



Public Comments Collected on Initial Proposed Changes to Recreation Fees Proposed by the Gifford Pinchot National Forest

1. To maintain our forests and for public use, these fees seem appropriate. With increased population and interest in outdoor recreation, we need to have the finances to adequately care for our natural resources.
2. People are already struggling to get by, but still need to escape occasionally. If prices get much higher then only the upper middle class and rich will be able to go there. Public forests should be accessible to all the public not just the financially well off.
3. While we are glad that prices are being raised to reflect the tremendous increase in demand, why is the increase not even more? At these prices, the Forest Service won't be able to afford painting the outbuildings or stock the toilet paper required. It will be unable to provide competitive pay to be staffed properly. Ape Caves, which doesn't have a price increase at all, should be per person not car load. Summiting Mount Saint Helens and Mount Adams should be more like \$100, which is more in line with what other amazing park experiences within the country. There is a huge demand for summiting permits, they sell out promptly when the Forest Service sells them for \$22 and they leave a lot of money on the table that can be used to maintain the trail. Just imagine increasing the prices and having some money to upgrade the parking lot. Additionally, it is impossible to return summit permits back into the system if people decide to cancel less than seven days before their hiking date, even if the hiker doesn't want a refund. The way that the Forest Service runs this forest is not acceptable. While the Forest Service is subsidized by the federal government, this price structure is a pure waste of opportunity. Many might argue that it's just more tax dollars from the citizens, you must realize that many visitors from outside the United States also use the park and there is no way that such a small fee for an experience like Mount Saint Helens will ever maintain the long-term operation of the attraction. The roads just to get there will never be repaired without the proper funding and that funding required would never materialize from \$20 per person with a limit of 110 per day for just handful of months out of the year. Implementing this price structure is an abuse of your power and defrauding the taxpayer out of the true financial opportunity that the Forest Service can provide. Implementing this price structure will mean never having upgrades or repairs to any of the facilities. You need to at least double the proposed prices and charging certain attractions like Ape Caves and Lower Lewis River Falls per person! Lone Fir Resort used to be the location to pick up Mount Saint Helens permits, and we would only get 69 cents for every permit sold. We were required to be open from 6am to 9pm everyday for this process. We asked for an increase to reflect the cost and the Forest Service just decided to shift it online. Now some company in Albuquerque, NM is getting \$2 a permit, which takes the 69 cents out of the local community. Why can't these sites collect a payment directly there? Hundreds of people have been very upset when we tell them they must go online in advance and make a reservation, in an area with no cell service. Many just decide to go anyway without even purchasing a permit which is a loss of potential revenue. The road signs on WA 503 for the Ape Caves are also blocked off, despite the attraction being open. A simple phone call from the Forest Service to the Washington Department of Transportation would fix this, yet the Forest Service refuses.

4. You are not permitted to increase the fees! You already steal far too much of our money and are illegally holding lands in violation of the constitution, these lands must be immediately returned to the people and their respective states.
5. No fee increases for access to OUR Public lands
6. I am all for charging the general public higher/fees, providing: 1. the road to the camp or trailhead is maintained to standard; 2. the trail is SAFELY accessible by all designated user groups. Paying and then only being able to go a mile or two would not be very good PR for the FS; 3. trail volunteers who are working there do not have to pay; 4. any amenities are maintained; 5. it is not costing more to implement this than fees taken in; 6. the few horse camps are not taken up with non-stock campers.
7. We are local resident users of the GPNF and love to hike, camp, snowshoe and ski at many of the recreation areas there. I think your fee proposal is VERY REASONABLE. We've happily paid more for no hook up sites at OR and WA state campgrounds. I urge you to adopt the proposed fees. The Gifford Pinchot is a great resource, and we need to keep the experience the best it can be.
8. Absolutely not! Fees have been charged in the way of federal income tax and the added northwest forest pass yet the 81 road has not been repaired in over 25 years (the section just before the ape cave turn off). The 81 road is used year round more than any road in the area both with snowmobiles and hikers yet it has not been taken care of. The answers are not fee-ing the public to death to use our public lands. Stop politicians from giving our taxes away and use them here where they are needed or let Mother Nature take it back.
9. I didn't know this site even had a picnic area. It's a popular spot for many, Boating and the hiking trail. The 5 dollar fee doesn't seem unreasonable. As a Pass holder and honor of the pass is a great idea.
10. I spoke with Dave Wickwire shortly after the outrageous implementation of the Lewis River area began without and public feedback. I also called and spoke to a PR person after Ape Cave was permitted. I still don't like what this has all become. Truly a circus. Dave complained about cars line the perpetually terrible FR 90 and spoke about people riding in the beds of pickup trucks to get to the Falls which is why the miles and miles of 90 are essentially closed off. That terrible because it closes off other area of meaning to people who have used this pullouts for years and now they can't park there. Terrible. Now I see you want to DRASTICALLY upcharge people for going to the forest that they already pay for. Crazy. You want or will need to add amenities which we all know will be shot up in no time and create more work for you. You want to penalize climbers and backpackers who probably do the least damage and then you want to charge more for people who probably are going out for the first time. I find it amazing as a Gifford supporter that Eric V somehow thinks that these projects will get them caught up with the rest of the state. Doubtful. Y'all can barely do anything to begin with so how are we supposed to believe that with some extra chump change that you'll create new habits? You won't. Y'all want to upcharge the horse camps to? Geez, talking about the hand that feeds you since they do plenty of volunteering. Anywho, like I told Dave not long ago, I really don't mind sharing my own off trail, in very sensitive locations to other people. I can literally see a business for myself as a result of the continued fee driven bs that the Gifford is growing accustomed to. Here's a few photos so you can enjoy and know that I'm not telling fibs.
11. I'm not sure which analytical genius made this decision... but charging \$10 to cancel a campground valued at \$25 is economically retarded. It costs me \$35 to cancel and allow someone else to have an experience.. or I can just eat the \$25 and not show up and let the campsite sit vacant. So if it's a big mystery why camping occupancy is only like 60% even though the campsite is fully

booked year round.. this is why. So much, this is why. If you offered a \$10 refund INSTEAD, you would still net \$15 profit from the person who canceled, opens up booking for other people, and everyone wins. In fact it's more profitable and provides more incentive to offer a refund rather than threaten to penalize someone for not showing up. Please god someone with some logic please read this email.

12. I am absolutely against any more fee increases to access public land. We see our taxes continue to rise and more fees and restrictions piled on top of that. The average American will soon be taxed out of being able to afford to take their families on simple weekend trips to the forest. We need more accountability and efficiency in the use of our tax dollars, and that is not achieved by increasing taxes.

13. I noticed you are soliciting public comments and have a page dedicated to talking about how to comment. However it never clarifies what the FS will do with the feedback. It appears to be a formality and required 'listening' exercise that has no bearing on outcome. We encourage the public to get involved in this process as public input is a critical part of the fee establishment process. Getting involved is a great opportunity to help shape the future of your public lands. If the public is largely against fee increases, does this mean the Forest Service will not increase fees? I guess I don't understand what the point of commenting is if it isn't clear that it could effect proposal changes.

14. I am writing in regards to the fees to charge to camping. I disagree with any change to the current fees. And don't think any fee increases should be made. As of now the money that is being made is not being used appropriately and the forest service relies on volunteers to maintain trails and to keep the trail system open. So the money saved in labor and equipment usage should make up for any shortcomings in the budget. Maybe other means should be made if the current budget isn't enough.

15. I am in favor of proposed day use fees at sites throughout the Gifford Pinchot National Forest as long as an annual Northwest Forest pass is honored in place of the fee. I urge the Forest Service to keep the complexity of the fee structure low to reduce administrative burden and to reduce confusion amongst forest users. I mostly use less developed sites such as trailheads and wilderness areas, but when I come to a site without knowing that there is a fee or how much the fee is it can be frustrating. I do not use many fee-based campgrounds, but from my observation the nightly fee can vary widely depending on where you are. Having the correct or exact amount of cash for a camp site is sometimes difficult to plan for in advance without doing a fair amount of research online. Thanks for your effort in providing access into and maintenance of the forest.

16. No No NO NO NOOO Plain enough for you? It's just too much... too much percentage increase from existing costs, too much overall fees for use of public lands, too much increase when we're in the midst of a recession... JUST TOO MUCH. Don't do it.

17. NOPE. What r u trying to do... just make it too expensive to access/use for us "regular" folk and just make it available to the ultra-wealthy? No to the fee increases. All of them... NO!

18. No way! The proposed increases are outrageous! Pretty soon, only the elite-wealthy will be able to access PUBLIC lands. It is being priced out of range for the middle class guy. NO FEE INCREASES

19. I have reviewed the draft fee proposals, and as an avid GPNF user familiar with most of these sites, I offer the following comments. If I remember correctly, didn't a judge ruled that fee sites must have certain amenities specifically restroom, parking area, garbage can. Has that ruling been overturned? Many of these proposed sites have no restrooms. I have no objections to sites with these required features having a parking fee, but I think that minimum prior standard be upheld. The

changes in campground fees are ok, if there are restrooms. Group sites fees are high and will drive away smaller groups—perhaps a two tier price based on numbers? Fee for cabins/guard stations is ok. Several of the places your list says they are “free” now are not free, but required a Northwest Forest Pass to use. I know Mt. Margaret is (or was) that way, and I have also seen this at some of the “free” campgrounds. Please fix this to accurately reflect that yes, some fee is already required at some of these \$0 sites. The Fees for the ORV sites are going to want proof and accountability of how those funds were used to on those specific ORV sites. They will not appreciate paying for the site, then have those funds used for a non-motorized area. This concept, where the funds are used for that specific site’s improvement, is a theme that could be repeated in many of these areas: Climbing permits to the climbing program and area, cabin fees to improve cabins, campground fees used to buy a new restroom for that campground etc. This will require more accounting and tracking and overhead. Make sure the cost of the program (collecting envelopes, patrolling, accounting) doesn’t use up all the funds or uses too many of the funds at very remote sites. If you are losing money or breaking even, its not worth it—keep it free! Don’t LIE about the costs of these things! If these prices are just the BASE PRICE, and the REAL Price includes some sort of administrative fee or vendor fee or internet user fee and is a couple dollars more, people will be MAD. The State of Wa did this with the “\$30” Discover Pass that was really more like 35. What about Senior/Veteran/Disabled discounts on camping? I know when you switched to vendors those went away and made people mad. Be clear that these are USFS fees and will be administered by USFS employees not vendors who get a cut. And if you do use vendors, who add to cost or take a cut, the cost/benefit to the public needs to be laid out and very clear. Show where the money goes! How about a pie chart with a breakdown of how the fees are used, including the clear cost of administration. Mount St. Helens 504 sites. (As a Toutle local and former USFS employee here, I am most familiar with these sites, their history, and peak and off-season patterns of use) It appears that the proposal will required visitors to purchase two separate items to visit the sites, some just yards apart, on SR 504. Currently, the wrist band fee is the only fee that is enforced. If I remember correctly, COLDWATER Lake and Picnic area are not part of the “official” list of free sites. Your list of current fees has Coldwater Lake area as a free site but I do not think this is technically correct. However, it is the way it has been managed because there is no way to purchase a wrist band here. I remember commenting some years past that Coldwater Lake should be removed from the fee sites because there was no way to purchase a pass when JRO was closed (as in the winter). This just demonstrates how difficult it was/would be to enforce a wrist pass here. I think if you raise the cost of the wrist pass at JRO, you need to additionally hand out a parking pass for the window in the same transaction. People will not pay twice here, especially if they are familiar with the area and know how to park in main parking lot to access the trails, or know they can park along the highway in places. You are asking for a parking nightmare along 504 if you charge for parking and for JRO. That is a state highway. The USFS doesn’t have jurisdiction to enforce parking along the highway. It won’t take folks long to figure this out and they will park along the road instead of in the parking lots. Also, the Trailheads and Viewpoints (except Coldwater) do not have restrooms or the additional required facilities to charge. Is the USFS seriously going to send someone up SR 504 in the winter to monitor parking fee compliance. I think not! I’m up there all the time in the winter/early spring and I can tell you that the USFS has no personnel up there then. I’m not sure about charging at Coldwater Learning Center in the winter. Do you seriously want to drive everyone away at that time of year. What do people get for that fee? Sure, if you provided a snowplay area it would be worth every penny, but you do not. I was up there numerous times this winter, and it was never open, even on weekends. They just had a threatening sign not even letting people walk in. What is there that is worth the hassle of a fee

besides a toilet? Overall, these fee schemes are going to convince more people to buy the America the Beautiful passes. But, isn't it the case, that the region/area that sells them gets the bulk of the funds? MSH could get no money from passes unless people buy them at MSH? You need to find a way to promote the purchase of those passes at GPNF/MSHNVM to get any real return from them. The week at the Monument (\$30 per car) isn't really cost effective when compared with the \$80 America the beautiful pass. Why not just promote the \$80 pass instead, and convince people to buy IT at MSH?

20. I go up to jro at least 2 times a month and tell people about how I am a mt st Helen's survivor and how I spent ten years of my life planting trees up there now I disabled and you are going to take the only joy I have left in my life plus you are going to kill people's desires to drive 100 miles to pay that kind of money wake up or are you related to bradon

21. Instead of charging more & more fee's to use our public lands here is an idea to improve the reservation registration process and collect more revenue at the same time. Start charging \$50+ reservation deposits that is non refundable for no-show parties that make reservations and block reservation access for others. I see these sites completely booked online then and only sparsely occupied. This is very frustrating for everyone! Site locations could generate a random code that could be entered online for automatic deposit refunds.

22. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the future of Burley Mountain Lookout. In my opinion, much restoration would need to be done to make this a rental property - much more than a good cleaning, coat of paint, and a new toilet seat! If you decide to do this, please take the opportunity to make it handicap-accessible. But there are many rentable lookouts, while the number of no-charge ones is declining. Rather than that, I would prefer doing the minimum work to stabilize the structure and keeping it as a free rustic camp shelter, first-come, first-serve. Even better would be the Vermont shelter protocol, where newcomers are welcome up to the capacity of the shelter.

23. Instead of increasing fees , work within your budget. Get off your backsides and do some actual FS work instead of riding the desk all day. Hell it is almost impossible to get some one to mark firewood. Roads are going to hell, no maintenance, . how about take back all the campsites AND PUT THEM UNDER FS JURISDICTION ., Why lease them out when the FS can manage them. In other words DO YOUR JOBS instead of asking for more money. My tax dollars pay for all of this. In case you haven't heard , WE ARE ON A PATHWAY TO HELL WITH BIDEN

24. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on recreational fees. Most of the proposed fees seem to be in line with other National Forests in the state. I noticed that a majority of trailheads listed indicate that the "Annual Northwest Forest Passes and Full Suite of Interagency Passes would be honored". However this is not the case for any of the OHV trailheads/areas. Why? This seems a bit disparate, since there seem to be fewer amenities in these areas than most other trailheads or day use areas. Will the fee money for ORV areas be kept separate and use differently?

25. I am against the new fees, because the fees are already taking the Forest away from those who are poor and low income. It is discriminatory towards those who cannot afford to enjoy our forest lands and leaves things open only to those who are well off. Plus we are just coming out of a pandemic, a 2-year shutdown, where barely anyone made any money at all, many of us are already struggling just to survive, and now we are being told there will be increased fees to do things that help us with sanity, such as taking a stroll through our public lands. Please do not increase the fees, or if you do, provide an option for those who are low income to be able to enjoy our forests. Please do not discriminate against those of us who can't afford your fees.

26. I was saddened to hear of the proposed fee increase in the GP. As someone who has used the forest for recreation and work for years, I knew that the USFS would tighten down the control in the GPNF. This step of increasing fees in all popular sites in the forest makes the barriers to using the public land the USFS manages ever greater for large sections of the American public. The four objectives of the proposal do not necessitate such a drastic fee increase. This solution ignores the inequality of access facing working-class recreationists. The cost of the tank of gas to reach these sites has now made the once a last minute trip to a mountain overlook a journey that takes real spending money away from an already cash-strapped public. Programs need to be in place to provide reduced or free access for members of the public that do the greatest good for the forest: public servants, educators, and children have the desire but no means of experiencing the GPNF. The practice of hiring temporary, seasonal employees to manage, protect, and interpret the recreation site that generates the majority of the visitors for the forest and the surrounding rural communities. If the USFS hires out the local community and pays a living wage to the entry-level workers the work in the organization will improve and the trust among communities and the federal agency that is the USFS may increase. Promoting the stewardship of the land by way of education is far more effective than increasing fees. A program to educate school kids on the merits of the forest and how to care for and invest in the resource may accomplish the goal of keeping the impact of heavy use sites down to a manageable level. The fee increase is a simple fix to a complex issue. The higher fee will exclude poor folks from the land they and we all have a right to. Do not increase the fee, do not lock up the forest, and keep the land wild and free. Thank you for your time and service to our greatest resource: public land,

27. I did not download a comment card but I am providing feedback. I doubt any feedback will make a difference as the Forest service continues to make the changes they want. Our campsites in the Gifford Pinchot need to be better managed, but the forest itself needs better managed. The past few years the increase in use of the forest has become a mess. I am glad people are "enjoying the outdoors", but there is less use and less respect. I thank you to those who continually clean up garbage and the residents on our road clean up our little area several times a year. There are more people getting out but also more homeless squatting and trash left. There are more fires left unattended and an increase in forest fires. I hike weekly in the Gifford Pinchot and also see an increase in "dog poop bags", garbage, destruction of property and many trails now I won't hike afraid my vehicle will be broken into. Increasing fees alone won't clean it up. Increasing fees to campsites will only encourage more dispersed camping to avoid fees. Cut back on dispersed camps, do not allow all year long campfires outside of campgrounds (or at least during Memorial Day through Labor Day and then depending on weather with fire season) Open campgrounds for a longer period of time, especially lower elevation sites that can be used Spring and then Fall with hunting season. Manage our forest better for crime- do we need to have trail cams at parking areas. Actually process criminals for garbage left, get info on the dispersed campers and treat them like they are in a campground (vehicle information, post signs if needed pack it out, no fires etc) these routine used areas will be little more protected from things if people realize they are not in the woods hiding but kept an eye on). If fees are increased for campground use, give fee incentive breaks to WA state residents and charge more for out of state residents. Allow more firewood cutting to clean up the fuel on the ground and ease up on those restrictions, especially with the inflation our country is in. I live one mile from the "forest service line" on Bear Creek Rd in Carson. We have terrible issues with squatters and garbage and I know there are issues all over the forest with this. We need to figure a way to clean up and prevent the dumping of garbage and how to keep our forest safer and cleaner.

