and levels of services and uses of these above areas within LBL. I would like each to be retained in their present form. |
| 105 | 1 | I will go with ALTERNATIVE W for my first choice. My second choice would be ALTERNATIVE Y. My main interest is in the Turkey Bay area. I come down with my family and friends for a week of trail riding, swimming and fishing with the kids. The area is a lot cleaner now and the freshwater on site was a great improvement. Small improvement in the Turkey Bay area and the rest of the LBL is all I would like to see. Too much improvement may take away from the getting away from the city experience. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add to Alternative Y a section expanding the wildlife viewing area. Because it could be critical to the success of an area.

Response

Alternative Y does add wildlife viewing opportunities. The selected Alternative adds additional acreage to the north Nature Watch Land Allocation as described in the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 270 | 6 | The section in Alternative Z on expansion of the wildlife viewing areas could be critical to the success of an area. This section should be reviewed and placed into the alternative Y scenario |
|-----|---|---|
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not choose Alternative W. Because it is not viable given TVA's incomplete Resource Management Plan.

Response

We appreciate your interest in LBL. Thank you for your comments. "Y" is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 265 | 8 | I should add here that Alternative W, "no change," is not a viable possibility, given TVA's incomplete Resource Management Plan and the lack of a Plan for public use. |
|-----|---|--|
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Alternative X.
Because people are supportive of it;
Because it will open up the forest canopy for wildlife.

Response

Alternatives W, X, and Y each provide for active vegetation management for wildlife habitat improvement. Thank you for your comments we appreciate knowing what is important to you. "Y" is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

83	2	Plan X is very good.
268	1	I support Plan X. I have two main reasons for that. From what was said it will open up more of the forest canopy and I've always said the best wildlife management tool is a chainsaw.
53	1	After much consideration and listening to other peoples' comments about LBL, I consider Plan X to be the better of them.
52	1	We have read about your plans and consider plan X to be the one.
51	1	I consider plan X to be the best one.
153	1	Alternative "X"

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Alternative Y.
Because it best fits the needs of LBL;
Because it will benefit ecosystem management, forest health and wildlife habitat;
Because it will improve recreation opportunities;
To facilitate attainment of LBL's legal requirements for species protection;
Because it will help the local economy;
Because it will keep Turkey Bay open for OHV use.

Response

We appreciate your interest in LBL. Thank you for your comments. "Y" is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

232	1	As a user of LBL, I prefer Alternative Y. I believe that the more dispersed recreation and EE in Alternative Y is more appropriate than the facilities based Alternative X.
254	1	Plan Y

-
- 185 1 Plan "Y", you guys keep up the good work.
- 123 1 We would definitely like to see alternative plan Y. This would allow for continued ORV riding at Turkey Bay, plus make improvements for better camping. Like you have heard before--better campgrounds with shower facilities.
- 256 1 Plan Y.
- 236 1 We feel that your Alternative Y would be the plan that would most fit the needs in LBL.
- 246 1 I favor Plan "Y" because I believe it benefits the wildlife.
- 181 1 Alternative Y best addresses the stated issues. Alt. Y makes the best effort to address ecosystem management, forest health, wildlife habitat and permanent local economy (as compared to seasonal recreational employment) by selling forest products to the wood products industry and supporting off-season recreational activities.
- 27 1 I recommend alternative Y - develop more areas (non-fee) scattered throughout the LBL. I like the idea of the two nature view areas. I think you seriously need to develop biking trails that are not one lane - paved or stoned ones that allow younger kids to enjoy the exercise - If paved it can be used by wheelchairs, strollers, kids with training wheels, etc. A trail paralleling the N/S road would be great.
- 227 1 The Division of Forestry recommends that the Forest Service select Alternative Y as the proposed action. The Division has several concerns of which Alternative Y comes closest to addressing. It is the Division's goal for forestland in Tennessee to be healthy with few insect and disease problems. We feel the best way to achieve this goal is to keep the forest growing vigorously. We realize that LBL is the center of a huge tourism industry that directly affects the economic well being of the area and that LBL will always give primary emphasis to recreation. Alternative Y will provide for the opportunity to actively manage the forest while also expanding recreational opportunities. As good forest stewards it is our responsibility to maintain and promote healthy forests, both public and private.
- 113 1 Please put me down as being in favor of Alternative Y for the new LRMP. I could live with X also, since my main concern is that Turkey Bay OHV be kept open for off-roading my Jeep.
- 168 2 I vote for Y.
- 244 1 I support alternative Y of the ones that have been drafted.

-
- 103 1 Based on the information that was provided for our review, we support selection of Alternative Y. Implementation of this alternative would benefit fish and wildlife and the habitats they depend on within LBL while providing additional recreational opportunities for the public. We anticipate that selection of Alternative Y would facilitate attainment of LBL's legal requirements to maintain the viability of native species and the protection of federally listed species. In particular, management activities, such as prescribed burning and selective forest thinning to achieve management goals, should influence ecological processes to attain and sustain a high diversity of habitat and species. For example, forest thinning that is used to help restore oak savannah habitats will likely result in increases in certain declining birds and may improve habitat for the endangered Indiana bat by improving foraging habitat structure within the forest.
- 249 1 Plan Y.
- 253 1 As a former resident of LBL I am very concerned as to what happens there. I prefer your plan "y".
- 255 1 I support plan Y.
- 252 1 I like plan "y" because I am a squirrel hunter, and hunt every day possible during season.
- 127 1 I vote for plan Y I love LBL and wish to keep it just the way it is.
- 251 1 Plan Y will be a more friendly program for everybody.
- 250 1 I support Plan Y.
- 270 1 The alternative that bests represents my views and what I feel the visitor enjoys is Alternative Y.
- 248 4 I support plan Y.
- 204 7 While I don't think any of the alternatives listed coincide completely with my opinions concerning the management of LBL if I had to choose one of the Alternatives outlined in the draft plan, I would have to put my support behind Alternative Y and hope that some modifications could be made to it.
- 247 1 The LBL Sportsman Club has reviewed the management plans for the future use of LBL and supports Alternative Y as the best management plan.
- 190 1 I vote Y.
- 193 1 Would like to see alternative Y.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not choose Alternative Z.
Because it wouldn't allow for expansive use of Turkey Bay OHV
Area.

Response

We appreciate your interest in LBL. Thank you for your comments.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 235 | 2 | I am very OPPOSED to Alt Z. |
| 269 | 3 | I am opposed to plan Z in almost every way. |
| 117 | 2 | I would also like to express extreme disfavor of alternate Z; which is a horrible choice; because it would completely remove my ability to come to and enjoy Turkey Bay; and the surrounding area. |
| 258 | 2 | We are strongly opposed to Alternative Z in its entirety. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create two oak-grassland demonstration
areas.
Because it will re-establish historical ecosystems missing since
European settlement.

Response

Thank you for your support. Discussion on Oak Grasslands may be found in Part 1,
Land Allocation Prescriptions of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 227 | 3 | We, TN Div of Forestry, support the development of two oak/grasslands demonstration areas (totaling 8,600 acres) that focus on the reestablishment of ecosystems that have been lost since European settlement. |
| 283 | 4 | I am also all for the development of Oak-Grassland Demonstration Areas. |
| 189 | 3 | Strongly support active management/development of the oak-grassland demo areas, with potential for future expansion. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not create oak-grassland demonstration areas.
Because they are not a historically native ecosystem;
Because it is just an excuse to log.

Response

Oak Grassland discussion may be found in Part 1, Land Allocation Prescriptions of the LRMP. Woodlands, barren and prairie systems and their existence at LBL is discussed in Chapter 3, FEIS, Historical Perspective. Further analysis may be found in the FEIS Grassland Cover Community Types along with current and optimal acres.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 221 | 16 | Another plan level proposal that should be withdrawn in order to facilitate the "green magnet" contiguous old growth forest vision for the area is this idea to try and create 8,000 acres of oak savannah grasslands. We don't see this as supported by historical accounts or credible scientific information. This appears to be just another excuse to continue to log the LBL at unsustainable levels. It appears that this entire proposal is based on one "personal communication" between the LBL and a professor at Austin Peay. This is not persuasive, especially when there is other sources which contradict the notion that LBL was somehow prairie historically. |
| 180 | 2 | The Oak-Grassland Demonstration Areas [8000 acres] proposed as "reestablishment ecosystems for rare communities that have been lost since European settlement", is totally off-base. The Land Between The Lakes never contained "barrens". The "barrens" historically are located approximately 100 miles to the east of LBL, and are well documented. These Demonstration Areas should be eliminated from the Draft Plan. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use conventional national forest standards for prescription areas.
Because there is no clear definition of areas currently.

Response

LBL is one large management area of itself. The LRMP further delineates LBL into four prescription areas: General Forest, Core Areas, Administrative Sites and Recreation/Environmental Education Sites which are described in detail in Part 1 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 237 | 25 | For example, LBL doesn't seem to be divided up into Management Areas the way conventional national forests are. There are maps in the EIS which refer to prescription areas, but there isn't any clear definition of the standards, guidelines, and even the boundaries of the areas are not clearly delineated. |
|-----|----|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should protect forests and the environment and keep LBL as natural as possible.
To preserve the area for future generations;
Because it is a unique and beautiful resource;
To benefit millions seeking relaxation.

Response

The LRMP has many goals and design criteria to protect and manage the natural resources. Please refer to the Area Goals, Land Allocation Prescriptions, Design Criteria and Standards and Program Strategies in Parts 1, 2 and 3 of the LRMP. In addition, refer to Chapter 3, Effects Analysis by resource area in the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

53	2	LBL is a very unique and unusual place, for there is no other like it anywhere, so please keep it as natural as possible in the woods and surrounding area.
146	1	Keep LBL as wild as possible while preserving the heritage of the area. It is neither possible nor practical to erase all traces of human habitation in the LBL.
24	4	I am totally against any destruction of this forest land or any roads admitting machines or personnel to destroy these forests. This land is absolutely beautiful and should not be destroyed because of greed and profit by the powers that want profit. Do not log any of this area.
146	3	Minimize environmentally unsound activities such as the Turkey Bay ORV area.
49	4	I started hunting in the KY woodlands in 1955. I hunted in LBL for many years. I quit when all I saw was trash, 4-wheeler tracks, horse shit and a lot of ticks, not much game. We used to go look at all the beauty in LBL and it's one of a kind slice of heaven, but things change.
38	1	The natural status of the area should be priority #1. More people are not the answer. Just look at our National Parks!
192	4	LBL should be underdeveloped and wild. It is not a place for crops. I can see crops anywhere.
24	5	I request that this area be reserved for the future generations to see and value our past and to have a feel for our past ancestors and how the area was in their time. If we do not value our past we will have no future.
24	6	Please do not destroy this beautiful national resource. We should maintain with our tax dollars this commodity. I do not wish my tax dollars to be used to destroy our national treasures.
51	2	Please keep LBL as close to natural as possible.

228	1	The final plan should vigorously protect the wildlife, non-motorized recreation and historic / cultural values of the LBL. Annual visitation to the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area averages around two million people. About 30 million people can reach Land Between the Lakes National RecreationArea within 5-6 hours, and one-third of the population of the United States is only a day's drive, away. Keeping this land as wild and beautiful as possible will benefit millions of people who now need peaceful natural areas more than ever, for relaxation and spiritual reflection.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not rely on the term "forest health" in its management of LBL.
Because it is not clearly defined;
Because the associated science is not up to date;
Because it is only used to justify logging.

Response

Please refer to the Land Allocation Prescriptions and Desired Conditions of the General Forested Areas in Part 1 of the LRMP. Also refer to Forest Management program strategies in Part 2 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

237	36	We have serious concerns about the reliance of "forest health" as a justification for continued and additional logging. We don't believe that the FS has any kind of handle on defining what "forest health" is, and how it can be maintained. When we requested the scientific basis for "forest health" we were supplied with several studies that were 10 - 15 years old, and were inconclusive at best. This is not using up to date science. We question the whole concept of "forest health." What is it? Is it the total number of species? Is it the number of live trees, basal area, the condition of the soil? How can bringing skidders, log loaders, logging trucks, etc, and compacting the soil and disturbing it, resulting in unavoidable adverse impacts on productivity, increase forest health? It's not credible. It appears to us that this is just a broad, vague public relations program to try and justify logging. Who doesn't want healthy forests? We all want that. But few people believe that a logged over forest is "healthy."
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should practice active management of its vegetation.
To make money;
To create habitat and promote ecological diversity;
To create lands which provide an alternative to a highly-urbanized world;
To promote desired species composition;
To improve forest health.

Response

Please refer to the Land Allocation Prescriptions and Desired Conditions of the General Forested Areas in Part 1 of the LRMP. Also refer to Forest Management strategies in Part 2 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- 189 17 Conversion of some poorly-sited open lands/early successional habitats (within critical habitats, large blocks or in unmanageable locations) to other locations in the general forest area that are better suited for open land sites; Strongly support conversion of open lands/early successional habitats as long as (1) sites of equal or greater size are created elsewhere, (2) conversion sites are allowed to regenerate naturally (managing for invasive/exotic species), (3) conversion sites are managed appropriately to promote desired species composition (e.g., use of prescribed fire, thinning, etc.), and (4) placement of new open lands (if used for agriculture) are such that they won't impact aquatic resources.
- 45 4 I also appreciate the Draft Plan's emphasis on increasing vegetation management to enhance ecological diversity and to apply management prescriptions appropriate to different site types and ecological communities.
- 283 2 I'd also like to see active timber & vegetation management for the benefit of wildlife, increased recreation opportunities, & improvement of the health of the forest.
- 233 2 In our urbanized culture it is important to show and promote habitat management, timber utilization and harvest of game and fish.
- 146 7 For the well-being of the area's wildlife, make efforts to keep open lands open, manage mature timber stands by thinning when necessary to improve wildlife habitat, and forgo clear-cutting anywhere. Continue the cooperative farmer program to provide food sources for wildlife.
- 269 1 I would like to voice support to the vegetation management proposed in Plan Y but feel that it is NOT aggressive enough. More than 10% of the timber should be cut over the next 10 years to help retain the oak/hickory character of the forest. I also support the restoration of native grasslands and oaks and the use of controlled burns. In fact I think the majority of LBL with the exception of the biosphere area should be rotationally cut on a cycle that promotes the greatest health of the forest and wild life.
- 222 1 I support: Select timber harvest and prescribed burning as a method for the Forest Service to make money and create habitat for wildlife,
- 237 26 What the draft plan is calling for in terms of management would mostly result in habitats that are plentiful elsewhere in the region. Private land in the region receives a significant amount of logging activity. This creates regenerating forest. Much of this logging is supervised by some type of professional forester - be a state, industry or private consultant. The results of this activity is virtually identical to that which would occur if the FS logged forests in LBL. There is already a significant amount of this habitat in the region, and for each acre of this created by private land logging, the amount of mature, contiguous forest declines. Why shouldn't the FS provide what is most needed?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should allow LBL to develop into old-growth forest.

Because old growth provides the land's maximum value to the region and world.

Because the eastern U.S. lacks large, contiguous blocks of this forest type;

Because it would provide habitat for forest interior species;

Because it will increase LBL's aesthetic and recreational value;

Because it will promote healthier watersheds by decreasing erosion and sedimentation;

Because it would be an effective tool for carbon storage and climate change prevention;

Because it fulfills promises made to former residents.

Response

A number of improvements were made to the DEIS and draft plan related to old growth. Old growth is discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Need for old growth is assessed within the species viability assessment also within Chapter 3 FEIS. Desired conditions of LBL's vegetative cover is discussed under General Forest Areas and Core Areas in Part 1 of the LRMP and are outlined under Forest Management program strategies in Part 2 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

217	5	We should be concentrating on trying to create and maintain a large old growth forest for this region. A large old growth forest, in conjunction with the lakes would draw more people for the scenic beauty and recreation, as well as attract additional wildlife species. Instead of "If you build it, they will come", I feel certain that you would find that, "If you let it grow, they will come" (people and wildlife). LBL should be allowed to naturally develop into an old growth forest, and become a much needed habitat for some of our rare songbirds and other wildlife.
221	8	Second, if the area were allowed to succeed to mostly contiguous, old growth forest, it would become habitat for rare forest interior species which has few other places to exist in our region. These include bird species such as the cerulean warbler, black and white warbler, wood thrush, wood pee wee, scarlet tanager, worm eating warbler, and others. Yet, the draft plan doesn't even propose to properly monitor for such species, let alone protect them. Also, there are rare bat species that are present in the area that require forest for their habitat, as well as rare salamanders, snakes, and other non-game species that require high quality forest habitat.
208	1	The forests in LBL should be left in their natural state. This is the promise made and this is the promise that should be kept. "Management" of nature is a particularly arrogant pretense. Cutting of the forest to improve it presents logical problems that even the Forest Service must find difficult to get around.
221	12	Fourth, it is an insult to the former landowners, many of whom protected their forests but were not allowed to keep them, for the government to now turn around and have these forests logged. We should honor the promises made to former landowners by preserving their forests and allowing them to grow to magnificent old growth forests.

-
- 221 3 In putting the LBL resources in relation to other lands in the region, that it becomes clear that the maximum value to the region is in LBL being primarily a large contiguous, old growth forest. This is the one resource and habitat that is lacking in this region. There is no other place from the Appalachians to the Rockies where you have nearly 200,000 contiguous acres in public ownership. LBL's value as a large, contiguous block of old growth forest in terms of habitat, recreation, scenic beauty, watershed protection, economic benefits, and carbon storage would be unmatched by any other management regime.
- 221 13 Fifth, whether the LBL wants to admit it or not, carbon buildup in the atmosphere and the resulting greenhouse effect are serious global problems that have local connections. If the LBL allows its relatively small trees to be cut, there is inevitably going to be a percent of that wood that going to be converted to forms which are not stable, long term carbon storage, such as paper. Also, as a matter of course during processing, sawdust and other by products that may end up decomposing faster or out and out releasing carbon to the atmosphere will be formed. While this may account for only a small percent (it could amount to a significant amount, though, cumulatively or in individual cases where most of the wood goes for paper) the situation in regard to the CO2 levels in the atmosphere is so serious that any increase needs to be considered, especially if it can be avoided. We support maximizing carbon storage on the LBL, which would be done by maintaining LBL as old primarily old growth forest.
- 221 7 There would be many advantages to allowing the forest to naturally succeed to old growth in most of the LBL. One major benefit would be protecting the reservoirs from accelerated filling in from the erosion caused by such vegetation management activities as logging and farming. It has already been shown that man made reservoirs such as Kentucky and Barkley will fill up over time anyway. Shouldn't one of the primary purposes of management of the area be to protect these reservoirs?
- 285 1 LBL should use a Regional perspective when considering the need for young forests and/or wildlife habitat needs. The missing forest type in the region is mature contiguous forest and old growth. The proposal (timber harvest) would lead to an increase in forest fragmentation with significant effects on specific wildlife species.
- 259 3 Let "Mother Nature" take care of the LBL forests. You should be allowing the trees and the forest to continue to mature. Besides the aesthetics, a more mature forest would provide a better home for some animals and songbirds that require the older forest environment.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not manage for any non-native species. Because there are too many native species needing restoration.

Response

Restoration of species and the need to manage species is described in Desired Conditions for General Forest, Open Lands, Oak-Grassland Demonstration Areas and Core Areas in Part 1 of the LRMP. Further discussion follows in Program Strategies in Part 2 and Design Criteria for General Forest and Open Lands in Part 3. The need for a variety of species is analyzed in the Species Viability Assessment in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	22	Management efforts should not be focused on sustaining viable populations of non-native species. Too many national efforts to restore native species (e.g., plans for songbirds, quail, shorebirds, wading birds, etc.) to justify managing for a "desired" non-native. Management of LBL should consider threatened and endangered species management, and careful planning for species of special concern and federal trust species (i.e., migratory birds).
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase the size of the Elk Bison Prairie. To benefit environmental education; To increase visitation; To increase environmental restoration.

Response

The LRMP Land Allocation Prescription for Elk Bison Prairie is included under Recreational Facilities in Part 1, Section 4B. Please refer to that for a description of the desired condition. The preferred alternative Y focuses on increased dispersed opportunities for environmental education and recreation. Actual changes to the Elk Bison Prairie will be decided at the project level. However, wildlife program strategies in Part 2 of the LRMP state the need to maintain the elk and bison herds and use for environmental education purposes.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

100	3	Expand the Elk/Bison Prairie.
87	1	To increase wildlife viewing opportunities, environmental education, natural environment restoration and to increase visitations the Elk & Bison Prairie size should be increased by two to three times the current acreage.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should clarify the long-term benefits of the Work Area 18 timber treatments.

Response

The long term benefits of work area 18 timber treatments are that of improved wildlife habitat, however this is not a plan decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use the "green magnet" concept for development.

To help surrounding communities;

To protect the rural/natural character of LBL.

Response

Thank you for your comments. The Forest Service considered a range of alternatives within the provisions of the LBL Protection Act, input from the public, and scientific analysis. This green magnet concept was considered in detail. Forest Service selected alternative balances natural environment with visitor service demands. These considerations are detailed in the EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

221	5	This mngt. for old-growth is consistent with the "green magnet" concept, in which a large, undeveloped natural area in public ownership (such as Smoky Mts. Nat. Park) is kept undeveloped as a draw to bring people into the area. Economic development is limited to private areas on the edge of the "green magnet," but not allowed within the protected area. While the commenters are not advocating turning such areas around LBL as Aurora and Grand Rivers into Dollywood or Gatlinburg, the general model is working there, and could work here, with specific goals and objectives to maintain the rural character of the area while stimulating some economic development in the communities around LBL. In order to fulfill this vision of LBL, there will have to be some significant changes to the new draft plan changes we urge the FS to make.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create a table of specific monitoring elements in the LRMP.

To identify the evaluation question;

To identify how monitoring will occur.

Response

Thank you for your comment. Evaluation and measures are discussed in Area Goals, Part 1 of the LRMP. An Operational Monitoring Plan plus identified research needs are documented in Part 2 of the LRMP. A more detailed chart has been added to the Plan Appendix.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	8	EPA agrees with the use of monitoring to provide information necessary to determine whether the LRMP is sufficient to address resource management objectives. In addition to the generic operational monitoring plan included in the Draft LRMP, EPA recommends creation of a table of the specific monitoring elements to identify the evaluation question, as well as how the monitoring will occur (e.g., duration, frequency, responsibility). As an example, the Southern Appalachian Forests that have recently completed revisions to their LRMP developed similar monitoring tracking tables.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should release data on environmental impacts of jet skis.

Response

This is out of scope for the Plan. Large lake use is not under LBL's jurisdiction.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201 8 It is past due for the USFS to share baseline data around LBL resulting from jet skis, and the potential environmental impacts on the flora, fauna, air and water quality of LBL.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ban personal watercraft in LBL
In conjunction with agreements between the two states, the Army Corps of Engineers and the TVA.

Response

Personal watercraft (jet skis) are not allowed on interior lakes of LBL. Regulations on Ky Lake and Lake Barkley are beyond the scope of our authority.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201 39 It is time for the USFS to assert its leadership and ban these personal watercrafts (jet skis) from the bays of LBL in conjunction with agreements between the two states, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better analyze air and water quality impacts of recreation and management activities.
Because air quality issues have been identified in surrounding areas;
Because of erosion arising from controlled burns.

Response

Air quality was analyzed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and no effect is anticipated from proposed activities. Future projects must meet the Air program strategy stated under Part 2 of the LRMP. Low intensity prescribed burns generally don't increase erosion. Erosion potential from proposed burning was analysed under the watershed assessment model, as described in Appendix B of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

180 5 A source of information should also include the utilization of the data recorded by the several air pollution monitors located around the Calvert City Chemical Complex. This organization obtained the installation of the monitors in 1988, including "grab monitors" that record air pollutants at a specific trigger level. The air pollution tapes are in Frankfort Kentucky Division of Air Quality. A Remote Sensing study made several years ago, at our behest, concluded that damage to the oak and hickory forests from the chemical complex, including the Land Between The Lakes, is occurring.

201 7 Air and Water Quality: There is not sufficient discussion about specific impacts that will happen to air and water quality as the result of activities being suggested by the USFS such as the controlled burns. With Calvert City in Marshall County and air issues documented in Christian County, air quality baseline data should be included in this document for the reader to consider, compare and contrast the proposed actions and their subsequent impact on the air quality of the region. Also, with uncontrolled or controlled burns erosion issues arise. Water quality baseline data for both reservoirs is essential for the reader to determine potential impacts on additional erosion issues resulting from USFS activities.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should monitor streams in LBL three times per year.
 Because it would help guide management decisions;
 Because there is impact from recreational activities;
 Because information could be shared with other areas.

Response

High priority watersheds for restoration and monitoring were identified through the watershed assessment model, area-wide roads analysis and CATT stream survey data, and include Turkey Creek/Turner Hollow, Crooked Creek, and Lick Creek. A program emphasis for watershed is to inventory and monitor all perennial and major intermittent streams on a 10 year cycle to determine physical, chemical and biological integrity. At the program level decision space, an agreement with local watershed watch organizations is possible.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

142 1 I want to ask that three streams in the LBL be sampled three times yearly to establish a data base for these watersheds. The streams of concern are: 1) Turkey Creek 2) Crooked Creek 3) Laura Furnace Creek. Crooked Creek seems to be the largest single watershed in the LBL on the Ky. Side. Information from an established data base would be beneficial in providing background information for future management decisions as well as knowing what is entering Lake Barkley. Laura Furnace Creek accepts drainage from the Trace Highway and flows into Fords Bay which is designated as wildlife management area on the map. There is impact from horseback riding trails in this area also. Information from an established data base would contribute to provide stream information for future management decisions as well as knowing what is entering Lake Barkley. These sample events would correspond with the three sampling events that the Ky. Watershed Watch organization conducts in the summer months. The data would be shared with the Ky. Division of Water along with all of the other agencies and organizations doing stream sampling in the Four Rivers Basin Area.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should inventory populations of rare plant and animal species and rare ecological communities.
 Because these species need consideration in management decisions.

Response

Special management considerations will be given to Threatened and Endangered Species and Rare Communities. Please refer to Strategic Goal #5 in the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

239 1 We do ask that an emphasis be placed on efforts the inventory to forest for populations of rare plant and animal species, especially those of state and federal concern, and for rare ecological communities; that these species and communities be carefully considered during individual project or timber sale planning.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should reconsider some of its management indicator species.
 Because there are more appropriate species to use in some cases;
 Because the proposed set doesn't accurately reflect those species which should be present at LBL;
 Because the MIS list is confusing and hard to find.