28. I went to Mt. St. Helens yesterday on a whim, but generally go once a year. The ONLY reason I was able to go on a whim yesterday is because the park fee is only \$8. I am not able to afford the \$30 vehicle fee that other national parks charge, so rarely get to go to other wonderful places like Mt. Rainier. An increase to \$12 is something I'd be happy to pay for, but the vehicle fee would prevent people like me from going. I often travel solo, and while I encourage carpooling to reduce emissions it's not always an option, which is the only way I'd be able to afford the entrance fee. Please, please, please keep the fee low for single travelers. Mt. St. Helens is such a wonderful place to visit and I would be so sad if money is the reason that myself and others are no longer able to visit. I'd even love to see a combination option to pay per person as a day pass for \$12 or a week-long \$30/car rate.

29. I support the proposed fee changes for Gifford Pinchot and Mt St Helens Monument, as I want to support the upkeep and staffing at these important parks and trails. I cannot tell if the interagency America the Beautiful pass will continue to be honored at Johnston Ridge under this proposal. For ease of use, I would prefer that it does continue to be honored, and I would understand if the yearly fee needed to increase to allow for that. Simplicity with passes is so helpful. I do not support expanded off road vehicle use in Gifford Pinchot. Off road vehicles are noisy, wear down areas so much, and scare away wildlife.

30. I am against new fees. I would like you to enforce the law against camping within 50 feet of a stream. My swimming hole has been ruined and it's getting worse. The natural flora has been stomped on and ruined, and it is not the pristine site it once was. I am referring to the location a mile up the road from where Hemlock Lake used to be.

31. Operating all of these sites and facilities requires a lot of funding. It makes perfect sense that the people that use them most should make a significant contribution to their upkeep. I am in favor of all of the proposed fee increases.

32. Please be aware that current expectations of Washington State citizens and visitors regarding seasonal openings and closures of recreation sites, maintenance of trails, access roads, parks and campgrounds and development of new recreation areas in Washington are not even close to being met. Washington is way behind adjacent options including Idaho, Oregon and British Columbia. I would be happy to contribute more funds via a higher charge for the NWF pass but please do not complicate the process and inhibit access further by new tiers of fees. The Discovery Pass is already a huge, and redundant, nuisance. Take your financial needs to the people via a referendum as the legislature is deaf to your needs but be aware that restricted calendars, multiple fees, impossible lotteries and unmaintained trails and facilities do little to promote your cause.

33. I'd like to say the proposed fees are extremely high and unfair. Hikers get charged \$5 at trail heads, but motorized users will get charged \$10? We already pay for OHV tags as well as Northwest Forest Passes for our vehicles. These OHV areas have nothing more than a parking lot and a vaulted toilet. The OHV users and groups like NMA are the ones packing saws and clearing trails in the GP and many other forests. We haven't had any new trails added to the OHV area. Users aren't even able to access trails from the two separate areas unless they have a plated motorcycle. These prices seem like a back door way to push motorized users out of the Forest. A family with with a couple kids on bikes won't be able to afford these prices. What are we getting for our fees paid for the OHV tags? What about the fees for the Northwest Forest pass? Why are hikers and mountain bikers not charged the same fee? What other options are there for raising funds? Are volunteer hours not matched funds by the government? What about increasing logging to mitigate fire danger, improve roads and raise funds from timber sales?

34. Aloha and Greetings- Thank you for your work as stewards for our public lands in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. Since my childhood with my family I have spent most of my 57 years of life visiting National Forests, monuments , National and State and County Parks. In the past 50 years I have sadly observed steadily increased usage and abuses including littering, improper human waste disposal (diapers & toilet paper) right alongside the trails, vandalism, thefts, gunplay, and general disrespect for the land and others. I also realize the immense extra burdens and dangers placed on the Rangers/ Employees and Volunteers due to these added problems - as your budgets have shrunk proportionally to the increased modern day responsibilities. I feel that even though Gifford Pinchot Nat'l Forest IS Public lands- there needs to be a way such as User Fees to help mitigate/ pay for these additional budget shortfalls/ expenses. I also believe the Fees will encourage more awareness of a visitors basic responsibilities and conduct and to encourage "good behavior" .Additionally, maybe a Tasklist can be utilized in lieu of Fees for Volunteers. The Fees should be waived for Disabled Veterans (as myself) and Senior Citizens- with discounts for Active Duty Military, 1st Responders, and Teachers. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion on the subject and stay safe!

35. I am an avid hiker, backpacker, and dirt bike rider. When I'm hiking, I don't carry a saw and I only pick up little little because I'm carrying it. However, when I'm on my dirtbike, I cut many logs each season, and I always have a bag ready for trash, because people can be really inconsiderate. I don't log my volunteer hours, because it's just part of being responsible in the forest. And that's what my entire group of dirt biking friends do- clear trails and pick up trash. I pay over \$100 registration fees already on each bike that get used about 10 times per year. I pay to stay at a campground with services. I already buy a NW Forest Pass, Discover Pass, and Mt Rainier Pass every year. I also pay tabs on snowmobiles. Haven't I already paid to access these areas? I don't understand why there would be an extra user fee for trailheads, particularly those that have no services. And, I don't understand why off road trails (\$10 or \$20) would have a higher priced fee than other trails (\$5). If money is needed to provide more access to these off road trails then ask for a work party, there are hundreds of dirt riders volunteering each year. I've hiked for the last 30 years around here. I can go to the Wilderness, a State Park, or National Park when I don't want to share the trails with bikers, but I think it's ridiculous that dirtbikers seem to be discriminated against especially the amount of times I've picked up trash at hiking camp sites, or after the salal or mushroom pickers. I am against added fees for off road access points.

36. As a long time resident of the Pacific Northwest I feel that I am a great sounding board for this idea. My father was a career USFS employee. I personally have worked for the Forest Service and National Park Service as a seasonal for many years. Over the years I have seen the budgets in these agencies decline. I have seen cuts in staffing, supplies and maintenance go down. Use fees are always touted as a solution to this loss in funding. In reality I have seen very little if any change to the local trails I use In many cases the trails and access roads have simply become impassable. In many cases if volunteers don't step up and take care of these trails they see absolutely no attention from federal employees or contractors. I have personally been a part of volunteer groups that help to maintain some of the local trails on the GP. The Northwest Forest Pass system has been in use now for many years. I know the revenue from this is supposed to help take care of these facilities and trails. Honestly I cannot see examples of where these funds are reaching their intended areas. I cannot support this idea increasing the areas where these parking passes are required at all. If I could see evidence of these funds at work then I would absolutely support this plan. For me it's a big NO for this idea.

37. My wife and I are residents of Trout Lake and are avid users of the Gifford Pinchot Forest for hiking, camping, snow shoeing, dirt biking and cycling. We hardly support the folks that maintain and

run all of the facilities, trails and programs in the NF. Generally we are supportive of necessary fee hikes and permit fees needed in order to keep up with the increased use. We do have a few caveats that we feel should be taken into consideration:

1. We feel it would reduce the amount of maintenance and impact on camping and day use areas if some of the funds were applied to educating users at the time of arrival of how to care for nature. This could be a simple copied handout that was attached to the site markers. What we observe as high impact are people tearing down live trees or undergrowth to make fires, or space to put their boats, tents, etc.
2. We have a concern that increased fees will exclude some people from using due to cost; if there is a program to serve social-economically disadvantaged folks, it'd be nice to tie in that program with the ability to book with lower fees.
3. Lastly, we'd like it if people appreciated, cared for and travelled to their local Forests in order to build more of a community around caring for shared resources. We'd love to see a fee structure that allowed "locals" to pay a lower fee than "non-locals". The local folks have not significantly increased their use. As more people discover and travel farther to the GPNF, they should help fund the additional budget needed to keep up. We understand that as a Federal agency, this might prove challenging.

38. I do not support any additional fee for motorized access, Motorized trailheads, camp fees for motorized ORV users or other ORV use fee introduction or increase in GPNF. The motorized trail system is primarily maintained by its motorized users. There has not been any improvements (or even repairs) done by the US FS for many years (Is there a bridge on Trail #116 yet? How long has it been gone?). To use the area, they have either a legal license plate or a WA ORV tag currently. They pay for the camping areas that exist now. An additional per USFS fee for each unit or area or whatever it is called across the USA will become overburdensome. We already have a difficult environment for ORV users to navigate in knowing which pass or fee they need to have on hand to go to an area with the Discover Pass for some state lands and FS fees for others. This has become even more complicated in recent years as states have dissolved their ORV sticker reciprocity agreements making it quite difficult for ORV users to ride legally in other states. The volunteer hour requirement for a free pass being considered is not reasonable. The FS should cherish its volunteers, not diminish their efforts. Consider more FS organized and sponsored work parties. Use volunteer opportunities to bring differing user groups together. What hourly wage is a volunteer worth. Please consider that versus the proposed fee and volunteer work time required to attain one. If the USFS has one additional fee that was good for all the areas in the USA. It is called an America the Beautiful Annual Pass. In addition to USFS, it is accepted at National Parks for entrance and some BLM areas. This pass should be accepted for entrance, parking and travel within a NF whether in a street licensed vehicle, on a horse, on a bike or on foot. I do not support higher fees for ORV users than non-ORV users. If you institute a per rider fee for ORV, you should institute the same per person fee for horseback riders, bicyclists, campers and pedestrians. ORV trailheads and CG should not cost more than non-ORV trailheads and CG. I would like to see some of the roads in GPNF be opened to ORVs like they are at other NF in the western USA. Currently it is not possible to ride from one of the ORV campgrounds like Blue Lake Creek CG and do a loop on the Dark Divide Trails without having a license plate to connect the trails via some of the 2 track, gravel and paved FS roads. Please share the plan to bring increased ORV opportunities to GPNF (near doubling is what it says). It is referenced in Phase 2. Are more trails planned or is it just higher fees? I do not support a fee to stay at Burley Lookout. I see a lot of fees but no improvements mentioned. Many of the places I am

familiar with which have fees coming are not developed (like Cat Creek Camp). And I do not see any mention of developing them. Just charging for them. What are you going to do with the money? Adding all these user fees is not the answer. The answer is to sell more lumber. You are running a working forest, not a National Park. My final question is how the users would pay for these passes at all the locations listed. Would they have to travel back out of the forest to Randle to the FS station during the office hours?

39. I am against added fees for off road access points. I pay fees for discover pass, dirt bike snowmobile, NW wilderness forest pass. More fees for area's with no services makes no sense. ask the community clubs for help, many of us pick up trash cut our logs already and are more than willing to continue. In my experience Salal and mushroom pickers leave the most trash and then the hikers are second in line. NO MORE FEES

40. I am a local who has enjoyed this forest my whole life and I am strongly against this fee proposal. Raising fees or adding fees to free sites in a time when Americans are struggling financially due to government caused inflation is unacceptable. We all have a right to enjoy public land and nobody should be financially barred from doing so. I understand many fees go to maintaining the sites, however the government receives plenty of money as it is and bureaucracy needs to manage their resources and money more efficiently. In a time when Americans are struggling already due to governmental failures, raising fees is immoral. If you want to improve and protect the forest, start by policing the people who go up there and leave trash and damage the sites that used to appear untouched. Not by raising fees which get washed through the government that the citizens have no idea where their hard earned money is actually going. I can assure you that many locals I know personally share the same opinion who may not take the time to write an email.

41. I'd like to provide OHV rider feedback regarding GPNF proposed fee increases. My husband and I are avid riders, and love respectfully exploring the lands that are still available to us for this purpose. In a state with already high taxes, high tab fees for each of our OHVs plus for the truck and trailer to pull them, and already requiring specific use passes to access certain trails (Discover pass, for example), this proposed fee increase comes as another blow to us riders. Not to mention the overall inflation we're all experiencing. For reference, our household grosses over \$140k annually, and having to purchase yet another pass would have me reconsider recreating elsewhere. Acknowledging that many enthusiasts have household incomes less than that, I'm sure I'm not alone in this thought. There is also concern that fees, if implemented, will be imposed before riders ever gain benefit of the proposed improvements. While we'd all love new trails, I'd prefer the existing area with no added trails and no added cost. With FS approval, I'm sure many of the riding clubs would volunteer to forge new trails, without the need to hike fees. Another concern is that the fees generated from trail use will be diverted to other areas of GPNF or a FS general fund - riders should not be the ones burdened with providing revenue streams for non-trail specific use. OHV areas are becoming rare in this state, yet there are still hoards of us that love responsibly riding this land for our mental health and overall happiness. My dirtbike is my happy place!! Please reconsider not increasing use fees from us - we're taxed and tabbed to the nines, and inflation and increased fuel prices has already taken its toll on when and where we ride. Another added fee for GPNF is another burden for riders, only available to those whom can afford it. Our public land shouldn't be available only to the upper class, it should be available to all to enjoy!!

42. All ORV already pay for tabs that make it legal to ride ORV trails. There is nowhere else in WA that charges extra to ride an ORV trail. The NWFP should have been required at all parking areas/\$5.00.

43. I don't have a problem with a fee for camping, providing that there are actually improvements to the facilities etc.... Now the extra fees for using your ohv in a ohv area are a sticking point. Ohv operators are already paying ohv license fees. Also are you going to start charging hikers, mountain bikers, and horse riders for permits to use there trails?
44. We trail volunteers and bike users would like to see a 5 or 10 year budget data chart showing this growing gap /negative trend? Is there a link or file to review so we can understand the budget gap you mentioned? Thanks \$100 a year PER PERSON! On top of all other fees! I will beat this horse till it's a pile of hooves, teeth, and bones. Contact the Forest Service before September 16!!
45. No fee increases.
46. Thank you for your efforts to keep our forest and recreation areas in good condition, safe, natural and clean for public enjoyment. I personally understand the need and desire to add use fees to many of the areas you listed. I think the fees are reasonable overall. My questions or suggestions are related to how they will be levied and collected. What will be the increased expense and resources on the forest service to collect the fees at all of these sites throughout the system? Can that be done in a cost efficient manner to use the collected funds directly for forest management. Will there be an online or app based system for payment? That can be challenging in areas without cell service, however, park visitors could pay for it in advance of their trip and certainly at sites where there is service. The reservation system you listed in the public comments, if it were to be expanded, in my view, should NOT have a \$2 use fee to pay a \$5 park fee. Any system used to take payment for park services should NOT have a user fee for the payment system, that will deter people from using it. I personally use the NW Forest Pass. Will the fees for that pass increase also? I also find all of the various forest use passes a bit confusing. I want to make sure I am using the right pass and so however the agencies can make that clear and simple for the public, that is appreciated. We live in the Carson/Stabler area and I use the Gifford Pinchot lands almost daily. It is a special area and I am keen to support efforts to keep it that way. If you need other Citizen Advisory Committee members or the need for volunteers, please let me know if I can be of service.
47. Hi. I would like to submit a comment regarding the proposed changes to the status of Twin Falls Campground in the Gifford Pinchot N.F. I went camping there last week and noticed the Developed Recreation Fee Proposal that would turn this into a group site and charge fees. I strongly oppose making this into a group site, and I urge you to keep the site on a first come, first serve basis that cannot be reserved in advance. Twin Falls C.G. is an absolute gem that offers a unique type of camping that is very rare in today's world because it is a more primitive and remote campground of extreme beauty that allows people to get away from all the RV camping that tends to exist at most campgrounds. My wife and I have been going to Twin Falls C.G. for a number of years and it is one of our favorite places to be. This campground should not be limited to groups, but should remain open to individual / small group camping. Also, it should be kept as a non-reservable first come, first serve campsite because otherwise, it becomes necessary to reserve online months in advance. The current status of the campground has allowed us to make more spontaneous, last minute plans to go there and camp, which has been wonderful. Please do not go through with this proposed change.
48. Sustainable forests managing timber land provides feed for the animals and the spotted owl. Which use clear cuts for food. They don't use rotting trees not to mention the fire danger of in our forests that is terribly managed. I remember in the 90s. There was a few hundred people working at our forests service office now there is 1 desk lady that works 5 hours a day. Monday to Thursday. I have to leave work to get permits. More fees for what ? For you guys to use it on anything but what you say its for? Then you will ask for more next year!

49. Why do we need more fees when I already pay taxes for the forest

50. I recognize the difficulty of this course of action, but I suggest you close key facilities and services rather than raise fees. Access to our national forests and parks should be publicly supported and free to users, period. When you effectively tell Congress that you can get the money from users, Congress will choose the easy route, and not provide adequate public funds. There is never enough money. I suggest we fund congressional travel through user fees. :)

51. I think doubling the price for this cabin from 50.00 to 100.00 is too much. 75.00 would be more appropriate. There are people on fixed incomes such as my self that deserve to enjoy the cabin.. especially since it is ADA accessible. Disabled people are usually of a lower income and it encourages people to take care of this special place. If you hike the price up I don't think people will be as careful and certainly won't be able to afford it.

52. As a current worker at Johnston Ridge Observatory, I personally sell the passes that the Forest Service is suggesting a price change on. My main feedback is twofold. One is that no clear way to enforce a car fee and a per person fee exist or are currently planned. You would need additional staff in the parking lot checking, and a both near the parking lot or some other system. Beyond that the system simply and wholeheartedly will confuse people. Tourist regularly do not understand the current system with its one flat fee. Throwing into fees will confuse people. Secondly if the price is increased the Forest Service will need to up its game in maintaining the monument. Just this year the movie, and the curtain did not work for extended periods of time, which was the source of many complaints. If this happens again, with a twelve-dollar fee, either no one will show up or their will be demands for money back. This also means trails that are always maintained, always having ranger talks, when currently there might not be, always having guided hikes. Overall, a larger fee will require everything to always work. So, I believe that the current fee should remain the same, to avoid issues and confusion.

53. Something we need to understand is whether, as users of multiple NFs in WA, we will be required to purchase a number of passes. Mt Baker Snoqualmie, Olympic, Oka-Wen, Colville, etc. It is conceivable that I need passes to all of them. If that is the case, there is no way this proposal is met with anything other than angry disagreement. How will that work and be practical for those of us who visit multiple NFs?

54. Will there be further opportunity for public involvement on the modified proposal going to the RAC and then onward to the Regional Forester? Will we see the proposal which goes forward to each level? When will the RAC meet and how can we watch? Why is GPNF not using a Recreational Resource Advisory Committee for reviewing cost changes on recreational fee changes? I have not seen the process or analysis by which the trailhead fees for OHV are determined. I understand "market analysis of other public and private developed recreation sites", but I know of no other such arrangement to compare against when we talk about OHV trailheads and trail networks. Where is the \$10/50 phase 1 and \$20/100 phase 2 fee derived from? How can we get a hold of historical data such as budgets and expenditures for the OHV trail network and trailheads? What is the estimated cost of deferred maintenance in those areas? What benefits do OHV users see with fee-based increase of funding? Is there consideration of contracting with private individuals and organizations (such as the Northwest Motorcycle Association) for heavy trail maintenance and/or logcut? Volunteers can do a lot, but the kind of maintenance required in some places is beyond what most volunteers can provide. In this case, I assume you are familiar with the NMA's work with the ST-240 single track excavator on Valley Trail and Tongue Mountain trail. Will we see more of that? I assume one of the Forest Service's greatest shortfalls other than funding is in manpower, which

private contracting could help alleviate. As Ryan Ojerio from WTA stated in the FB townhall thread, it would be very useful to see at least an annual if not a semi-annual recreation group meeting to better understand budgetary concerns and to coordinate volunteer activities as well as partnerships.

55. I agree with the institution of the proposed fees as listed with the recommendation of monthly and annual camping pass which would allow up to the maximum days/month. Additionally area use fees/day fees should be waived for current active duty, national guard, and active reserve service members; as well as public safety (LEO/Fire/EMS).

56. I am an avid user of our public lands and regularly participate in outdoor recreation such as hiking and backpacking. I lived in Washington state 2013-2022, when I relocated to Oregon. I am very familiar with the areas covered in the proposal. I am strongly in favor of the fee increases proposed by the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. Maintenance, conservation and improvements are worth paying more for.

57. May I suggest before considering raising fees, which seems to be the norm across this country, consider upgrading the major roads in the Forest Service area. South Climb road is terrible, the 90 road has mostly disappeared from the over grown Alder, plus dangerous chuck holes! 23 Road still has not been repaired where it is slipping past Reilly Creek Trail head. Plus major bumps which are not motorcycle safe. Think the public wouldn't mind paying the extra once they can drive safely to the sites without destroying their vehicles!

58. As a hiker and a climber, I oppose the increase of the recreation fees. Particularly, the fees that impact backcountry users. Generally speaking, raising prices for backcountry users just outprices the users with lower incomes. Mount St. Helens Climbing Permit - \$15 is already high, considering that the services that FS provide at the trailhead and along the route are mediocre at best. The restroom at Loowit Trail / Monitor Ridge trail intersection has been closed for the last several years. The road to Climbers Bivouac 8100-830 is in horrible condition (why is it not paved?). The services at the trailhead maintaining a clean restroom and trash collection were not provided last time I visited. While I do appreciate the community outreach and the education services that Mount Saint Helens Institute provides, I am very frustrated that the climbers are the ones paying the price (and not getting much out of the money they pay) Mount Margaret Backcountry Permit - \$10 for night for a person is unreasonable and excessive. I am not aware of a good justification or benefits that increased fees will bring to the users. And given the limited number of permits and camps, it will not make much difference for the FS budget anyway. Mt. Adams Climbing Pass - Similar to Mount St. Helens above. \$15 is high, and it doesn't provide benefits to the climbers. I am very frustrated with the Forest Service's use of the FLREA act to actually restrict access to the public lands in various forms (fees, permits), instead of enhancing that access. I also oppose using rec.gov for collecting fees. This organization exhibits irresponsible behavior, and has a negative impact on natural resources and public lands conservation. "make the fees more consistent throughout the state" is the worst excuse for raising the fees ever...

59. Why don't you try managing the Forest? Like doing selective patchwork clear cutting instead of leaving huge expanses of our forest choked with trees so closely spaced that no sunlight reaches the ground. Your terrible "no logging" policy has directly led to massive forest fire losses and is an embarrassment to all who understand that you are totally influenced by the environmental lobby.

60. I did not see if you said fees would need to be submitted by an app on rec. gov. I am opposed to this method of payment where there is not sufficient cell service to use rec.gov directly or if an additional fee would be charged. I also did not see if the senior lifetime pass will cover the daily fee at places like Crest trailhead. While I realize maintenance costs have increased I am opposed to

most further development of campgrounds. I am much more for keeping the campgrounds low cost and simple.

61. While I truly believe that our national parks should be open to everyone, and I do believe that fee structures and such are a tax on poor, I also understand the reality that these parks cost money to maintain, and we're continuing to prove that we won't fund our parks to the fullest through federal budget allocation. So fees to recreate in the park is logical- make those of us that use the park help contribute to its maintenance. It would be ideal if there was a discount for folks facing financial struggles, similar to the senior discounts or disability discount offered. Something such as access to a discounted annual pass or similar.

62. I wouldn't mind paying \$5 fee to access the lands. Maintenance is important and I am happy to fund it.

63. My comment would be to not increase fees. While everything else is increasing nature should be an opportunity for everyone to enjoy. We stayed at the gov't mineral springs guard station recently and it was not well maintained by the guest before us. While I do understand the fees might go to help this problem, they aren't as of now so why would an increase change this? A suggestion I had for the cabins would be to give a free night or 2 to whomever cleans and leaves the cabin in the best shape. Then everyone will try hard to keep it maintained. Now that I have stayed there and know the layout I would bring supplies and buy new things for the cabin. Like pillows for the couch. Maybe a new futon mattress cuz that one smelled like rat pee and oven mitts. I couldn't see us staying there again for \$100 though. Thank you for reading my comment and allowing the public to comment.

64. I'd like to voice my strong disagreement with the recently proposed fee system and especially with the process that has gotten us to this point. I'm an avid off-road motorcyclist and very much appreciate the incredible trail system in GPNF. I've put in volunteer time to maintain it, worked with my user group to promote best riding and trail maintenance practices and am in general very invested in this public resource. What I've seen so far in the public process on this fee proposal is very little about what the problem is and a large emphasis on the proposed solution. The public presentation and comments seemed to focus almost entirely on the solution and very much missed a transparent explanation of the financial problems that drove our land managers to the solutions proposed. I can understand that inflation and increased use drive increased costs and that this may not be recognized in the existing GPNF budgetary process. My assumptions about the problem (and I'm backing into these from the solutions proposed) are that there's inadequate campground funding as well as multi use trail maintenance funding for the upcoming fiscal years. I separate these two problems because they seem to require different solutions and affect different users. I support recreational funding that focuses on the users of the resource ("pay to play"), instead of general budgetary increases that cause someone's grandmother hundreds of miles away to pay higher taxes to improve my recreational experience. The campground shortfall exists in an area that already has user fees. The proposed increase in those fees seems to match those who drive them and the system to collect and manage this is already in place. That makes sense to me. But the shortfall in trail maintenance appears to have created a brand new user fee system, and for only a portion of the users (motorized), and is the approach with which I adamantly disagree. Why is this system proposed before vetting that problem with the public and investigating alternate solutions? Why does it ignore other users of those same trails? Starting with this new user fee jumps right past any approach to mitigate expense increases, utilize greater volunteer support, or even, if more funding is needed, looking at who should provide that increased funding. I believe this is the most important part of public review and by skipping over it, you've polarized those who might help most with creating solutions as well as

implementing them. Public comment should be an initial step in problem solving, not a closing step, seemingly to meet a process obligation. Please back up on this topic, present your case that describes the problem and share it with the public for both understanding as well as solution generation. Oh, and coordinate this with other Forests in the Region, and look at all this from the user's perspective. I don't want every Forest in the Northwest to duplicate your user fee proposal requiring incredible complexity and collection costs ... as well a glove compartment full of passes. We already have an access pass for national forests. Help me and the rest of the public understand why the current fee system isn't working, why you've singled out one user group for the financial problems of our multiuse trails and work with the public to review solutions and move forward.

65. Fee increases are needed to take care of one are most valuable asset. The National Park Service.

66. 1) Chambers Lake Campground (15-30-5) A. Will fees be implemented as NFS amenity fees administered by FS (R6 Camping) or under the terms of a concession campground operation Special Use Permit? I recommend it be included in the concession campground program. B. What physical improvements/amenities (tables, fire rings, etc.) have been or will be provided to justify a fee?

2. Chambers Lake Day Use (5/day) A. What area has been or will be designated for day use only? Should also be administered under the concession program.

3. Burley Mountain Lookout (Cabin Rental) A. What is the season of use? How is access managed, i.e., road maintenance? Who, how, and how frequently will on-site inspection and administration be provided? Will use permit include a hold harmless clause to protect FS from the hazards and risks inherent in the site, especially for overnight and extended use seasons? B. How will conflicts with the general public visitors be managed?

4. Where are the 234 "developed recreation sites" which remain free of charge? What is the nature of these sites? What amenities are provided to qualify as "developed"? How do they differ from sites such as Chambers Lake for which a fee is proposed but no amenities exist (other than a few signs and one toilet)?

5. Will staffing and funding levels support necessary increases in site quality and standard of care for fee sites?

6. How will the District manage access and adverse environmental impacts to new "dispersed sites" due to the displacement effect of new fees on existing areas of use?

7. Related questions: A. How and when does the District intend to take action to manage/reduce recurring, periodic extreme use and impacts in the Snowgrass Flat area? B. Why not apply a similar fee to the Packwood Lake overnight use area? With minor improvements it would be just as appropriate for a fee as Chambers Lake and Cat Creek...and desperately needs control of use and rehabilitation for the lake environment and as an entry point to the Goat Rocks Wilderness.

67. I have been a user of the trail system for the past 30 years. For those ORV trails affected, this proposal would only collect revenue from non-highway vehicles. In reality, you must have a street licensed motorcycle in order to connect the trails here (you have to ride on forest service roads). As drafted, this proposal would miss a large amount of revenue stream from all of us riders who are following the rules and have street licensed motorcycles. For those who are riding non-highway motorcycles, you likely will not collect from those users either since they are not following the rules to begin with. Why would they suddenly start now? Perhaps you could instead offer an option for riders to license their bikes specifically for the forest service roads. This way, those of us who are following the rules could be paying revenue to the National Forest rather than to the State. We do not need the

street license plate except on the forest service roads, since we haul the bikes to the trailhead in a truck.

68. I am writing to comment on the proposed fee increases in the Gifford Pinchot. I will first admit this does not impact me greatly as I carry an annual America the Beautiful pass and regularly boondock in my van. Regardless of that we continue to see proposed fee increases in the outdoors (Mt Hood is exploring this as well for many recreation sites) and in many other sectors of life. My first strong objection is the large increases for lookouts and group camps. Some are going from \$0 to \$90 or \$100. Surely a compromise can be made to either \$30 or \$50. Finally, and this is more a rhetorical question, is where and how will the increased funds be spent? Looking at this through a wider lens than only the outdoors is fees and costs go up and yet I don't see an increase in services or maintenance. Especially in the outdoors. I recreate very frequently in the outdoors between hiking, trail running, backpacking, and mountaineering. What I see across OR and WA is dirty bathrooms and litter at trail heads and on trails. How many times have I seen a ranger in the wilderness checking permits? Once in Glacier National Park in 2017. I want to make it clear I am not hammering the folks who work for the park service and other agencies. I only am highlighting what I see and the trying to articulate how current service levels disconnects from the promise of increased services with raising fees. I do also understand that staffing challenges abound. It is clearly covered in the media. I will come to a close with another very serious example of lack of current services offered by the agency. My friend and I went for a quick overnight the 9th and 10th to Indian Heaven. Despite the fire danger being extreme and further heightened by the strong winds we came across a party of three with a camp fire going near Bear Lake. So I will ask. Where are the rangers helping to protect our valuable outdoor spaces? Indian Heaven is a hugely popular area. This is not some remote mountain valley that requires an all day trek to reach. Where are the staff on patrol? I believe you need to rethink the proposed fee increases until more value for current money is displayed.

69. Recently, Visited Mt. St. Helens and the Johnston Ridge Observatory it has been 10years since my last visit to the area and we were impressed with the way things have improved. As for paying for these types of things I would think a \$12.00 per person would be a fair arrangement as opposed to charge per vehicle. Sadly, the days of just our tax dollars paying for all the services once provided are no longer sufficient to provide for all the things we enjoy. I would hope that the Senior citizen passes will continue to be honored and that there may be other arrangements made to help out others who are on limited income as well.

70. I would like to comment on the proposed camping fee increase for Chambers Lake, which I camped at last week. I generally support user fees. However, I think \$15 is high for nothing but a toilet. And there should be some improvements in return for the fee: - the most important improvement being clear and improved access to the lake for fishing, swimming, and small inflatable watercraft. Also trail direction signs would help those without GPS devices.

71. I live at 298 Skate Creek Road, Ashford, WA 98304. This cabin has been in my family since 1962. I am 75 years old and am a cancer survivor (so far) and have heart problems. The entrance to my gate and driveway front directly into Jerry Road, the short, one-lane county road leading into Big Creek Campground. The U.S. Department of Agriculture is proposing to open the cabin (guard station) in the campground for rental at \$85/night, up to four persons. Are you proposing to open it only during the season when the campground is open to campers? Or are you proposing to open it all year long? Are you considering Rocky Mountain Recreation Company and the host who take care of/rent the campground during summer? Are you considering Jerry Road at all? Have you really done your research? I don't know if you are aware that: 1. Campground Host. The campground

host's trailer sits directly in front of the cabin's front door. That is the only campground site with electricity, a very large in-ground sewage storage container that connects to his trailer's bathroom. And wi-fi connection. As the host, he is entitled to the use of all of those things as part of his monthly benefit. Where will they park their cars? He already parks his 25-foot trailer and two trucks in front of the cabin (his own and the campground host truck which contains the tools, etc. he uses to clean the campground toilets, camp sites, litter, brush, etc.) I am sure renters won't be too happy to open their cabin door directly into his trailer door.

2 Fall, Winter, Spring--The Gate/Trash. The campground is open only from May Memorial Day to September Labor Day. The rest of the year the gate is closed and locked. Are you proposing to rent the cabin during the rest of the year? Who has the keys to the gate? Who is going to unlock the gate? Who is going to return the keys? If the campground is unlocked year-round without a host, I can guarantee you it will be trashed. And trees cut. It has happened in the past. Campers are not as respectful as they were in the 1950's and 1960's. These days I am constantly picking up trash along Jerry Road and Skate Creek Road in front of my property.

2. Jerry Road Parking. Jerry Road is a county road, a one-lane county road. As far as I know, it is illegal to park on or beside county roads in the State of Washington for any extended period of time. And particularly when they are one-lane roads. Yet city people, when they come to the country, leave all common sense behind and park on/beside Jerry Road all the time, thereby blocking it. They also park directly in front of the bridge leading into the campground so no one can get into the campground. They even park directly in front of my gate so I cannot get out to my medical appointments. Nor can emergency vehicles get into either Jerry Road or into my property in case I need help. They park for hours, even days and weeks at a time. There have been as many as ten (10) cars parked on Jerry Road at once. And I CANNOT get out! More than once I have had to call to have their cars towed. This happens during all four seasons. I wish the State would put up no parking signs.