Response

Management Indicator Species were selected in compliance with the NFMA, 1982 regulations, to be representative species of focal habitat and vegetative cover types and must be monitorable. The selected MIS are described in Chapter 3 of the FEIS and used as monitoring measures under Area Goal #5, Part 1, LRMP

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 237 | 30 | [Continued from comment 29] Birds shouldn't be the only MIS. Bats, snakes, frogs, salamanders, fish, and even mammals such as squirrels and certain forest mice, shrews, or voles should be named as MIS. Then and only then, with regular and ongoing monitoring, can the FS tell if the forest is functioning as a successful natural community. But it first needs the baseline data. But there is no baseline data on these species and no MIS from these species. It is our opinion that the MIS is inadequate and doesn't comply with NFMA and the NFMA regs. |
| 221 | 9 | The proposed set of indicator species doesn't accurately reflect those forest species which should be present at LBL. |
| 45 | 13 | With regards to the Management Indicator Species, I think those are good for the most part. However, rather than use Eastern Bluebird as an indicator for an adequate abundance of snags in open woodlands, why not use Great Crested Flycatcher or Red-headed Woodpecker? They are of much greater conservation concern than the bluebird. |
| 228 | 4 | The final forest management plan should have strict requirements for monitoring management indicator species, and those management indicator species should consist of non-game birds, fish and other wildlife that truly reflect the biological health of the forest. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should enforce strict safety, riding and maintenance rules in Turkey Bay OHV Area.
To keep OHV's on designated trails;
To keep Turkey Bay a sustainable use area;
To increase enjoyment and safety of users.

Response

Turkey Bay policy was changed to designated trails in June 2004 outside the planning process. Safety requirements for riding are in the rules. See further details in the Turkey Bay OHV land allocation in the Plan. Detailed policies are outside the scope of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

228	5	The Forest Service needs greater law enforcement to keep ORV's confined to designated trails in the Turkey Bay Off Road Vehicle area.
80	2	Better enforcement of speed & riding rules [Turkey Bay OHV Area].
104	3	Turkey Bay Goal: enjoyable sustainable riding area. Fines-should go along with education, example-rider training/traffic school.
41	3	Safety rules (to be enforced) on "hot dog" & trick riding in these designated parking & camping areas will increase the enjoyment of those camping & spectating.
5	9	Introducing severe fines for littering or spilling fluids. Although this is more a policy matter, it assuredly speaks to the improvement of, and sustainability of, the entire Turkey Bay environment, not to mention reducing staff labor that might be required to clean up someone's mess.
221	20	There needs to be adequate law enforcement, and monitoring requirements consistent with the ORV Executive Orders and the FS regulations should be included in the plan. There also needs to be clear, enforceable action-triggering benchmarks consistent with these regulations that will close areas or trails that are suffering from considerable adverse effects from such use. Also, there should be strictly enforced trail condition standards that limit or prohibit ORV use in Turkey Bay when the trails are too wet or soft. Under no circumstances should any ORV use be allowed outside of Turkey Bay.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better regulate hunting
To prevent illegal activities.

Response

The Forest Service expends great resources to enforce hunting regulations at LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

109	3	Poachers should be dealt with to the fullest extent of the law.
-----	---	---

219 3 If possible, increase the amount of game wardens during draw hunts. I believe that some people hunt either the wrong area or without a permit.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should re-analyze and clearly present its species viability assessment.
Because it's unclear what the analysis is based on;
Because the information concerning the Henslows Sparrow, Northern Bobwhite, and Prairie Warbler isn't satisfactory.

Response

The biological environment is described in Chapter 3.2 of the FEIS. Its species of viability concern assessment is displayed under section 3.2 with many tables and discussion of effects. Worksheets supporting the assessment may be found in Appendix E of the FEIS. Much of this information has been clarified and updated between Draft and Final.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

45 9 Further, the birds of viability concern listed under "grassland generalists" are Henslows Sparrow, Northern Bobwhite and Prairie Warbler. The association description for grassland generalist on pg 157 of the DEIS says "grasslands, old fields, hayfields of all site types". I think if that were true, each of those species would be much more abundant and widespread than they currently are. Neither Prairie Warbler nor Henslow's Sparrow are found in any numbers, if at all, in annually mowed non-native hayfields; Henslow's are typically very area-sensitive and require a good amount of litter before they'll nest at a site. I can't imagine they would use any of the open land habitat types listed in the DEIS other than relatively large expanses of native grasses; bobwhite are sensitive to both the amount and configuration of grass shrub land-crop in a landscape, and native grasses are preferred nesting cover. The optimum amount of cropland is probably under 25% of the home range if Rotenberry's models of bobwhite-landscape relationships in Illinois are any indication (citation below) and I take that to mean there is a need for relatively small patches of grain interspersed in a grassland-dominated landscape, rather than having very large agricultural fields placed within forested landscapes as appears to be the case at LBL at present; Prairie Warblers need a pretty healthy shrub component and typically aren't found in open expanses of grassland per se, and they also appear to be somewhat area-sensitive, though not at the scale of Henslow's Sparrow. On page 164 of the DEIS it suggests that you have 6,801 acres of habitat for the grassland generalists but I would say you have no where near that amount of suitable grassland habitat for the birds species listed under that heading. I also question whether you'd find Henslow's in any numbers in grasslands, old fields and hayfields on riparian sites unless, again, they were very large and the structure was right.

-
- 237 29 Logging has many adverse impacts which are not adequately disclosed in the EIS. But first, in order to assess the impact of logging on a programmatic level, the FS needs to know what the ecosystem contains. This has to be documented by in-the-field surveys. Then, based on those surveys, the FS must designate Management Indicator Species that must adequately represent the various habitats that are present on LBL. The list of MIS provided by the FS is not only confusing and hard to find, mentioned here and there scattered through sections, but they are so biased toward open and disturbed habitat that they can't even come close to being able to represent forest interior habitat. The list is Prairie Warbler, E. Meadowlark, Quail, Bluebird, Great Crested Flycatcher, Acadian Fly catcher, Pileated Woodpecker, and ovenbird. 5 out of 8 MIS are associated either out and out with openland or, as with the Great Crested Flycatcher, openland and edge habitat. The Ovenbird is a good forest interior species, but it is a ground nester and doesn't represent the tree nesting species. The Acadian Flycatcher represents forest interior fly catchers, but not the Tanagers, the Thrushes, or the Vireos, such as Scarlet Tanager, the Wood Thrush, and the Red eyed vireo. These all should be MIS. In addition, a species like the Cerulean Warbler should be designated so that they will be monitored. Also shorebirds, eagles and hawks, and pine species should be designated. Having a majority of the MIS be openland is not only out of proportion to what is in LBL now, but it portends great destruction of the forest in the future.
- 237 31 The proposed set of indicator species doesn't accurately reflect those forest species which should be present at LBL, as explained above. There is some listing of species of viability concern, but it isn't clear what the viability analysis is based on. Is this just computer models of general matches of species to habitat, or is this based on in-the-field baseline data. There is no indication that there is any in-the-field data supporting these assumptions. But, none of this data seems to be correlated with any kind of relative value analysis to try and determine which species need the habitat best and which can be found elsewhere. We believe such an analysis would support protecting LBL as mostly an old growth forest.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should reconsider its analysis of the need for fire suppression.
Because forests in TN and KY face different dangers than western pine forests.

Response

Fire management and the role of fire, the need for prescribed fire and the natural fire regime is described in section 3.3of the FEIS. Program strategies for fire management may be found in Part 2 of the LRMP. Wildland fire use is an option to be considered under the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- 265 38 That arguments based on the need for fire suppression were used, when Kentucky and Tennessee hardwood forests do not face the same dangers as pine forests in the west, where such policies originated, is even further revealing of the bias in the evaluation leading to the preferred Alternative(s).

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use ecological science when managing for habitat types.

Because the larger region is missing certain habitat types;
Because the DEIS aims to provide too many habitat types within LBL without considering their recreational or biological role.

Response

Major forest communities, including cover and structure types are described in Chapter 3.2 of the FEIS. Optimal acres needed across LBL for sustaining diversity are displayed in several tables of section 3.2 of the FEIS. Effects of all alternatives are also displayed with alternative Y preferred for sustaining habitat diversity.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	31	Recreation is not the only basis for valuing Alternative Z, however. The surrounding region is already over represented by edge habitat and small blocks of young forest-and selected for dollar value, such as an encouragement of oaks and hickories to the exclusion of other species. The result is an over population of those species that thrive in such habitats, such as deer, cowbirds, etc. If the criteria is ecological and biological diversity of the region then it is clear that LBL ought to be focused on moving its natural resources towards restoring the types of habitat that are missing, and cannot be re-established, on private lands-such as large blocks of mature forests and fields of native vegetation. Instead, the DEIS opts to follow, despite a scattering of statements to the contrary, TVA's plan of providing the full range of habitats within LBL itself, without consideration of its important recreational and biological role in the region. This approach dramatically limits the ability to provide large blocks of the type of habitat that is missing in the rest of the region.If biological science, rather than a limited version of economic science, had been applied to the analysis, the DEIS would have had to give far more credence to Alternative z.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should reconsider its list of "demand species" in the EIS.

Because it neglects the non-consumptive recreationist, such as the birder or other nature viewer.

Response

Demand species are discussed in Chapter 3.2 of the FEIS. A level of demand was recognized for non-consumptive uses such as viewing. Many bird species were specifically analyzed under Forest Interior Bird Habitat, Birds of Conservation Concern, MIS selection and Species of Viability Concern, all described in Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

270 7 On the Draft EIS, the section I found a little troubling was the "Demand Species". The introduction talks about the different demands on certain species (hunting, fishing and viewing). I strongly support the current list of species, but feel it is incomplete. I feel it covers the demands for species of consumptive users adequately. But the list neglects the non-consumptive user. It does not mention or give the effects for songbirds, an important group of species for many outdoor recreationists. Birding is one of the fastest growing and largest recreational activities. Many visitors to the Nature Station have strong interest in migratory birds. This interest can be demonstrated by the large number of people visiting the Nature Station during birding programs. I feel that songbirds as a group should be considered for the "Demand" list and the effects of the alternatives weighed out. I am surprised it was not listed. I was happy to see fallow deer (a historical species) and bald eagle mentioned. I was confused to see quail and rabbit mentioned so prominently when their main habitat and recreational use is more common and popular outside of LBL where more of the grassland, fencerow habitat occurs. I strongly support the planting of native vegetation spread to open lands, which would increase the amount of quail and rabbit. I was also surprised other "Demand species" were not mentioned including furbearers (otters, beaver, foxes, and bobcat), spring wildflowers, waterfowl, trees with fall colors. All these species help enrich the LBL visitor's experience.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do a more accurate historical and cultural analysis for the LRMP.
 Because the current Heritage plan is incomplete;
 Because the area's history and culture are very unique;
 Because waiting for project level analysis will lead to insufficient protection of these resources.

Response

This has been updated in the Final Plan & FEIS. The affects of the selected alternative on cultural resources are discussed in Chapter 3 of the EIS. The existing HRMP complies with all applicable laws and provides protection for all cultural and historical resources. As new information is found, this Plan will be updated.
 Thanks for your comment.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

221 21 The historical and cultural analysis and the guidelines for protecting these values is inaccurate and inadequate. This takes on unique importance and significance in LBL, as a result of the unique culture that existed there prior to the relocation. The current Heritage plan is unacceptable and incomplete. Because of the unique geography of this area, the many generations of settlement, and the way the culture was changed by the forced relocation, this culture and community should be recognized as a unique, cultural and historical entity that should be recognized by historical and cultural preservation agencies.

263 7 The [historical] work to be done here should include many universities, scholars, historians, anthropologists, sociologists, and the few remaining residents who remember the place. Perhaps most imporantly the tribal people with interests here must be welcomed and consulted. Even the two rivers involved should be recognized for what they were-the Cherokee and Shawnee rivers. All of this would actually be good for the much-courted tourism.

-
- 265 4 It has also been confirmed that the Traditional Cultural Places contained within LBL are NOT properly addressed by the HRMP. The TCP issue, as well as the factual and historical issues must be corrected before many of the components in the larger Management Plan can be approved. For instance, the Benges Route of the Trail of Tears is never mentioned in the HRMP, yet it could play an important role in a well thought out management plan.
- 263 6 Heritage and history are, once again, forsaken in the plan. The laughably simplistic page which exists in the document at least acknowledges there was a history and maybe some Indians; and, at most, acknowledges there was a history and maybe some Indians.
- 12 6 You should also consider effects on other cultural resources that may not be directly related to the historic environment, such as ongoing but non-historic cultural uses of the LBL.
- 12 1 I've reviewed the draft Environmental Impact Statement on the LBL Land and Resources Management Plan (LRMP) and am concerned about its treatment of the area's cultural resources. As you know, cultural resources must be considered in judging the intensity of impacts under 40 CFR 1508.27, and impacts on those that are eligible for the National Register of Historic Places must be considered under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and 36 CFR 800. Several other federal laws, executive orders, and regulations may be relevant. However, I see no evidence in the DEIS to suggest that such resources are being considered in any meaningful way. True, there is a "historical review" on pages 7-9 that provides a broad overview of the area's history, and in Chapter 3 there is Section 3.4.6, a five-page discussion that says roughly the same thing, but nowhere is there a serious discussion of actual places (or non-place cultural resources) actually affected. The LRMP's own treatment of "heritage resources" is similarly shallow and insubstantial.
- 12 4 Yet the EIS makes only passing reference to the residents and their descendants, and gives no indication that their history and cultural ties to the area might give it any historical significance.
- 228 6 The current heritage management plan for the LBL is inadequate and should be amended, with thorough archeological survey data to properly document the cultural and historical values of the Area. The plan should protect these special cultural areas with a desired future condition of old growth. Many people were forced to relocate from the LBL, after many generations of settlement, their culture and community should be respected for their unique heritage qualities.
- 237 33 Then, there is no attempt to try and properly incorporate this plan [Heritage Resource Plan] into the overall management plan. How are these management activities prescribed in the plan going to impact the cultural aspects of the LBL area? How does this interact and interplay with "the Promise" and the suffering of the former residents? Having some "Heritage Plan," that is incomplete and not properly promulgated standing alone off to the side while this issue of the cultural and heritage values of the area are brewing. It isn't a rational planning method.

-
- 26 1 The history and culture of Between the Rivers are unique components of the heritage of Lyon County and all of western Kentucky. The forced removal of some 900 families from their ancestral homes along with the justification used for those actions are critical to an understanding of that history and culture. On behalf of the Lyon County Historical Society, I ask that this aspect of LBL's history be given a more prominent position in the Land and Resource Management Plan and in the Heritage Resource Management Plan. In doing so, this defining feature of western Kentucky heritage will not be lost to future generations.
- 12 2 First, not all cultural resources -- that is, aspects of the environment that are important for cultural reasons -- are covered by NHPA and ARPA, so promising to comply with these authorities does not guarantee that cultural resources will be dealt with. Second, putting off compliance until some later date, and linking it to specific threatening actions, almost guarantees late identification of problems, late coordination with cultural resource authorities and the public, and difficult-to-resolve conflicts. Third, Section 106 of NHPA applies to all federal undertakings that have the potential to affect historic properties, not just site-specific actions. Adoption of a management plan is certainly such an undertaking, and accordingly must be subjected to Section 106 review. The sort of deferral represented by the EIS is simply inconsistent with the requirements of 36 CFR 800. Fourth, NEPA requires that effects on the environment be considered, not that they be ignored until some later date when they have become more critical and can be dealt with less well under some other law.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should preserve and restore wetlands.
 Because profit destroys nature;
 Because wetlands support a high number of wildlife and plant species;
 Because wetlands have been so rapidly lost elsewhere.

Response

Existing wetlands are described in the Plan under Part 1, Natural Resource Condition and Assessment and Land Allocation of Managed Wetlands. A program strategy stated under Soil, Water and Air Management of Part 2 of the LRMP is to protect and manage wetlands for no net loss.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- 2 1 As an avid outdoors person, I would like to see a concerted effort for LBL to focus on wetlands and the restoring of existing wetlands. The amount of wildlife and plant species that wetlands provide is amazing. I feel that this way you will be including a part of the US that has been destroyed in other places.
- 24 3 Water and wetlands must be reserved as close to nature as possible again profit destroys nature and the living spaces of creatures only found in this area.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use adequate Riparian Buffer Zones along waterbodies.
To protect water quality;
To protect reptile and amphibian habitat.

Response

Riparian corridors are described under Design Criteria standards of Part 3, of the LRMP. Further discussion may be found in Appendix B of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 189 | 6 | Streamside Management Zones have been converted to Riparian Buffer Zones; Support. |
| 279 | 6 | EPA supports the use of riparian buffers along perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral waterbodies to protect water quality. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better manage for healthy whitetail deer herds.
Because a healthy herd structure would ease stress on spring fawns and provide better hunting.

Response

Whitetail deer are recognized as a demand species, and effects to their habitat are discussed under Chapter 3.2.9. Herd management is a program level decision and out of scope of this document.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 109 | 6 | I do not think LBL is at carrying capacity for deer. We do not need more deer we need better deer quality and a better buck to doe ratio. So what I am saying management of the deer herd could be better, if we worked and educated people, we could acquire that goal. |
| 286 | 8 | Several months ago I provided a scientific paper that was published in Conservation Biology concerning adequate buffers for amphibians and reptiles (A/R) in forest planning. In reviewing the draft EIS and plan, I was unable to locate any discussion on this issue. Since many of the species covered in this research also occur on LBL, it has important relevance. It is also important on LBL because many of the riparian areas are bordered by open lands, development and/or roads. Although the riparian buffers proposed in the plan may be adequate to prevent many of the detrimental effects land management activities can have on wetlands, this research raises serious question about the adequacy of the buffers to protect the core habitat needs of A/R. This study has important implications for land management activities across LBL and should certainly be addressed in forest planning with a well reasoned and comprehensive analysis of the issue. |
| 116 | 2 | I would like to see LBL have a quality Whitetail Deer management program. |

170	3	Deer management program designed more towards a healthy herd structure rather than numbers would ease stress on spring fawns. In the long run a healthy deer herd would provide a better hunting season, equal in harvest numbers and larger trophy harvests.
161	1	I would like to see [LBL] managed for a healthy herd first and big bucks secondary.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should control and manage fish and wildlife by sound biological means.
 Because there is too much focus on game species;
 Because the fallow deer herd is a disgrace.

Response

The Species Viability Assessment and selection of MIS provide a sound biological means to manage wildlife habitat.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

217	6	LBL should be managed to promote wildlife diversity, not focus primarily on game species.
17	2	I would like to see more and better fishery and wildlife management implemented. The deer herd is an absolute disgrace. TVA had the perfect opportunity to have the "nations" best fallow deer herd, but blew it.
152	2	The 6th District [of the League of KY Sportsmen] believes that wildlife should be controlled and managed by sound biological means, such as the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife. We also believe and support hunting and fishing as a sound biological tool.
285	4	Why should we manage for a narrow range of commercially valuable species, when a more diverse forest will provide a more diverse habitat?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should save the fallow deer.
 Because they are doomed.

Response

Fallow deer are recognized as a demand species; see Chapter 3.2.9 of the FEIS.
 Alternative Y will enhance their habitat.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

192	2	Also, I guess the fallow deer are doomed. You didn't sound to upbeat about saving them but sounded like 0 well we don't need them anyway. If they were hunted I bet you would do something to find out what is happenen to them. Save these deer.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase turkey hunting.
Because there are too many hens.

Response

This is out of scope for the Plan. Turkey hunts are a wildlife program level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

116	3	I would also like to see LBL do something about improving its turkey hunting. I put in for the quota hunts every year, and I hunt the non-quota hunts every year. There is a real bad hen problem. There needs to be either some serious trapping and relocating of wild turkey hens, or more liberal harvest of them during the fall deer hunts.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should address the tick problem in the EIS.
Because there are serious impacts on human and wildlife health.

Response

Tick problems would be a program management level decision and project. However, the LRMP recognizes the need for visitor safety and viable wildlife populations under recreation and wildlife program strategies in Part 2 of the LRMP. Specifically, an emphasis under Pest Management is to conduct pest operations to maximize safety, address public health concerns while minimizing pesticide use and environmental hazards.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	6	Tick Issue: There is not sufficient discussion in this document about the history, the impacts or the potential dangers associated with deer management, seed ticks or Rocky Mountain Spotted Tick and the potential health impact on visitors to LBL.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase turkey, quail and other game bird populations.
Because it would increase hunting and tourism.

Response

Habitat of demand species will be enhanced under Alternative Y. Refer to Chapter 3.2.9. Population management and hunts are wildlife program level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

251	3	I would like to see bonus turkey on KY end of LBL
232	4	A good goal would be to try to manage turkey, quail, etc. populations to be equal to anywhere else in the state. This would certainly enhance the reputation of LBL as a place to visit for hunting opportunities. This will lead to enhanced tourism the resulting economic development that was one of the primary purposes of LBL.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should restock the lake with more fish.

Response

The Forest Service does not have jurisdiction over fish in the lakes.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

10 5 Need method of restocking lake with more fish.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should reintroduce top predators, like the black bear and red wolf, to LBL.
Because this will maintain the natural balance;
Because this will increase environmental education and viewing opportunities.

Response

This was not identified as a major issue of the plan. An in-depth, site specific analysis for any possible reintroduction would be required.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

87 4 The LRMP should make provisions for reintroduction of top of the food chain predators such as the Black Bear and the Red Wolf. Having the complete food chain will assist in maintaining the natural balance and unequalled educational and viewing opportunities.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make provisions for free ranging elk and bison in LBL.
Because it would assist in restoring native vegetation;
Because wildlife viewing and environmental education would be enhanced;
Because LBL would be the only site east of the Mississippi River with free ranging bison.

Response

The value of the LBL elk herd as the only disease-free, closely-monitored, permissible source herd in North America far exceeds the benefits to allow free-ranging elk and bison at LBL at this time.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

87 3 The LRMP should make provisions for free ranging Elk & Bison within LBL. The Elk & Bison Prairie could provide the animals for release. The reintroduction of these animals would greatly assist in restoration of historic native vegetation conditions. Wildlife viewing and environmental education would be greatly enhanced. LBL would be the only site east of the Mississippi with free ranging bison.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase the elk and bison populations.
To provide animals for movement to restoration areas;
To provide animals for auction;
To increase visitation.

Response

The Elk and Bison populations are carefully balanced to coincide with the sustainable resources of the Elk-Bison Prairie and South Bison Range.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

87	2	The herd sizes should be increased accordingly. In addition to improved customer service the increased herd size will provide the ability to have larger numbers of Elk for movement to restoration areas and more bison for auction. The sale of additional bison will provide added funds for Maintenance and Improvements. Potentially visitation will increase also providing additional funds.
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should extend the small game season.

Response

Project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

247	3	Extend small game season into October and November except for the days or weeks scheduled for deer quota hunts.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should implement a Quality Deer Management program (QDM) with buck/antler restrictions and increases in the doe harvest.
Because it could lead the way for wiser management statewide;
Because it will give LBL a more balanced age structure;
Because it could increase revenue from hunting permits for LBL;
Because it increases the benefit to hunters seeking trophy animals.

Response

Hunting will continue under preferred Alternative Y. QDM is a wildlife program management level decision and out of scope of this Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

264	1	I would love to have LBL as a trophy [deer] management area with a point restriction on each side or something to this effect.
-----	---	--

-
- 143 2 I would also like to see LBL take the initiative (at least concerning the TN portion) in the wise management practice of QDM (Quality Deer Management). Thus far in TN this is only practiced on select private lands. Adequate harvests of both sexes and balancing sex ratios as well as improving buck age structure per size restriction regulations is a great beginning and could very well lead the way for wiser needed management practices statewide.
- 204 4 I also believe that management of the deer population should include a Quality Deer Management approach for the entire LBL area. With proper habitat management and restrictions on the size of bucks allowed to be harvested during the quota hunts and non-quota archery season, LBL, with its size, could produce a number of quality deer. This could be done by implementing a point restriction (e.g., minimum 4 points on one side), antler spread restriction (e.g., 15" minimum inside spread), or a combination of these.
- 110 1 In the future I would like to see some type of size restriction on the bucks harvested. This will help LBL which is on the right track to have a more balanced age structure.
- 235 3 I would like to see healthier deer herds, with just as many bucks as doe. I would like to see a more natural balance in the buck age structure, i.e., more older bucks. This could be accomplished with more liberal doe-hunting opportunities coupled with antler restrictions on bucks. I would like to see LBL going with a 15 inch outside spread rule defining legal bucks. there needs to be no more "buck-only" hunting within LBL. All deer hunting should be "either-sex".
- 165 4 And last, if you want to expand on the great deer herd you have now, make all the Adult Gun hunts Either-sex with bucks having antler restrictions allowing 2 deer only one may be a buck. I know what you are thinking, 2 deer either sex, no way everyone should be able to take 2 does. But trust me, this will not happen, fewer than 20% will actually take 2 deer but for the ones that do take 2 does will help the herd continue to grow healthier.
- 109 2 I do feel there are some things that could be done to increase the possibility of a hunter take a mature whitetail. First reduce the number of bucks taken and increase the doe harvest. The bucks that are taken should have a size limit. I would suggest a 15 inch inside spread of the antlers.
- 220 1 Implement antler restrictions on deer for all hunts to improve buck quality even more. LBL is a unique self contained property where this could work with tremendous success. Tie the preference points for deer and turkey together.
- 169 3 I would not be opposed to some restrictions being placed on bucks to improve the age/size structure of the bucks that are harvested. I would be in favor of a more liberal doe harvest.

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 150 | 2 | My suggestion would be to make the restrictions on bucks stiffer, such as the buck must have 4 pts on one side or be ear wide. If the number of young bucks killed each year was reduced in approximately 2 to 3 years the class of deer taken would increase drastically. My opinion in a couple of years with the amount of bucks becoming mature bucks, the Forestry service could use this trophy management to increase the cost of a hunting permit. This does two things, it allows the hunters to have a better chance at a trophy deer and increase the revenue for LBL. |
| 162 | 2 | Start a QDM program, which basically means put in some sort of buck or antler size restrictions, along with an increase in doe harvest. This will bring the herd into a more natural balance, decrease the total number of deer, and allow for increased opportunities for taking trophy bucks, of which LBL has excellent potential. |
| 167 | 2 | Make at least half of LBL a trophy deer area. Use antler spread or point restrictions. Charge a higher hunter permit fee for access to the trophy areas. Thus if a hunter wants to hunt just any deer, they will not be burdened with the extra cost. If this is perceived not to work, all of LBL could have some type of spread or point restriction. I truly believe that the future of LBL's deer hunting lies in the growth of mature bucks. |
| 147 | 1 | I would like to see a management program started, such as a 15" spread. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should establish and upgrade more waterfowl hunting areas. Because it will provide more hunting opportunities and wildlife viewing areas.

Response

Desired conditions of managed wetlands and wildlife refuges is discussed under Parts 1.D and 1.E of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 244 | 3 | I would like to see more wetlands established or potholes and waterfowl holding areas that could provide more waterfowl hunting opportunities as well as waterfowl refuges that could also be used as wildlife viewing areas. |
| 247 | 13 | Upgrade waterfowl hunting areas by flooding creek bottoms. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should study the effects of ponds and watering holes facilitating dispersion of nest predators. Because they may be inflating predation rates.

Response

Fragmentation and predation is discussed under Special Habitat Components, Forest Interior Bird Habitat, Chapter 3.2.7 of the FEIS. Populations of interior birds will be monitored through the MIS selection of wood thrush for habitat needs. Management of waterholes is a wildlife program level decision and out of scope of this Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

45	12	I also fear that the 300 ponds and 500 wildlife watering holes at LBL that have been shown to be used by deer, raccoon, turkey, bobcat, coyote, mink, and squirrel (pg 63 of the DEIS) are also facilitating the dispersion of those nest predators through the forested areas and may be inflating predation rates even further.
----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not actively manage vegetation Because unmanaged forests are healthier and more economically productive.

Response

Viability of species of concern are dependent on diverse habitats. Optimal benchmarks of these habitats are displayed in many tables of Chapter 3.2 FEIS. Alternative Y provides for diversity of vegetation and forest health, as described in Chapter 3.2.10, FEIS. Area Goal #5 and Program Strategy for Forest Management of the LRMP stress the need for diverse and sustainable ecological conditions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

285	7	Unmanaged forest provided for an abundance of wildlife and catapulted the U.S. into world economic leadership. Managed forest have resulted in "puny homogeneous forests" and failing ecosystems.
180	1	The overlapping of southern and northern forest and shrub species in Western Kentucky and the Land Between The Lakes has historically been scientifically considered as contributing to the interest and beauty of the woodlands. Wechallenge the repeated reference to future management of the Land Between the Lakes forest resources as for oak and hickory emphasis. This smacks of commercial and production of a forest sales crop. The maples, beeches, sycamores, hackberry, and other native species provide food for wildlife in addition to the oak and hickory. The varied native species should not be "managed" from the Land Between The Lakes woodlands.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should maintain at least 12,000 acres of open space on LBL, and potentially more.

Response

Alternative Y provides for approximately 10,600 acres of open lands with approximately 3,000 acres under cultivation. Some relocation of open land fields may occur. See objectives in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

258 10 We strongly support maintaining at least 12,000 acres of open space on LBL. We also support the potential movement of these areas to new locations over time.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should convert open areas on LBL from fescue to warm season grasses.
To benefit wildlife.

Response

Alternative Y provides for restoration of 75 acres of open lands to native grasses annually. See objectives in the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

258 4 We strongly support the conversion of open areas on LBL from fescue to warm season grasses. More warm season grasses on LBL are a good thing for wildlife.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should include open areas of native herbaceous vegetation, row crop, water in the LRMP.
To increase habitat diversity;
To benefit wildlife.

Response

Open lands, including row crops and native vegetation are included for management under Alternative Y. Refer to discussion on Open Lands in Section 1.A in the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

244 2 I would like to see some more openings and open land established for food plots, crops, wildlife viewing areas and native warm season grasses.

87 5 The use of native grasses and wildflowers should be included in the process of maintaining open spaces in addition to the use of agricultural crops. This will provide food for all wildlife including the reintroduced elk & bison and increase the historic condition of LBL.

204 2 Open areas of native herbaceous vegetation, row crop, water, should also be included in the LRMP to increase habitat diversity. In addition, these different habitat types should be interspersed throughout LBL to achieve the maximum benefit for the wildlife.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase its target acres for Mature Open Stable and Successional Oak Forest by 10,000 acres.

Response

Acres of stable and successional oak cover types are displayed in Table 3.2.4 E, Chapter 3 of the FEIS for expected acreages by alternative. Optimal benchmark acres were determined by the species viability assessment, described in Chapter 3 FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189 2 Despite the TWS KY Chapter's general support for Alternatives X and Y, these options do not adequately address the needs for mature open forest (Table 3.2.4E). We feel that the number of target acres for Mature Open Stable and Successional Oak Forest should be increased by 10,000 acres for both categories.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should replace the work area concept for vegetation management with a best information approach to projects.

Response

Thank you for your comment. The work area concept is not carried forward under Alternative Y.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189 7 Work Area concept for vegetation management has been replaced with strategies that allow for intensive management in specific locations for forest health, critical wildlife habitat needs, and scenery management, as well as area-wide projects; Strongly support use of best information to implement projects, not location of work area.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should release more information pertaining to its use of herbicides and pesticides.

Response

Standards for use of herbicides/pesticides on LBL are included in the Design Criteria, Part 3 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

192 3 What is happening with all of these chemicals that you have been dumping on these fields for 50 years. You don't even talk about chemicals at all. How can you talk about keeping corn fields and not talk about chemicles?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should plant more trees.
To better the forest aesthetics.

Response

A pre-dominantly oak-hickory forest will be maintained under Alternative Y. The determination of need for regenerating trees and its method is decided at the project level.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

52 3 Plant some more trees, for we see where you have cut down a lot; so replace them with good oaks, walnut, birch and pine.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should change its standard of not applying herbicides within 30 feet of a lake to a minimum of 100 feet.

Response

Standards for use of herbicides/pesticides on LBL are included in the Design Criteria, Part 3 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201 38 Page 81: "item 17. No herbicide will be applied within 30 horizontal feet of the lake..." Disagree. I propose this should be a minimum of 100 feet.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should control and avoid the introduction of invasive exotic species.

Response

The threat of non-native invasive species is recognized. Refer to the program strategies under Pest and Non-Native Invasives Management, Part 2 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

239 3 [We do ask] that invasive exotic species be controlled and that such species not be introduced.

265 43 I support every effort to eliminate invasive non-native species from LBL. This should be the goal of LBL's resource management, not commercial logging. This would provide an important tool for EE as research and demonstrations could be undertaken on what works, and what does not, as well as the impacts on the environment of various methods.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should keep cultivated land and food plots at current levels within LBL.
Because if herd densities remain as is, there is no need for more plots.

Response

Cultivated land and food plots will continue under management of Open Lands for Alternative Y. An emphasis is for no net loss of open lands. However, based on acres of habitat needed by the species viability assessment, it is forecast that acres of cultivation will decline. Water (ponds and marshes) will stay the same. Refer to Table 3.2.5C of the FEIS; Expected acreages of grassland and cultivated cover type by site type. Demand species and effects to the populations are discussed under Chapter 3.2.9 FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 219 | 1 | Do not change your current plan as relates to food plots and timber harvests. It looks great to me. |
| 109 | 5 | Farm land, I feel there is enough farm land at the present time. If we maintain the herd density as it is now there is no need to increase crop land. |
| 247 | 4 | Continue farming policy and the use of herbicides and pesticides for use on wildlife food plots. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase the amount of cultivated land and food plots within LBL.
Because it will improve deer quality;
Because it will improve hunting.

Response

Cultivated land and food plots will continue under management of Open Lands for Alternative Y. An emphasis item is for no net loss of open lands. However, based on acres of habitat needed by the species viability assessment, it is forecast that acres of cultivation will decline. Water (ponds and marshes) will stay the same. Refer to Table 3.2.5C of the FEIS; Expected acreages of grassland and cultivated cover type by site type. Demand species and effects to the populations are discussed under Chapter 3.2.9 FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 251 | 4 | More food plots. |
| 246 | 11 | Reclaim and plant fields that were open land in the past. |
| 171 | 2 | I also would like to request that there be more soybeans and agriculture planted there as this would greatly improve the quality and health of all the deer there. |
| 145 | 4 | It seems to me many of the areas at LBL have fallen by the wayside. I'm not sure if it's taking a back seat to the elk herd or what the problem is. I realize there is very little if any agriculture going on at LBL now. Is there any way to reintroduce row crop fields to the areas? This would greatly improve hunting. |

246	7	Keep farming all possible farmland. This feeds all wildlife. I would be in favor of subsidiz[ing] the farmers to do more planting.
232	3	The populations of several of the game species, including quail and wild turkey, could be greatly enhanced by the creation of more open areas and food plots.
10	2	There seems to be a need for more planted vegetation for wildlife.
167	4	I have also noticed an increase in food plots. This is a great thing and I would encourage more of this type of activity.
222	6	Increased agriculture and wildlife plantings as long as the area can be hunted.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should decrease or eliminate cultivated land and food plots within LBL.
 Because there is enough cultivated land outside of LBL;
 Because cultivated lands are not good habitat;
 Because it fragments the forest;
 Because it is contrary to environmental education goals aiming to show how natural ecosystems support wildlife;
 Because it is an injustice to former residents who were forced to abandon their farms;
 Because it contributes to sedimentation;
 Because pesticides and fertilizer degrade water quality.

Response

Cultivated land and food plots will continue under management of Open Lands for Alternative Y. An emphasis item is for no net loss of open lands. However, based on acres of habitat needed by the species viability assessment, it is forecast that acres of cultivation will decline. Refer to Table 3.2.5C of the FEIS, Expected acreages of grassland and cultivated cover type by site type. The effects of each program have been analyzed in the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

221	14	In close conjunction with ending logging on LBL, the FS needs to eliminate commercial farming operations. This program is one of the worst that is currently subsidized by the FS on LBL. Not only is it one of the worst contributors to sedimentation into the reservoirs, but the FS allows the farmers to use all kinds of chemical fertilizers and pesticides. These pesticides and fertilizers are unnecessarily contributing to water quality degradation, from the local streams in LBL to the dead zone in the Gulf of Mexico. In addition, this annual farming keeps open areas from reforesting naturally. This contributes to forest fragmentation, and allows cowbirds and other ecologically disrupting factors to be prevalent in the landscape.
-----	----	---

-
- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 221 | 15 | Allowing these farm leases is a huge slap in the face to the former residents, who were forced to abandon their farms so that the area could be managed as a wilderness type area free from this type of activity. To turn around and allow leases for commercial farming after kicking the people off so they couldn't farm is the worst kind of injustice that cannot and should not be supported. |
| 265 | 41 | Let me add, up front, that as a native of the land, I find it desirable that a significant portion of the landscape has retained the basic patterns that existed prior to the forced expulsion. It makes it possible to see the outlines of the communities and the farms and neighborhoods that are now absent. If the goal is plantings for wildlife, there are certainly more desirable food sources than corn and soybeans and seresca. There are also other means of achieving the goal than by commercial farming practices in a land intended to become increasingly natural. It is also counter to EE goals to be demonstrating that an ecosystem apparently cannot feed its own native species and must be supplemented by tillage. |
| 237 | 27 | What the draft plan is calling for in terms of management would mostly result in habitats that are plentiful elsewhere in the region. There is thousands and thousands of acres of row crop farm land outside LBL. It isn't even good habitat for much of anything. Why dedicate thousands of acres of row crop farmland to LBL when all it is doing is fragmenting the forest and contributing to the overabundance of this bad habitat across the region. It makes no sense. The same can be said, although to a lesser degree, about the native/natural openlands. While there is a great deal of this habitat which has grown out from old fields and pastures that have either been put into CRP or abandoned in the region around LBL, some intelligently placed high quality native/natural openlands in LBL could provide habitat for some native, beautiful bird species for the enjoyment of visitors. However, too much of this poorly placed could hurt the forest interior birds, which much worse need the habitat. We believe all of this has to be considered when deciding overall goals and objectives for the area. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should cut back vegetation and trees on trails at Wrangler's.
To allow for better trail riding.

Response

Trail maintenance will continue under Alternative Y. Locations for annual maintenance are decided at the program and project level. This is out of scope for the LRMP.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 81 | 2 | My comments will be for Wranglers Campground & trails. Some of the trees & vegetation on some of the trails could be cut back to allow for better trail riding. |
|----|---|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should only cut trees for necessary safety and maintenance purposes.

Response

Objectives for managing LBL's forest cover are to maintain and improve wildlife habitat, to manage for forest health concerns and to provide scenic vistas (Vision and Direction, Part 1, LRMP). Hazard trees are removed for public safety (3.A Recreation Areas, Vegetation Management Practices, LRMP).

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 35 | 1 | No logging or clearing except for fire breaks, maintain[ing] existing pasture areas and to control blight. |
| 9 | 2 | Cut trees only when it is absolutely necessary. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should allow some of LBL to be managed for old growth.
Because it would be of value to the public;
Because it is the most lacking habitat in LBL.

Response

Old growth is discussed in the LRMP, part 1 and Chapter 3.2.3. FEIS. The need for old growth habitat is assessed under the species viability assessment. Large, medium and small blocks of potential old growth have been delineated within Core Areas for which most natural processes will be allowed to evolve. Additional small and medium sized blocks of potential old growth may be identified under project level proposals.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 228 | 7 | I am writing these comments on the draft forest management plan for the Land Between the Lakes National Recreation Area (LBL) to insist that the U.S. Forest Service allow as much as possible of the LBL to evolve through natural processes into contiguous, old growth forest. |
| 237 | 28 | We believe a wise choice is to have a long range goal of managing most of LBL as old growth forest. This would provide the most lacking habitat, and be of the most relative value to the public in this region. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use prescribed burning as a management tool.
To restore land to a pre-European settler condition;
To benefit wildlife habitat.

Response

Thank you. Preferred alternative Y calls for an increase in prescribed fire to manage vegetation cover types for a diverse set of wildlife habitats. An annual average of 10,000 acres is forecast but may vary due to weather. See objective in the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 258 | 5 | We strongly support the control burn objectives in Alt. Y. |
|-----|---|--|

189	16	Significant increase in use of prescribed fire, particularly in open lands, demo areas and ecosystem restoration areas. Up to 10,000 acres may be burned in appropriate, optimal conditions for forest health, regeneration and safety considerations; Strongly support and recommend a goal of 15,000 acres per year.
176	3	I like Alternative "y". I would like to see some areas as they were when the Indians managed the land. I am sure this can be done with controlled burns.
232	2	I support the active management of LBL including controlled burning for the enhancement of wildlife.
247	9	Manage wildlife areas by burning and enhancing habitat.
45	5	I think the application of fire to upland oak forests to restore savannah-woodland conditions is fitting.
283	5	I am for the use of prescribed burning in vegetation management.
244	5	I would like to see more controlled burning done, this really helps the wildlife all the way around and also makes the area less fire hazard.
227	4	We, TN Div of Forestry, support the increased use of prescribed fire in maintaining healthy ecosystems.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not use extensive burning in management. Because LBL has a different rainfall and unique plants from western states;
 Because the USFS isn't qualified (with either equipment or personnel) to effectively manage burns.

Response

Prescribed fire is a tool to be used for vegetation management, to meet goals and objectives of species viability assessment and to provide diverse wildlife habitats. Please refer to the fire analysis in Chapter 3 of the FEIS which speaks to the fire regime at LBL. Prescribed fire will be conducted under specific weather and fuel moisture parameters only. The number of trained personnel and specialized fire equipment is increasing at LBL so that the prescribed fire program may be safely carried out.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

180	6	This organization has great reservations regarding the Draft Plan regarding extensive burning in the Land Between The Lakes. Western Kentucky has many inches of rainfall, unlike Western states. We believe the destruction of the wild Huckleberry bushes, Turkey peas, Buckberry bushes, and unusual plants that wild turkeys, quail, and other wild creatures thrive on is short-sighted. Many of these plants, while small in size are very slow growing and old. We challenge the "Management" of areas where Mother Nature has always known best.
-----	---	--

201 18 I specifically and strenuously object to the significant increase in the use of prescribed fire, particularly in open lands, demonstration areas and ecosystem restoration areas. Up to 10,000 acres may be burned. Simply, the USFS doesn't have the credibility based on past year's burn fiascoes in the western states including the intentional setting of illegal fires by a USFS employee that destroyed hundreds of thousands of acres of land and private property last year alone. The USFS doesn't have sufficient fire protection equipment or personnel to handle uncontrolled fires at LBL, why should I believe they could handle controlled burns?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not sell timber.
 Because the forest should be managed for ecological values, not economic;
 Because it is in violation of the original purpose of LBL;
 Because the Forest Service should donate the harvest to a charitable organization instead;
 Because it is an economic detriment to the local region.

Response

Timber harvesting, as a tool for managing vegetation cover and diverse wildlife habitat, is used for ecological values, based upon the species viability assessment in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Revenues from harvests are returned to LBL, per the 1998 LBL Protection Act, to be used for recreational and environmental education purposes. National Forest Service policy recently has made possible Stewardship Contracting and LBL will use this tool where appropriate. An economic analysis for forest products is presented in the FEIS, Chapter 3.4.10.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

28	3	No timber sales. Clean and clear where necessary, but no sale of the timber.
29	4	Donate the timber harvest to a charitable organization-no profit!!!
101	3	It is also clear that the proposed logging plan is excessive and based on criteria that do not reflect the actual history or purpose of LBL. I ask that the criteria for forest management be re-evaluated in light of the actual history and the original purpose of LBL, and that revenues from such management NOT be accessible to the LBL managers, removing all financial incentive for using the forest according to its dollar value rather than its ecological and cultural values.
180	3	We challenge the Draft Plan regarding the yearly amount of timber proposed for sale now and in future years.
221	11	Considering that the FS routinely loses money from its logging program, there is no way that subsidized timber competing with private land timber can be considered to be an economic asset. In fact, it is an economic detriment to the region overall.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not log LBL.
Because it ruins the aesthetics of the land;
To preserve the forest for future generations;
Because the key to future economic growth lies in preserving what we have managed;
Because visitors will not come to see a degraded environment;
Because it is unnatural;
Because it contributes to erosion and sedimentation;
Because science cannot support claims that it is needed to maintain the oak/hickory forest.

Response

LBL and the U.S. Forest Service follow the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act of 1960 mandate to sustain timber yields and allow harvesting. Objectives of forest management at LBL, as stated in the LRMP, are for providing scenic vistas, wildlife habitat and forest health. Refer to the Suitable Uses, Part 1, Strategy, LRMP. Timber harvests will be integrated with environmental education to provide information on forest management (Forest Management program strategy, Part 2 LRMP). Projects for forest management will be designed with best management practices and regional soil and water practices as guidelines to reduce erosion and sedimentation. Visuals and scenic quality standards will also apply (Design Criteria and Standards, Part 3, LRMP). A scientific review supported the species viability assessment to determine optimal acres of community types and the need to manage for oak/hickory forest and future old growth (references, FEIS). Nearly 25% of LBL, or 42,000 acres are allocated to Core Area prescriptions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

257	1	I love trees and I am against any logging in LBL.
243	3	There should be no logging.
259	2	Logging in LBL should be stopped. It is so disappointing to be hiking a beautiful nature trail and come upon an unsightly logging area. I have seen the damage to the forest and to surrounding trees.
216	3	I am opposed to commercial logging within LBL. The Forest Service premise that they must log the area to maintain a predominantly oak/hickory forest to meet wildlife habitat needs is obviously based on poor and/or preferred science. The FS's supposition that without logging, beech/maple forest would replace the oak/hickory forest has no merit although it has been used again and again in an effort to gain public support for logging. Science and common sense does not support such a conclusion. If that were the case, the beech/maple forest would have surely replaced the oak/hickory forest thousands of years ago. Nature dictates forest species based on geographical and geologic phenomenon of the area. Oak and hickory trees are indigenous to this area, and without some changes in the natural phenomenon or perhaps some bureaucratic intervention, science tells us that the oaks and hickories will remain the predominant species within this region of the country. With surrounding private lands being increasingly logged, LBL forest should be allowed to mature naturally and provide a natural habitat for all species that are indigenous to this area.

-
- 24 1 Timber Harvest - against this proposal due to the fact that once these trees are removed it will take decades for them to look like they do today and in decades the present forest will be even more beautiful. We need to retain this timberland as is for the future generations; once these trees are destroyed they are not replaceable.
- 217 7 Also, it should be obvious that the lakes themselves will last longer if we stop the erosion and sedimentation brought on by the logging, and farming operations. Please revise the plan to eliminate logging and farming in LBL.
- 221 10 Third, the scenic beauty that would develop from a large, old growth forest, would attract visitors from around the world. As the plan and EIS admits, visitation to LBL has been dropping off, and part of that has to be attributed to the degradation of the environment through the many tens of thousands of acres of logging which have occurred there in the last several decades.
- 217 4 Commercial logging in LBL is wrong! It is not "natural". This is public land and as such, belongs to all of us and should not be logged.
- 221 6 The first of these changes should be to drop the commercial logging program. This program is unsustainable, and will degrade the area's environment to a degree that it may never recover for many decades. Already the area has been severely degraded by many decades of overcutting, including thousands of acres of clearcutting. Of the entire approximate 180,000 acre LBL, very few even have trees that are over 100 years old. There may not be one acre of , true old growth in the entire recreation area, although remnant patches of older forest indicate that the area is capable of growing magnificent old growth forests with a variety of huge trees and lush undergrowth. The almost complete absence of this condition is a travesty that needs to be changed.
- 242 2 I think logging in the LBL should be stopped.
- 265 40 There are maybe two, possibly three stands of mature forest on all of LBL, though the existing inventory left by TVA would make this impossible to determine by examining only the paper record. And, these stands are very small. Examination of the actual situation at LBL, rather than relying on TVA's incomplete records, make it very difficult to justify commercial logging practices anywhere in LBL. Timber management needs to take place in LBL, but TVA's stated criterion was the suppression of mature forest! Given the information stated above, such a goal is simply misguided. Yet, it appears to have been adopted without question.
- 212 25 It is not in the interest of this region to continue logging LBL especially. The key to future economic growth in this region lies in NOT destroying what we have managed to preserve.

120	1	I do not support logging in LBL. I prefer the land to remain as it is and not become a revenue generating operation.
183	17	The reference to the short leaf pine stand and the need to 'actively manage' the stand leads us to believe that it is likely the area will be logged. The concern over the need to manage this pine stand is not appropriate under Criteria 5, and should be considered in the analysis of the alternatives in the EIS.
183	20	Consideration for protecting (and not logging) the only portions of LBL and the only public lands in Western Kentucky and Central and Western Tennessee that may qualify as wilderness.
265	37	Given the projected trend towards an increasing need for large blocks of mature forest, and the increasing demand for places suitable for wilderness type recreational experiences, coupled with the mandate for EE, at least questioning the appropriateness of commercial logging as a resource management tool is an obvious need.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should practice limited logging in LBL.
 Because there is enough open land already;
 Because the viability of forest species cannot be ensured;
 Because a limited amount of logging will help the undergrowth;
 Because of the increased demand for wilderness recreation.

Response

Selected alternative Y calls for an annual average of 2200 treated acres based on wildlife habitat needs, providing scenic quality and meeting forest health concerns. Vegetative cover types will be managed to meet the needs of the species viability assessment discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Refer to Compatible Uses, Part 1 of the LRMP, for where timber harvesting is suitable.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
-------------	-------------	----------------

21	1	I have been informed that you are going to start cutting 12-11600 acres of timber per year for 10 years. You will not get money or support from me if this is the case.
121	1	No logging or clear cutting for views except for fire breaks.
266	2	Logging at a minimum rate will ensure the undergrowth to feed wildlife. I think there should be some logging but it should be kept to a small percentage.
116	1	I want it to go on record and say that I'm in favor of limited timber harvest.
237	37	Also, we do not believe that logging to create open oak woods is justified. Why sacrifice canopied forest to create openland when there are thousands and thousands of acres of existing openland that could be planted in oak trees to create this habitat, if that is justified. This proposal is not based on up to date science and appears just another excuse to log more. How can LBL justify logging more than the Shawnee National Forest proposed to log, but was stopped by court orders because it could not guarantee the viability of certain forest species, when LBL has 100,000 less acres?

247 8 Limit timber harvest and no clear cutting of large tracts of timber. We are aware that we need to harvest a certain amount of timber to maintain a healthy wildlife population.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should continue, or even increase, the amount of logging currently done in LBL.

- To create new growth;
- To create habitat for many animals for viewing and hunting;
- To improve herd health;
- To produce revenues.

Response

Timber harvesting, as a tool for managing vegetation cover and diverse wildlife habitat, is used for ecological values, based upon the species viability assessment in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Revenues from harvests are returned to LBL, per the 1998 LBL Protection Act, to be used for recreational and environmental education purposes. National Forest Service policy recently has made possible Stewardship Contracting and LBL will use this tool where appropriate. An economic analysis for forest products is presented in the FEIS, Chapter 3.4.10. Selected alternative Y calls for an annual average of 2200 treated acres based on wildlife habitat needs, providing scenic quality and meeting forest health concerns. Vegetative cover types will be managed to meet the needs of the species viability assessment discussed in Chapter 3 of the FEIS. Refer to Compatible Uses, Part 1 of the LRMP, for where timber harvesting is suitable.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 196 | 2 | Some logging and clearcuts would be nice. |
| 166 | 2 | ...Logging/clear cutting...would provide the browse needed during the winter and Deer management program designed more towards a healthy herd structure rather than numbers would ease stress on spring fawns. In the long run a healthy deer herd would provide a better hunting season, equal in harvest numbers and larger trophy harvests. |
| 167 | 3 | Cutting small amounts of timber would be beneficial. This would also create logging roads for use by game animals and hunters on foot. |
| 10 | 9 | There seems to be a need to double impact of forestry cutting. |
| 166 | 1 | Logging and clear cuts would provide a secure environment for a vast array of creatures. As the hardwoods age they create a canopy that blocks the sun needed by smaller underbrush and vegetation. As this vegetation fades so does the needed cover for the wildlife to escape and hide from predators. It also provides the needed nutrition to sustain the large population that exists in LBL. Through a well-organized logging and clear-cut program, LBL can provide the needed food source and shelter for its wildlife while funding programs by selling the wood. A sound logging program would involve a 15-20 yr rotation and can be zoned separate from Hiking trails. Nothing would be lost visually to the avid hikers and outdoors-men, while improving the environment for the wildlife they hike to view. |

220	4	Continue with timber harvest at the rate it has been in the past.
235	5	LBL needs to have an increase in annual timber harvests to improve wildlife habitat and biodiversity. And LBL and the Forest Service needs to follow their own plan! I have been very disappointed to see the lack of timber harvests during the past many years on both LBL as well as the Cherokee National Forests---when the management plans called for such harvests.
218	3	As for the specifics relating to deer hunting and management I think that this should be based on sound scientific principles and not on the emotions of those far removed. I do not have a problem with timber harvesting to the extent that it is done in a balanced way preserving a forest quality for all users. I do not think it should be done away with entirely and based on my own observations I think it should probably be increased as a tool for the improvement of wildlife habitat.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not clear cut.