3. Winter--Snow and Parking on Jerry Road. In the Winter Lewis County Public Works only plows the snow on Jerry Road up to my gate. It does not plow into the campground. Again, Jerry Road is only a one-lane road. Yet, again, cars have parked for days in the middle of the road so that the snowplow cannot plow the road and I cannot get out of my property. And I have had to call.

72. Generally, I support the fee proposals. However, what I see often occur with these fee proposals is the focus on large paved parking lots and fancy pit toilets for trailheads, while the actual trails and trail infrastructure go for many years without basic maintenance (blow down, washouts, brushing, crossings, etc.) Volunteer trail groups can only maintain so many miles of trails per year. I would encourage the Forest Service to hire more staff who actually patrol the backcountry and assess trail conditions. A special note on Goat Rocks: the District needs to seriously consider re-raising the topic of special permit restrictions for the larger Snowgrass/Goat Lake area in addition to the proposed trailhead fee. This area is being abused to death by backpacker overuse and horrible camping practices. The Goat Lake and Jordan Basin areas have been particularly abused while Snowgrass continues to be abused at it's usual level. This area should have been subject to special permit restrictions for at least 20 years now. I really don't understand the resistance to this idea. I know Forest Service staff are aware this area is being destroyed. We need to accept that this is no longer--and hasn't been for a very long time--a pristine wilderness area. This is rather a beautiful area being actively destroyed by humans with almost no oversight. Backcountry pit toilets and special permit/designated camping would go a very long way toward helping save this area for future

generations. I have recreated in the Gifford my entire life so I'm happy to discuss any of my comments/feedback.

73. I won't pay the fees to use these sites. I will just find something else to do outdoors. I already pay outrageous amounts of taxes in general. This is a bad idea

74. I am writing on behalf of the 13,300 member Pacific Crest Trail Association (PCTA). PCTA is the Forest Service's primary private partner in the management and maintenance of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT). The foundation for this private-public partnership for National Scenic Trails dates to the 1968 National Trails System Act (NTSA), and it is reinforced by PCTA's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Federal and State land management agencies. We take seriously our role of working with the Forest Service to ensure the best possible management of the PCT, and the unique experience it affords trail users, as described in the NTSA and Forest Service's PCT Comprehensive Management Plan. PCTA supports the proposed fee increases because we know the money is needed for campsite maintenance, wilderness restoration, education, and trail work. Further, without those funds, we understand it would be difficult for the forests to maintain consistent services with the increasing demand in the most popular places. While we think it's reasonable to increase fees as costs and service demands grow, we would like to acknowledge that fees can create a barrier to participation for some potential forest visitors. With the proposed fee increases, users would be charged only at the most popular trailheads, several of which are along the PCT. Considering that the Northwest Forest Pass will cover the new proposed fee areas, these increases seem reasonable. There are still many trailheads to choose from in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest that remain free. While we are supportive of the fee increase, we are also concerned about making sure the fees don't discourage people from visiting the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. PCTA suggests working with partner organizations to develop systems that will allow people to have access to the fee sites and eliminate potential barriers to visiting the forest. We are glad to see programs like Fee Free Days, Every Kid Outdoors, and the various Interagency passes for seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities. The PCTA is committed to collaborating on these solutions, and we hope the public will contribute ideas. PCTA wants to acknowledge existing programs that help give access to these sites. For those who have the capacity to serve as volunteers on the forest, there are opportunities to earn free Northwest Forest Passes and Interagency Volunteer Passes. PCTA and other trail work volunteer organizations in the region currently have incentive programs for volunteers who serve a certain number of hours annually to receive Northwest Forest Passes as a reward for their service. PCTA awarded 363 of these passes in 2021, giving those volunteers access to all these fee sites for the year as a thank you for their time and effort on our trails and in administrative roles.

75. I wholeheartedly disagree with any proposal that establishes or increases fees for the public to use public land. The U.S. and state governments take money from its citizens at every turn, while still spending money it does not have. Instead of spending +\$40 billion annually on foreign aid, our government could be using that money to increase the size and health of our public lands. A increase in fees for the public to use public land is not warranted.

76. My name is ... and for the past 30 years me, my family, and many friends visit the Mt Adams Ranger District for camping, hunting, and fishing multiple times each year. I have recently rented the Peterson Cabin this year and found it to be an awesome experience. After reading the suggested rate increases that are being considered, I would like to comment of two of the cabins, Government Mineral Springs Guard Station & the Peterson Cabin. You are considering raising the Government Mineral Springs Guard Station that sleeps up to 9 persons from \$65 per night to \$100 per night, which

is and increase of \$35. The Peterson Cabin that sleeps up to 6 persons at \$50 per night, you are considering to raise up to \$100 per night, which is an increase of \$50. It is my opinion if you are raising a cabin's fee that sleeps nine \$35, then a cabin that sleeps 6 should only be a \$25 increase. Thank you for time and allowing me to give a comment on this matter.

77. I strongly support the fee proposals (especially at Snowgrass--I've been and didn't realize no fee was required! I always show a pass) and think the GPNF needs even more in the way of fee collection and recreation management. There are far too many forest users and I think the days of free dispersed camping for example need to end. I use our national forests far less than I used to because of crowds, increased target shooting, litter and lack of ranger presence. It just doesn't feel safe to me anymore.

78. I regularly recreate within the Gifford Pinchot National Forest. I oppose a number of the proposed fees for the following reasons. I reserve the right to amend this comment in the future. 1. The Forest Service lacks legal authority under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act ("FLREA") to impose the climbing fees at Mt St Helens and Mt Adams, and the fees for Mt. Margaret backcountry camping. FLREA Section (d)(1) provides a broad ban on the collection of fees on lands managed by the Forest Service for general access to public land. This ban is consistent with Congress' intent in establishing the FLREA to deal with maintenance backlog on facilities used by the public entering those areas, but to not otherwise charge the public for general access to public land. The Forest Service asserts that it has authority under the FLREA provision allowing for a "special recreation permit fee." FLREA section (h) allows collection of a "special recreation fee" in connection with the issuance of the permit, for specialized recreation uses of Federal recreational lands and waters, such as group activities, recreation events, motorized recreational vehicle use." Emphasis added. General access to climb Mt St Helens and Mt Adams or backpack in the Mt Margaret backcountry does not amount to "specialized recreation uses" as defined by the FLREA. The plain language of the FLREA limits special recreation permit fees to activities "such as group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicle use." The legislative history of the initial FLREA bill supports the notion that Congress limited the special recreation permit fee to only those three specifically enumerated uses, which clearly do NOT include general access to climb, hike, or backpack. "Congress proposed the FLREA in 2003 as HR bill 3283. Initially, the "special recreation permit fee" language was much broader. However, during the legislative process, Congress changed the initial language, and ultimately decided on the most limiting definition. HR bill 3283 initially provided: SEC. 7. SPECIAL RECREATION PERMIT FEE. (a) Fee Authorized.--The Secretary concerned may require a special recreation permit, and charge a special recreation permit fee, for a recreation use, including any of the following: 1 A group activity. (2) A commercial tour, including commercial aircraft tour.

- (3) A recreation event.
- (4) Use of a motorized recreation vehicle.
- (5) A competitive event.
- (6) An outfitting and guiding activity.
- (7) An activity requiring an allocation of use.
- (8) An activity for which a permit is required to ensure public safety."

n this initial version, Congress enumerated eight specific uses that constitute "special recreation uses." As Congress re-worked the bill, they changed the language again, eliminating some of the specifically named uses, but added broad language to include potentially many uses: (h) Special Recreation Permit Fee.--The Secretary may charge a special recreation permit fee for uses such as

group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicle use, and other specialized recreation uses of Federal recreational lands and waters. (emphasis added) However, by the time that Congress finally enacted the FLREA, which occurred after further discussion and Congressional hearings, they changed the language to its current and most restrictive definition by eliminating the broad catch all language, “and other specialized recreational uses of Federal recreational land and waters.” Therefore, both the plain meaning of the text and the legislative history of the FLREA indicate that Congress intended the special recreation use permit fee to be issued only in limited instances, specifically, “group activities, recreation events, motorized recreation vehicle use.” General access to climb or backpack are merely general and typical uses of our public land, and clearly do not amount to a group activity, recreation event or a motorized use. Accordingly, these fees are illegal under the FLREA and the Forest Service should abandon/not impose these fees. 2 The FLREA prohibits layered fees. By charging both at the trailhead and for climbing/backpacking permits, the Forest Service is unfairly and illegally charging two fees for the same use in these areas, which is in violation of the FLREA. (c) Special considerations The Secretary shall establish the minimum number of recreation fees and shall avoid the collection of multiple or layered recreation fees for similar uses, activities, or programs. 3. The climbing and backpacking fees for general access to public land disproportionately negatively affect lower income individuals. Public lands are owned by all citizens and all citizens should be allowed to access them without overly restrictive fees and burdens, particularly at this time when we should be trying to find ways to be more inclusive instead of restrictive. Adding significant fees, such as the multiple day use fees for access for climbing (\$5 at Climbers Bivouac/Marble Mountain/Adams South Climb, \$20 for general access to climb, plus reservation fees of at least \$5 at rec.gov) and the multiple fees for general access to backpack in Mt Margaret backcountry (\$12 at JRO, \$5 for Coldwater Lake, and \$10 per person per night, plus at least \$5 for rec.gov fees) are unreasonably large and cost prohibitive to lower income people. Mt St Helens, in particular, is a national treasure and anyone who wants to experience it should be able to do so without having to incur substantial cost to do so. If a family of four wanted to backpack with these new fees for three nights, it would cost them \$120, a \$5 reservation fee, plus the \$12 fee at JRO or \$5 fee at Coldwater. This is simply unacceptable and cost prohibitive to many people. Imposing such fees for general access effectively creates an elite outdoor playground for those with expendable income. Further, there are relatively few backpacking opportunities within the Volcanic Monument and adding an economic barrier is unfair. The same goes for climbing. Everyone who wants to walk up Mt St Helens and peer into that spectacular crater should be able to do so without economic burden. 4. The Forest Service hasn’t provided any support for its need to charge the climbing and backpacking fees in these areas. As previously discussed, the Forest Service already charges for the facilities at the trailhead. Yet, it hasn’t justified the need for significant fees for general access to climb or backpack in these areas, as opposed to any other area within its district, or even compared to elsewhere on federal forest land within Washington. What do visitors obtain for the \$20 plus reservation fee to climb Mt St Helens or Mt Adams, in addition to the \$5 charge at the trailhead? Why is it necessary to charge a family of four over \$100 for a three night backpacking trip? Permit enforcement rangers already exist and are out on the mountains and in the Mt Margaret backcountry. Additionally, volunteers do a lot of the trail work. On Mt St Helens, the Forest Service has handed significant public involvement/ responsibility to organization Mt St Helens Institute, which also uses many volunteers on the climbing route and elsewhere. It seems like the Forest Service is unfairly targeting these areas to simply generate income, which negatively impacts a number of users, particularly low income users, depriving them of the opportunity to experience the land that we the public own.

79. In my opinion renting this place out would take away from the wow factor for so many that travel all that way. So many places we have to pay to see now. Please keep the nostalgia of this place.

80. We acknowledge that the needs of the Forest more than justify opportunities for increased revenue, and know that hikers enjoy well-maintained and funded recreation on the Forest. Our comments pertain broadly to the implications fees have on access. We share the following comments using a lens for equity. Process. We believe that the public would benefit from more information on market analysis and the potential for revenue as generated from these changes, as well as more detail on the planned allocation of revenue. While the proposal discusses the intention to leverage the increased revenue towards campsite and day-use site improvements and staffing, partners like WTA who benefit from knowledge of potential project areas could benefit from understanding what priorities that Forest has in revenue allocation or plan for specific or localized allocation depending on collection area. This information, combined with market and revenue analysis, would instigate more robust public comment as it would create a more informed evaluation of the proposed changes. WTA would like to see the Forest reestablish a Recreation Resource Advisory Committee (Recreation RAC) in the future. We are unclear about what Citizen Advisory Committee the Forest is utilizing in place of a Recreation RAC and would like to know more about what this committee constitutes. We believe standing up a Recreation Resource Advisory Committee as stated in the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act will allow for more thorough processing and involvement in continued discussions of user fees. Additionally, reestablishing the Recreation RAC will enable forests without a RAC to propose fee changes. "User Fees. We acknowledge that finding means to generate revenue is necessary and important to meet the needs of the forest. WTA understands that the Forest will utilize this revenue to fund critical maintenance, operations and improvements across the lands it manages. However, we also have concerns about an increase in fees resulting in barriers to access for many people who see recreating on our national forests as a more affordable option and who may no longer be able to afford recreating in the forest. Most of the fees proposed bring a charge to recreation sites that did not previously have fees. Many sites that did have fees will see those double under this proposal. This may create a financial burden on the user that will mean fewer people will be able to enjoy the benefits of the Forest. We are seeing user fee increases happening across forests in Washington, with both the Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest and Olympic National Forest releasing fee proposals this year. The timing of these changes means the cost of getting outside is increasing for all users across the state, resulting in less capacity for affordable recreation statewide. While we are supportive of ensuring that the Forest Service has the financial resources to take care of critical needs on national forests, we cannot go without stating that increased fees will increase barriers to getting outside for many Washingtonians." Group Camp Reservations. Beyond increases in fees, this proposal also includes moving a number of first come first serve campsites to be reservation based. While reservation campsites offer the opportunity to plan ahead, they also require knowledgeable monitoring and technological skills to access the reservation website, which may instigate an information gap from those who seek to enjoy the Forest. Additionally, not all people have the ability to plan their time off ahead of time, which could create a barrier for these individuals to access the outdoors. According to the research paper Exclusionary Effects of Campsite Allocation through Reservations in U.S. National Parks: Evidence from Mobile Device Location Data, reservation systems can inherently create exclusivity within campground systems. The exploratory study found that with the campgrounds it analyzed, "...online reservation systems present the unintended consequence of excluding low-income, and perhaps non-White, would-be campers." Please consider how moving first come first serve campsites to a reservation based system may

contribute to inequities among the recreating public. Cabins and Lookouts. WTA sees the value in the Forest seeking the maximum allowable charge for cabin and lookout rentals in order to ensure the most flexibility in charge for the future. We believe that if the Forest is planning on imposing fees as high as those listed in the proposal (up to \$150 per night at a certain site), implementation of a fee should be phased over time as to not begin with the maximum amount. This will also allow for improvements of these facilities to be made prior to a maximum charge fee. Overall, we are supportive of the Forest's step towards funding key operations and improvements in Gifford Pinchot National Forest. We believe we could benefit from more information that details how certain fee increases relate to revenue and allocation, which would allow us to comment more specifically on the numbers associated in this fee proposal. Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing about any next steps associated with this work.

81. I wanted to write and express my concerns with the proposed recreation fee increases. While I understand the need for some price increases, a lot of these rates seem pretty extreme. Horse camps are going up from \$5 per night to \$15. When most trail riders are the ones going in and maintaining the horse trails for free. Downed trees are removed or cut safely from trails, garbage picked up etc. \$15 to park a trailer is too much in my opinion. There's even a whole work party of horse riders that I seen repairing a washed out trail in 90 degree heat this summer. Burley mountain lookout. This has always been first come, first serve. It's one of the only lookouts around here that isn't over populated with constant traffic. My Grandpa worked at this lookout years ago and it's been a special place that my kids and I enjoy being able to drive to and visit for free. Locals visit this place and enjoy the peace and quiet more than people traveling from all over to come see it and as a local, we should be able to enjoy the places around here. It's why we live here. This one should stay as is so people can enjoy it on a first come basis as it has been for years. Please keep this one off the reservation list. Most lookouts that are available by reservation are booked out for years, you can't even enjoy them and privatizing profits from the public's access to public lands is wrong. This is a local treasure and should be kept that way. Also, if maintenance is ever needed, please make a post and the community will help! Public land fees are supposed to be used as an investment into the public lands to help operate and maintain facilities. Fees are paid yet road maintenance isn't done, vault toilets aren't maintained, trails are not cleared and roads with washouts aren't repaired. So where exactly do these fees go? We take our own gas and own equipment to maintain the trails that we use. I know many people that do this same thing. Because if we don't do it, it doesn't get done. We have no problem working to enjoy the lands we love but we are not ok with being locked out of multiple areas or being required to pay just so we can continue to do the same thing. So while all this sounds great in a PowerPoint presentation, it lacked the statistical data of the growing gap the Forest Service is seeing. Without that information, it makes it very difficult to understand. My Grandpa retired from the Forest Service and our many camping and hiking trips is why I developed a love for nature and the area I live in. As a single-Mom, I have luckily been able to pass that same love of nature on to my kids with our many drives and adventures in the woods. We live in Randle and it has been a blessing to be able to pay for gas and take a drive and explore all the areas around here. This is an experience that many kids don't get and I feel very fortunate to be in this area and have the National Forest in our backyard to enjoy. It's already covered with a ton of weekend traffic, berry/mushroom pickers that abuse the forest and leave their garbage everywhere. I feel those issues should be dealt with first. Most of these fee increases are at least doubled in price if not more. The ones that have a lower increase, I can understand but a lot of these increases seem like it's too high.