Response

No clearcutting is proposed under Alternative Y

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

169	1	I think that some logging would be good to open up some of the understory for browse growth, but not clear cutting.
201	26	This commenter does not support any clear cutting, even-aged management (or any other practice irregardless of what you call it) where the USFS or its contractors go into an area and remove all the trees from that area. I could support a carefully and thoughtfully crafted selective tree harvesting management program that is reviewed and approved by an independent technical and lay board of reviewers. In fact, I could be an advocate of this approach for the production of better and healthier populations of deer and turkey.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use a variety of harvest methods to manage for oak-hickory habitat.
 To ensure various stages of growth and succession are represented;
 To support the local economy.

Response

The management of oak-hickory is a major emphasis area of the General Forest land allocation for xeric, dry and dry-mesic site types. Over the ten year period, 22,000 acres will be treated by a variety of mechanical means and the end product will support local economies. Refer to Area Goal #5, Forest Management program emphasis in the LRMP and discussions of Major Forest Communities in Chapter 3.2.3 of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 227 | 2 | With LBL's professional staff, coupled with the availability of forest resource, we, TN Div. of Forestry, recommend that LBL attempt to restore oak species on the area's better sites. Ultimately, proper silvicultural practices will lead to preferred species composition and stand structure and, at the same time, support the local economy through occasional timber harvests. |
| 204 | 1 | It is my opinion that any plan approved should provide a management scheme that provides for a long-term sustainable oak-hickory habitat. The plan should allow for the use of timber harvesting by clear cutting, select cutting, shelter wood cutting, etc. in order to ensure that the various stages of succession and growth are represented in a scientifically sound manner to allow the LBL to be sustained as an oak-hickory forest for the long term. |
| 258 | 3 | We agree and support the preferred alternative for vegetation management in Alternative Y. However, we ask that this alternative be altered to increase the acreage available to receive timber management for wildlife habitat. As you may be aware, the oak/hickory forest of LBL is in decline. We are gravely concerned that the current total impact of Alt. Y (roughly 18,000 acres) will be insufficient to maintain oak/hickory forest and forest regeneration across the 125,000 acres of LBL that can receive management. While we do not know what percent of the forest being managed over a 10-year period will protect the oak/hickory forest regeneration and productivity, we do not feel it unrealistic to expand alternative Y to 25% of the forest base of LBL over the next 10-years. This will balance against the 25% of the landbase being placed in the biosphere core area, which we also support (42,500 acres). |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use the acreages of even and uneven aged management proposed in the Draft LRMP.
 To attain a better balance of age classes and structure;
 To enhance benefits to priority bird species and other wildlife.

Response

Thank you for your support. Please refer to Area Goal #5, Prospectus, and General Forest Land Allocation Prescriptions in the LRMP for Alternative Y's estimate of acres for treatment

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
-------------	-------------	----------------

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 45 | 6 | The proposed acreages of even-aged and uneven-aged management in the various forest types are indeed needed to attain a better balance of age classes and structure that will help to perpetuate those systems and enhance their benefits to priority bird species and other wildlife. |
|----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use selective cutting;
To provide wildlife habitat and food;
To allow for new growth;
To improve the health of the deer herd;
To produce revenues for LBL.

Response

Alternative Y forecasts treating an annual average of 2,200 acres using mechanical treatments to sustain habitat diversity (refer to Area Goal #5, LRMP). Habitat for deer populations is provided for under program strategy statements of forest management and wildlife management, part 2 of the LRMP. Mechanical treatments may utilize a variety of silvicultural methods but will not include clearcutting.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 143 | 1 | I have developed a sense of dedication to the sport of deer hunting and it is of my opinion that LBL could become a leader in wise management practice. I would personally like to see adequate timber harvest in the form of small clear cutting and select cutting so as not to jeopardize the integrity of the beauty of LBL but at the same time, provide a more diverse habitat for the whitetail as well as providing much needed food sources. |
| 109 | 4 | Another thing I feel would help is to log a small percentage yearly. Two to five percent, not clear cut but selective cutting would allow new growth and yet take the mature trees which are often beyond their prime mast production years. This would improve the health of the heard also. This would also produce needed revenues for LBL. |
| 246 | 12 | "Select" timber harvest. Harvest the trees like they were on "your" property. |
| 110 | 2 | I would also like to see areas of select cut timber harvesting. I wouldn't want a whole area to be select cut but if it was feasible to do strips in each area and roatate every 3 to 5 years. This is very beneficial to wildlife, but you already know that. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should give slash and debris to area entrepreneurs to sell.
Because it is an innovative way to deal with this debris.

Response

This concern is out of scope for the LRMP and decisions are made at project levels. However, wood products are currently and will continue to be made available to the public under special use permits.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 201 | 31 | Page 37: "reduction of slash and logging debris" If LBL and the USFS is truly going to be innovative then it should "get out of the box" on thinking how to deal with this. Why not work with area entrepreneurs and offer this slash and debris to them? Give them this debris. Let them cut it up and then shrink package it and let them sell it at their stores outside LBL for firewood to visitors and others. |
|-----|----|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should minimize commercialization.
Because it can lessen the visitor experience.

Response

Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service has clearly stated in the vision section its decision not to allow major commercial developments. Minor existing services that are considered appropriate and essential to visitor convenience and sustain visitation will be retained. See the Plan for more details.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

200	1	This serene atmosphere is an extremely attractive amenity. I sincerely hope that careful consideration is taken in the decision to bring in "commercialism" of any type; as this can, in our personal experiences, deter "die-hard" camping families from returning.
29	1	Make it clear on your website that NO ADDITIONAL COMMERCIALIZATION will be considered.
246	2	I live here and "play" here. No more commercialization of the LBL.
184	2	No more store or ice venders being put in, ect.
146	4	Minimize commercialization.
9	1	I would urge you to keep commercialism to a minimum.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should eliminate commercialization of any sort in LBL.
Because it violates commitments made to former residents;
Because there are public objections to commercialization;
Because it is a detriment to the local economy;
Because private landowners can better meet the needs of visitors.

Response

Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service has clearly stated in the vision section its decision not to allow major commercial developments. Minor existing services that are considered appropriate and essential to visitor convenience and sustain visitation will be retained.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

29	5	Get rid of any current commercialization or give the land back to those who originally owned it to create their own businesses.
243	1	I would like to see all commercial activities in the LBL eliminated. Any activity that is in competition with outside businesses should be stopped.

-
- 188 1 I am a former resident of BTR and I am not in favor of commercializing the area and that includes the campgrounds.
- 265 12 Efforts have even been made to claim that sales at gift shops and camp stores and restaurants are not "commercial" because the revenues generated remain within LBL for management purposes. I can imagine no other case where a business owner would claim their sales were not commercial since they used the revenues themselves. This attempt to circumvent the obvious is a flaw that must be corrected. There is little doubt what those who pushed for the use of eminent domain had in mind by the term. LBL was managed for close to twenty years before a dramatic change in management direction produced the public uproar that still haunts LBL today. A look at what was present then vs. now is a major step towards determining what was to be excluded under the original mission of LBL. Such an examination did not occur in the DEIS and should have been a necessary first step. All efforts to claim we cannot know what the term means must cease, as must all efforts to rename the commercial activities. As I have stated numerous times in the past: Anything that replaces what was forcibly removed in order to establish LBL, or that competes with private businesses outside LBL, was to be excluded. Nothing that falls under this definition must ever be added; and all facilities currently in LBL should be evaluated to see if it must be removed once again. In short, if it was forcibly removed the first time, it should be forcibly removed again.
- 35 2 No commercial development period: The trace was promised as a natural habitat and should remain so. Campers should bring their own food, etc.
- 242 1 I would like for the LBL to be free of any and all commercialization. To do otherwise is unfair to the businesses in the outside areas. After all this was a promise.
- 29 6 Promote economic development in surrounding areas because private enterprises can not compete with the government, especially one that believes the dollar is part of the trinity.
- 248 1 I oppose any commercial development in LBL.
- 29 3 Honor the original promises: no commercialization-none, never.
- 228 2 Millions of people, myself included, do not want to see any commercial logging in the Land Between the Lakes National recreation Area. There should be no further commercial development in the LBL.
- 272 3 Removing any commercial facilities or activities authorized by TVA and the Forest Service in the absence of the NEPA process or public involvement of any kind. In using the term commercial, it is intended to include all activities undertaken by private or public interests which are done for a fee. This includes stores, equipment rental, cabins, restaurants, logging, farming, mining, quarrying, and any other activities that are commercial in nature, using the plain meaning of the word.

-
- 28 2 Get rid of Wrangler's and any other store that exist there.
- 38 2 Commercialization is not an alternative. It was never intended.
- 240 1 In keeping with the original mission of LBL and the promises made to the former residents, I am opposed to any commercialization in LBL including at any of the campgrounds. There were never suppose to be any businesses in LBL.
- 265 21 The DEIS states that there will be no high end commercial facilities such as marinas or golf courses.It does, however, allow for concessions and vendors. There is much room beneath the stated upper limit in the terms "concessions" and "vendors." Despite verbal assurances to the contrary, I can find no place in either the DEIS or the Draft Plan that places solid limits on such developments, despite the obvious public objections to development. In one place (page 12) it is stated that there are "four major campgrounds" that provide outposts with "essential items campers need." (Having recently looked over the items for sale in the gift shops and campground stores I would ask that the definitions of the terms "essential" and "need" be reviewed.) In another place (page 212) it appears that such concessions and vendors are, and supposedly will be, limited to "Level Five Campgrounds." It is there indicated that there are, and supposedly will be, only three Level Five Campgrounds. Such discrepancies are not reassuring to a public that is unsure of the motives concerning development of LBL. I am more troubled by what is not said with reference to commercial sales than I am by what is said. All references to Level Five facilities refer to what is already present-the discrepancy in number not withstanding. I find nothing specific that would assure the public that no additional Level Five facilities will be added in the future, despite repeated verbal assurances. I find nothing that limits Level Five facilities with concessions and vendors to campground areas. What would prevent a concession area from being installed along Highway 68/80? I find nothing, short of the bench mark of no marinas or golf courses, that would limit how developed a Level Five Campground could become. What in the plan limits the addition of an arcade, or a McDonalds, or a gas station? Or the expansion of an existing store?
- 120 2 I do not support building grocery stores or other commercialization inside LBL. The land should be used as originally intended and represented to original landowners.
- 125 1 Periodically I like to write and let your agency know I am still opposed to any, and I do mean ANY, commercialization of LBL.

-
- 221 18 The current commercial development that is ongoing in LBL should be shut down and removed. There should not be fees for camping or entrance, or for any of the featured environmental education facilities. There should be no stores of any kind, nor any leasing of cabins or any other kind of real estate transactions. All of this should occur in the communities surrounding LBL. This is consistent with the original promise and with the green magnet concept. Any inconvenience to LBL users is miniscule compared to the injustice done to former residents who were removed from their culture against their will. If users are properly educated in the history of the past residents, they will be glad to honor their sacrifice by keeping LBL undeveloped and pristine. During the scoping process for the LBL plan, the public showed overwhelming support for keeping the entire area free from commercial development, consistent with the original demonstration project and the promises made to the former residents and the region and nation. LBL will only be a unique demonstration of how a formerly settled area can be returned to a wilderness area for outdoor recreation and environmental education if it is kept free of commercial development.
- 247 5 No commercialization.
- 101 1 If it were not for the unique management plan of LBL that would exclude all commercial activities--stores, gift shops, rental cabins, and even facilities--the Land Between the Lakes would never have been established. The forced relocation that was legally justified only under the narrow parameters of that unique demonstration would have never happened without that mission. That plan, and the resulting promise that LBL would "remain forever free to the public and undeveloped commercially," is compromised by a single clause in the LBL Protection Act which allows the LBL management to keep any revenues they can raise from fees, commercial facilities, contracts and leases with corporations or individuals and from logging. This clause forms the context within which LBL's new management plan MUST attempt to protect the original mission and the promise of LBL. In short, while the plan states that it must honor the former residents, but it does not actually do so. The currently proposed management plan does limit commercial facilities to three "level five" facilities, but it places no limits on how developed, or extensive, the "concessions" and "vendors" in those three facilities may become over time. With the Protection Act providing full economic incentive to continually increase revenues by increasing facilities and fees it is essential that firm language banning such facilities and fees be added to the plan. I ask that such language be added to the plan.
- 93 4 Don't commercialize.
- 92 3 I do not support commercialization, food chains, amusement parks, golf courses, or field sports areas in LBL.
- 121 2 No structural additions / stores / shops.

-
- 163 2 With the LBL Act as written it is safe to assume that the USFS will continue to expand commercialization in LBL to help supplement their budgets. The existing and any potential future commercial services simply is an infringement on the private sector and violates the commitment made by our U.S. Government when this land was seized under the right of Eminent Domain.
- 205 26 When LBL was created, the government promised the displaced people of the area that the land they lost would not be exploited for commercial gain, but would be held in trust for the greatest public good. The proposed plan puts the lie to this promise and paves the way for the further breaking of this important guarantee years into the future. Kentucky Heartwood is in favor of non-commercial management of the LBL, with the focus being exclusively on watershed, wildlife, recreation, and local community values of the land therein.
- 217 3 As we all know, the use of "eminent domain" to take the land for this recreation area was specifically justified by the fact that it was to be a "demonstration". It was to demonstrate that if all commercialization, including homes, farms, and businesses were removed and the land was allowed to return to a completely "natural" state, it would demonstrate the "green magnet" effect. This completely natural area would attract people seeking outdoor recreation and would promote environmental education. In doing so, it would also stimulate the economy of the surrounding areas. Therefore, any part of the proposed management plan for LBL that allows commercialization of any kind should be revised.
- 216 2 In keeping with the "Original Mission", I am opposed to any type of "commercial development" within LBL. Former residents were forced to sell their businesses to void the area of any commercialization "from the past and in the future". The no commercialization issue was to be part of LBL's unique character which set it apart from other recreation areas. Cash register receipts, or the preferences of some visitors for business conveniences within LBL should not be allowed to destroy the uniqueness of the area. There should be no business operations within LBL period - including no businesses within any of the campgrounds. Past records will show that LBL visitation was greater before there were any businesses established in LBL. I take strong exception to any interpretation of data or studies which infers that businesses within LBL would help the surrounding communities. Every bag of ice sold within LBL has an enormous impact on businesses along the perimeters of LBL. If a camper at Hillman Ferry goes to Grand Rivers to buy a bag of ice, it is almost a certainty that he will buy other goods and services while in Grand Rivers.
- 214 2 In my opinion, the promises made by the government should be held as the number one priority when making any decision in LBL. No commercial activity should occur within the boundaries of LBL. The term "commercial" has been questioned in the past. In my opinion, commercial should be understood as any activity that was occurring then TVA stole the land. This would include but not limited to: farming, grocery sales, souvenir sales, logging, food/drink/restaurant sales, grocery/supply/ tackstores, cabin rentals, canoe rentals. It is not hard to understand.

-
- 278 1 I am concerned about plans that include commercial business. I am against any type of commercialization, even in the campgrounds.
- 175 1 We are opposed to any commercialization in LBL.
- 272 9 Those promises were that in order for the area to be a true demonstration of unique public recreational land management, that all evidence of commercial and residential activities must be removed, even to the extent of using eminent domain, and that no commercial development would be allowed inside the area. Instead, it would be managed as a "green magnet" with the commercial development taking place in the private areas outside of the LBL. This was undoubtedly what was intended for the area's management, and yet, the government has been violating that sacred promise by allowing a creeping series of commercial activities to take place within the area. These need to be stopped, and all signs of such development should be removed.
- 178 4 We do not need inside LBL the following: gas stations, motels, restaurants, fast food, big advertizing signs, etc.
- 163 1 The LBL Protection Act of 1998 was supposed to stop any further commercialization of LBL; at least that is what the area businesses thought. Unfortunately, when you read the fine print you will quickly see the Act doesn't provide any incentive to stop development, yet rather it promotes development and commercialization within LBL. Simply, the USFS under the LBL Protection Act can keep all monies (income from the sale of anything in LBL) received from consumer fees and profits from sales and rentals. there is absolutely no restriction on any further development of commercial businesses and services that can be provided by the government through the USFS or their contractors.
- 201 1 Your observations about continuing your pursuit of commercialization (The Forest Service may add morecamping sites, small stores and wildlife viewing areas) is in direct opposition to what the local area merchants and former residents have repeatedly told the government and violates the trust that the former residents and business owners placed in the government when the government used the right of eminent domain to force the sale of this land. Existing commercialization of all types must be removed and planning for future commercial services must stop for the healing process between former residents and the local business people and the government to ever begin. This commenter totally opposes the USFS receiving any money back from the sale of any items in LBL including timber and goods and services. The retention of these funds simply encourages the USFS to find ways to further develop commercialism inside LBL and to cut more timber and further develop commercial; services that directly compete with the private sector.
- 263 5 The new plan leaves open the doors to all sorts of development, when all of these should not only be closed, but locked, barred and forgotten.

-
- 198 1 As former residents of LBL, we are very much opposed to commercialization of the area and this includes any commercialization in the camp grounds.
- 263 2 There should be no commercial activities in this recreation area. This includes restaurants and food services, campstores, equipment rentals, users' fees, souvenir sales, timber sales, etc...
- 238 1 KWW [Kentucky Western Wateland] has historically opposed, and continues to oppose, the development of retail or lodging facilities in LBL that would compete with surrounding businesses. Most of these businesses were built based on the non-complete promise that was made during the federal purchase of Land Between the Lakes. Nothing should be done that decreases their viability.
- 197 1 NO COMMERCIALIZATION IN LBL...EVEN IN THE CAMPGROUNDS...
- 265 2 Without a willingness to disregard the culture and people connected to the land, no serious proposal to retain the illegal commercial facilities established by TVA would be possible. This disregard for commitments made to us when we were forcibly removed from our land and heritage must be addressed. Any legitimate analysis of the Alternatives must include the ultimate cost of LBL, which was the loss of homes, farms and heritage suffered in exchange for commitments that our homeland would remain "forever free to the public and undeveloped commercially;" that it would become "increasingly natural" as the surrounding region became increasingly developed.
- 253 2 [I] would not like to ever see any commercial ventures there.
- 250 2 I do not support commercialization of LBL.
- 259 1 We like the trails and the idea of being close to nature. That is one of the reasons that we feel strongly that the area should not be developed and commercialized. The attraction is not the existing stores or gift shops, which should not be there, but the areas that have been left natural.
- 258 7 Additionally, we feel strongly that private landowners and businesses can provide the needs of the public outside of LBL, leaving LBL as the natural scape it is intended to be.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add discussion to the Plan/EIS of suspected environmental areas of concern.
Such as former maintenance area off US Hwy 68;
such as transportation yard behind the Admin complex;
such as former garage and maintenance area at Model and Empire Farm;
such as abandoned wells or cisterns.

Response

Thank you for your comment. All identified and known areas of environmental concern have been addressed.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	2	There is no discussion in this document of suspected environmental areas of concerns such as the former maintenance area off U.S. Highway 68; the existing transportation yard behind the Administrative complex; the former garage and maintenance area at Model and Empire Farm. All data from these areas should be included in an appendix at the very least for the reader to consider. I see no discussion of abandoned wells or cisterns or any insight into monitoring wells to profile and landscape the water quality issues, if they exist in various parts of the project. Such a discussion is necessary.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should address the problem of the landfill at Jenny Ridge.
Because it is rumored to have harmful substances;
because former management should clean it up.

Response

Thank you for your comment. All identified and known areas of environmental concern have been addressed.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

214	5	The landfill close to Jenny Ridge needs to be addressed. This landfill is rumored to have lead-based paint, used motor oil, herbicides, and ingredients for agent orange buried in it. The Forest Service should not be required to clean it up, but the former management who created the mess, should.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should put up cellular towers in LBL.
Because they are needed for safety/security purposes.

Response

Cellular towers are analyzed on a case by case, project level basis by the US Forest Service.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

33	1	I would like to suggest cell towers in the Land Between the Lakes. It is dangerous not to have them, since everyone has them as security purpose.
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider TVA's maintenance of transmission lines and their access roads in one land allocation, for the final LRMP.

Response

Thank you for your comment. A variety of land allocation prescriptions were considered.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

159	2	Two TVA transmission lines cross the area, one of which extends almost the length of LBL. Routine maintenance of these lines includes vegetation management and pole replacement and use of access roads that may not be within the actual cleared corridor of the transmission line. TVA requests that these transmission line access roads and the need to use these roads for routine maintenance and minor upgrades be reflected in the land allocations for the final LRMP.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider the adverse effects of forest fragmentation when considering future requests for new utility corridors.

Response

Thank you for your comment.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

224	7	Consideration should be given to the adverse affects of forest fragmentation when considering future requests for new utility corridors.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not allow permits for military operations and maneuvers anywhere in LBL. Because there is sufficient space at Fort Campbell for such exercises.

Response

Thank you for your comment. The Forest Service follows national permitting protocols.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	35	Page 59: Permits for military operations and maneuvers should not be permitted anywhere in LBL. There is sufficient space at Fort Campbell for such exercises.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should keep all current roads open.
Because roads are needed to optimize use of LBL;
Because older and disabled hunters need roads to access hunting areas.

Response

Some roads will be decommissioned, however, specific roads will be identified under project level analysis.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 248 | 3 | I would like to see all present roads maintained and not be gated. (the roads are needed to optim[ize] use of LBL) |
| 246 | 4 | Keep all numbered roads open. Never close a road for any reason. In the past some roads have had to be closed because of a few "social problems". Don't close the roads - fix the problems. I have heard rumors that some of the "300" numbered roads could be closed because of the cost to maintain these roads. Please keep these "300" numbered roads open because older and disabled hunters need these roads to access the hunting areas. |
| 252 | 2 | I also would like to see all roads left open. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better explain to the public its philosophy of road maintenance and decision making regarding road closures.

Response

The Plan does outline our general philosophy. Specific roads are covered by project level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 201 | 5 | The public needs to understand the USFS philosophy of road maintenance and how decisions have been made or will be made to maintain the internal road system. It is also incumbent on the USFS to discuss how decisions will be made or have been made to close roads to the public and when and why such decisions are necessitated. |
|-----|---|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should study the 300 - series roads to determine which need to be upgraded, temporarily closed or completely closed.

Response

This is a project level decision and out of the scope of this Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 87 | 8 | To better Protect the Resource the LRMP should provide for studies of the three hundred series roads to determine those that require Upgrading or Closure during wet conditions or Complete Closure. |
|----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not pursue further road work.
Because there are enough roads;
because more traffic will interfere with habitat and migration routes.

Response

Roads analysis for project level decisions will follow the LRMP

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

24	2	Related Road Work - Against - there are enough roads to provide access to this fabulous area - Roads will bring traffic and businesses that interfere with animal habitation and migration routes for birds and other wildlife.
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should pave the rock road leading to the 68/80.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

4	2	Please pave the rock road leading to the 68/80.
---	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make improvement on gravel road from 68/80 to Energy Lake - maybe even new gravel.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

82	4	Make improvement on gravel road from 68/80 to Energy [Lake] - maybe even new gravel.
----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should gravel all roads.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

251	2	[I would] like to see all roads maintained and graveled.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should close some roads - leave open only to foot or bicycle traffic.
To keep the area wild;
To keep "mudders" out.

Response

The plan does describe a strategy to keep the road system to the minimum level needed to meet multiple objectives. This will be done at the project level.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

110	4	As far as roads and access, there are some roads I believe that should be closed year round to foot or bicycle traffic only. This helps keep the mudders out and the area more wild, if you will.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should expand hiking & biking trails and build new ones.
To enhance visitor opportunities and experiences;
To encourage people to get out of their cars.

Response

The plan emphasizes the need for expanded trail opportunities. Refer to the Vision, Goal 7, and the recreation strategies in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

270	3	I feel the opportunities for visitors can be enhanced through the creation of more loop trails
130	1	Hiking Trails - there are needs for more loop trails for hiking/biking that would allow visitors to enjoy the outdoors and end up at the place where their car is parked. This comment has been heard no less than 20 times at NW, NS, GPVC, and SW.
100	2	Several "quiet walkways" (as you see in the Smokey Mountains NP) or short walks into woods or grassy areas would encourage people to exit their vehicles and enjoy nature under their feet. A short loop 1/4 to 1/2 mile long would be nice. A pull out for 3-4 cars would be great. Some of these short trails could extend to the North/South Trail to create longer loop trails.
100	6	Build a bike/walking trail generally following The Trace utilizing, as much as possible, roads like the Kentucky Lake Drive (lane painted to show bike/walking lane) and existing trails.

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 87 | 6 | The volume of Hiking, Biking and Hiking/Biking Trails should be increased by 2X to 3X including a N/S Trail on the eastern side with tie-in to the current N/S Trail. Several East/West connectors should also be included at ten to fifteen mile intervals. The Eastside N/S Trail should wind between near Lake Barkley and somewhat westward to provide varied views and terrain for users. The new Trail and future changes to the current N/S Trail should include water sources every ten to twelve miles (the lakes are satisfactory sources- hikers & bikers can use filters); if springs are not available wells with hand pumps should be considered. (back country users know to treat water). The southern portion of the current N/S Trail should be moved to the West side of the Trace. |
| 100 | 4 | Expand mountain bike trails and open up the south part of the north/south trail to bikes. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do maintenance on trails.

Response

Trail maintenance is performed within allowable annual budget; the plan outlines (Goal 4) the Forest Service strategy in this area.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 42 | 2 | Some of the trails could use some maintenance work but overall it's a great place to enjoy our great outdoors. |
|----|---|--|
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should change the stop sign as leaving Piney (going uphill) to a yield.

Response

Not a plan level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | 2 | Change stop sign as leaving Piney (going uphill) to a yield. |
|---|---|--|
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add a cantilever bridge to the canal bridge for pedestrian/bikes.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 100 | 5 | Add a cantilever bridge to the canal bridge for pedestrian/bikes. |
|-----|---|---|
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should put some engineering in place to stop the silt from entering the stream and lake at Turkey Creek.

Response

Improvement of conditions in the Turkey Bay/Turner Hollow watershed is a primary strategy in the Water Management program, as described in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

142	2	Turkey Creek is the recreation vehicle - 4 wheeler area and has considerable damage / disturbance to the soils and lower watershed area. This contributes a heavy siltation problem to Ky. Lake. I am asking that if LBL continues to permit this activity that some engineering be in place to stop the silt from entering the stream and lake.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should add food concession at Golden Pond & North/South Entrance.

Response

After consideration of all public input, determined that no new food concessions will be added.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

36	1	Food concession at Golden Pond & North/South Entrance.
----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should keep development of Rec/EE facilities at its current level.
Because the current facilities are adequate;
Because there is too much development;
Because gateway communities can handle further needs of visitors.