82. I love to hike & enjoy the outdoors & with the gas & food prices now days it's getting so expensive for everything! I think alot of people won't be able to afford coming to the parks & outdoor

areas if they cost a lot! It's getting harder for people to travel with everything going up! So, I beg you to not charge for this!

83. I oppose the proposal for new or increased fees in the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (GPNF). The GPNF has proposed adding daily access fees at a number of areas that previously were free to access. This is both antithetical to an ideal of open access to public lands and an inequitable creation of a pay-to-play system. Furthermore, as the GPNF has a large deferred maintenance backlog, it is inexplicable why they would expend additional money to build new facilities without first performing necessary maintenance on the ones that already exist. The Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA) was intended to allow National Forests to supplement their budget with additional user fees for specific types of "special" recreation, or when certain amenities were provided. This program was never intended to be the main source of National Forest funding, as the National Forests are supposed to be funded by Federal taxes. The GPNF, like the others before them, claim that the majority of areas are still free, but as more National Forests continue to add access fees to the various trailheads in their jurisdiction, the end result will eventually be a zero sum game where there will no longer be freely accessible public lands without paying additional fees. Adding fees presents a number of problems. Such a pay-to-play system is inherently inequitable, as it disadvantages lower income people. It will always be easier for someone who can afford to pay the fee to visit public lands, versus those who may have to weigh their ability to pay extra fees against their daily financial needs. As wealth disparities in the United States become more stark, we should strive for a system that eliminates financial hurdles and closes the gap between those who can afford to pay and those who can't. Instead, adding more and more fee areas in our National Forests creates increased barriers to access for those without the excess income needed to visit public lands that are meant for everyone. FLREA also requires a number of amenities in order to justify the charging of a fee. The GPNF proposes adding fees at a large number of areas that previously had none. This indicates that many of these areas currently lack the necessary amenities required to charge a fee. According to a 2020 article (https://www.columbiagorgenews.com/news/gifford-pinchot-national-forest-seeks-input-on-rec-sites/article_e68823af-93d2-581c-b308-37c588d8ca76.html), the GPNF faces a \$10 million backlog of deferred maintenance in the facilities under its jurisdiction. It is completely nonsensical that the National Forest would expend additional tens of thousands of dollars at each proposed fee site to add the missing amenities in order to justify charging fees. The new facilities created would themselves require ongoing maintenance, further adding to the backlog deficit. The National Forest has presented no documentation of its cost/benefit analysis of creating new revenue versus how many of the currently existing facilities would be repaired. It seems like a blatant exploitation of FLREA to spend additional money creating facilities for new fee revenue while letting existing areas fall further into disrepair. As a specific example of an area I am most familiar with, the GPNF proposes adding daily usage fees at the Coldwater Lake, Hummocks, and South Coldwater trailheads in the Mt St Helens monument. These areas are all within 1 mile of each other by car. Coldwater Lake currently has a bathroom and other amenities. Hummocks and South Coldwater, which are 1 mile down the road, have no amenities. The GPNF therefore would be required to add toilets, picnic tables, kiosks, and other amenities at 2 additional facilities within a brief drive of an already established area. It stretches the imagination that a recreationist would not be able to drive the few minutes from South Coldwater Ridge over to Coldwater Lake if they need a bathroom, which is the current situation at these trailheads. The only explanation for the proposed new facilities is that they would allow the GPNF to charge parking fees. Adding fees to these areas would mean that all of the access points to the very wonderful hiking system around Coldwater Lake would cost money to visit, where previously they were free. These are areas that I have never seen more than a few cars parked at, even in

summer, and can be easily visited by locals from the Toutle River Valley, especially in the off season. The GPNF also proposes adding or increasing fees at a variety of other locations. Backcountry camping permits for Mt. Margaret are proposed to increase to \$10 per person, per night, from previously being a free reservation. These permits are already limited and managed by the National Forest; the GPNF has not provided any explanation of why charging a permit fee is now necessary, aside from market conditions. Certainly, backpacking itself does not rise to the level of “special” recreation that would justify a fee. It is already bad enough that the USFS requires users to purchase permits through the third party website Recreation.gov, which is run by government contractor Booz Allen Hamilton and requires that users pay a direct service charge to the contractor. Adding recreation fees to ordinary activities that previously were free again runs counter to the intentions of FLREA, and to our expectation of open and equitable access to our public lands. The GPNF also proposes overnight reservation fees at both the Burley Mountain (Dark Divide) and Red Mountain (Indian Heaven) lookouts. Burley Mountain lookout has been in a state of disrepair, and I applaud any work the GPNF plans to do to restore it. However, to be rentable, both lookouts would need additional facilities constructed, such as toilets. Again, the National Forest has not provided explanation of why this is an efficient usage of their resources when so many other areas are suffering from a maintenance backlog. Surely, while a greater availability of recreation areas is needed, it makes sense to repair roads and currently existing infrastructure that allow access to a wide swath of public land, rather than pay for high budget facilities (lookout rentals) that would yield income but not meaningfully expand access. Furthermore, the \$90 per night fee the GPNF proposes is substantially higher than any lookout rental I can think of, and is more akin to a commercial Airbnb than a Forest Service amenity. Please again see the previous point about financial restrictions that place socioeconomic limits on who gets to access public lands. In their proposal, the GPNF quotes that “about 70% of the 234 developed recreation sites on the Forest would remain non-fee.” We should do better than this. Not only the majority, but the vast, vast majority of developed recreation sites should be free to access for anyone. A large proportion of the American public does not use public lands, and in part this is due to constraints on money, time, and access. Looking to the future, we should aim to encourage visitation among those who historically have had the least ability to do so. We want someone who works two jobs and has to clip coupons to be able to still take their child out to see the woods, to see the mountains, to experience the awe and love of nature that will encourage people to protect these areas in the future. We also should aim for sustainable infrastructure that requires the least maintenance and has the most longevity. The National Forest should be prioritizing fixing roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure that will allow people to spread out into areas that have become inaccessible due to neglect. The National Forest should not try to game the FLREA system by spending its budget on creating new infrastructure in order to justify charging new fees.

84. A small note- it was extremely inconvenient that the fee structure/list was not fully viewable on a smart phone. I had to get on a computer to access the list to provide critical analysis. Accessibility should be made to a broad audience, including those with limited computer access who wish to engage in the public comment process. The sites I have visited on the GPNF are both adequate and standard with what is offered among the other national forests in Region 6 at large, thus the statement that the, “fee increases will help us maintain the sites to the level and quality people have come to expect” seems unjustified. Currently, there are no fees of \$100 per OHV per year to park at a trailhead implemented at any other public site in Washington State, so to assert that the fees are to make “fees more consistent throughout the state” is both misleading and wildly inaccurate. Other forests are proposing fees of similar cost on public land in Washington State, but there has been no trial to prove its efficacy and should there be any sort of trial, it should not start with the GPNF.

Further, there has been no budget or plan outlined how funds will be spent. There have been blurbs about how fees *could* be spent, and there have been assertions made by USFS staff about how fees will be spent, but with zero work plan or financial proposal outlined. The public has no idea what we are agreeing to as far as “upgrades and maintenance”. The USFS needs to provide such detailed work plans and budgets before proposing fee hikes. It would be pertinent for the public to see a breakdown of how much one person affects an amenity (such as a bathroom), what the cost is for the labor and resources to maintain the amenity. In regards to the proposed fee implementations at 2 OHV trailheads: revenue produced from an OHV site needs to remain at an OHV site. Our OHV funds in the state of Washington dump into a general fund and the OHV community sees very little return into the OHV areas. If the fees are intended to handle the influx of new OHVs on the roads (and in turn, utilizing the forest) in the event they are opened to non-plated OHVs (through a legal public engagement process), the USFS should go back to the drawing board and figure out where additional recreation opportunities (ie staging areas) can be implemented and what additional grant opportunities are available to support said additions. The USFS should provide proof that they will be able to employ the necessary staff to carry out such maintenance and upgrades. For example, the USFS had the funding to support trail crew for both the motorized and non-motorized trails on the GPNF during the summer months of 2022 but were unable to hire personnel - thus, funding was wasted and no work was completed by USFS staff. Instead, on top of the fees we (the public) already pay for a Northwest Forest Pass, the user groups were asked to step up and compensate for the needed trail maintenance. Is this what will happen with the trailheads, facilities, and amenities? Which brings me to the waiver or gift of a pass for volunteer work. The current intent is to gift users free passes if they put in 40hrs of volunteer work. The current going rate for volunteer work is \$29.95/hr. The math doesn't add up: $40 \times 29.95 = 1,198$... the USFS will gift a \$100 pass for \$1,198 worth of work? Per the math, the USFS would need to gift a volunteer a pass after 3.34 hours of work... if such a fee is implemented. Back briefly to my point about accessibility and discrimination based on technology or financial resource... One of the goals with the Gifford Pinchot Sustainable Trails Committee is to make sure that the trails are an inclusive place both through terrestrial accessibility, but also as a viable financial option. To charge \$100 for a pass to park at a trailhead unfairly discriminates against those with limited funds but seeking enjoyment in the outdoors. I find blatant biased discrimination towards OHV users versus non-motorized users in the fees being proposed. The fees being collected at the OHV trailheads are not based on “vehicle” parked at the trailhead, ie a truck or van, like they are at a non-motorized trailhead. For example, you could pack 6 hikers into one vehicle and they would only be paying (1) \$5 fee, versus if a truck shows up with 6 motorcycles - they would be paying \$30 dollars. The math and impact on amenities doesn't add up. All that said, I disagree with ALL of the fees being proposed. There needs to be a work plan and budget provided to show the public where the funding would actually be going. The fees proposed would generate more revenue than what's needed to maintain or upgrade facilities and amenities. The fees proposed seek to exclude those with limited financial means from enjoying the forest.

85. I don't agree with the proposed increase of fees. Increasing the cost of using public land diminishes access for all groups of people, including those of lower socio economic status. Recreating outdoors on public land should not be unattainable to the public because of fees. It also increases the financial consequences for buying permits for backcountry locations. For example, at \$6 a night, it's affordable to get a permit and then cancel it if the weather looks bad. At \$6, it's affordable enough to just book another trip for a different day. It's going to get expensive real quick to book multiple night backpacking permits, which again, just increases the lack of access. It also increases the likelihood of recreators heading out in unsafe conditions simply because that's the date

of their permit and they can't afford to purchase a different one. Keeping the financial consequences for releasing a permit low, increases the likelihood of climbers and backpackers making safer decisions in the backcountry.

86. I am recently aware of the restoration going on to the Burley Mountain Lookout. Sounds like it is being looked into becoming a rental if this is approved. Would this not allow the public to still access the lookout views at any time? Or would this then become restricted to who is renting the lookout? I am a local in Randle and frequent this lookout to get the beautiful view the lookout offers.

87. I thought I'd write and add my own personal comments since I have some more specific input that didn't make it into our organization's response. PS - my comments, not as a WTA representative
Campground Fee Increases and new NW Forest Pass requirements - These increases seem reasonable and in line with inflation so I support them. Campground Conversion - Turning Wakepish and Twin Falls into reservable group camps is also something I support. It has become increasingly difficult to rely on finding places to camp volunteer groups like volunteer vacation crews or to stage a volunteer work party over a three day weekend. We recently had a very uncomfortable interaction with an angry member of the public who felt our crew leader was taking up too much space (sans horses) at the Green River Horse Camp. We have also used Chamber's Lake for volunteer vacations. Marble Mountain could be used as a staging area for a big volunteer event on the south side of the Monument so it would be nice to be able to reserve that (I think NMTA has annual events there). If these campgrounds are on the reservation system it increases our confidence that we can plan an event and provide a place to stage but only if we can get our plans booked in the system. With Camille this has been very easy through recreation.gov. But with campgrounds managed by private concessionaires it can be a bit more difficult. Guard Stations and Lookouts - Like campgrounds we have used these for staging areas for volunteer activities (though less frequently). This past year we camped at the Gotchen Guard Station grounds and in year's past we've stayed at Red Mountain Lookout. Like campgrounds it would be helpful for volunteer activities to be able to book sites like that far in advance if we planned to stage a volunteer group in that area. As for the price, I think the amount in the proposal is a bit steep. Climbing Permits - I think the cost increase is in line with inflation and support it. Mount Margaret Backcountry Permit - I support adding a fee on top of the reservation fee for these sites. I love, love, love this area. I think \$5 - \$10 per person on top of the \$6 admin fee is reasonable and if the money could be put into a fund to help fix toilets, tent pads and do enforcement - that would be great. Contrary to WTA's stance on permits I think that permits for very popular areas do make it much easier for me to access an area. When I was in my twenties I could backpack into a popular area (like the Three Sisters Wilderness) and if all the good camping spots were taken I could just keep going and eventually find a spot or just bivy in an LNT fashion somewhere. That approach does not work with kids or aging adults. If I go on a camping or backpacking trip with my young kids (7 and 11) or my aging parents/in-laws I need to have certainty that we're going to have a place to camp when we get there. Trying to LNT bivy with a family just doesn't work nor does hoofing it further on hoping to find a site. Here is my ask for the Mount Margaret Backcountry area - specifically for Ridge Camp, Dome Camp, Margaret Camp and Bear Camp. The tent pads aren't in the places where I'd want to pitch a tent, have dinner and watch the sunset/sunrise or stars. I recommend relocating the tent pads to more desirable places to camp (combination of view plus a bit of cover of trees). Ridge camp is particularly boring and one is probably not nearly as popular as the others. I'd also ask that you consider adding a reservation site or on the Lakes Trail closer to JRO. Camille gives our crews permission to camp in there sometimes but its tricky, I think she's hesitant to let us in there every year to do annual brushing because its not a formal camping site - but it really needs constant brushing which is hard to stage from the Coldwater

boat launch to work on the end of the lake up to Snow Lake. I hope that a fee on top of the \$6 admin fee would discourage no shows. I think that there are a lot of people that book sites in advance but then don't drop their permits back onto the system and instead simply don't show up. I picked up a permit to go midweek back in August for Dome Camp and went with my 11 year old daughter and her friend. We didn't encounter anyone between Norway Pass TH and our site who had a permit. But we did meet two parties who did not have a permit who planned to camp (we encountered them late in the day as they were looking for a place to camp). This is just one anecdote but I suspect there are too many no-shows and too many "poachers" - which are two sides of the same coin. If backpackers believe that there are a lot of no-shows and there is minimal risk of enforcement then the scofflaws will flourish. Is there a way to sign up for a notification if a reserved site is made available when someone cancels? Is there capacity for the USFS to have a person do some random pass checks at the trailhead for Norway Pass? I don't remember there being a self-registration process at the Norway Pass TH but if you did something like that it might be one way to capture data on the extent of no-shows.

88. Use of Recreation.gov for permits

Recreation.gov is an absolute scourge and leech of the public commons. The public should never be paying a private for-profit company a per-transaction fee, with non-refundable costs, for legal access to public lands. Operated by Booz Allen Hamilton, and owned by an equity firm The Carlyle Group, there is minimal incentive for satisfactory public experience as there is limited competition to take on such a large government contract. Booz Allen Hamilton was already paid \$182 million of tax payer money to operate recreation.gov for 10 years. That they are able to capture additional fees on every transaction for public access to public land is deplorable and in direct opposition to the ethos of public lands. Recreation.gov harvests all the rewards with minimal risk and holds no responsibility in the upkeep and maintenance of public lands.