Response

Thanks for your comment; This has been incorporated, in part, into the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

244	4	I would like to see LBL kept as is as far as development is concerned. There's too much development in this region to begin with. I'd like to see LBL developed more for outdoor recreation that could provide more good hunting, fishing, wildlife viewing, hiking opportunities.
222	11	I am strongly opposed to: Increasing facilities (buildings, etc.) inside of LBL.
189	12	Support development of rustic EEA only if an existing facility is used, otherwise do not support building of entirely new structure.

-
- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 201 | 30 | Page 34: "LBL must walk a fine line" the determining criteria for these decision will be the effect to visitation, and whether the private sector is able to meet the identified need. Overall, the regional economy must not be significantly impacted. I am not sure I understand what this doublespeak means at all. Simply, if there is a need identified at LBL I am quite confident that the private sector could meet that need, if given an opportunity to do so without excessive government interference. And frankly, when needs such as rental bikes, horses, campers, etc. are identified and the private sector is employed to handle this service as a provider at the gateways it should impact the economy in a significantly positive way. |
| 17 | 1 | LBL should be left in the undeveloped status that it is. After all, no one is more than a few minutes from services in nearby towns. I enjoy all aspects of the outdoors. I especially enjoy horseback riding, hunting, and fishing. I started coming to the LBL when I was 10 years old "1970," with my family and friends. There are few places in our world today that are as undeveloped and relaxing as LBL. |
| 14 | 1 | We have been users of LBL for approximately 30 years and would like for the area to remain undeveloped. We are tent campers and it is becoming difficult to find good camping areas that are tent friendly. Too many campgrounds have bent over backwards to accommodate large RVs. |
| 204 | 5 | Recreational and Educational opportunities appear to be satisfactory in their current state. I believe that developed facilities are adequate for LBL and should not be increased. If there is to be a change in these opportunities, the change should be a shift to more dispersed opportunities with no expansion in highly developed facilities. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should reduce the levels of development in LBL. Because of commitments made to former residents; To provide better environmental education.

Response

LRMP emphasizes more dispersed opportunities balanced with developed facilities.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
-------------	-------------	----------------

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 265 | 18 | Expansion of RV pads with power hookups that would rival most modern homes while giving little, if any, consideration to the backcountry recreation user belies a bias that seems to undercut the analysis of the Alternatives in the DEIS and the choice of Preferred Alternative(s). This can also be seen in the limited area available for nonhunting backcountry use during hunting seasons, which happen to be the prime times of year to be in the woods. |
|-----|----|--|

265 3 Abandoning the commitments to the land and the Promise made to the people in exchange for increased numbers of RV sites with higher wattage outlets and grocery stores so that these "campers" might not be inconvenienced while "getting back to Nature" is also an abandonment of the obligation to provide Environmental Education to the region. For LBL's EE program to be effective, a visit to LBL should not be like a stay in a trailer court, complete with amenities.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not close any more areas to hunting.
 Because LBL is big enough for all types of recreation;
 Because money from hunting licenses helps wildlife;
 Because there is a need for more public land for hunting;
 Because there is enough area available to non-hunters;
 Because hunting is a big money maker for entire region.

Response

Except as described in the land allocation prescriptions, the hunting area designations are annual policy decisions. Very few changes to hunting have been identified in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

109	1	I feel our public ground is diminishing at a terrific rate. I and many others do not own land and cannot afford to lease ground. I depend on public ground for hunting exclusively. LBL is one of our greatest assets in Tennessee, bar none. I am opposed to closing any further areas at LBL to hunting. I feel there is already enough "Safety Zone" areas, for people who do not hunt, to watch wildlife and enjoy the great outdoors, just as I do when I am hunting.
170	1	With 170,000 acres of beautiful forest and fields there is enough room to make all parties happy, from hikers to hunters.
171	1	Please do not take any hunting ground away from LBL as this public land is the only option a lot of hunters have anymore with development and housing. I believe there is plenty of nature areas there already.
266	4	Hunting and fishing is a big money maker, as sportsmen and women spend millions each year to support their hobby. Please don't take away from that by making the safety zones larger.
149	1	Public hunting grounds are the only source of hunting land for a good many people. These people buy their hunting license and tags. This money directly helps the wildlife. I'm not in favor of losing any public hunting grounds, what-so-ever. In fact KY needs more public accessed hunting grounds. The hunters and fishermen have always "paid their way". Some other groups have not. Hunters are informed and concerned about habitat, and if asked, will help do something about the loss of it.
150	1	I think LBL is a great place to hunt and it would be a great loss if any of the land was to be rezoned to prevent hunting.

196	1	As far as the hunting goes it is working already, I have been seeing more deer and a lot more bucks. I don't want to lose any land.
222	10	I am strongly opposed to: Closing any areas to hunting. Hunters have been involved in helping LBL becoming a destination of choice in western Kentucky. They add value to the surrounding communities with their (our) support by spending money on camping, hotels, restaurants, etc.
235	7	I do not want new large closed areas to hunting and if they do then they need to charge who ever uses it a User Fee like they charge hunters.
162	5	LBL hunters use the park for a limited time of the year and come from all areas of the state (and country). While we may not be as vocal or informed as other user groups in the park, we certainly don't want to see decreased opportunities placed on our hunting privileges in the park. Since most hunting takes place during the off season for most other park activities and uses, I believe hunting can co-exist with current and additional park uses. Please consider this whenmaking/changing regulations.
218	4	I have heard that there is a proposal to increase the number of no-hunting zones. I am opposed to this however I would understand if areas we closed for a period of time and hunting allowed at others, in other words if these areas were shared.
143	3	LBL is big enough to provide for the hunter as well as the non-hunter. Neither should be denied the pleasure of their stay or visit.
110	3	I would also like to mention that I believe that there is more than enough area available to non hunters. We (the hunters) only use LBL as a whole for a few months per year. I believe that we both have ample time to enjoy doing the activities we enjoy without laying aside more area with no hunting allowed.
174	1	I use LBL for hunting and fishing. Please continue to allow hunting on all the current areas. I am strongly opposed to any reduction in hunting opportunities.
222	2	I support: Continued use of all currently open areas for hunting. Hunters have been involved in helping LBL become a destination of choice in western Kentucky. They add value to the surrounding communities with their (our) support by spending money on camping, hotels, restaurants, etc.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose the Rec/EE stipulations of plan Y. Because federal budgets may not adequately support X; To support more tourism in the nearby communities.

Response

Thanks for your comment. This is supported by financial analysis in the EIS. Y is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

258	6	We support Alternative Y for Recreation and Environmental Education on LBL. We are concerned that federal budgets will not adequately support Alt. X.
189	15	Dispersed facilities that support gateway communities' economic development and tourism are more actively considered; Support use of dispersed facilities for EE for nearby communities.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should manage recreation to reduce erosion or deterioration of riparian areas/watersheds.

Response

LRMP Goal 4 calls for improvement of watersheds.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	21	Recreation uses and road and trail networks will be managed to reduce erosion or deterioration of riparian areas and watershed conditions. Support, although special attention needs to be paid to OHV area.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should manage LBL for a wide spectrum of recreation opportunities.

Response

These comments are supported by the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

266	3	If they fish or hunt, camp or just boat, please keep the chance to do all that available to the youngsters of today.
183	21	That the Forest Service provide a variety of recreation opportunities including those on the more primitive end of the scale.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create archery only hunting areas.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

169	2	Land Between the Lakes is a very special place that has been developed into a tremendous recreational resource. Part of that resource provides hunting opportunities for citizens such as me, and for this I am very thankful. I would like to see the possibility of some ARCHERY ONLY hunting areas on both the KY and TN sides.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should designate non-hunting areas.
To ensure that non-hunters can safely recreate;
Because there is demand for non-hunting backcountry recreation;
To provide for better nature viewing;
To minimize hunting of human tolerant wildlife in nature view areas.

Response

There are such areas designated as part of Nature Watch land allocation prescription in the plan and non-facility based environmental education section of the EIS and seasonal policies..

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 286 | 3 | Because of the vehicle-oriented nature of recreation at LBL, we think it is very important to have a high use road, near an existing facility, with reliable nature-viewing opportunities to serve as the hook for expanded, non-facility based EE. Silver Trail meets this requirement very well. Protecting individual wildlife along Silver Trail is critical to maintaining the human-tolerant stage of wildlife viewing. That is the sole reason why the 1350-acre Silver Trail addition was identified: To provide a chance at an opportunity while minimizing the chance that the "human tolerant" wildlife that does become tolerant to human activity will be shot. It is ethically wrong to encourage wildlife to become human tolerant on one day and then subject them to hunting on the next. They will be very easy targets. That is what will occur along Silver Trail if we encourage human tolerance and then allow hunting 'just across the road.' |
| 265 | 28 | Even in the current, and Draft Plans, a significant and growing portion of the population is excluded from access to the existing backcountry areas. Very little of LBL is safe for family or group (or even individual) recreation during hunting seasons. With the exception of the trailer park camping areas, even the very small areas that are designated as non-hunting areas are open to hunting part of the year. Surely, it should not take a child being shot to motivate designate a more significant portion of LBL as a backcountry non-hunting recreation area. The data and resulting long-term projections indicate an increasing demand for such recreation and a decreasing supply of land on which it may occur. It is true, and will be increasingly so, that public lands are the only places where such forms of recreation are possible. Alternative Z is the only Alternative that moves LBL in that direction. It appears that through their financial contributions, the large hunting organizations have been purchasing influence and special access to the exclusion of the rest of the population. (I am, myself, a hunter but I see the interests of the non-hunting backcountry users to be among the most under represented in the Draft Plan.) |
| 221 | 23 | While hunting has a proper role in the future of LBL, there should be areas designated that are off limits to hunting, so that non-hunters can safely recreate during hunting seasons. |

-
- 286 4 From the very beginning of the idea, we recognized that there would be impact to hunting on LBL by changing how the resources are managed and by an extension of the nature view area by 1350 acres. The land we are talking about (1350 acres) is 0.79% of the total acreage of LBL. (Even these 1350 acres could be available for very limited hunting based on resource carrying capacity.) We do not think this is an unreasonable request for the potential gain in improving watchable wildlife and eventually EE on LBL. You support this contention with your discussion and facts about the demand for viewing wildlife, birds and wildflowers on page 228 of the EIS. This is a minor sacrifice in hunting opportunity for what the data shows is an explosion in nature watch activities and demand.
- 265 19 Given the documented trend towards rapidly increasing demand for backcountry recreation, and the decreasing amount of back country accessible to the average person, this should be a high priority in the Plan. Rotation of hunting areas could be arranged for game management, without decreasing the amount of land available for hunting, while making additional land available for non-hunting uses. To be "multiple use" is not to be "multiple fee-paying use." The lack of significant areas available to non-hunters on a free access basis is exclusionary to a population of potential visitors, the very same population of users the Forest Service says is increasing.
- 237 38 Perhaps the bird conservation and watching areas suggested above could help contribute to the non hunting areas that would rotate and be off-limits for hunting on given years so that non-hunters could recreate without fear of getting shot accidentally.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create and maintain more day use areas.

Response

Strategic direction is discussed in the Developed Recreation land allocation prescription and other parts of the Plan. The specific changes to any developed recreation site will be analyzed and implemented at the project level.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 10 | 8 | There seems to be a need for more public use areas as you enter LBL. |
| 36 | 2 | Picnic areas (day use) expanded. |
| 146 | 2 | Keep commercial activities to a minimum but continue to maintain campgrounds and informal use areas. |
| 93 | 2 | More playgrounds and picnic areas through LBL. |
| 189 | 13 | Support logical placement of day-use sites. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should upgrade lake access areas.

Response

Project level decision; This use will be looked at in more detail during implementation.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

222	5	I support: Improved access to KY or Barkley Lakes (and some smaller lakes within LBL) via boat ramps
146	6	Maintain lake access points for boat launching and for informal use. Maintain and enhance opportunities for hunters and fishermen.
246	9	I live here and "play" here. Access to and maintain all boat ramps.
82	3	Fix boat ramp - knee deep pot hole (gravel). [Energy Lake]
247	6	Maintain and upgrade boat ramps and leave them free to the public.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide an adequate firearm range.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

247	11	Provide an adequate shooting range.
-----	----	-------------------------------------

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide small rental cabins in certain areas for limited budget families.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

36	3	Small rental cabins in certain areas for limited budget families.
130	4	"Cabins" - there have been some who have expressed interest in "cabins" in the vicinity of NS. This is a limited comment of no more than 5 persons. They wanted to be able to enjoy the nature sounds and sights in a primitive shelter facility in the vicinity of the lake at either the canoe rental shack or Honker Lake in general.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should consider the sustainability of land and wildlife when making decisions on dispersed or developed recreation.

Response

Thanks for your comment; refer to program strategies for recreation in the Plan. Affects to resources were analyzed in the EIS. Sustainability was considered as a significant factor for the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

258	11	With regards to the dispersal or consolidation of campground and boat ramps, we would ask that LBL staff take into consideration the type of experience that users are looking for when they visit the area. Typically, gateway oriented projects make more financial sense, however they may work to remove some of the dispersed recreational opportunities. We recognize that this is a tough decision, but ask that LBL and the Forest Service consider first and foremost the welfare of the land and fish and wildlife when addressing these issues.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make a reservation system equitable for all campers.
Because now, the more you pay the longer you can reserve a spot; forcing the average visitors out of prime locations.

Response

This is a policy decision which is outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	20	This same emphasis on serving the high-dollar visitor over the disadvantaged population is found in the length of stay allowed for campers. The formula appears to be that the more you pay the longer you can reserve a spot. Such reservations obviously exclude the average visitor from prime locations, even when the high-dollar visitor is not at LBL. Allowing the well-heeled to reserve spots for months at a time, while forcing tent and truck campers in less developed facilities to relocate every few days is a bias toward the wealthy. These issues must be addressed.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should develop Lookout Point.
To give visitors a canopy view of the woodlands.

Response

Such developments are allowed in the Plan and is a project level decision under the recreation and environmental education program.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

130	2	Lookout Point - there is a need for a lookout point or two that would allow visitors to walk/climb to an elevation where they have a canopy view of the woodlands. This comment was made on the northern part of the property at NS and NW by at least 10 persons.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should keep Turkey Bay open as it is.
To ensure the area remains open to Jeeps;
Because OHVs can be less damaging than horse or human foot traffic;
to provide user enjoyment;
To prevent illegal OHV use elsewhere;
Because it is wonderful as is.

Response

Turkey Bay is not proposed for closure. Policy for designated trails was made outside of the planning process in June 2004. See the Turkey Bay Land Allocation prescription in the Plan for further discussion.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 154 | 3 | Please, please, please do not close the Turkey Bay OHV area, nor restrict it to ATV's only. We Jeep people cherish the land and the opportunity to use the park. |
| 117 | 3 | Keep Turkey Bay open for Jeeps and other offroads; including all sizes of motorized offroad vehicles. Jeeps and atvs can and do intermingle well together; and 99% of the time, have no problems with each other. |
| 154 | 2 | While Alternative W would be my first choice, if some changes are to be made to Turkey Bay, I'd ask you to consider Alternative Y as my second choice. |
| 154 | 1 | As a user of Turkey Bay's OHV, I'd like to cast my vote for Alternative W. Turkey Bay is wonderful just as it is. The park offers off-roaders a rare opportunity to enjoy trail running with other like-minded people, while enjoying the beauty of Turkey Bay. |
| 5 | 1 | I have reviewed the major portions of the DEIS that involve Turkey Bay. My "executive summary" would be quite simple: Alternative W, no change. Turkey Bay has evolved into what it is today for a reason, and this is that it works and works well, at least from a user's standpoint. |
| 118 | 1 | For the people who enjoy riding off road equipment we need places like turkey bay to keep us legal by going to this and other marked ohv places we can do what we like best riding and driving our equipment on weekends to relieve stress get together as a group or just prove we have a better truck, bike, buggy than the next guy. You take it away and they will find some where else to ride but not a legal place. We need the parks, it is our families favorite past time |
| 122 | 3 | If that [prohibiting jeeps and jeep type vehicles] is an open option in "Y" I would change my selection to "W" and wish that things be left the way they are. |
| 246 | 6 | I live here and "play" here. Keep off-road area open. |

-
- 173 1 In my view, closing this [Turkey Bay OHV] area off to 4X4 use (ATV's and Jeeps) is a mistake. There are many offroad enthusiasts in the area that want and need a dedicated place to enjoy their rigs and nature. If this area is closed, most, in my view, would still go offroading, but in unapproved areas, causing MORE damage over a larger area than LBL itself. Most offroaders, given an area to use, tend to be careful and work to follow the Tread Lightly program. The people I offroad with even stop to pick up trash while wheeling.
- 168 1 The Turkey Bay OHV is a great place to ride. The M-715 zone had a get together at LBL. It was by far the cleanest public riding area that I had ever seen. I would like to keep it open for 4-wheel drivers and 4-wheelers.
- 179 1 Please keep the OHV riding area open so we can enjoy it for years to come. Thank you!
- 1 1 Turkey Bay is definitely needed and wanted by all of us here at Midwest Jeepthing.
- 234 1 Please do not restrict the use of this good facility any further. It was set aside for OHV users years ago so that people could enjoy it. I would therefore have to choose the No Change Alternative (labeled "Alternative W"). People like myself need a place to go for a fun ride in the woods. Turkey Bay is the place.
- 10 1 There seems to be a need of another 4-wheel & two wheel off-road travel.
- 284 1 The major concern for all parties should be the continuation of the area for off highway use. This area has been used for decades, but the use has substantially increased causing potential problems. Erosion is cited as one factor that could cause the closing of the facility. Studies have shown that foot traffic, by man or horse, can cause more damage than wheeled traffic. This is generally applied to mountain bike traffic, but the study mentioned motorcycles as well. Granted, as you are aware, the bulk of the erosion/damage is NOT caused by 2 wheeled traffic. Larger 4-wheeled vehicles have caused considerable damage to the hills where trails exist and places where they've cut new trails. Am I suggesting banning the larger 4-wheelers like jeeps and dune-buggies? Not necessarily, but maybe they could be limited to a smaller area to study their impact. This way, the impact of smaller vehicles, motorcycles or light 4-wheelers could be studied as well. I would prefer motorcycle only traffic on an area where true single-track could be developed, but that is probably asking too much. There are off road facilities where they limit the size of vehicle by the means of an entrance gate with a certain clearance, I believe it's 50"[inches]. Maybe some adjustments could be made to allow them restricted access to ensure the survival of the park.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Alternative X for Turkey Bay.

Response

Thanks for your comment. However Y is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

164	2	Alternative X is the next best alternative [as it pertains to the Turkey Bay OHV area], however I do see problems arising as mentioned in the plan.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Alternative Y for Turkey Bay.
To provide for public use;
To provide for the convenience of riders/campers.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Alternative Y is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

164	1	Of the options listed, I am in favor of "Alternative Y" [as it pertains to the Turkey Bay OHV area].
102	1	Alternative Y is the most logical of the options for ATV users. But the best alternative is to keep Turkey [Bay] free to riding in all the areas.
122	1	After reading the proposed plans for Turkey Bay OHV area I would like to see alternative Y.
258	9	We support Alternative Y for Turkey Bay.
112	1	I would like to throw in my vote for Alternative Y for the proposed plans for Turkey Bay.
223	1	I would prefer to have Alternative "Y". If Alternative "X" is used, then have the camp site accessible by OHV. This would save having to load and unload ATV's everyday for weekend campers. My family and I visit Turkey Bay about 4 to 5 times a year and stay usually 2-3 nights.
114	1	I think alternative Y is the best of the 2 choices. Simply because a lot of campers use their RV to pull the trailers that have the ATV's on them. Having to break down camp to pull ATV's to Turkey Bay to ride will be a major ordeal for some.

117 1 I would like to take a minute, and voice my support for Alternate Plan Y. I am a season pass-holder; and greatly appreciate the ability to have a park dedicated for Offroading of my Jeep; and to the responsible and family atmosphere that is associated with it. Were it not for Turkey Bay being open and available for Jeeps, my family and I would not spend so much time at LBL, and would have to look elsewhere to spend our time, tourist dollars, etc...With the continued encroachment of public lands being shut down and made off-limits to OHV people; Turkey Bay is a shining example of how the public can cater to that growing and important segment of our society.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do remediation of Turkey Bay on a smaller, as needed basis.
Because large closures will mean more users on smaller areas which is more harmful.

Response

Maintenance and rehabilitation continues within financial capability for the protection of resources within Turkey Bay. Decisions on which areas require mitigation and the size are outside of the scope of this plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

5 7 As I read the statement (page 220), "A decreased level of challenge would be expected as steep hill climbs would likely be targeted for rehabilitation", I think I'm reading an implied management approach that isn't stated elsewhere, other than to note the decreased area from 2,160 acres to 1,700 acres in another table. Aren't we already doing remediation on an as-needed basis? If not, then we should be, as has been successfully done in the past. Certainly it is a correct extension of logic that if the same number of users are sequestered to a smaller land area, then the impact on the land being used will be greater. However, it probably isn't necessary to close 20% to 25% of the land area at any given time, when a rolling 3%-5% temporary closure at a time would probably be sufficient in selected spots, although this is opinion only, not scientific.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ensure that Turkey Bay is sustainable, with restrictions if needed.
Because of its below-average water quality;
Because a sustainable Turkey Bay is better than none.

Response

Thanks for your comment; refer to Turkey Bay Land Allocation Prescription in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

5 6 As to the loss of special event dollars to surrounding businesses, if the 4WD's prove to be the "straw that breaks the camel's back" with respect to the longevity and sustainability of Turkey Bay, the overall impact would be far greater if Turkey Bay should cease to exist entirely.

279	4	EPA strongly recommends restrictions on OHV use in the Turkey Bay area due to average or below average water quality conditions in the watersheds that contain and surround this recreational area. The two watersheds in the vicinity of this area are shown to have the highest percentage increases in sediment delivery over baseline conditions.
104	2	Turkey Bay Goal: enjoyable sustainable riding area. Vehicle restrictions-yes modified vehicles can do a lot of damage in a short time. Designated trails-whatever it takes to make TB sustainable riding area.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should get volunteers to build access bridges to a campground over the existing creek at Turkey Bay. Because it will keep riders out of the creek bed for environmental purposes.

Response

This is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

102	3	Volunteers to build access bridges to campground over the existing creek [at Turkey Bay] wide enough for ATV's but keeping the ATV's out of the creek bed for environmental purposes. This helps both the ATV'rs and the environment. Makes both sides able to get along better.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should choose Z for designated trails in Turkey Bay OHV Area. Because if jeeps/buggies are making land unsustainable they should be banned; Because of environmental damage.

Response

FS has decided to implement a designated trail system as of June 2004, This policy decision was made outside of the planning process. Turkey Bay Land Allocation Prescription and the Design Criteria in the Plan address management of the natural resources within Turkey Bay.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

5	4	Alternative Z - This is a difficult plan to reconcile. I'm not a jeep or buggy driver, so the prohibition of these would not limit me personally, but I understand their enjoyment of their machines is no less than mine. The hardest part to reconcile is the fact that these larger vehicles are also the most damaging to the land. If the inclusion of 4WD's and buggies renders Turkey Bay to ultimately become unusable and unsustainable to all OHV's, then I would understand the necessity to prohibit them. If their presence causes the loss of Turkey Bay to everyone, then it makes more sense to exclude them (since either way they would end up with no use of Turkey Bay), and at least preserve the area for the rest of us to continue to use. Philosophically, this is a most difficult question for me, but perhaps past data gathered and future monitoring would render a more scientific answer. I'm not certain that I understand the premise that "increased staff would be necessary to insure compliance."
---	---	---

5 5 I like Alternative Z's suggestion to leave primitive camping and open riding in place [at Turkey Bay].

221 19 The Turkey Bay Off Road Vehicle (ORV) area has suffered significant environmental damage from lack of regulation and control of these vehicles over the past decades. Riders should be prohibited from going cross country and a set of controlled designated trails should be established.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should close Turkey Bay. Because it is environmentally unsustainable.

Response

Turkey Bay remains open under the selected alternative. This decision is supported by analysis in the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

272 7 However, recreational activities that have proven themselves to be incompatible with the original promises and mission, such as what has occurred at the Turkey Bay Off Road Vehicle area, should be prohibited. This has been nothing short of desecration of the land and is not sustainable or environmentally responsible in any way.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not allow new trails at the Turkey Bay OHV Area. Because there are erosion problems.

Response

The current policy is that no new trails will be created. A new policy of a designated trail system is intended to keep TB sustainable.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

80 1 No new trails & close off those that need to be due to excessive erosion and restore same. [Turkey Bay OHV Area]

Public Concern

The Forest Service should upgrade the area/facilities at Turkey Bay. To offer a more user friendly & safer area Because ORV riders deserve the same amenities as other users.

Response

The Plan allows for improvements of Turkey Bay facilities. Types of upgrades and/or improvements are project level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 115 | 1 | I, along with other friends in the KY & TN area use the Turkey Bay OHV area on a regular basis and would love to see it improved. Having a legally designated place to go 4 wheeling will have a better outcome than closing it and risk people taking it into their own hands to find a place to go. People respect the OHV area and the surrounding landscape because we value the privilege of having a designated area to explore. Without this area, you will see some people lose this respect and "pave" their own trails in other areas which, in my opinion, would cause more harm in the long run. |
| 41 | 1 | In order to offer a more user friendly & safer area, you should consider some of the amenities that are offered at your other camping/boating/horseback areas. Off roading is a family recreational experience and I believe that several improvements are overdue at Turkey Bay. A gravel paved "day use" area should be created for those coming to ride for a single day. This should include organized parking, some picnic tables and restroom facilities. A paved road should be provided starting from the entrance and continuing to the lake. This road should be wide enough for 2 way motorhome traffic. |
| 123 | 2 | ORV riding at LBL has always been a large part of activity in the national recreation area. ORV riders deserve better. Compare Turkey Bay with Wranglers. Why do they deserve a better facility? |
| 114 | 2 | I would like to see a nice campground in the field near the highway with hookups. This would relieve some concerns about camping inside the [OHV] Area. We could build a bridge across the creek so we would not be in the creek bed. I think I can get enough volunteers to build the bridge. We have rode a lot in years past and really enjoy LBL. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ban ATV's outside of Turkey Bay. Because the ability for abuse is too easy.