Use of SRS RACs

One great concern is that the FS has provided no rationale for why a Pacific Northwest Regional Resource Advisory Committee has not been formed in what appears to be 12 years¹, the last meeting notes shown online appearing from 2/2/2010. Fee Authority for FLREA² derives from §6802(B)(5) "The Secretary shall obtain input from the appropriate Recreation Resource Advisory Committee, as provided in section 6803(d) of this title." It is only under 6803(d)(1)(D) that an alternative Resource Advisory Committee is permitted to be used. "In lieu of establishing a Recreation Resource Advisory Committee under subparagraph (A), the Secretary may use a Resource Advisory Committee established pursuant to another provision of law and in accordance with that law or a recreation fee advisory board otherwise established by the Secretary to perform the duties specified in paragraph (2). This largely by-passes many of the requirements in 6803 regarding the composition of membership representing the public for changes based on recreation decisions. Secure Rural Schools RAC's Objective and Purpose are as follows: "The purpose of each RAC is to improve collaborative relationships among the people that use and care for the National Forests and to provide advice and recommendations to the Forest Service concerning projects and funding consistent with Title II of the Act." Title II of SRS is for projects on Federal Lands. Recreation site fee changes are not Title II projects. It is convenient that the SRS charter has shoehorned that the DFA (Designated Federal Officer) may request the SRS RAC take on recommendations "in addition to regular SRS duties"³, including offering input on the implementation, elimination, or expansion of standard amenity, expanded amenity, and special recreation fees and sites. This language would imply that having an SRS board provide these recommendations based on fee terminology from

FLREA is irregular, if it is outside of their regular SRS RAC duties. This is highlighted by the fact that SRS RAC seats must be held by members from the specific state the SRS RAC serves. In a case of the Gifford Pinchot SRS RAC, NW Oregon's metro areas in close are not allowed to be represented on financial decisions affecting recreation, even though Gifford Pinchot National Forest may be their primary area of recreation. This same fault of using SRS RACs also excludes Washingtonian's participation from the Hood-Williamette SRS RAC even if those Washington recreationalists may frequently take trips to Mt. Hood National Forest. The continued use of SRS RACs in lieu of forming a Pacific Northwest Regional Recreational RAC is antithesis of FLREA's intent and the Forest Service has had 12 years to provide the public with a rationale and explanation for why a Recreational RAC does not exist, and does not seem to have a readily available answer. As of Jan. 2022 the Gifford Pinchot National Forest had approximately \$1.05M available in Secure Rural Schools Title II funds, with an estimated additional \$1.2M coming over the next three years. The funding on hand includes multiple years of funding during which time, for reasons mostly outside of our control, we did not have a quorum on the Resource Advisory Committee, the body required to review and make recommendations on Title II projects to fund. The committees specifically support Forest Service strategic goals to 1. Restore, sustain, and enhance the national forests; and 2. Provide and sustain benefits to the American people. If an SRS RAC is going to make decisions about sustaining and enhancing national forests and provide benefits to the American people, perhaps the \$2.25M can be spent on recreation site amenities? Instead of having fee increases? If not, is that because these are not considered Title II projects? Despite Hampton Lumber's 'collaborative' efforts, I frankly don't think any commercial lumber interest or lumber management interest should have a say in anything that goes on with recreation fees. And there's a reason that Recreation RAC members make-up doesn't include commercial timber industry. To that end, the Committee Chairperson, Anjolene Price-Ngari, is also an at-large officer on the board of directors for Pinchot Partners Collaborative. How much logging influence needs to be represented for recreation fees? This make-up reflects the interests of a SRS RAC, not Recreation, despite a number of people who may be recreationalists and/or be affiliated with organizations which share overlap with recreation, the position they are supposed to represent is not the same as a Recreational RAC. The SRS Committee exists for SRS Title II projects, not the shoehorned 'irregular' duties.

Gifford Pinchot National Forest Fee Changes

Gifford Pinchot National Forest, like most other National Forests, has a large and ever growing deferred maintenance budget. This demonstrates that the existing fees do not pay for the sustainable maintenance of recreational facilities. FLREA, as an extension of the Northwest Fee Demonstration, was never intended to self-support funding for recreational sites and activities. It was intended as a supplemental revenue source such that a user who visits a site and pays the fee, could expect it to be in better condition on a subsequent visit. Funds are intended to be a supplement to existing appropriations. The response to falling appropriations and revenue from resource extraction is not to raise fees on the public, as this continues a downward spiral of pay-to-play and inequitable access that will ultimately undermine public support for the National Forest and increase the likelihood of private capital involvement and concessionaires. I am categorically opposed to adding any fee to a location where any capital expenditure must be made to make the site compliant with FLREA Standard or Expanded Amenity fee requirements. This is good money after bad, as it will only contribute to the on-going deferred maintenance budget to build new facilities or provide on-going maintenance, garbage collection, etc. Snowgrass Trailhead: Gifford Pinchot 2019-2024 Proposed Program of work suggests to make FLREA Standard Amenity Fee compatible, a permanent toilet, picnic table, garbage can, and improved signage will be required. At a cost of \$30k in 2020 (probably

more now). Expected Revenue \$6500. Has expected revenue increased? How can the FS justify spending \$30k on capital investments that will have forever outlay of garbage service, toilet paper, and facility maintenance (vandalism, treefall, structural issues, etc)? In a place where these expenses did not previously exist? With an existing maintenance backlog. This is craziness."Chambers Lake Campground & Day Use: Gifford Pinchot 2019-2024 Proposed Program of work suggests to do full redesign to make this a Concession Fee site at a cost of \$50,000. Hell no! Keep privatized interests out of public lands. The public has already given this feedback. Charging a fee for a previously free site is the first step to monetization which our public lands do not need to be monetized. No other site information is really available on your existing website. How can the public comment about proposed changes when you don't provide accurate information to comment on. This alone should prohibit fee changes on any sites. It is not the public's responsibility to hunt down detail at numerous sites because the FS is unable to provide it. On your Sustainable Recreation Program Public Input GIS program it says there is a garbage receptacle at this location, is there? Only information I can find says pack it in, pack it out. Are there fire rings? Picnic benches already? So will this be a standard amenity fee for a campground or will this be an expanded amenity fee without water or other services?" Wakepish, Orr Creek, Marble Mountain 'Group' campsites. Has the FS paid for all of the facilities at these locations or have snowmobile clubs. It was my understanding the Marble Mountain Shelter was built by snowmobile club goers before it burnt down, and after? So now you want to charge the public \$100 a night to treat it as a group campground. No thanks. La Wis Wis Guard Station. Volunteers have done a ton of the work on this. Listing the cost previously as \$0 is disingenuous, it is not like you could stay here for free. \$150/night is WAY too high. I can rent a lookout and cabin to sleep 8 in Northern California (Bear Basin Cabin and Lookout) for \$75. "Burley and Red Mountain Lookouts. Where on earth did \$90/night come from? Why was the work of the Passport in Time volunteer crew from 2010 on Red Mountain left to go to waste? Why disrespect the efforts of volunteers and then open it up this much later after spending additional funds to make the lookout ready for rental. 12 years of exploring, amazing. Rental cost should be \$50/night or \$65 at best. Once it is demonstrated the FS can maintain the lookout to high standards and not just let it rot, then consider raising the price." "Cat Creek/Blue Lake OHV Area Permit. These prices are too high and should be 'per family' or group. \$50 annual is a lot if you have two adults and 4 kids. \$100 annual per person is crazy. I am not an OHV user nor do I enjoy them but even this seems putative for their usage. " Coldwater Lake area (Hummocks, South Coldwater, Picnic Area). Keep this free. There's 3 trailheads all in very close proximity. You only need one bathroom between the three. It's stupid to make capital investments to build new privy's just so you can charge a fee. This is ridiculous. Interpretive sites, keep them free, nickel and diming people is not helpful. "JRO Monument Pass. Whoever proposed making a new pass has some blinders on. Across multiple hiking groups in Oregon and Washington a concensus is people asking 'what permit do I need' – and the answer to this can be incredible complex, from permits for day use (Lewis River, Central Cascades, NW Forest Pass for parking, Discover Pass for state lands, SnoPark Passes [WA and OR specific], climbing passes, Mt. Margaret Backcountry Passes).. nobody needs another pass. Please do not offer another pass with another different date of validity (7 days instead of annual)

a. Signage needs to be made clear that parking at JRO does not require a fee. Deceptively there are signs saying the parking is a fee area. But there is not a fee for hiking, only entering the observatory building."

"Siouxon, June Lake, Marble Mountain. If there is no existing privy, once again do not build the infrastructure and require forever outlay of maintenance. All it takes is a tree to fall on one privy, a foundation to crack on another, a vandal to light one on fire or shoot it up, and multiple years of site

revenue will be used up to address this or be offset from other activities. Keep popular spots free, do not build infrastructure so you can collect fees. You could probably work with hiking coalitions to help teams of volunteers handle microtrash and other site specific issues. Allow adoption of Trailheads by clubs perhaps?" Mount Margaret Backcountry. The public would be hard pressed to see the numbers of expenditure on the 'amenities' at these sites over the last decade. Is it more than \$5,000? Fees per/night are ludicrous for difficult backpacking and extremely rustic backcountry sites with marginal water access. Mt. St. Helens Climbing Permit. No, no, no. Keep at \$15. What 'service' do people get for the permit? MSHI seems to tout their volunteer force. Why does the public need to pay the FS and Recreation.gov private contractor money to travel on 10ft of snow in May? Is snow not a durable surface? This is a money grab, always has been. There's no service or amenity on the route, especially when it is covered in snow. Mt. Adams area Trailheads and campgrounds. Same notes as above. Don't list existing fee as \$0 when you can't currently stay in a guard station for \$0/night. Don't charge for trailheads that are currently free. Mt. Adams climbing permit. \$20 flat, what, per day, per weekend, per weekday? What happened to the annual pass? Why can't the public get more information before we're asked to comment? As part of maintaining equitable access, preventing the monetization, privatized profits from public recreation, it is immensely important to maintain all no-fee campgrounds for the public. Frankly it seems like the FS should locate 5-10 strategic spots along main access points and at strategic nexuses within the Forest to place more formal bathroom facilities. Putting bathrooms and trash service at the end of long roads is a boondoggle. People still vandalize-having them in more public areas probably would reduce vandalism though there might be an increase in trash left, the sites would be less near wilderness and easier for the FS or volunteers to police/maintain.

Accounting not provided of funds collected and spent

The Forest Service at large, including Gifford Pinchot National Forest regularly tout that money is retained for expenditure at the site collected, whatever it is, 85% or 95% is kept 'in the forest'. The breakdown by National Forests of funds collected and spent, but it is so generic as to be vaguely informative about where money actually goes. The latest, 2020 (https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd973168.pdf) doesn't really say much. As far as line item is concerned, \$7,000 on Law Enforcement, \$10,000 on overhead. \$593,000 on repair and upkeep. \$931,000 on visitor services. We should be able to see how much was collected and how much was spent on Mt. Adams Climb Route. On Mt. St. Helens Climb Route. On Campgrounds, and in the future, on Lookouts. Without this line-information, we read boiler plate messages about funds going back to sites. Yet go to sites year after year rarely seeing improvement. Never have I been able to find an accounting on a per-site basis where funds have been spent. I have stayed in many lookouts across Washington, Oregon, and California and exempting those officially staffed on a seasonal basis for firewatch duties, most are in need of significant maintenance and are regularly improved by volunteers. Even items as menial as functional brooms, unperforated screens in windows, chairs, and cots are often in disrepair. It is laughable as these items do not cost thousands of dollars and are easily transported in a FS truck. This same line of observation is clear at trailheads where simple items like a new picnic table go years between replacement, the state of bathrooms is unacceptable, overflowing trash cans lead to more litter on the ground, and informational kiosks get vandalized or damaged by tree-fall. Why does the FS want to commit to the forever outlay of on-going maintenance and upkeep of new such facilities at sites where these 'amenities' previously did not exist? This is a misguided endeavor Where would the public find actual revenue numbers based on each site's collection, and expenditures on a per-site basis? Without this information I cannot support raising existing fees on lookouts and campgrounds.

Legal grounds for collecting standard amenity fees for users who do not use amenities

The United States District Court, District of Oregon, Portland Division moved to dismiss a ticket given on the basis of requiring a fee at trailhead for someone backpacking.⁸ Citing *Adams v. U.S. Forest Service* whereby Judge Gettleman specifies the FS may not charge solely for parking and hiking, as this is unambiguously prohibited.⁹ It seems the MHNH has avoided litigation on this topic as they hand out 'warnings' that appear as citations and allude to the possibility of being cited for violating the law. MHNH should state a clear position on the validity of the NW Forest Pass and if it is required solely for parking and hiking without using the other amenities enumerated in FLREA.

89. Addendum to fees and accounting. If the FS moves forward with making lookouts available for rent, the accounting should be very clearly provided to the public about their fund expenditure and usage at the site. Based on other lookouts at similar elevations/access areas in Oregon, Washington, and California, it would seem an approximate window of operation of 4 months (June-September [Or mid June through Mid October]), approximately 120 days. I have frequented many lookouts over the last decade+ and in the last 5 years the booking has to be near 100%. At a 95% booking rate, that is 114 days of fees at \$90 = \$10,260 in revenue. If "80-95% of fees help support blah blah blah talking point", that's \$8.721 a year that should remain at the site itself. From doing napkin math at other lookouts, it is really incredible that when generating even \$5-8k/year for years on end, simple things like brooms, screens, door gaskets, window latches, deck boards, chairs, cots, tables cannot be replaced when broken or worn. This is almost the defacto case, where the money goes, one can only wonder. Even replacing a single chair seems like a reasonable 'return' on the fees. But much work ends up being done by volunteers anyways. If Gifford Pinchot rents these lookouts out, they could set a positive standard by posting online and in the lookout, where the rental fees went each year. As in a hypothetical listing like the below would help users better understand the pressures the forest faces. Without transparency of specifics, broad 'we're underfunded' may be true, but it is very hard to 'sell' that to the public when you are increasing fees.

90. The Northwest Motorcycle Association represents the interests of offroad motorcyclists in Washington. We're submitting this letter as comment on the Gifford Pinchot National Forest Recreation Fee Proposal as it relates to off-road motorcyclists. Off-road motorcyclists understand that trails and facilities need maintenance and upgrades in the GPNF. They also have noted an increase in new visitors/use of the forest in recent years and recognize that trail and facility maintenance increases as utilization rises. Additional funding and workforce is necessary to address the needs. Regarding the Special Use Permit for OHVs Off-road motorcyclists contribute directly and commensurately to this increased use through the purchase of an ORV permit that is managed by Washington State Department of Licensing. The funds collected from this permit are legislated for use solely on trails and facilities where OHV use is an approved recreational activity. Additionally, off-road motorcyclists contribute directly to this same funding source through a portion of state and federal fuel taxes, also through existing legislation. Adding another permit as a prerequisite for off-road motorcyclists to use motorized trails on public lands unfairly burdens a user group that already contributes more money to maintenance and facility funding sources than every other user group on a per-user basis. Adding another permit would be hugely burdensome for families and potentially price them out of this family-oriented pass time. This is akin to adding a new barrier to off-road motorcycling, which directly impacts lower-income families and defeats inclusiveness. Adding another permit could lead to even more confusion about which pass is needed to recreate on public lands. Adding another permit creates new administrative overhead for the agency. Given these considerations, NMA cannot support the imposition of another special use permit for off-road motorcycling on any public lands. We do, however, have a solution in place for trail maintenance

which has been rapidly growing since 2018. NMA is the primary workforce in maintaining and constructing motorized single-track trail across the state. Through our collaboration with state and federal agencies, environmental issues have been mitigated and many trails are more sustainable as a result. We are a direct link to the user group and empower them with education and tooling to complete trail maintenance properly. Our capacity is increasing with continued support from state, federal and private sector funding sources. Since just 2018, NMA has completed work across the state through two RCO managed NOVA grants, three RTP grants, and two Yamaha Outdoor Activities Initiative grants. However, our work and positive impact to the environment through stewardship of motorized trails has a decades-long history across the state. Currently, NMA is in a five-year planning process to expand our work. We are engaged in work activities with The Nature Conservancy, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Washington Department of Natural Resources, and USFS, Region 6, Washington (nearly every ranger district where off-road motorcycling is allowed). NMA has put tools to the ground to implement trail maintenance and construction per USFS standards across the state. The solution to meeting increased maintenance demands on motorized single-track trail in the GPNF – and across the state – is continuing our partnership and collaboration with each other while seeking areas of improvement and celebrating successes. Regarding Site Fees NMA and off-road motorcyclists recognize a need and potential benefit of upgrading Chimney/Cat Creek Campground with structures to create campsite boundaries, fire rings and tables. There should be planning for overflow and discussions about a reservation system. All fees collected should be spent only on the campsite maintenance. We would gladly accept an advisory role in the design and perhaps assist in the construction and maintenance as a contractor or in at a volunteer capacity. The Blue Lake ORV trailhead provides a toilet and parking. This should have only a parking fee that is equivalent to the other non-motorized per-vehicle-per-day structure. All fees collected should be spent only on maintenance of the facilities at this location.

91. Concerning recreation fees. This should be something that people expect with inflation but also the increase in population with it toll on outdoor activities. Several years ago we advocated an entrance station at Hwy 504 to the Monument area. Letters to senators and representatives of state and federal for about 10 years with no results. The main problem was Washington State Highway Department who insist that no barrier is placed on their highways. Hwy 706 ends at the entrance to Mt Rainier NP. The only difference that we see is that road maintenance is done by Park Service. This seems like a reasonable solution for MSHNVM that FS do road work. From a specific point the roadway is to Monument territory. Without an entrance station, Coldwater Lake, Hummocks Trail, S Coldwater Trail and any others need a fee. The crowds have become rather overwhelming with many individuals ignoring the simple requirements -- stay on trails, no overnight camping (with permits for backcountry), limited areas for pets and on leash. The increased number of dogs adds to the overcrowding. Increase campground fees is important to control of areas but the many dispersed campsites have greatly increased. These sites should have fees also with fines for people developing new ones. Along FR81 there have been new sites used at least once per year which has denuded much of forest undergrowth. Moss and flowers are completely obliterated in large areas which are in the Monument area. We quit going for hikes in that area due to the type of people that frequented parts of forest. Some people are very considerate but there are those that realize the FS has limited personnel. We had our paid pass for using/parking at trailheads. It was always pleasant to see forest personnel checking on our pass and speaking to us. Fees are a necessary portion of being able to use our national forests, monuments, parks. Increases in fees is just part of the formula. Thank you for all you do.

92. We were less than impressed with the JRO's video. 20 minutes of roughly the same video clips. This needs to offer far more information; no mention of the devastation west of the crater along the Toutle River. No mention of Harry Truman, etc. Raising your fees is a mistake and not worth the humble exhibits. Think again about such a move. This puts entry into the Observatory beyond a lot of families. We also were hoping for a docent that knew the whole story. The people staffing really didn't know that much.
93. I understand the failure of Congress to adequately fund our National parks and Monuments creates the need to seek other funding sources. Every fee imposed prices some Americans out of visiting and experiencing our national treasures. It is tragic that some of the public can't afford to visit their public lands. Could people earning below the poverty line as per their tax filing be issued annually by the IRS a pass that would allow fees to be waived at our National Parks? We must make fees be subject to an ability to pay somehow so all Americans can enjoy our public lands and there is sufficient funding.
94. Your proposal \$30 per vehicle or \$25 per motorcycle for seven days is too much. How about an annual pass so people can return when they want? Say \$20. MSH doesn't have as much to offer, such as Olympic National Park. \$12 too much for JRO, when you cannot count on it being open all the time. I covered the eruptions and have told stories when no rangers were there to help visitors. Think about what you can offer visitors. Showing them things on the ground through guided walks. If you raise fees, you need to give people more.
95. I found this form at Snowgrass Flats TH asking for suggestions to how to respond to the major growth of use there and the impact to the ecosystem it's causing. #1 Install wilderness toilets -- 100+ people per day digging cat holes has a huge impact, especially since all the ground is covered by wildflowers or trees with large roots. #2 prohibit dogs -- owners let their pets run and dig in meadows disturbing vegetation and wildlife. #3 require a NW Forest Pass or other pay to park system.
96. I support the increase of fees in order to support the forest.
97. Ok with fee increase if relevant to facility. If relevant to recreation opportunity
98. I agree with the increase in fees to support the forest.
99. Feels an increase of fees is justified
100. This is just my observation from working the fee desk at JRO, and several National Park Service areas. The infrastructure suffers at MSH. Just the wear and tear of 200,000 visitors at JRO. Right now, there are no functioning restrooms at Coldwater Lake Recreation Area (Sept 7, 2022). There are a lot (I'm estimating 50%) of visitors who take advantage of the resource and do not pay anything and should be (This is not counting people with an interagency pass). A fee change is a good idea, I think. I agree with a \$30.00 per week monument pass proposal. Right now, it is \$8.00 per day. If people come back 7 days in a row, that is \$56.00. And we do have visitors that come back multiple days. That being said, unless the means of collecting fees changes, only people who come in to JRO will pay. Perhaps a Self-pay fee station in the parking lot would help, but someone has to enforce it. We are missing a lot of users to the monument. This is visitors before 10 AM, or after 6 PM when we are closed. This is road rallies and other events that use the parking lot and hamper visitor parking access for JRO. People who use trails during the day, but never come in to pay. People who go out on the plaza deck or even use the restrooms at JRO that never pay. And the sheer number of visitors that try to pass by the fee desk without paying. This is a huge financial burden on those that do pay. Wrist bands are how we track currently. I find 5-10 of these laying around each day. We are supposed to place them on wrists of visitors. With Covid (Close contact and less than 5% of visitors wearing masks), and now monkey pox that spreads through skin contact, this worked in the past, but

this is a new age and a new way of collecting fees and tracking who pays needs to be assessed. And raising fees without a plan for collection method and implementation, has failed in the past. Many visitors and different cultures do not want us to place the wrist band on them. So, they take the wrist band and throw it away or toss it on the ground, or give it to other visitors. Coldwater Lake Recreation area, as I mentioned about the restrooms. Also, daily use in the Summer. It is becoming more of a destination point each year as the recovery from the eruption continues. The use is incredible, and yet that is a free area unless people drive up to JRO and pay. I hope this isn't too much, but just what I have noticed.

101. Context: Before commenting on specific fees, I think it's appropriate to look at the correctness of charging fees for use of public lands. This is complicated. I believe the public expects and tolerates reasonable fees for use of facilities such as visitor centers, campgrounds, guard stations, lookout towers and other developed sites. I was surprised some guard stations and lookout towers do not now require a fee. Most National forest land, however, has traditionally been open to the public for free. Dispersed camping has long been allowed without charge (though not without garbage, vandalism and other consequences). Passes to park at trailheads (NW Forest Pass) are seen as charges to hike despite the Forest's insistence they are for upkeep of required trailhead facilities such as toilets, garbage containers etc. This causes some to park the required quarter mile away to avoid the fee, causing enforcement and traffic problems. The recreation fee pilot program, begun in 1994, was intended to allow forests to keep 85% of fees on site. That was a key selling point. An unintended but predictable consequence was the Babylon of fee programs that ensued. Even the fee-supporting public was confused and frustrated by the myriad fee programs. The regional committee I served on tried with limited success to address that confusion. There were Forest Service fee programs along with fees charged by National Parks, the Corps of Engineers, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation and of course state and county recreational fees. The passage of the 2004 Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act went a long way to setting standards and consistent protocols for federal fees. But it's still complicated. Way too complicated, even for a respectful public that accepts the need for some fees. Just at the Mount St. Helens NVM, one can pay just for entrance to Johnston Ridge Observatory (\$12) or buy a seven-day Monument Pass (\$30 per vehicle or \$25 per motorcycle) or purchase an annual NW Forest Pass (\$30) or an Interagency or America the Beautiful Pass (known by both names and formerly known as the Golden Pass adding to confusion) for \$80 annually. Pity the poor visitor. The Interagency Pass gets one into most federal sites for free or half price. But it doesn't work at state campgrounds or other facilities. An annual "Discover Pass" is needed in Washington, and a separate pass in Oregon. There is also a joint Forest Service/State of Oregon Coastal Pass. Separate passes are needed for climbing Mount St. Helens, backpacking into Mount Margaret Backcountry, exploring Ape Caves or visiting the Lewis River Recreation Area. Proposed ORV permit changes are so complicated they take 143 words to explain. The public rarely discriminates among federal, state or county lands. The myriad of passes would make Rube Goldberg blush. For an idea of how complicated the recreational fee landscape can be, visit: <https://www.discovernw.org/recreation-passes-faq.html>. I believe along with many others that Congressional appropriations should pay for most Forest upkeep. Taxes are the ultimate one-stop pass. The challenges in federal funding have caused Forests and other federal agencies to become dependent on and advocates for recreational fees. That's unfortunate. And, as these proposed fee increases demonstrate, recreational fees will be applied to more areas and continually increased. The philosophy of charging for use of federal lands will continue to limit use by those of lesser means. National forests were set aside for public use and enjoyment. For many, public lands are the only places they can afford to recreate. Not so long ago, the only charges in a national forest were minimal

fees for campsites. Under this proposal, nearly every valued site on the Forest will require a pass, permit or reservation. Sad. "For years, federal agencies have pushed the "Get Outdoors" philosophy -get kids away from their screens and into the woods. More and higher fees work against that goal. Twelve dollars to explore the wonders at JRO - a 50% increase -- may be an inconvenience to some but a showstopper for others. While you say 70% of Forest recreation sites would remain free, I would guess 90% of the most-used, most-loved sites will not be free. Forest Supervisor Eric Veach says "These fee increases will help us maintain the sites to the level and quality people have come to expect ... ". A cynic might say expectations are low, but we all know campground quality varies widely. Many are not up to regional standards. Water systems have been removed from some, and others have much deferred maintenance. A Lower Fork CG is much more than a \$5 difference from a Cultus Creek CG or a Forlorn Lakes CG. If you are going to charge fees at some sites and increase them at others, you had better be ready to explain what people are getting for their money. An increased camping fee for unkempt sites, broken tables and smelly outhouses will not sell well. I know from experience that people will find ways around paying fees, causing enforcement problems and tweaking of fee programs. When the focus becomes the collection of fees rather than enhancing public enjoyment and understanding, we've lost our way. " Specifics: Speaking to the proposed fee schedule on the Gifford Pinchot: Charging for rental of cabins, guard stations, lookouts and group sites makes sense. I was surprised many are currently free. It will be interesting to see the reaction of those accustomed to using, for example, Orr Creek and Wakepish group campgrounds for free and now being charged \$100. Charging for trailhead use, as I've said is not acceptable. I realize it's not for hiking, but the amenities provided and the maintenance of trails should come from appropriated dollars. I also oppose charging fees on the Monument for viewpoints such as Loowit, Donnybrook, Cedar Creek and Cascade Peaks. They are not heavily used, and confusion about the need for a \$5 pass for a 5-minute stop will anger the public and make them more trouble than they are worth. I strongly oppose increased fees at Johnston Ridge Observatory. Increasing the fee by half to \$12 will be a hardship to many and exclusionary to others. JRO provides wonderful learning opportunities. A good case could be made that it should be free to the public. The Monument was originally designed with three entrance portals for area-wide fees on the national park model. That system was rejected for a more targeted approach. But with fees proposed at nearly every destination, it makes sense to charge a Monument entrance fee. People are used to this approach at national parks. A piecemeal approach is confusing, frustrating and will cause continuing public discontent and controversy. It will also require more law enforcement, tarnishing the image of the "forest ranger" into the "forest cop." "On the Mt. Adams District, there are different charges proposed for Gotchen Guard Station, Red Mountain lookout, Govt. Mineral Springs G.S. and Peterson Cabin. This will prove confusing to the public and time-consuming for staff to explain and enforce. I understand they are all different, but one consistent charge in an already complicated fee program would be helpful." In conclusion: Recreational fees are a complicated topic, both philosophically and practically. Their increased use and inevitable increased cost will bar some from their public lands while at the least confusing others. Implementing, explaining and enforcing this potpourri of fees and passes will be a giant headache for the Forest. I ask the Forest not to continue down this trail of user-fee exclusion and confusion.

102. Phone Comment: Generally supportive. Understands how fee at Marble Mtn Shelter could support FS O&M of the building. Likes idea of day use, reservable. Had some questions, and would like to be involved in any discussions around how to implement.

Verbal Comments from Meetings

103. Questions around process, transparency on where funding is going, explained SRPs.

104. Comment: 1) timing of fee proposal interesting, with inflation and how expensive things are nowadays, 2) impact of fee change to poor communities.

105. generally folks we spoke with were supportive of fee changes

106. Clarified with him that the \$5 day use fee is part of the NWFP (and not in addition to). The Museum would have liked to have been consulted about LWW cabin before we went out for fee proposal (this group has spent time and money on helping to maintain this facility). Why was High Rock not included as a cabin rental, and if it were, the White Pass group would have liked to have input on the future of this building (because they have been spent time and money helping to maintain/restore). Suggestion to have someone staff High Rock Lookout full time. Unhappy about condition of road to High Rock. And suggestion that High Rock TH needs a toilet.

107. generally supportive of fees, especially about CG fees/increases. Clarified with them that the \$5 day use fee is part of NWFP (and not in addition to). This couple had questions about Yellowjacket Ponds, and why not make it a site again and open to public. Also unhappy about road conditions (they feel like roads on MTA are better maintained than on CV). They did ask if a portion of funds from fee sites could be set aside for road maintenance.

108. Gentlemen in grey shirt who lives in Cispus– asked about Cat Creek Mixed Use area, shared that the map at kiosk doesn't match the MVUM that I showed him. He expressed concerns about the lack of trails open (and actually rideable) to side by sides. Generally he seemed supportive of fees. But had questions about the funding source for trail work and if that's where the fees would be going.

109. Explained that fee revenue goes to O&M of developed rec sites. concerned that these were fees on top of NWFP- explained it's the same that NWFP would cover these fees too. concerned about how we would enforce the fees. There was also general feeling that Forest Service should run campgrounds not concessionaire. Sheryl Hall from the Gifford Pinchot Trash Force - was generally supportive of fees and did not share anything specific about the fee proposal.

110. He was very supportive of fees in general and understood that they will help the Forest Service maintain public trails and facilities. He was concerned that the new proposed fees would be in addition to existing NWFP fees. He mostly wanted to know that his \$30 annual NWFP would still allow him to access the NWFP sites that he has always accessed. He liked the idea of fee dollars going to trail crews. He also wondered if the group sites would be available to volunteer groups for staging larger work parties. He had questions about phase two of the Cat Creek ORV/OHV mostly related to which roads would be open to mixed use in the future and what the loops might look like. He seem to understand why we have been implementing reservation systems to manage visitor use at LRRR and Ape Cave. We showed him the maps and how he could use the fee proposal interactive map on line to provide comments. He indicated that he would do so

111. Was generally supportive of recreation fees and the FS

112. Pete Krabbe who is the current Pinchot Partners Chair and Title II RAC member – he was also generally supportive of recreational fees and our fee proposals. He expressed some reservations about the influx of visitors and recreational users to the Packwood area and the impact on housing prices and taxes, but also expounded on the merits of increase tourism and the positive effects on the local economy. He shared his opinions about FS staff (mostly good), information and thoughts about carbon sequestration, huckleberry field restoration, and more.

113. Man in gray shirt -- expressed concern about impact of fee changes on low income communities. Wanted to see fee revenue accomplishment reporting for 2021. Curious about budget and O&M, and how much the fee increase will actually help with O&M (how much would we close that gap)

Comments from Interactive Map

114. Chapter 87, Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement

"(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(B) For general access unless specifically authorized under this section."

The Federal Courts have stated that placing a fee on this kind of site is unambiguously prohibited by the FLREA.

115. Chapter 87, Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement

"(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(B) For general access unless specifically authorized under this section."

The Federal Courts have stated that placing a fee on this kind of site is unambiguously prohibited by the FLREA.

116. Chapter 87, Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement

"(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(B) For general access unless specifically authorized under this section."

The Federal Courts have stated that placing a fee on this kind of site is unambiguously prohibited by the FLREA.

117. Chapter 87, Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement

"(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(B) For general access unless specifically authorized under this section."

The Federal Courts have stated that placing a fee on this kind of site is "unambiguously prohibited" by the FLREA.

118. Chapter 87, Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement

"(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(F) For use of overlooks or scenic pullouts."

The Federal Courts have stated that placing a fee on this kind of site is "unambiguously prohibited" by the FLREA.

119. "(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(F) For use of overlooks or scenic pullouts."

The Federal Courts have stated that requiring recreation fees in sites like this one is "unambiguously prohibited."

120. "(d) Limitations on recreation fees

(1) Prohibition on fees for certain activities or services

The Secretary shall not charge any standard amenity recreation fee or expanded amenity recreation fee for Federal recreational lands and waters administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, or the Bureau of Reclamation under this chapter for any of the following:

(A) Solely for parking, undesignated parking, or picnicking along roads or trailsides.

(F) For use of overlooks or scenic pullouts."

The Federal Courts have stated that requiring recreation fees in sites like this one is "unambiguously prohibited."

121. Please dont change this wonderful spot! Plus, there isnt parking for that many people! The only change needed is signs at the begining of the road, no trailers. We were there when someone brought a long camp trailer down. All the campers had to be hunted down to move their cars but it wasnt easy for them to get turned around. Again, please dont change this place!

122. If beginners and new riders are charged fees every time they turn around they may give up on the sport entirely and not be there to purchase a Discovery or NW Forest pass - thus you will eventually work yourselves into collecting less overall fees.

123. Curious if the washout on FR 6040 will be repaired with this increased fees? This road is dangerous.

Camping is an affordable family activity, and I'm concerned it may become too expensive, especially with the price of fuel, for many lower income families to continue.

124. This is a 100% increase—it is shocking. This fee increase makes the rental of this cabin out of reach of many lower and middle income families. Disappointed.

125. What a shame to implement this massive fee of \$90 from the current rate of \$0. It was charming and a delightful novelty this lookout could be rented for free. I don't know how many people took advantage of this—but what was once accessible to all, now will be accessible to those with extraneous income.

126. The actual mileage open to motorized use with the the Gifford Pinchot National Forest is far greater than that described. This should be corrected so people have accurate information prior to commenting.

127. Additional sources of funding should be found to connect motorized trails in this region of the district with the other regions that have trails open to motorized access.

128. I guess if the goal is to keep people away - charging \$30 to drive up there each time is a good way to do it. It's unfortunate that the \$20,000+ I pay in federal taxes each year don't allow me to enjoy public property anymore.

It use to be that a small fee felt OK. That the bulk of funding came from pooled funds, and the small fees helped to justify some amenities, clean up, etc. But \$30 parking fee is really expensive - and to go up with a group of friends to enjoy the scenery would be \$50? That's too expensive - we'd just do something else.

In context of \$30 for JRO, \$30 for NW forest Pass, \$30 for Regional Parks, \$30 for Discovery Pass, \$25 sno park it's ridiculous.

129. Nehalem Bay, one of the most popular horse camps in the PNW, is \$21 a night. Both Lewis River and Mt. Adams horse camps at the suggested rate of \$15 are somewhat difficult to get to and offer much less services/access than Nehalem Bay. Other camp sites in the Gifford Pinchot have rates going up by \$5, not \$10. These two sites also rely on Back Country Horsemen to maintain trails which is a great asset to the state and forest. I would strongly consider the rate of \$10 instead of \$15.

130. See comment on Lewis River Horse Camp.

131. I would have no problem paying \$15/site at Mt. Adams to guarantee a site under the following conditions/questions

1. does this mean a concessionaire will be there to keep the camp clean and safe?