Response

ATVs can only be legally ridden at LBL inside the boundary for TB with the exception of special use authorizations.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 235 | 6 | I want to keep their ban on ATV's through LBL except Turkey Bay Offroad Area. |
| 167 | 5 | Please do not allow the use of ATVs outside of Turkey Bay ATV use area. Although ATVs make the trip from a downed deer to the truck much easier, the ability to abuse this privilege is very tempting to some hunters. Thus the current plan in place is one I would retain. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should introduce noise limits on OHV's in Turkey Bay.
Because such a sound limit would increase the enjoyment for riders who are in compliance;
Because such a sound limit would serve to reduce any annoyance to others outside of Turkey Bay.

Response

This is a policy decision outside of LRMP scope.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

5	8	The introduction of noise limits for all OHV's, which can be measured by a variety of standards, the most common of which is the AMA (American Motorcyclist Association) standard which is developed in cooperation with the MIC (Motorcycle Industry Council) for both motorcycles and ATV's, and would be equally applicable to 4WD's and buggies. Such a sound limit would not only increase the enjoyment for riders who are in compliance, but it would also serve to reduce any annoyance to others outside of Turkey Bay (if there is any). Noise annoys. Mostly, however, this would serve to vastly reduce the "yahoo factor." I don't think a "yahoo rider" requires additional explanation.
---	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use Turkey Bay as a training ground through the use of professional off-road safety courses.
Because this would blend well with the educational aspect of the DEIS and management plan.

Response

ASI safety training courses are provided in Turkey Bay periodically. Refer to Turkey Bay Land allocation prescription for further information.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

5	11	A plan to use Turkey Bay as a training ground through the use of professional off-road safety courses, for a fee of course. There are a variety of these courses available and well-developed for both motorcycles and A TV's, and a number of qualified instructors. I'm not sure if there is any such thing for 4WD's. This would blend well with the educational aspect of the DEIS and management plan.
---	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should designate separate trails for different vehicles at Turkey Bay.

Response

Turkey Bay doesn't differentiate between types of motorized recreation. Refer to land allocation prescription in Plan. Policy decisions are outside the scope of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

80	3	Close off certain areas to rock climber trucks. Separate and mark trails for ATV, dirt bikes. List certain trails for jeeps, 4-wheel trucks and buggies for safety reasons [Turkey Bay OHV Area].
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not choose Alt. Z for Turkey Bay.
Because more problems occur within smaller vehicles, not jeeps.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Alternative Y was selected for the Plan. Designated trails was a policy decision made in June 2004 outside the planning process, however the policy does not restrict vehicle type.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

164	3	Alternative Z is not the answer [as it pertains to the Turkey Bay OHV area]. As an offroader that spends a fair amount of time at Turkey Bay, I have witnessed many instances of unsafe riding behavior. The vast majority of these instances involved the smaller motorcycle and ATV riders, rather than the larger 4wd vehicle drivers.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should allow camping in Turkey Bay.
Because camping too far away could promote abuse;
Because keeping users out of Turkey bay will crowd other campgrounds and cause user conflicts;
But only non-developed, because developed will limit number of users;
To ensure user enjoyment, convenience and safety.

Response

Camping is allowed within Turkey Bay in the Plan. Further decisions on camping development will be made at the project level.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

122	2	I would love to see improvements to camping made [Turkey Bay OHV Area] as long as there are no provisions to prohibit jeeps and jeep type vehicles from the area.
199	1	Alternative Y would be preferred because it would allow the users of the area to remain on site rather than to load up at the end of the day and go to another facility to camp. Although Turkey Bay does not have the facilities which some campers may desire, the availability of facilities at Wranglers is a good option. It is very desirable to go to the facility, set up camp, and ride without having to travel to and from alternative camp sites.

-
- 211 1 I would like to let you know that I prefer Alternative Y with regard to Turkey Bay. My reasons for this are: 1. Riding at Turkey Bay without being able to camp there will require packing and unpacking four-wheelers and gear each day I ride; loading and unloading the trailer repeatedly. 2. Setting up basically two sites, one for camping and one for the day at Turkey Bay (for riders and for companions that are not riding, mom, kids, animals, etc.). 3. After a day of riding, one of the enjoyable things is sitting around the fire that evening with other riders & your family and not having to worry about repacking and driving another ?? Miles to your campsite. I frequently ride and camp for at least 2 nights. The inconvenience of camping at a different site would be tremendous.
- 230 1 Keep camping open all year round at Turkey Bay. We like to camp in the riding area at Turkey Bay.
- 102 2 Build a campground in the hay field adjacent to Turkey Bay above the entrance, with electric sites in part of the area-higher camping rate for hookups--still have primitive camping regular price.
- 190 2 There should be overnight camping [at Turkey Bay] available because I have met people who come from farther away and they need the space because their time is limited. I do not want to haul my 4-wheeler to and from sites. I like to ride and rest. When I make camp, I like to stay in one place.
- 98 1 The people that ride the ATVs at Turkey Bay are not allowed to camp there any longer and they overflow to Rushing Creek. These people for the most part are not family oriented. They are there to ride, drink and party, which is fine but I wish they would leave Turkey Bay open for camping so they all could stay together. Rushing Creek is a more family oriented campground.
- 191 1 We feel that Alternative Y would be the best for Turkey Bay. We as a family love camping at Turkey Bay. It gives our children a great learning experience on riding 4-wheelers, camping and conservation. If we teach our children when they are young how to respect the land, then they will do so as adults. It would be hard to trailer in and out of Turkey Bay for the family.

-
- 5 2 Alternative X - Although I understand that the idea is to reduce usage, or to maintain usage at current levels within Turkey Bay, this is a very bad plan overall. It ruins the uniqueness of being able to ride out from a campsite. Contrary to the DEIS proposal, it would not serve to "provide increased riding opportunities." To be forced to camp at a remote site would be extremely limiting and extremely inconvenient. To correct the DEIS statement that this "could be troublesome for some users," I would suggest substituting the words "ALL users" for "some users." The only ones not affected, of course, would be those who only came for day use anyway. I personally would probably not camp at all. If I have to load up my OHV and gear at the end of the day and go elsewhere, I would either opt for a motel or would just go home. Therefore I believe it is a challengable assumption that "increased visitation at other campgrounds would also be expected." This might happen a little bit, but I would be surprised if it would be significant. The negatives to the remote camping scenario would be that in the evenings when camping, riders usually take that opportunity to do minor maintenance and repair on OHV's. I doubt other campers in other campgrounds would care much for looking at my bike out in the open, or hearing me start the engine after dark, whereas my fellow campers inside Turkey Bay wouldn't mind a bit... they're probably doing the same thing. Even if a safe haven for leaving my OHV overnight was provided within Turkey Bay, I would not be inclined to use it. The uniqueness that is Turkey Bay is that it is the only place I know of, or have even heard of, where I can do all of my favorite things in one spot: ride my bike, camp, swim, water ski and jet-ski, and fish. If Turkey Bay were converted to day-use only, I wouldn't do any of the other things, but simply come in, ride for the day, and then leave.
- 41 2 Off roading is a family recreational experience and I believe that several improvements are overdue at Turkey Bay. In order to offer a more user friendly & safer area, you should consider some of the amenities that are offered at your other camping/boating/horseback areas. Improved camp sites (some reservable) should be offered that are large enough to accommodate motorhomes & trailers and should include electric, fire ring & picnic table. Most should be "pull through". Shower houses & clean restrooms are a must!
- 176 1 I like Alternative "Y". I think the Turkey Bay area needs to be cleaned up and the area improved for camping.

-
- 5 3 Alternative Y - This seems to be the opposite extreme of Alternative X, but with some of the same negative results. "Visitor comfort" might be increased "through the development of bathhouses and amenities," but it would only increase for the few who are fortunate enough to get one of the limited number of campsites, leaving the rest back at "Alternative X" and having to pack up and go elsewhere. While there have been many times I've thought it would be nice to have indoor plumbing or showers, I have for many years found the primitive camping of Turkey Bay to be completely acceptable, and I can honestly say that every rider I know feels the same way. If the idea is to reduce or maintain current levels of usage, then it is counter-productive to make Turkey Bay more attractive, but then limit its interior facilities to a fewer number of users. This, I think, is a recipe for increased levels of user frustration. Thus I believe that it is incorrect thinking to suggest that "An increase in visitor satisfaction is also expected." My personal suggestion would be to save your money and use it more wisely for other more important things. There is not an overwhelming demand for a developed campground, and in my view it would be taking LBL in the opposite direction of the intentions of the overall management plan.
- 191 2 We feel that if Alternative X is passed that Turkey [Bay] will become a place where more single people without families will evolve and therefore, they may not care about the areas around them. They may not care how the facility looks because they are only there to ride, not to camp and stay.
- 231 1 We travel close to 500 miles to ride in Turkey Bay. We spend at least 3 days there when we come to ride,. We will not be able to do this and enjoy ourselves when all we can do is load and unload the bikes all the time. Camping there makes it possible for us to just pack up and go riding there when we want to. (please do not take the camping privlages away)
- 189 14 Turkey Bay will be converted to a day-use-only facility, with OHV enthusiast amenities offered in a nearby campground (Alt X); Support if campground is within OHV area or adjacent to; moving it too far away could promote abuse.
- 80 4 Please, update and improve camp area, [put] water closer to sites, electric service, and mark sites. Limit number of sites to stop over crowding [at Turkey Bay].
- 195 1 We want Alternative Y - Our family enjoys camping in the same area, so we can ride our 4-wheelers while at Turkey Bay. We have been able to do this many, many years.
- 91 1 I have one concern for Piney Campground. If you make Turkey Bay a day use only it will effect Piney.

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 99 | 1 | Over the last two years it has been a horrible situation with the closing of camping in Turkey Bay. We always camp at Rushing Creek. Last year we could not even get into rushing Creek for all the four wheeler and dirt bike riders. I know that they have a right to camp at Rushing Creek, but what we have encountered with the drunk, loud, obnoxious and selfish Turkey Bay people is unreal. In the planning of what will happen to LBL over the next several years, we would just hope that you could at least re-open Turkey Bay for camping or fix a camp site closer to it for these campers. |
| 194 | 1 | Would like to see Alternative y - We like to camp and ride at the same place - But would rather see a campground next to Turkey Bay ORV Area. The ideal place would be the field right North of the entrance. Electricity would be nice too. Volunteers could build bridges across creek to keep from riding in the creek bed. This would also be good for the environment. Volunteers could help build the campground. A bath house and shelter house combination would be good also. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create more campsites.

Response

Analysis doesn't support the need for more campsites at this time.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 40 | 2 | Could use additional camp sites. |
| 10 | 4 | Need about two additional campsites. |
| 81 | 3 | At Wranglers Campground it would be better if there were either more campsites or on major holidays restrict campsites to horse riders and campers only. 4-wheeler and buggy campers seem to take up several campsites during these holidays. |
| 222 | 4 | I support: Maintaining full service campgrounds (like Hillman Ferry, Piney, Wrangler etc.) and opening day use areas (like Star Camp) back up to primitive camping/overnight. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should upgrade and maintain campsites.
 To provide for user enjoyment and convenience;
 To create new jobs;
 Because users will pay for additional amenities.

Response

Possible under the selected alternative. Campsite upgrades or specific policies are project level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 22 | 1 | Please put in more sewer hookups or at least sites with electric and water together. There just aren't enough to meet the needs of all who need that type of hookup. |
|----|---|--|
-

-
- 82 2 Fix pot holes and gravel. [Energy Lake]
- 83 1 Piney Campground: Needs more sites with full hookups, better laundry facilities, shower houses with dressing rooms so we don't have to step out into the hallway to get our towel and clothes.
- 178 2 These [hands-on, educational] workshops would require that participants stay in the near-by area so thus the campgrounds would be utilized and would need to be well maintained with plenty of water and electric sites. We do not believe we need more sites, but many sites (such as Rushing Creek) need to be updated with water and electricity.
- 268 2 Improve and upgrade the campgrounds.
- 155 1 I support some improvements to the facilities--bathrooms, restrooms, electrical. More full service hookups, internet access, etc.
- 86 2 The following items reflect our position/desires for LBL. Plan X: More full hook-ups in Piney and Hillman Ferry. As more people get into the RV market the demand for full hook-ups is increasing. This can limit the stay for some RVs with smaller black water tanks. The purpose of owning an RV is self-containment. Install additional grey water dump sites (if not black water also) for far removed sections from the main dump site. Bigger/additional sites. RVs are bigger. Trees have grown. Sites are the same size. Crowded sections due to this phenomena are anything but aesthetically pleasing and restful.
- 18 1 I love Piney Campground. More full hookups would be a nice addition and more campsites in general. Two basketball courts would also be nice.
- 82 1 Spend more money on Energy [Lake], increase the budget so that you can do something.
- 156 1 I would like to see more sewer sites in the Piney Campground.
- 151 1 We camped at Piney Campground a few weeks ago and really enjoyed it. The Park is really nice, but we wish that there was water at each site and more with sewer hook up.
- 22 2 Level up campsites would be great also.
- 47 1 We would like to see some additional full service sites (water-sewer-electric) and an upgrade to 50 Amp service on all sites. This is a very nice area and campground but with a few upgrades it could be made much better.
- 44 1 We would like to see more full (sewer) hook-ups at Wranglers Camp.

-
- 51 3 Please make more full hookups at Piney campground and modernize the restrooms with more shower stalls. (Please don't make them with push buttons like the one in Virginia.) I love LBL, please continue the good work on keeping it so clean and neat.
- 93 1 Permanent sites at Lake Energy for long-term; Playground equipment for kids. Lake Energy, more insect control, squirrels, a dump station. Lake Energy, Need concrete poured under fire rings.
- 42 1 We enjoy camping and riding at Wranglers. The new improved facilities are greatly appreciated. My suggestion would be to put more water hook-ups at the camp sites.
- 91 2 We have too many non-electric sites. I have watched people in non-electric take electric skillet and go to an electric plug. Keep on improving sites with sewer and electric and all new bath houses for storm purposes.
- 89 1 More water and sewer.
- 19 1 We love this place, but we would really love it more if there were more full service hookups and if there were sites with electric and water together.
- 55 1 We would like to see more full hook-ups at Wranglers Camp, LBL.
- 3 1 Need more full hook-ups. Remodel old bath houses/ladies for privacy. Maybe a sewer collection for non-full hookup sites for minimal charge.
- 50 1 The addition of more camping sites with water and sewer would be so grand. This is a beautiful campground and these additions would more than pay for themselves.
- 52 2 Would you please make more full hookup sites at Piney and could you please enlarge some of the sites.
- 8 1 The new generation is leaning to more and more full facilities at campgrounds and as an old timer that enjoys the convenience of full facilities in my site, I agree with them. Add more full hookup electric, water and sewer as rapidly as the finances allow.
- 53 3 Please improve the camp grounds. Bigger sites, more full hookups, more water and electric sites and level them better. Improve or update the restrooms, especially more improvements like these at Piney.
- 54 1 We would like to see more full hook-ups at Wranglers Camp.
- 56 1 Need more full hookups, at least water.

177	1	At Piney need more full hook-up spots.
46	1	(Piney) is a great campground but it is unbelievable that there is not water at every site. It would also be wonderful if there were more sewer hookups or a portable honey wagon with a pump and tank installed on it that could be taken to various RV's to dump their holding tanks.
168	3	The only thing that I would change would be to put a bath house at the Fenton camping area.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not add campsites or expand.

Response

No additional campsites are proposed under the LRMP alternatives

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

146	5	Curb expansion of the wrangler's camp.
121	3	No enlargement of present camp sites.
35	3	No expansion or additional campsites.
184	1	We are not in favor of any more land being made into camps such as Star Camp. Leave as is.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should implement a reservation system and charge those who don't show up.

Response

This is a policy decision and outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

86	3	The following items reflect our position/desires for LBL. Plan X: Reservation system. For those who work and can only RV /camp a few times in the year, to get a site when they want, they often have to obtain it a week before and not use it. While the campground makes the money, it is possibly depriving others who could or would use it during that week.
271	2	I wish they [Wranglers Camp] would accept reservations there so we can come more often.
177	2	I think it would be nice to be able to make reservations.
56	2	If reservations come into effect, charge those who don't show up.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should open Energy Campground for the entire year.

Response

Thank you for your comment. This is a policy level decision outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

247 14 Open Energy Camp Ground for the entire year.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should open a dumping station for campers. To provide for user convenience.

Response

The selected alternative allows for upgrades in developed sites. The specific improvements are project level decisions outside the scope of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

4 1 Our [Energy Lake] only problem is this. We, along with many others come and stay for weeks at a time. This poses a big problem for us all. We have no dumping facility inside the grounds. In this situation, we have no choice but to leave the area to find a station, which the closest is a 30 mile roundtrip to come back. Due to this fact, we do not stay as long as we like. It's just too much trouble packing it all up. I know many would stay longer if we had a facility in the campgrounds.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should implement shorter term leasing for RV's (2,3,4,6 months). Because there are many more Rvers today than before.

Response

This is a policy decision that falls under the Seasonal Camping Program.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

86 1 The following items reflect our position/desires for LBL. Plan X: Shorter term leasing for RVs (2,3,4,6 month). I know this has been tried previously, but I believe that has been a couple years ago. There are many more Rvers today than then. Also, I am not sure it was widely known beyond those who normally participate in the leasing program and I feel that most of those folks were primarily interested in the longer leases anyway.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should have a store for items for camp use.

Response

Outposts are available at Piney, Hillman and Wranglers campground. No other outposts or stores will be added.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not allow camping in Turkey Bay.
Because campers could be accommodated elsewhere nearby;
To keep alcohol off trails;
Because the amount of money to build a campground is too much;
Because not everyone camps;
Because there would be an abuse of amenities for OHV maintenance.

Response

Primitive camping will be allowed under the preferred Alternative. A new campground is a project level decision. It is illegal to drink and drive by KY state law.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|--|
| 201 | 33 | Page 57: Alternative X: proposes that Turkey Bay be a day-use facility. I concur with this and the suggestion that an existing campground be upgraded to handle the overnight visitation. This campground can be very basic, however, with no amenities. I don't support the development of a campground inside the OHV area. |
| 104 | 1 | Turkey Bay Goal: Enjoyable, sustainable riding area. 1. Yes move camping outside Turkey Bay. Day-use example: Memorial Day 2. Basic sites - water and electric, no full hook ups, limited stay. |
| 284 | 2 | I learned that further development of a campground at Turkey Bay was a potential plan. Now, the letter sent out doesn't agree with that statement. Years ago, there was a trail that went South to another campground with showers, etc. Similar to St. Joe park (an OHV park in Missouri), the riders can camp at a real campground with hot showers and real toilets, then ride a short distance to the riding area. This campground to the South, either Colson Hollow, or Rushing Creek could be adapted to campers from Turkey Bay with a connecting trail to the riding area. Anyone veering from the trail could be severely penalized or banned. This would be a hybrid option you mentioned in the letter and little funds would be required since the camp already exists. |
| 262 | 1 | I would have to place my vote for the X plan [Turkey Bay] for a couple of reasons. With no campsite to go back to, perhaps it would keep more alcohol off the trails. I can't say enough about my feelings for having alcohol on the trails. I know it is prohibited but from what I have seen it seems that you can go back to camp have a few, throw one or two extra in the cooler and hit the trails again. Perhaps if they had to just unload it could help. Also the amount of money spent would not benefit all since there are those of us that don't camp. I would rather see the money spent on upgrading trails for everyone's benefit. Also and this is not just a slam against 4 wheelers or trail bikes, but I envision seeing bikes and 4 wheelers tore apart and parts being washed in the bath houses. Yes there are [irresponsible] jeepers out there that could do the same thing. I would rather see just a complete day use area for all. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide more sight-seeing activities/wildlife watching.
Because wildlife viewing is a major attraction here.

Response

Nature viewing opportunities can be found in selected Alternative Y. Refer to Nature Watch Land Allocation and other parts of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 270 | 4 | I feel the opportunities for visitors can be enhanced through the creation of nature viewing areas (Watchable Wildlife), scenic viewshed with native vegetation, and enhancement of areas such as Fort Henry and Center Furnace historic sites. |
| 93 | 3 | More site-seeing activities. |
| 100 | 1 | We would like to see more wildlife viewing areas from the main roads. These viewing areas would need a small parking lot for 5 to 6 cars or at least a pull out to enable visitors to stop and get out of their vehicle. |
| 189 | 5 | Scenic viewing and wildlife watching enhanced. Vegetation treatments for scenery management are more clearly focused; Support; clearly marked areas, maps, developed platforms/boardwalks to focus foot traffic, educational signs as dispersed EE. |
| 235 | 4 | Wildlife Viewing is a major attraction of LBL to both hunters and non-hunters. Few things are more attractive to non-hunters and hunters than viewing large buck deer. Many people are not wanting to just see another goose, or another deer, but rather something a little more unique. Every large buck carries a unique set of antlers--no two are alike. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should improve dispersed Rec/EE options.

Response

This supports Alternative Y which is the selected alternative.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 189 | 9 | Strongly support use of signs, self-interpretation tours, wildlife/scenic viewing areas versus development of new buildings, clearing of new development sites, expansion of existing sites, etc. |
|-----|---|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ensure dispersed recreation increases are sustainable.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Refer to program strategies for recreation in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

45 3 I would hope, however, that care will be taken to minimize the negative effects of human disturbance and habitat fragmentation on wildlife and ecosystems if an increase in trails and facilities used to increase dispersed recreational activities are designated in the final Plan.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should open a clothing optional beach.
Because it is growing in popularity;
Because there are areas for other types of recreationists.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Recreational demands and opportunities have been carefully analyzed in the EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 213 | 2 | Clothing optional areas could increase both visitors and tourism revenue. Indeed, a CO section could draw visitors (with their tourism income) from Europe, where naturism/nudism/non-sex nudity is so taken for granted. Also, Forbes.com reported a few years ago that naturism had become a 400 million dollar industry in the USA, about double that of just more than a decade before. |
| 85 | 1 | LBL has places for hiking, biking, camping, horseback riding, and off-road vehicle usage, along with several other things. We think opening a clothing optional beach in LBL would be great for the area. There are a lot of people that like to skinny-dip or try to get the all over tan and just enjoy the relaxation. There are many places in the United States that have them already and LBL has several bays that are secluded that would allow for a clothing optional beach. I have never had the opportunity to go to one in the United States but I have been to a few in Europe and they think nothing of it over there. There will be people against it in the area but those that are against it do not have to go to them. There are other beaches for them to swim at. It would be nice to be able to have a place to go to for the people that do enjoy it. |
| 213 | 1 | I'd respectively like you to consider this idea as part of your Land and Resource Management Plan. As a naturist/nudist for 14 years, would you consider the possibility of designating at least some sections of LBL(waterfronts, lake areas, hiking paths, etc.)that are clothing optional? There are growing numbers of individuals and families in theUSA and Canada that don't want to deal with uncomfortable clothes and swimsuits (being wet and getting irritating sand inside their suits). |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide Rec/EE options according to demand/supply.
Because of more demand/less supply for wilderness recreation.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Recreational demands and opportunities have been carefully analyzed in the EIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 265 | 27 | While it is clear that there is, and likely will be for some time to come, a demand for developed forms of recreation, complete with minimal amenities, these should be provided ONLY after a careful-and legitimate-evaluation of the trend towards an interest in recreation in a more natural environment and the extent to which the private sector outside LBL can meet the demand for developed, but not backcountry, recreation. It is a truism that the private sector can, and will, provide developed areas for such recreation, but the private sector can NOT provide a large block mature forest environment that is increasingly natural and wilderness-like in character. Neither can the private sector provide access to outdoor recreation to those of limited income; only the public sector can. These simple facts were not taken into account in the DEIS. Had they been, additional weight would have been added to Alternative Z. |
| 265 | 30 | As the need, and demand, for an increasingly natural, wilderness-like area grows, so is the access to such areas decreasing. This simple fact ought to have given weight to Alternative Z, but it was not taken into account. |
| 265 | 24 | A key factor in evaluating EE and recreation in LBL should be the data contained in the book the Forest Service used for its own economic analysis of the Alternatives: Demand for wilderness and wilderness-like recreation already exceeds supply in the region and is projected-by the Forest Service researchers-to increase at a steady and rapid rate for the foreseeable future. This should dictate a direction away from scenic trailer park style recreation and towards educating the public about sustainable uses of increasingly natural areas, combined with interpretive displays and signage to progressively augment the public's growing appreciation of such habitats. Getting people out of their vehicles and away from their televisions while in LBL should be a first step. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should close LBL to motorized recreation.

Response

Motorized recreation is a legitimate use of public lands.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 228 | 3 | The LBL should be open to non-motorized recreation only. |
|-----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should maintain the current level of hunting/fishing opportunities in LBL.
To provide for management of the wildlife;
Because of the lack of places to hunt, due to the private land owners;
Because not everyone can afford to purchase hunting land or lease;
Because LBL is a nationally known treasure for hunting and fishing;
Because land for use in outdoor activities is shrinking every day;
To manage for quality deer with a minimum antler restriction on bucks;
To continue the Carp-O-Ree at Energy Lake Campground.

Response

Except as described in the land allocation prescriptions, the areas of actual hunting are annual policy decisions. Very few changes have been identified for hunting or fishing in the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

167	1	Do not cut hunting opportunities at LBL. LBL is a nationally known treasure for hunting, fishing, hiking, biking, camping and many other outdoor pursuits. It doesn't take a Ph.D. in wildlife biology to know that land for use in outdoor activities is shrinking every day. The average outdoorsperson is being squeezed out by land developers and high lease prices. Thus, areas such as LBL are not only vitally important to current interests, but are a MUST if future generations are to be introduced to the great outdoors.
246	5	I live here and "play" here. Continue to allow horseback riding and horseback hunting.
162	4	Turkey Hunting: I've hunted LBL on quota and non-quota hunts over the last several years, and have been really pleased with all aspects of the hunt. Keep the current regulations and management practices in place regarding turkey season.
172	1	I am a hunter and have hunted at LBL and I don't want hunting banned on the site.
218	2	As with any recreational opportunity it should be prioritized relative to the number of users who currently take advantage of it. Other "users" or recreational activities should receive an equally proportionate priority based on the number of people who currently use those activities. However it should be kept in mind that hunters are also campers, hikers, wildlife observers, etc and they should be counted among those users as well.
204	3	Also, management of the wildlife should include maintaining the current level of hunting opportunities and acreages available.
108	1	I am very concerned about the loss of ANY hunting land in LBL.

-
- 147 2 I have enjoyed the opportunities and challenges of hunting LBL...Please do not stop public hunting at LBL.
- 161 2 I want to keep it open to hunting and you may officially put me on the record as saying so.
- 235 8 I would like to see the amount of hunting opportunities in the future remain comparable to the recent past.
- 111 1 I ask you to please keep hunting a TOP priority at LBL. For the times I have had there and the future expectations I have with [my step-son] there is more than words can describe.
- 145 2 With the price of land on the rise and the rough economy many hunters have to turn to high price land leases to have a place to hunt at all, not everyone can afford to purchase hunting land or lease it for that matter. That's where LBL comes into play; public land will be the way of the future for the next several generations.
- 229 1 I would hope that the interests of the bowhunter is taken into consideration in your future planning study. I have bowhunted LBL for many years & find it very enjoyable.
- 152 1 The 6th District Federation [of the League of KY Sportsmen] is writing in full support of the continuation of all hunting and fishing activities that are presently available.
- 131 2 We also deer and turkey hunt at LBL. I would like to see a part of LBL managed for quality deer with minimum antler restrictions on bucks.
- 218 1 I believe that hunting at LBL should be viewed first and foremost as a recreational opportunity and secondarily as a deer herd management tool.
- 131 1 Carp-O-Ree sponsored by United Bow Hunters of KY event is held at Energy Lake Campground and has been supported by LBL management. I would like to see this partnership continue.
- 119 1 Hunting is getting tuff these days due to the lack of places to hunt, due to the private land owners and that is why LBL is a great place. It gives people the chance to hunt that can't afford the private land leases. Please keep it open to the hunters.
- 266 1 I would like to see continued deer hunting there with laws to insure that the big bucks that were known to come from within LBL will return.
- 247 2 Continue all hunting in the LBL.

158 1 I've heard scant bits and pieces of possibly not having LBL as it is now for hunting, fishing etc. I ask that we try and leave things the way they are. With the ever increasing urban sprawl, we as hunters and outdoor enthusiasts are losing ground to enjoy this right at an alarming rate.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase the hunting/fishing opportunities at LBL.

Because small game season should correspond with statewide seasons;

To allow for a handicap hunting only area To add a couple of archery 3-day draw hunts;

To allow for small game hunting in November when gun-deer hunting is not going on;

To achieve management goals;

To provide for more youth hunting opportunity.

Response

Hunting opportunities are expected to increase under selected Alternative Y, as analyzed in the EIS. Except as described in the land allocation prescriptions, the hunting seasons are annual policy decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	18	Support increased opportunities for hunting and fishing activities.
144	1	I am in favor of more area for hunting and fishing at LBL.
165	3	More youth hunting opportunity, 2 weekends instead of one, the youth is the future of hunting and the future of LBL.
222	9	I support: Releasing Elk into LBL for limited hunting as a means for the Forest Service to make income (like KDFWR does with the eastern KY elk hunts) and allowing Bowhunters to harvest an elk during deer season if they pay an extra fee if they happen across one.
141	1	I would like to see increased hunting and fishing opportunities at LBL.
219	2	Add a couple of archery 3 day draw hunts to your current quota hunt system. These could be timed around the rut and would be well received. These would also make it easier to be drawn for a hunt. Tie the preference point system for both deer and turkey together i.e. if you get drawn for a turkey hunt in 2004, your preference points for the deer hunt 2004 would be 0.
283	1	I'd like to see increased hunting opportunities.
165	2	How about a Handicap Hunting only area, this could happen in parts of area 16 where the terrain is not too bad. This could happen with all types of hunting from deer to ducks.

246	13	I live here and "play" here. Allow small game hunting in November (when gun-deer hunting is not going on).
218	5	Although I personally would like to see increased firearm hunting opportunities but I am very satisfied with the bow hunting currently allowed.
247	10	Expand youth hunting activities and hunter education.
162	1	Decrease the number of gun permits for each hunt. On every hunt I've participated in, hunters were in too close proximity to each other. If needed, add another hunt to achieve management goals.
248	2	I would like to see small game season correspond with statewide seasons.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should allow more liberal bow hunting opportunities on safety zones.
 To have one bow draw hunt for Safety zones;
 To allow bow hunters to harvest an elk during deer season.

Response

Hunting will continue under the Plan. Except as described in the land allocation prescriptions, the policies for hunting are annual policy decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

162	3	Consider allowing more liberal hunting opportunities on safety zones (bow hunting only), especially during the non-tourist seasons.
220	3	Make bow season "Open" only until Oct. 15 - following that create a few draw bow hunts - to limit hunting pressure. Have one bow draw hunt for Safety Zones.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should include the history of hunting as a wildlife management tool as part of Environmental Education.
 To stress the importance of hunting as a management tool;
 To stress the history of hunting in the U.S., particularly the 1937 National Wildlife Restoration Act (Pittman/Robertson).

Response

Thanks for your comment. Environmental education program content is a project level decision outside the scope of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

222	7	I support: Environmental Education that includes stressing the importance of hunting as a management tool, history of hunting in the U.S. particularly the 1937 National Wildlife Restoration Act (Pittman/Robertson).
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better maintain and increase signage for the horse trails.
To ensure horse and rider safety.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Trails are addressed in the recreation strategies in the Plan. Specific changes to trails are project level decisions. Signage is outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 84 | 1 | I would really like to see the trails at Wranglers Campground better maintained. Sometimes the trails get so mucky and muddy the horse will sink down deeply. The roots and rocks beneath the mud injure his legs and feet. Sometimes a horse will act up when trying to go through these areas, thus jeopardizing the rider. |
| 81 | 1 | My comments will be for Wranglers Campground & trails. Some of the trails could be remarked or better marked. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should continue to allow horseback riding throughout LBL.

Response

This is outside the scope of the plan however, this is the current policy.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|----|---|
| 247 | 12 | Continue to allow the use of horseback riding all over LBL and the use of horses during hunting season. |
|-----|----|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should better advertise fishing areas.

Response

Thanks for you comment. Outside the scope of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|--|
| 10 | 3 | Need more advertisement for fishing area for public or lay people. |
|----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should increase the number of horse trails in LBL.
To further enjoy these wonderful animals and companions;
To accommodate the needs and desires of equine owners across the US.

Response

Trails are addressed in the recreation strategies in the plan. Increased mileage of equestrian trails is not anticipated based on analysis in the EIS, however it is not prohibited in the Plan. Specific changes to trails are project level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

48	1	It is essential to our economic well being that USDA, not only maintain, but add to the equine facility located at LBL, in order to accommodate the needs and desires of equine owners across the United States.
40	1	We would encourage you to add more beautiful trails so that we might further enjoy these wonderful animals and companions [horses]!
187	1	Let horseback riders ride all the north south foot trail in the winter months like November until sometime in March. Let horse riders camp in some areas on the north end like the hunters do. Ride and drive wagons on [the] Trace.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should designate some bays for non-motorized recreation.
 Because there is not one lake or bay that doesn't allow motors;
 To provide swimming areas.

Response

Forest Service has no jurisdiction on the lakes surrounding LBL. More dispersed recreation in the Plan includes the possibility of improved swimming areas in LBL for the public.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

192	6	We need more places to canoe. I can't think of one lake or bay that doesn't allow motors and again you did not talk about this.
272	8	Some bays in LBL should be designated as non-motorized boat/canoe areas only.
260	2	Beaches or swimming areas for the public.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should offer discounts or free passes to active duty military and their families.

Response

This is a policy decision outside the scope of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	36	Discounts or free passes should be given to all active service military and their families with appropriate identification.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should restrict fees to offset expenses for services and high impact areas, eliminating fees for education facilities and dispersed activities.

Because there can be no justification for charging fees for routine access to LBL's educational facilities or for backcountry camping that involves no facilities and no services;

Because recreation should be free and unfettered and of the type that is respectful to the land and low impact.

Response

There are no general access fees at LBL. Specific fee structure is a policy decision made outside of the planning process, however the plan guidance requires consideration of visitor income level during this process. See Business Management Strategies in the Plan. The vision is to provide opportunities at LBL in a cost efficient manner.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	15	It is important to note that we do not consider fees to recoup expenses for services or high impact activities or the provision of items necessary for health or safety to be commercial activities.
272	6	That isn't to say that recreation within the area shouldn't be allowed - after all it is a national recreation area. But that recreation should be free and unfettered and of the type that is respectful to the land and low impact.
272	2	Providing access to LBL for the public free of charge.
242	3	Backwoods camping should be free.
243	2	There should be no fee for backwoods camping.
10	7	The fee at wilderness area needs to be taken off.
230	2	20 years ago it was free to camp and ride...Now it's sign in and get a permit...Money...Maybe it's about more money...and for what...just to stop folks from having a good time ATVing at Turkey Bay.
101	2	While it may be necessary to have fees to offset expenses incurred by electrical and sewage hookups and routine upkeep of developed camp sites and at the location of high impact recreation activities, such as Wranglers Camp and Turkey Bay OHV Area, there can be no justification for charging fees for routine access to LBL's educational facilities or for backcountry camping that involves no facilities and no services. I therefore ask that fees be limited to those activities that involve increased maintenance and/or facilities that involve a cost beyond routine operation of LBL and that all retail facilities in LBL be reduced to a level consistent with the original mission.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should have users pay for the use of Turkey Bay based on the type of vehicle they bring.
Because the more environmentally insulting the vehicle, the more the user should pay.

Response

Thanks for your comment. This is a policy decision that is not within the scope of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	32	Page 55: 4.C. Turkey Bay. Why not have users pay for the use of this area based on the type of vehicle they bring? The more potential environmentally insulting the vehicle the more the user pays. Off road non-motorized bikes would pay less for example than 4-wheel ATVs.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make all of LBL free and open to all the public.
Because more than 70% of LBL customers make less than \$50,000 Because prices are too high ;
Because LBL is an area of demonstration and innovation;
Because it excludes large segments of population;
Because the land is public.

Response

There are no general access fees at LBL. Specific fee structure is a policy decision made outside of the planning process, however the plan guidance requires consideration of visitor income level during this process. See Business Management Strategies in the Plan. The vision is to provide opportunities at LBL in a cost efficient manner.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

265	26	In catering to the fee paying, high dollar forms of recreation the Draft Plan is excluding large segments of the population from access to LBL. Despite statements to the contrary in the DEIS, there are no assessments of the impact fees, and the increasing levels of amenities that drive up the fees, have on the above average level of low income residents in this region. Had this been included in the evaluation of the Alternatives, a clear boost would have been given to Alternative Z. To base access to a public land on the ability to pay is wrong. It goes against the basic principles for which public lands were established in the first place!
-----	----	--

-
- 214 3 In your planning background document, you state that "Congress designated LBL as an area of demonstration and innovation and to share the results with other agencies." (pg. 1) You also state on page 10 of the planning background document that "More than 70% of LBL customers make less than \$50,000 per household, making free or extremely affordable recreation alternatives essential." Since LBL is supposed to be "an area of demonstration and innovation," why not make the facilities in it free and open to all of the public? It would be the only one in the country; and, being centrally located in the United States would make it ideal for this sort of demonstration. Yes, fees should be charged in the developed campgrounds for sites with electricity and water to recover costs. However, backwoods camping should be free. The Forest Service does not have to do maintenance (other than roads) on areas for backwoods camping. Why is there a need to recover costs? All facilities in LBL have an entrance fee. For a family of four, (2 adults and 2 children), the total admission to the Nature Station would be \$11.00. Add this to the cost of camping (backwoods or developed), the high gas prices and food. For a middle- or low-income family, it is way too expensive. Public land (and environmental education) should be free and open to all . . . not only to those who can afford it.
- 201 22 Under no circumstances would the public or the politicians agree to a "general entrance fee." In fact, I find it difficult to understand why the taxpayer who pays significant taxes as it is already is required to pay fees to "enjoy" a public resource. The less development of this public resource, the fewer fees are needed.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should charge additional fees for existing services and sights.

To increase revenue;

To hire more patrols for the area;

To provide further services and utilities.

Response

There are no general access fees at LBL. Specific fee structure is a policy decision made outside of the planning process, however the plan guidance requires consideration of visitor income level during this process. See Business Management Strategies in the Plan. The vision is to provide opportunities at LBL in a cost efficient manner.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- 46 2 Most people would be glad to pay a fee to have this (dumping) service available. It could possibly be provided by some private individual who would probably be glad to have this opportunity for a job.
- 121 5 Increase revenue by increasing present existing fees.
- 222 3 I support: Assessing fees for non-hunters who use the area as a means for obtaining financial support (hikers, bird watchers, horsbackriders, etc.)
- 220 2 Raise Use Permit fees in order to hire more patrolling of the park.
- 37 2 If it is desired to increase revenue, increase the present very low access fees.

35	4	Increase park revenue by charging additional fees for existing services and sights.
189	8	A key factor will be additional utility sites within existing developed campgrounds that can recover all of their costs; Support development of appropriate fee structure to recover costs.
41	4	We would be anxious to pay a fair price for a first class camping/OHV riding experience.
50	2	I would be willing to pay an even higher rate for the convenience (water and sewer hookups).

Public Concern

The Forest Service should continue the issuance of the handicap (ATV) permit.
To provide for wider recreational opportunities.

Response

This is a policy decision made outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

246	10	I live here and "play" here. Continue the issuance of the handicap [ATV] permit.
-----	----	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should pursue a stronger focus on environmental education and "outdoor classrooms".
To provide an environmental education message to each visitor;
To showcase different ecosystems and their management;
To ensure visitors develop a respect for the land and its wildlife;
To ease public tensions concerning active land management.

Response

The LRMP responds to this concern. EE is woven into all program areas and has specific goals and objectives. Refer to the vision and EE sections of the Plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	20	Provide an environmental education message to each visitor engaging a variety of methods and opportunities. Support.
216	4	As included in the "Original Mission", environmental education should be a primary focus of activities within LBL. This environmental education should not be based on one's ability to pay for an excursion through an unnatural setting such as caged animals at the Nature Station or the Elk/Bison Range, but rather on helping develop a respect for the land and all of its inhabitants.
227	5	We, TN Div of Forestry, support a stronger focus on environmental education. We feel that LBL should be an "outdoor classroom" showcasing different ecosystems and the various ways they can be managed.

265	25	The management should not be blindly providing what the visitors have been directed towards by a multi-million dollar advertising industry marketing the wares of corporate giants. Rather, the visitors should be exposed to the concepts of sustainable and appreciative recreation and use of an increasingly natural environment.
181	2	I believe strong environmental education outreach programs, which provides understandable explanations of proactive ecosystem management issues (forest and wildlife), are necessary to calm the public outcry against practically any active land management attempted in LBL or on other public lands. The visiting recreating tourist and the general public did not notice or was not concerned about [wildlife habitat improvement/tree harvesting]activities. The opportunities to solve the uninformed status of our citizens might include: 1. Promoting wise-use land management experiences (limited to land owners/friends). 2. Providing ecological management learning opportunities for visitors to public lands. 3. Writing popular articles, published in a wide variety of media and produced also for the visual media, about the benefits of ecological management in 2004 and beyond. 4. Teaching teachers about the need and principles of ecological management.
45	1	The emphasis on improving and enhancing environmental education and recreation opportunities is appropriate given the large audience that could be reached among the population of visitors to LBL.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should conduct ground surveys of surface artifacts.
To ensure that the LRMP will properly assess or connect these programs and resources to environmental education.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

221	22	We also don't believe that proper on the ground surveys have been completed of surface artifacts of both recent and more distant past occupants and users of the area. We believe that this ties in importantly with environmental education, but that the plan does not properly assess or connect these programs and resources.
-----	----	---

Response

Required by law to conduct surveys prior to ground disturbing activities. Heritage resource management is discussed in program strategies of the Plan.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should expand its environmental education to include funds that can go into facilities supporting vehicular visitation.
To meet high-yield environmental education opportunities.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

Response

This comment has been incorporated into the Nature Watch desired condition in the Plan. Specific delivery methods are outside the scope of the Plan.

258	8	We do ask however, that Alternative Y's description of Environmental Education be expanded to include monies that can go into facilities that will support the largely automobile driven visitation. This does not necessarily mean a ton of new facilities, but rather adequately supporting existing facilities through LBL budgets and creating new facilities to meet strategic high-yield environmental education opportunities.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should conduct in-depth workshops on historically significant skills and crafts once used in this area.
To provide hands-on learning to interested visitors;
To help bring in more people and business to the surrounding communities.

Response

Program delivery method is outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

178	1	Cultural Education: We would like to see numerous, in-depth workshop on skills and crafts familiar in the past history of the land. We enjoy the demonstrations at the Homeplace but more hands-on, really learning-from-the ground-up type classes are needed.
178	3	These [hands-on, educational] workshops would also help the surrounding areas (Dover, Grand Rivers, Cadiz, Aurora, etc.) by bringing in more people and thus more business.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should enhance current facilities and potentially add more.
Because the current facility-based recreation and environmental education doesn't cover it all;
By adding signs and explanations to buildings;
Because the facilities are a strong benefit to the area youth and visitors.

Response

The analyses do not indicate a need for new facilities. However the plan does allow for enhancement of existing facilities. Specific types of upgrades are outside the scope of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

145	3	The educational areas at LBL are of strong benefit to our area's youth and vacationers alike. That is the allure of LBL. These areas can be set aside for educational purposes (IE golden pond, elk/bison area, check stations).
155	2	Some developments to better view wildlife would be great.

270	2	There are so many exciting nooks and crannies tucked away all throughout LBL that facility-based recreation and education does not cover it all. I am all for the enhancement of current facilities and maybe a few small additional ones.
6	1	The buildings [at Homeplace] could use an explanation sign telling what happens in each building and what the building was for. The tobacco barn could tell about seedling growing transplanting and growth, then the harvest and curing a finally readying for market.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should abandon the 1880's Homeplace.

Response

Thanks for your comment however there are no plans to close this facility based on analysis in the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

146	9	Abandon the 1880's Homeplace.
-----	---	-------------------------------

Public Concern

The Forest Service should maintain the planetarium, Homeplace, Nature Center and Elk/Bison Prairie.

Response

No plans to close these facilities based on analysis of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

282	1	Keep the working farm [Homeplace] and implements as in the past. Wonderful examples of how life used to be when we had to work for everything, including our comfort!
222	8	I support: Maintaining the current attractions (planetarium, Homeplace, Nature Center, Elk/Bison prairie.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should place pet kennels outside facilities where pets are not allowed.
To make facilities more convenient to attend for visitors with pets.

Response

Thanks for your comment; this is a project level decision.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

178	5	We do need for the areas such as the Visitors Center, Nature Station, Homeplace to be more petfriendly. Kennels placed outside these places in a shady area where our pets could be locked up safely with shade and water are needed for campers and drive-thru visitors.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should re-open the Youth Camp, Silo Overlook and Empire Farm.
Because many visitors have fond memories of these areas;
Because they are valuable resources;
Because the Empire Farm may be eligible for listing on the historical register.

Response

This has been an important consideration during the planning process. Refer to the Plan for direction on closed facilities. Youth Station and Empire Farm will be decommissioned, however these areas will be utilized as part of Nature Watch Demonstration Areas. Buildings will be evaluated for the National Register.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

260	1	Is Silo Overlook going to be opened again?
39	1	I cannot believe that the silo is closed. What a waste of a resource that is. Many, many folks are missing the view of a life time.
130	3	Silo Overlook - many visitors have memories of the Silo Overlook and want to return to that site for those memories. Some had been married there, some had brought children there to see the water, and some had simply heard that it was a neat feature of LBL and wanted to experience it themselves. It was heard at NW, NS, and GPVC by at least 10 persons.
100	7	Reopen youth camp, silo overlook, and Empire farm.
214	4	The Youth Station and Empire Farm were part of what little environmental education TVA had. In my opinion, they should be reopened. Empire Farm may also be eligible for listing on the historical register. This is an important asset to LBL and should be pursued.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should keep closed facilities closed.

Response

This has been an important consideration during the planning process. Refer to the Plan for direction on closed facilities. Youth Station and Empire Farm will be decommissioned, however these areas will be utilized as part of Nature Watch Demonstration Areas. Buildings will be evaluated for the National Register.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	11	Support keeping closed facilities in current state, and potentially even demolishing and reverting area back to appropriate vegetation.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use the Environmental Education area to display low impact and/or sustainable logging.

Response

The EE Area will become part of a Nature Watch Demonstration Area under the Plan. Refer to the land allocation prescription for further information. The types of activities and delivery methods within the area are project level decisions.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

285	3	There has been a failure to use the Environmental Education area to display low impact and/or sustainable logging methods.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should place historical markers on the site of former schools, churches and businesses.
To expand its cultural awareness program.

Response

Outside the scope of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

29	7	Place historical markers on the site of former schools, churches, and businesses and expand the education programs.
----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create one nature view demonstration area.

Response

Thanks for your comment. The selected alternative identified two Nature Watch Demonstration Areas.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

176	2	I don't think there needs to be two nature view demonstration areas. I believe that one would be enough.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should create two nature view demonstration areas.
Because wildlife viewing is a major attraction here;
To allow the visitor to utilize their time at being an amateur naturalist;
To enhance the visitor experience;
To provide more environmental education.

Response

Thanks for your comment. The selected alternative identified two Nature Watch Demonstration Areas. See vision and land allocation prescription and other sections in the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	3	EPA supports the creation of the Nature View Demonstration Area.
45	2	I think the development of the north and south nature viewing areas as proposed would enhance the experiences of many who would otherwise have little chance to see a wide array of native plants and animals in their day-to-day lives, and will serve to increase their awareness and appreciation of the need to protect biodiversity not only at LBL, but perhaps even across the globe.
270	5	In talking to LBL visitors, the main queries I receive are "where can I see wildlife?" In the absence of a large geological feature, wildlife is what draws many visitors to LBL. I feel the establishment of nature viewing areas can best meet the needs of the visitor. These areas allow the visitor to utilize their time and skill at being an amateur naturalist most efficiently and give them an experience that will bring them back for years. I feel the Environmental Education Area (Barnes Hollow) and the Fort Henry Area would best meet that need. The creation of a nature viewing area in the EEA would bring people to an area rich in wildlife. The EEA is the top place to view a diversity of wildlife in LBL (included at the bottom is a list of species that on a daily basis can be seen by visitors in the EEA).
189	10	Development of two Nature View Demonstration Areas designed for wildlife viewing, totaling approximately 3900 acres (Alt Y); Support expansion of NVA from existing EEA, but maintain provisions to control deer herd via hunting.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ensure public access to all areas of LBL, with no leases or sales of acreage.

Response

None of the Alternatives would allow for "closure", leasing, or sale of any land located in the boundaries of LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

246	3	I live here and "play" here. Never sell or lease acreage in the LBL.
146	10	Make the entire LBL accessible. Do not contract with or participate in "Biosphere" or other programs that would diminish the right of the public to access any area of the LBL. Do not close areas of the LBL to the public.
90	1	I hope the Forest Service can continue to keep LBL open for us to enjoy.
92	2	I do not support private leases of public lands unless it is used in an environmentally friendly, nature related purpose that can be shared with the public.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should give back its land to the original residents. Because no one should be allowed to make money in this area unless it is the families who previously owned the land.

Response

Returning land to former owners is not within the scope of Land and Resource Management Planning.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 13 | 1 | I would like to know how to file a grievance to try to reclaim the families land and not have to take this to the media. I would have done this sooner but two things; 1. I did not know about my fathers mental problems back then due to my young age and he has just recently started sharing this information with me. 2. I do not think anyone should be allowed to make money in that area unless it is the families that owned the land. |
| 28 | 1 | That we are given back everything the government stole from our father's family in Kentucky (a sense of place, a way of life, our land, the family members who died early b/c of the forced removal from the land, etc.). |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should maintain the current special designations. Because there is plenty of land set aside for these purposes already; Because research hasn't yet been done in any of the "research areas".

Response

Thanks for your comment. Core Area acreage increases under the selected alternative to the level identified in 1994 by the NRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 232 | 5 | I do not support increasing the Core Research area. In my opinion there is already too much area designated for research. As I understand research has never been done using the set aside area. The Core areas should be reduced to that truly necessary to conduct research and the rest of the area currently set aside used to further the other purposes for which LBL was created. |
| 204 | 6 | Further, the current special designations also seem to be adequate and should be maintained as status quo in the new LRMP. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should give larger blocks of land to create bird preservation areas.

Response

Habitat for all species including birds is analysed and assessed in Chapter 3 FEIS. The land allocation prescriptions were selected with "all-bird conversation" in mind.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

237 32 In addition, we believe that some specific bird preservation areas should be designated outside the core areas. Perhaps that could be an expansion of core areas. This could be done pursuant to the requirement to try and locate wilderness areas in LBL. If wilderness areas are not possible because of the need of former residents to access cemeteries and other historic and cultural landmarks, then extra effort should be made to give larger blocks of land additional protections. These could be specifically set aside as a bird viewing area or preservation area. They could be developed lightly with trails and other areas for bird viewing. One such area could be designated on the far northeast corner of LBL, adjacent to the core area which is in far north central LBL. Other areas could be designated elsewhere. This should at least be considered.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should re-do its analysis of roadless or wilderness potential on LBL.
Because the evaluation conducted was inadequate;
Because there are questions as to how many roads are actually in the area, and how much acreage is affiliated with them;
Because clarification on supporting documentation is needed;
Because Congress intended that federal agencies give the benefit of the doubt on consideration for wilderness designation in the East;
Because many of the abandoned trails show potential for recovery;
Because there are contradictions in the analysis of sound in the area;
Because the UN Biosphere Reserve Core Area has been minimally disturbed for so long.

Response

Thanks for your comment. The final evaluation is included in the project record and Appendix C of the EIS. Additional detail has been included since the draft.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183 18 We formally request a re-evaluation of the Backbone area, taking these comments into consideration. An objective evaluation in the determination of roadless and wilderness on LBL and adherence to Forest Service regulations and policy. Performance of necessary inventory, analysis or studies to support the findings per 36 CFR 219 requirements on the following resources:
a. Roads; b. Trails; c. Fences; d. Homesteads; e. OHV routes; f. Historical properties; and
g. Law Enforcement actions. Objective evaluation of roadless and wilderness designation per the CEQ NEPA regulations and Forest Service policies.

-
- 183 16 The two log yards are producing noise which is impacting the Backbone. Schaefer (2003) reports the noise and displays the locations where the noise was occurring when the surveys were completed. The study states that sounds of heavy equipment may travel close to the center of the area, and hence impact its potential for perpetuating wilderness values. This appears to directly contradict Schaefer's report on noise. What is the basis for this contradiction? The criterion is: is there currently more than 1/2 mile of road per 1000 acres in the study area? (FSH 1909.12) The criterion is not 'how much road is within the study area, and how much new road would you like to build after you find it not eligible for roadless/wilderness. The Schaefer (2002) report found that there are currently 0.2 miles of road per 1000 acres in the Backbone. The maps that you supplied us bear this out.
- 183 7 Current uses - Roads. The description of current uses is confusing. Mention is made of trails, logging roads, gravel roads, etc. From review of the information you sent to us, the following roads fall within the 7,782 acre roadless area - 400, 402, 404, 406 and 236. Each of these appears to be a rather short intrusion and to be associated with cemetery (and perhaps open lands) access. (The Largest cemetery appears to have no road or trail access.) Is it true that these are the only "current" roads within the 7,782 acre roadless study area? Are these in fact the logging or gravel roads referred to in the Evaluation? Again, it appears that by removing all of these roads from consideration, the acreage would reduce to about 7,000 acres.
- 183 1 We are very disappointed with the finding you reached - no roadless or wilderness potential on Land Between the Lakes (LBL). We are also concerned with the processes followed and lack of documentation that appears to have occurred. The evaluation is inadequate compared to other similar documents we have read. Inclusiveness of all potential roadless areas in the evaluation. Most of our comments will refer to the Central Devil's Backbone (Backbone) area since that is the only area considered in the draft EIS, Appendix C. There were other areas identified in the paper titled Core Areas, Roadless Areas, and Wilderness Study Areas, (Spring 2003 by Schaefer.) There is no documentation in the EIS, Appendix C, on an evaluation of the other 12 areas referenced in that study. We request that planners study and document their findings on the other areas included in the Schaefer study, as some of them appear to be good candidates for consideration as roadless/wilderness. We are still somewhat confused over roads and trails in the Backbone. After reviewing the first two criteria in Appendix C, we assume that the designated trail system in the study area is really an old road system. According to the roads and trails maps, there are no roads within the area other than those listed under 1#2 - Current Uses' above.

-
- 183 2 It is apparent from the law [Eastern Wilderness Act] that congress intended that federal agencies give areas the benefit of the doubt on consideration for suitability for wilderness designation, especially eastern wilderness. It does not appear to us that you gave the Devil's Backbone the benefit of the doubt, as the intent of the law indicates. This is particularly disturbing after checks on the internet showed that there are no designated roadless or wilderness areas in western Kentucky or Central and Western Tennessee. Your own studies display an increasing demand for wilderness and primitive types of recreation into the future. We request that you consider all potential areas as roadless and possible candidates for wilderness, as this is the intent and spirit of the Eastern Wilderness Act.
- 183 4 Reduction of Backbone acres from 7,782 to 5,334. We will accept your claim of a legal requirement to provide access to the cemeteries, although we have seen no proof of such a legal requirement. We are concerned about the very large reduction in acreage to provide this access when in fact all of the cemeteries are on the boundaries of the original 7,782 acre Backbone study area. By our calculations, which are approximations, it would be possible to maintain about 7,000 acres of study area while still providing access to the cemeteries by existing roads.
- 183 6 Under FSH 1909.12.7, 7.11b, #6, (Land Management Planning Handbook) Chapter 7 - Wilderness Evaluation) it states that one of the criteria for determining roadless areas in the east is that it contain no more than 15% of "non-native planted vegetation." In the evaluation, the authors of the evaluation never considered if the open lands met the requirement of 15%; they arbitrarily reduced the acreage by eliminating the open areas, and then applied the 15% criteria. If our estimate of 500 acres is correct, the open lands only comprise about 7% ($500a / 7000a \times 100 = 7\%$) of the study area. As documented in the evaluation, the Backbone initial proposal has only 0.2 miles of road/1000 acres, which is well below the 0.5 miles allowed. The above is inconsistent with a similar analysis prepared in support of the Jefferson NF plan. In the Record of Decision for that plan, the Regional Forester wrote "When we delineated the boundaries of these roadless areas, we extended them as far as possible out to primary access roads, utility rights of way, and private land ownership boundary." Why was this not done for the Backbone? Using the regional forester's criteria, the Backbone (and many of the other roadless candidates) could expand. The reasoning for reducing the acreage from 7,782 to 5,334 appears to be arbitrary given the above points. We request that you redo the Backbone evaluation using the 7,782 acre figure adjusted to allow for necessary cemetery access, or something around 7,000 acres.

-
- 183 9 Previous residential, agricultural and industrial uses under Current Uses (Evaluation Page 426) it is stated (and the maps confirm) that the area including and surrounding the 7,782 acre wilderness study area is designated as a U.N. Man and the Biosphere Reserve Core Area. Core areas, by your definition (EIS Page 186) are: "Minimally disturbed ecosystems and protected to serve as benchmarks. . . ." . . . Activities which have minimal environmental impacts are encouraged in core areas." "The naturally evolving character of the landscape (within core areas is) due to low intensity management. It appears the Backbone study area has been managed for the last decade (at least since 1994 Forestry Plan) to preserve the very characteristics that would make the area prime for consideration for wilderness. Given that it has been managed as a core area for the last decade and has been in public ownership for the last 37 years, if the Backbone is not regaining its natural appearance (Evaluation, Page 426), then, what specific activities are you allowing to occur in the study area (and core area) over the past decades which are so obviously degrading the area and preventing it from regaining its natural appearance? If the management plans are not allowing degrading activities, then why is the area not regaining its natural appearance?"
- 183 12 Abandoned roads or travel ways and unauthorized OHV tracks Trails are authorized improvements within wilderness. The fact that the trails are currently maintained three times a year with bush hogs, ATV's, etc., is not an "improvement" per se, and has no bearing the determination as roadless (Page 427 of the EIS). The evaluation states that some of the trails are '10 feet wide and significantly entrenched'. We refer you to FSH 1909.12, which states in the introduction, that "much, if not all of the lands show some signs of human activity and modification even though they (the lands) have shown high recuperative capabilities." Is it not reasonable to expect signs of some abandoned roads, travel ways and unauthorized OHV tracks? Is that not why special criteria were developed for considering roadless and wilderness in the east? Certainly, an entrenched road will take a long time to heal or become invisible; but surely the intent of the regulations is not to eliminate any eastern area with old, closed and 11 entrenched roads."
- 183 5 The second stated reason for reducing the acreage from 7,782 to 5,334 is due to agricultural access needs. We believe these agricultural areas are displayed on your Cover Type map as croplands, hayfields and maintained open lands (it is somewhat difficult to see due to the scale). The EIS, on page 89, identifies these lands as cultivated for crops or in a grass/forb condition. Although we have no way of determining the areas actually planted in crops or grasses/ forbs, it appears to be very small portion of the study area, perhaps less then 500 acres.

183	14	Noise - several sources of noise are listed in the study, including lake traffic, highway and road traffic, military aircraft and logging yards. The study acknowledged that persistent noise is limited to approximately 500 acres (of 7000+) with a larger area experiencing some intermittent noise. If the Schaefer (December 2003) report is correct, the finding was that 4,380 acres, (approximately 60%) of the area is receiving no noise, with other areas receiving persistent to occasional noise. This is a substantial portion of the Backbone and a decent sized area devoid of noise by eastern standards. The study goes on to state that there are likely reasons for the "low" percentage of the Backbone affected by noise in the Schaefer (2003) report. Although the findings in the Schaefer (2003) report are questioned, they're apparently not verified or contradicted in this study. The study seems to totally ignore Schaefer's statement that all noises were taken in the winter and in a deciduous forest. It is obvious that the noise levels would be lower in the summer, spring and fall when the trees and other plants had leaves. Although Schaefer's conclusions are questioned on what effect weather would have, or why the days that were surveyed would have had low traffic volumes, you provide no supporting or contradicting rational or reasoning. You displayed no details to contradict or challenge Schaefer's noise study protocol, only mentioning things that "may have led to these readings".
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not set aside land for wilderness or roadless areas in LBL.

Response

None is proposed. The analysis in the EIS was reviewed and details added between draft and final that support this conclusion.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

227	6	We, TN Div of Forestry, support the position that LBL does not lend itself to a "set aside for wilderness" area.
258	1	We fully support the finding that no acreages on LBL meet the classification for roadless areas, wilderness study areas, or wilderness designation.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should supply more data on the impacts of military flights over potential wilderness areas of LBL. Because it is unclear whether there are official reports for the Army on this matter.

Response

Thanks for your comment. Information is included in Appendix C of the EIS and project record. Appendix C has been updated since the draft in consideration of this use.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183 15 The documentation we were supplied with on the impacts of military flights on the Backbone are meager. All you supplied us with is an unidentified e-mail from Jon Hallack @ campbell.army.mil, stating that there are 'probably' 150 aircraft per month at an altitude of 500 feet over the exact area. We have the following questions on this topic: a. Is this one e-mail all of the data that was gathered on military flights? B. Are there no official reports from the Army citing specific information referencing flight plans, flight corridors, training grounds, etc? C. Is this e-mail the data on which a conclusion was reached that these flights are needed for national security? The request to Jon Hallack stated "I just need an estimate, it does not have to be anything too specific." d. The FS is tasked with preparing a factual, unbiased determination on suitability of areas for roadless/wilderness. Since the evaluation states that an issue as important as national security is at stake, more data than one e-mail needs to document the following: i. What are their actual flight requirements? ii. Why are they flying 'directly over' the Backbone? iii. Is another flight path available to meet their needs and if so where would it be? iv. Is it necessary that they fly over this area at 500 feet 150 times a month?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should do a cultural survey to determine the status of trails eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Response

Thanks for your comment. This is a project level decision and is done in concert with the direction of the HRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183 8 Current Uses - trails and cultural resources (In these comments, we assume that the trail system displayed on the legal road and the trail maps are in fact those 29.3 miles of 'National Recreation Trails'). The historical resource discussion under Current Uses is also confusing. The claim is made that at least two of the trails in the study area have historic values and that neglecting them would be a violation of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA.) (Evaluation Page 426) We will assume, for arguments sake, that Telegraph and Artillery trails are eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as your staff archaeologist believes. If our assumption is correct, then these trails are being used and maintained as part of the 29.3 mile trail system, and have been for a number of years. Why has no cultural survey and determination been made of the status of these trails in relation to their eligibility, per Section 106 of the NHPA?

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make available documentation on the extent or location of barbed wire fencing and other signs of habitation at LBL in potential roadless areas.

Response

Staff observations are summarized in the project record.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183 10 The response to the last portion of these criteria is to state that past archaeological uses and numerous residences in the area, barbwire fencing and other signs of habitation are prominent features. FSH 1909.12 states that "National Forest System lands in the eastern United State have been acquired over time from private ownership." This is an acknowledged fact and in no way is intended to eliminate the area if they are" disappearing or muted." We requested background information in our FOIA about the extent of the barbed wire. Apparently there is no documentation on the extent or location, just a statement that it exists. There also appears to be no facts or figures about the other signs of habitation referenced. A discussion beginning on Page 237 of the EIS talks about the history of the area. It appears that there are still remnants of the past occupation but that the last resident was moved from LBL in 1967. In the intervening 37 years, we expect that most of the artifacts are slowly disappearing into the environment, i.e., are being primarily affected by the 'forces of nature' as the FSH suggest. The FSH states in Section 7.11a, #7, that minor structural range improvement, such as fences"... are not improvements which would limit the area for consideration." This refers to existing, used and maintained range improvements. It is stated that fences over 40 years old were a partial reason for elimination of the Backbone from further consideration under Criteria 2.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should make public its roadless evaluation.
Because it appears to be made under different standards than other forests;
Because it appears that the policy in the FSH was not followed;
Because the findings appear arbitrary and biased.

Response

Roadless inventory was conducted utilizing current Forest Service standards and reviews. Refer to Appendix C in the EIS. This information has been updated between draft and final to respond to this comment.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183 19 Clarification of supporting documentation.

183 11 The Regional Forester (Jefferson NF Record of Decision) stated: "So while portions of most of the roadless areas are remote, other parts include good roads, lie right along main roads and include areas that have been actively managed for timber and wildlife habitat for many years because of the easy access. It appears that the policy in the FSH was not followed and that Region 8 is applying different standards on different forests when determining the suitability of roadless and wilderness. The findings in the LBL evaluation appear arbitrary and biased. We request that this evaluation be made available for public review in a revised draft document.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should produce records to support the contention that there is illegal OHV use and degradation preventing roadless designation.

Because we were denied this information;

Because the EIS suggests that OHV trails and use are confined to Turkey Bay.

Response

Incident Reports by officers document that illegal use is occurring. The Plan and EIS reemphasizes that Turkey Bay is the only area open to legal OHV riding with the exceptions of special use permits. The roadless analysis in the EIS has been updated between draft and final.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

183	13	Stated on Page 427 is that illegal OHV use is still prevalent in this area. What is the true amount and impact of illegal ATV use on the area? We requested supporting documentation for this claim in our FOIA but were told that information was not available for this area from your database. Since these records are not available to us under FOIA, are there any records to support the contention that there is considerable illegal OHV use and degradation? Certainly the FS is not allowing any widespread illegal OHV use. Given that, how widespread can the impacts be? In the soil effects analysis, on page 57 of the EIS, you state that: "there would be no change in motorized trail mileage by alternative across LBL because OHV trails would stay confined to the Turkey Bay OHV area only "and that "effects (of OHV use) on soil productivity would be insignificant across LBL." Are OHVs prevalent outside of the OHV area or not? OHVs can't be both prevalent in the Backbone and confined to Turkey Bay at the same time.
-----	----	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should designate additional land to the Biosphere Reserve Program.

Response

The Plan includes 6600 additional acres, now totalling approximately 42,000 acres in the Core Area land allocation prescription of the plan.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

279	2	EPA supports the designation of additional lands to the Biosphere Reserve Program.
-----	---	--

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not participate in the UN Biosphere Program.

Because management should remain the responsibility of those who enjoy the area;

Because it is treasonous;

Because the UN will ban all hunting areas.

Response

Thanks for your comment. The Forest Service exercises all authority over the Core Areas of LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

-
- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 166 | 3 | The International Biosphere - LBL's membership in this program may result in additional Federal Funds. But in the long run, international influence by people who never step foot on this wonderful land will take every management tool from our hands with the exception of trash pick-up. I cannot stress enough how important it will be to see that the management of LBL remains the responsibility of those who enjoy it. Few, if any of the countries that currently influence the decisions of LBL can even manage the land in their own country, let alone the land WE call home. |
| 170 | 4 | The International Biosphere - LBL's membership in this program may result in additional Federal Funds, but in the long run. International influence by people who never step foot on this wonderful land will take every management tool from our hands with the exception of trash pick-up. I cannot stress enough how important it will be to see that the management of LBL remains the responsibility of those who enjoy it. |
| 172 | 2 | If the United Nations has their way they WILL ban all our hunting areas. The U.N. should try to keep their Tiger sanctuaries and Elephant parks free of poachers as those two species are endangered, our deer are not in any danger of extinction so let our hunting along. |
| 160 | 1 | I am 100% against the UN having control of LBL. This is treasonous in my eyes I will vote AGAINST ANY politician who supports this and expose EVERY government official connected with LBL in news and on radio talk shows for allowing this to happen. International Biosphere...BULL MALARCH!!!!!!!!!! |
| 269 | 4 | I would also like to see any outside influence regarding the biosphere be rejected and total control of the property be turned over to the Forest service. The UN and other foreign concerns should have NO say as to the disposition of United States public property. It can still be used for its current purpose but it should be at the discretion of the people who it belongs to. |
-

Public Concern

The Forest Service should use lands set aside for the Biosphere Reserve and other areas as comparison demonstration areas. To demonstrate how proactive ecosystem management practices on lands surrounding the reserves improve values society uses every day to remain viable.

Response

Supports LRMP direction; see core area land allocation prescription in the Plan.

Ltr#	Cmt#	Comment
------	------	---------

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 181 | 3 | Use the lands set aside for Biosphere Reserve and other ecological areas as comparisons (the original intent of the Biosphere Reserve concept) to demonstrate how proactive ecosystem management practices on lands surrounding the Biosphere Reserve lands improve values society uses every day to remain viable. |
|-----|---|---|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not exclude management tools (such as fire, gap creation, etc) from Core Areas.

Response

Fire is not excluded from the Core Areas. Natural occurrence of gap creation or treatment within the area for safety, insect & disease is allowed.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

189	4	Support Alternative Y, with caveat that management (e.g., prescribed fire, gap creation) not be excluded from Core Areas.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should continue to protect and manage the two existing registered state natural areas in LBL.
To protect rare and valuable communities;
To ensure that other rare communities are identified and restored when possible.

Response

Supports LRMP direction. See goal and program strategies supporting a diversity of plant and animal communities in LBL.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

239	2	[We do ask] that the two existing registered state natural areas on the forest continue to be protected and appropriately managed; and that other such rare communities be identified and protected; that degraded but restorable rare communities be identified and restoration measures employed.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should not pursue the Work Area 18 timber harvest.
Because it is in violation of commitments made to former residents.

Response

Out of scope of this Plan. WA 18 Decision Notice was signed August 3, 2004 under authority of the 1994 Natural Resource Management Plan, and upheld in appeal.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

285	2	The proposal ([WA18] timber harvest) is a violation of the 'promise' made to residents when the area was purchased by the government.
-----	---	---

Public Concern

The Forest Service should contact/work with appropriate agency for necessary and/or project level activities.

Because any planned activities which will disturb or destroy monuments, NOS requires not less than 90 days notification in advance of such activities;

Because the USFS should complete informal consultation under section 7 of the ESA prior to final decision-making in accordance with the NEPA;

Because the "transition area" will encompass the lands managed by the Corps of Engineers;

Because construction of new stream obstructions in the TN River basin may require Section 26a approval from TVA;

Because this act requires federal agencies to consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Office before they carry out their proposed undertakings;

Because the Dept. of Environ. & Conservation will need to review any specific project involving a property 50 years old or older and render a final comment upon them before work can begin;

Because LBL must have specific linkage with the US Army Corps of Eng. And the TVA to be effectively managed;

Because some of LBL's streams may be Waters of the US, subject to Dept. of the Army (DA) Permit authorities under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 403) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344);

Because any plans to establish new or increase the size of existing specially managed areas should be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers.

Response

The Forest Service has fully complied with all consultation and agency coordination requirements required for strategic LRMP documents. Project level decisions require additional and site specific consultation and/or coordination procedures which will be met as those projects move forward over time. Both SHPO's have been involved throughout the planning processes for the HRMP and the LRMP. Regional partnerships and cooperative efforts are welcomed by the Forest Service.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

201	4	For LBL to be effectively managed it must have specific linkage with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority at a minimum. If agreements exist between other federal agencies or bodies such as the United Nations, the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, etc. they should be articulated and discussed in this document as they relate to the Land and Resource Management Plan.
-----	---	---

-
- 224 1 LBL is surrounded on all sides by sister federal agencies (Corps and TVA). We were unable to find anything in the draft plan and DEIS spelling out that there would be coordination with TVA or the Corps. Within the limitations of funding and manpower, the Nashville District would be pleased to cooperate with the U.S. Forest Service on any issues of mutual interest.
- 224 8 Alternative X states that, "There could be increased opportunities with partners such as concessionaires, entertainment, and special events." The specifics of these "opportunities" are not stated, however LBL should be aware that any activity conducted below elevation 378 on the eastern shoreline should be coordinated with the Lake Barkley Resource Manager prior to the realization of that opportunity.
- 224 6 Plan, Pg. 45 "Biosphere Reserve Core", specifically the "transition area". This 17 county area will encompass the lands managed by the Corps of Engineers. What is the intent of including this 17 county surrounding area and how might the Corps partner with LBL to help accomplish common goals?
- 224 5 Some of LBL's wetlands are man made and some are natural. Regardless, they, and the streams of the LBL may be Waters of the United States, subject to Department of the Army (DA) Permit authorities under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC 403) and Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1344). Section 10 prohibits the obstruction or alteration of navigable waters of the United States (U.S.) without a Corps permit. Section 404 requires a Corps permit for any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands. The U.S. Forest Service should be aware of this fact before entering into either stream or wetland areas to perform certain activities. Detailed permit program information and required application forms are available at the regulatory website: www.lrn.usace.army.mil/cof.
- 225 1 As a reminder, the LBL may use the NEPA process to comply with Section 106 of the NHPA provided that your unit has sent a letter to the SHPO and to the ACHP advising us that you intend to use NEPA to comply with Section 106. Please review the coordination process and requirements at section 800.8 of our regulations. If you have not provided the initial letter and appropriate coordination and consultation, then the LBL has not fulfilled its obligations under Section 106 of the NHPA.
- 224 3 Any plans to establish new or increase the size of existing "reserve", "protected" or specially managed areas, that include areas below elevation 359 on the eastern shoreline, should be coordinated with the Corps of Engineers.

-
- 159 1 A number of activities within the national recreation area may involve TVA. Construction of new stream obstructions in the Tennessee River basin (western side of LBL) may require Section 26a approval from TVA. For example, the currently proposed US 68/Kentucky State Route 80 upgrades and bridges across the Tennessee River require Section 26a approval for the Tennessee River bridge and land use approval below elevation 354. TVA's Kentucky Reservoir is adjacent to national forest system lands. New shoreline facilities on Kentucky Reservoir may require TVA Section 26a approval...TVA wishes to work cooperatively with the Forest Service on activities within the Land Between the Lakes in all areas of joint responsibility, including reservoir management and transmission line maintenance.
- 25 1 Considering available information, we find that the projects as currently proposed in this planning document may affect the integrity of properties listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. While we have no objections to the federal agency encumbering funds to implement this document, we will need to review any specific project involving a property 50 years old or older and render a final comment upon them before work can begin. Until we have rendered a final comment on each project, you have not met your Section 106 obligation under federal law.
- 12 5 I strongly recommend that you immediately initiate consultation with the Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer, Between the Rivers, Inc., and other interested parties to begin review of the management plan under Section 106.
- 12 3 In Chapter 4 of the EIS, which purports to discuss "consultation and coordination" but in fact only lists the members of your planning team and the parties to whom the draft EIS itself has been sent, I see no evidence that the Kentucky State Historic Preservation Officer or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation has even been sent copies of the document, let alone been consulted in any way that might approximate compliance with 36 CFR 800.
- 103 2 The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) recognizes that the programmatic nature of the LRMP draft EIS does not provide the level of project specific detail considered adequate for determining affects on federally listed species under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). However, the USFS should complete informal consultation under section 7 of the ESA on the LRMP prior to final decision-making in accordance with section 102 (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act. Informal consultation for the LRMP may generate ideas for innovative or more efficient protection and recovery programs.
- 11 1 All available geodetic control information about horizontal and vertical geodetic control monuments in the subject area is contained on the National Geodetic Survey's home page...This information should be reviewed for identifying the location and designation of any geodetic control monuments that may be affected by the proposed project. If there are any planned activities which will disturb or destroy these monuments, NOS requires not less than 90 days' notification in advance of such activities in order to plan for their relocation. NOS recommends that funding for this project includes the cost of any relocation(s) required.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should minimize campground and visitor center lights.
To avoid light pollution.

Response

Thank you for your comment. A standard regarding protection of the night sky can be found in Part 3 of the LRMP.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 121 | 4 | Make all existing outdoor lighting nonreflective ground lighting - LBL is one of the few places you can still see the Milky Way. |
| 35 | 5 | No light pollution. This is one of the few areas of the USA in which you can see the Milky Way. Keep it that way. All campground and visitor center lights should be kept to a minimum and be ground deflected types. |
| 130 | 5 | Dark Skies - there have been comments from visitors about the adverse impact that parking lot lights and snack shack light has on dark sky viewing on Saturday night sky shows at the Planetarium. These comments refer to the fixtures that send light up rather than being shielded to only send light down. There was no comment about elimination of parking lot lights just the shielding on the lights. This was heard by not less than 10 persons at the GPVC. |

Public Concern

The Forest Service should ensure all constructed facilities are aesthetically complementary to the natural setting of the eastern shoreline of Lake Barkley.

Response

Thank you for your comment. This is a consideration.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 224 | 2 | Alternative X states that, "Constructed facilities will almost always be visually subordinate to the land." Due to the natural setting of LBL and its aesthetic importance to the recreating public visiting Lake Barkley, the Corps requests that all constructed facilities be in keeping with the natural setting of the eastern shoreline of Lake Barkley. |
|-----|---|--|

Public Concern

The Forest Service should improve management of litter along LBL shorelines.
Because the trash is bad for the environment.

Response

Thank you for your comment. Although outside the scope of the plan, this has been a focus of both our volunteer (reactive) and environmental education (proactive) programs.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

92 5 I would like management improvement of litter and garbage control along the LBL shorelines. The current condition is just appalling to the environment.

Public Concern

The Forest Service should provide more complete analysis of the Nature Watch Demonstration Areas.
Because the analysis was inadequate for alternative Z in the EIS.

Response

Thank you for your comment. The analysis has been revised in the FEIS. Please refer to Chapter 3 of the FEIS.

Ltr# Cmt# Comment

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 286 | 6 | There is also nothing in the analysis about why the 1350 acres is critically important to identifying and protecting the human-tolerant individuals in any wildlife species, or how the 1350 acres would help insure successful nature viewing along Silver Trail. There is no documentation from studies, research, or other experienced individuals in the field of watchable wildlife to support any of your conclusions.....there is no discussion on the effects on tourism and spin off effects on local economies. |
| 286 | 5 | The two sentences of "analysis" in the comparison of effects for Alternative Z (EIS, page 229) do not discuss anything about this topic [Nature Watch] that is substantive. The EIS basically states that hunting and camping opportunities would be somewhat affected and visitation would see little difference from Alternative Y. There is nothing quantitative about the effects to hunting or camping. There are no examples or support for your determination that there would be little difference between Alternative Y and Z on visitation. |
| 286 | 7 | We respectfully request that you do a real analysis of this issue, and that you reconsider and select Alternative Z for non-facility based EE on this topic because: the concept is supported by successful programs around the world and by your own experiences at the E&B Prairie; because wildlife viewing is a much larger portion of your visitors and is the best for the overall public who visit LBL; and you are obligated to provide balance in your recreation and education opportunities. |
| 286 | 2 | There are some things you are not considering adequately. They include:
Wild animals, in most instances, are afraid of human beings; Wildlife know who the apex predator is and given the opportunity, they avoid us; Actively hunted wild animals are particularly afraid of humans, and most will maintain a safe distance, or the flight distance, necessary to insure their safety; Certain wild animals that are not hunted or harassed, or in other ways threatened, can lose some of their fear for humans over time; A subset of the above population often will become "human tolerant," approaching humans at relatively close distances. (This is different than food habituation, where wildlife are fed by humans.); Over time and if properly managed, humans can actually become part of the human-tolerant wildlife's world, and very unique and exciting behavior will become observable, often at close range; Human visitors will become captivated by this human-tolerant wildlife that serves as the hook. These people will be in an open frame of mind where environmental education can be most effective. |

286

- 1 We are commenting on Alternative Z in general and the extended nature view area specifically. We are disappointed by the lack of coverage this topic received in the plan. The entire analysis of nature view extended area in Alternative Z is two sentences long. We feel this is totally inadequate for an idea that has considerable merit for enhancing watchable wildlife and environmental education on LBL.