2. Will the funds collected go toward improvements? Right now there are high lines only. I would expect the fee increase would include corrals being installed.

3. Will there be a "technology" fee of an additional \$8 when booking on line like there is for Kalama horse camp? This is misleading then to say the fees are \$15/night as it would be \$23 for the first night and \$15 for additional days. You could say I like transparency!

132. This is one of the few places that seniors on a fixed income can still camp! There isnt enough parking for that many people anyhow!

133. I agree with the fee. If people pay to use these properties, they may have greater incentive to respect and care for the property. And if they don't collecting the fee will help maintain such properties.

134. Please charge fees. This helps maintain these sites and encourages a sense of nominal buy into sustainable recreation.

135. Charge fee for recreation users driving motorized off-road vehicles, including e-bikes.

136. User fees are a good source of revenue, please apply this fee.

137. Charge this fee. Encourage users to take some ownership of recreation and fund expenses associated with bad users of such areas.
138. Charging option 1 would require more diligence in collection and counting of persons, whereas charging option 2 would collect more efficiently with fewer options for scamming the system. However, there will still be people in large suvs trying to avoid the fees. Charge more fees though, for anyone without the national parks or other passes.
139. The \$15 and \$30 fees would be hard to administer. Better to just charge \$15 per vehicle and let people camp where they wish. The sites are poorly defined and there are no fire rings or tables. If the fees are enacted, would tables and fire rings be added? What about the dispersed sites nearby? Would they also be added to the site and a fee charged?
140. go ahead, fuck it all up by charging money.
no one wants to be charged for using their forest.
leave it alone. quit making excuses to bill us for everything - how can the population fire everyone involved in fee based recreation.? or should we just burn it all down.?
141. make it \$100 per day. St. Helens actually has a growing glacier. If people are going to climb- they will pay \$100. We have an opportunity to make some programs sustainable with a good increase.
142. I would be in favor of a fee here if the Forest could guarantee the money collected at this TH was spent only on this TH and the riding community was empowered to provide input on projects during their planning period.. I also believe the Forest should add another camping area lower in the valley to reduce vehicular traffic. We want to ride in the forest, not drive.
143. I would be in favor of a fee here if the Forest could guarantee the money collected at this campground was spent only on this campground and the riding community was empowered to provide input on projects during their planning period. This campground should have a beginner rider loop created and the Forest should solicit help from the riding community to plan and build the loop. This place is full by Friday evening, so the Forest should add more camping areas closer to Randle that connect to the motorized trail system.
144. A trail for dirt biking families is needed in this campground that connects to Wright Meadows trail. It would also be great to have a trail for new riders nearby.
145. Would it be possible to create a motorcycle trail from here to trail 80?
146. I have the same opinion as commented elsewhere. I would be in favor of a fee here if the Forest could guarantee the money collected at this campground was spent only on this campground and the riding community was empowered to provide input on projects during their planning period. This area looks like it might support a beginner level trail system that is a huge benefit for families. I also think the Forest should add a new camping area lower in the valley to reduce vehicular traffic on the 23 rd. We want to ride in the forest, not drive.
147. The annual fees do not sound reasonable for the available roads/trails involved. For example, Black Hills NF South Dakota has 3600 miles off road/trails available for \$25 annual fee.
148. As a snowmobiling family we pay for our snow park permits and would prefer not to have to pay \$5.00 for each trip. I believe that additional revenue could be generated by enforcing the current snow park permit requirements. I Routinely see vehicles without permits including Oregonians with Oregon snow park permits. Enforcement first please
- Thanks you for all you do. The Gifford Pinchot forest is an amazing place.

149. Charging \$100 per year when a Northwest Forest Pass costs \$30 and an interagency pass costs \$80 makes zero sense and seems to be a completely arbitrary number. If this fee is intended as an additional pass, it only muddies an already complicated fee system in Washington state.

150. While I can understand charging for these permits, this fee structure has the potential to be one of the most expensive backcountry permitting systems in the state and once again seems arbitrary. A 4 person trip on the Wonderland Trail for 10 days, at 9 different campsites will cost me \$20. For a 4 person 2-night trip in the Mt. Margaret Backcountry it would cost \$80. This comes with less amenities than the Wonderland (IE ranger stations and a system to mail and cache food, bear poles or boxes, rangers that actually patrol, a robust search and rescue program, etc.). A standard permit cost per night would make sense, but not per person. These backcountry sites are more primitive, minimally maintained, and rarely patrolled. The per person per night cost is not justified.

151. These proposed fees are highly exorbitant in comparison to other backcountry permit fees (IE-Mt. Rainier and North Cascades permit are a flat \$20 for the cost of the permit). Charging per person per night will make this camping experience inaccessible to lower income families, which does not support the Forest Service missions. A flat rate fee for the permit with a cap on how many are allowed to camp would be best- especially since this backcountry is seldom patrolled and the per person per night fee will subsequently be rarely enforceable.

152. The proposed fee is excessive - almost to the point of being outrageous. Backpacking should not be a sport that is only available to those who are rich and prosperous. A group fee of \$10 per trip is more appropriate.

153. 1. When I look at the two OHV-oriented trailheads, Blue Lake and Cat Creek, I see a proposal of \$10. Neither have any amenities beyond a gravel lot and a vault toilet. When I look at the various hiking trailheads, with signs, picnic tables, vault toilets, paved lots, and more, they are proposed at \$5. I would like to understand the methodology behind this disparity.

2. Unless there is a promise to do so after fees are enacted, I do not support any fees whatsoever until the Forest Service finally creates a viable link for dirtbikes between the east end of Boundary Trail #1 and Adams Fork CG so that the two separate riding systems can be joined. There is no reasonable purpose for preventing non street legal dirtbikes from making the short connection from the east end of Boundary #1 to the remains of FS 5601 at Olallie Lake CG.

154. The fee schedule for the OHV trailheads indicates that it is per OHV. This means that if I drive down with my 3 teen kids and we ride dirtbikes, we are liable for \$40 for the 4 of us to use that trailhead. In phase 2, it increases to \$80. To use a gravel parking lot with a vault toilet. That will never, ever work. First, why is this requirement not levied per hiker or per MTB? Motorized users are already paying for access via their OHV registration or license plate. It does not matter how much of the money comes to the Forest Services, the user group will absolutely not pay that much for parking. If you want to guarantee vehicles will be parked all over the road and in every wide spot, forcing enforcement which will create an even more adversarial relationship between the usergroup and the Forest Service, this is the way. It is a money-loser all day. The entire proposal looks very much like an effort to reduce and deny OHV users access.

Please explain the rationale behind charging per OHV instead of per truck/vehicle. Also I am unclear, so please explain whether the year/annual pass is different from the NW Forest pass, then explain the mechanism for securing that pass since there is no signal in most of GPNF. This feels very much like gate-keeping, because even if I purchase an annual pass and visit more than 5 times, I am effectively paying \$50-100 per person to visit PUBLIC LANDS in GPNF.

155. No! I understand there are dirt-bags that think it's ok to leave their garbage and cut new trails, and they are going to continue to be that way. But that doesn't mean it is ok to ban the rest of us who actually help take care of the forest. One of our favorite things about living close to national forest is being able to go camp for the night on a moments notice, not having to have a reservation, not having to pay some ridiculous fee. We don't go to the forest without extra garbage bags and gloves, we never leave without packing out other peoples garbage, and now we are going to be punished because of dirt-bags that no one bothers to stop, instead, just charge those that ARE doing the right thing. Those leaving their garbage behind are NOT the people that are going to be paying those fees, they'll find a way around it.

What about an ALTERNATIVE! Maybe hand out garbage bags, maybe have dumpsters or something at the main entrances and exits of the "National Forest," make it easier for people to voluntarily clean up after themselves. We have been looking for a way to get involved and volunteer in this forest for the 10+ years we have lived in the area and every time i get online to look the process becomes too cumbersome. As a child in OR our family had a forest area that we were responsible for keeping up, once a month we went and checked out the area, cleaned up any trash, looked for signs of illegal hunting or any other abusive activities. If it was something we could fix we did, if not we had an easy forest service contact person to report to. I would LOVE to find something like that. We reported every month that we had been there, and what the area looked like. I would love more ways to encourage this concept in my children and any others

156. Thanks for reaching out about the fee proposal. The only feedback I'd like to provide is that backcountry permits should be as accessible as possible, preferably online to provide payment.

157. I would agree this is an area in need of ongoing maintenance. I and family visit this area for walking boating several times year. I would support developing an overnight camping area somewhere near here also.

158. I would go with option one so people can use purchased passes. too high fees will inhibit many people from getting here.

159. I do not like idea of needing daily payment if another option available. For younger people 10 day would be hard to come up with.

160. necessary evil? only do if no other option, too expensive for average young or old person.

161. necessary evil? only do if no other option, too expensive for average young or old person.

162. Additional funding for trails may be a good idea, but this proposal is not the right approach in my opinion. It seems to be very awkward in that it duplicates an existing system, ORV tabs and NOVA funding. I would rather pay a higher ORV tab than have additional requirements and stickers just to ride a trail.

163. How does a jump from \$0 to \$90 a night not price out people of lesser means from enjoying this site? What is the comparable site where this proposed fee was derived from? What is the reasoning for a price that high? I understand Filson is donating materials for refurb, but that lookout was trashed when I saw it last season, and what about the drive up?

164. More fees? Parking and camping sure but additional trail fees are going to discourage kids from getting outside. Please keep the parks free and inclusive for all income groups

165. Hello,

I have a few questions.

- What will these fees be used for ? Almost all the other preposed fee increases state in the other amenities state what the money will be used for.

- These trails are open to hikers , backpackers , horse riders and Mt. Bikers. Will the fees be the same for everyone ?

- If my vehicle is plated is it subject to the same fees ?

- Why am I not able to see other peoples comments ?

Thanks ...

166. Hello. I understand the need for a fee increase but to go from \$40 a night to \$100 a night for this cabin is unjustifiable. It is a wonderful facility and having a supply of firewood is essential for winter stays. The propane lights and appliances are terrific, too. But no water, asking guests to shovel snow and then do housecleaning makes for a no frills rental. Please consider a compromise on the fee increase and maybe charge \$65 or \$75 a night?

Frankly, I think that having a reasonably priced rental will encourage the current honor system. I want to stay there and help to maintain it but feeling overcharged will dampen my experience. Esp when I can get an Airbnb that offers housekeeping and a hot shower!

Thanks for your time.

167. Hello. I understand the need for a fee increase but to go from \$40 a night to \$100 a night for this cabin is unjustifiable. It is a wonderful facility and having a supply of firewood is essential for winter stays. The propane lights and appliances are terrific, too. But no water, asking guests to shovel snow and then do housecleaning makes for a no frills rental. Please consider a compromise on the fee increase and maybe charge \$65 or \$75 a night?

Frankly, I think that having a reasonably priced rental will encourage the current honor system. I want to stay there and help to maintain it but feeling overcharged will dampen my experience. Esp when I can get an Airbnb that offers housekeeping and a hot shower!

Thanks for your time.

168. Option 1 is preferable.

169. We camped at Chambers Lake Campground twice in the last three years. We would like a picnic table and a fire ring at each site. We would like a better lake access for launching watercraft such as a paddle board and a kayak. It would be nice if the roads FS2100 and FS2150 are paved.

170. I don't agree with this or any of the proposed fee changes. We pay federal taxes already so this is double taxation just like what WA does to its public land users.

Beyond that, you are taxing public lands out of the lower incomes reach. In a time of ramped inflation and increased costs for everything this is unjustifiable.

171. I don't agree with this or any of the proposed fee changes. We pay federal taxes already so this is double taxation just like what WA does to its public land users.

Beyond that, you are taxing public lands out of the lower incomes reach. In a time of ramped inflation and increased costs for everything this is unjustifiable.

172. I don't agree with this or any of the proposed fee changes. We pay federal taxes already so this is double taxation just like what WA does to its public land users.

Beyond that, you are taxing public lands out of the lower incomes reach. In a time of ramped inflation and increased costs for everything this is unjustifiable.

173. I am a student living in Portland and am already affected by these fees when I want to go enjoy the outdoors. I can't afford these further increases during these times.

174. \$90 is too high please keep this affordable. \$50 is still high but more reasonable than 90.

175. Thank you for making this rental but please keep it affordable. 90 is too high please bring that price down and if it's not enough raise it later but don't start so high. It should be available for minimum wage workers to enjoy too. Vehicle and gas prices and food and gear and that high rental fee will make it too impossible for workers. Thanks for listening

176. Why not go from 50 to 75? Why double?

177. Is this campground currently a single group site only? It seems like it is open to multiple groups currently. I support having a fee for camping, but do not think it should be single group only. This area should remain accessible to more people by allowing multiple groups to camp here.

Thank you for considering the needs of multiple users.

178. I fail to understand how adding another \$100.00 per year to a group will help this issue. I can say most of use on motorcycles clear those trails and keep them in the condition they are in. Your time donation is also insulating 40 hours of work for a free pass, that's \$2.50 a hour and we supply all of our own equipment and fuel. If you are adding a fee put a gate at the bottom and everyone pays the fee hikers, horseback , mountain bikes.

I realize there are some ORV riders that are total tools but a lot of us in the community put them in check when we see them doing dumb stuff and will continue to do so, unless you price us out of the area, We already have to pay Orv fees. which no other group has to pay. maybe we should impose a day hike fee 5-10 per hiker per day and use that money for ORV trails. Seems like ORV users are the ones that are punished .

I am against this fee structure i think it should be imposed on other groups not ORV riders

179. Opening up Burley Mountain for reservations is an outstanding idea. We frequently have driven up there, and discussed how neat this would be as an overnight site. This is an outstanding idea at a reasonable price point.

180. OHV recreation, since it has such a high potential to cause erosion, is imperative to have well maintained trails for. I especially like the proposed volunteer hours in exchange for a season pass. This is an excellent idea to promote both constituent engagement and resource stewardship.

181. This is a wonderful historic structure. I am glad to see this included in the proposal to be utilized for a useful purpose. We are excited for the potential for this to be available.

182. Hi, I think this \$10 fee is a great idea to help support the Mount Margaret backcountry sites.

183. I'm in support of the proposed changes as described in the text below.

Fee Per Day: Current: \$0 Proposed: \$5

Annual Northwest Forest Passes and Full Suite of Interagency Passes would be honored

184. I'm in support of the proposed changes to the Burley Mountain Lookout. \$90 / night would be money well spent.

185. First, thank you for your management of the Mount Margaret Backcountry (MMB). Second, I am not objecting to the new fee as proposed. However, I'm having trouble finding what improvements we can expect in the MMB as a result of the fees and what the priority order is for those improvements. Email below for response. Thank you again.

186. Existing campground seems pretty small for 50 people. \$50 to reserve the entire camp?

187. From my research the fees proposed are way higher for whats available at other NF. Check out Black Hills NF, Dixie NF, and Fishlake NF as few examples. I will continue to visit other NFs that are more ohv friendly. Also the proposal doesn't mention any staging areas for new routes.

188. Do not create a fee for the public to use public lands. \$50/night to sleep in a tent in the woods is way too much. President's are now signing trillion dollar bills while the ordinary man is getting throttled at every step.

189. Is there really a vault toilet at Snowgrass trailhead? The FS's own website says there is no toilet. <https://www.fs.usda.gov/recarea/giffordpinchot/recreation/recarea/?recid=32134>

Is the road paved? Is there paved parking? Are there picnic tables? is there a garbage receptacle? Is there a fee collection station here? Is the only proposed change to add a fee?

The public cannot offer any meaningful comment on incorrect information. If the above amenities do not currently exist, why on earth would the FS with an already existing huge deferred maintenance backlog that clearly cannot be paid for by existing fees, want to make the capital investment in new facilities and a forever outlay of servicing the site, dealing with repairs, vandalism, etc.? No fee here, no new facilities. If people need facilities, there is a campground approximately 1 mile away that has them

190. as detailed by your website, usage at this site is 'light'
(<https://www.fs.usda.gov/recarea/giffordpinchot/recarea/?recid=31850>)

Equestrians do a ton of volunteer work throughout many national forests in the West. Please do not penalize them by raising rates without providing any additional amenities.

FLREA fees were never intended to sustainable self-fund recreation activity, but to supplement existing appropriations. Raising fees is a race to the bottom and only goes contrary to FS guidelines to provide equitable access.

191. is the current cost to stay there right now actually \$0, as in free? or is it unavailable to rent? It is disingenuous to even list it as having no cost per night if nobody can stay there now.

What visitor security is provided if a visitor was to call 911 (if they had service) at 3am on a Sunday morning to report an emergency. Would Yakima County Sheriff respond or would FS LEO respond? If the former, don't list that as a security service since it is not a service the FS would provide.

192. this lists a current \$15 per day fee. But currently it is \$15 for a 3 day pass during the weekend. It is \$0 for 3 day pass during the week.

Incorrect, Incomplete information is useless for the public to comment on. FS has not provided clear description of fee structure change and thus cannot possibly have met the threshold for soliciting public comment. It's really the public's responsibility to click and analyze every listing on this and educate/clarify for the managers of this system that their information is faulty? Ridiculous.

The Mt. Adams permit used to be \$30 for an annual pass. What happened to that?

193. Here are the questions and concerns I am forwarding along to the rest of the OHV community that I can reach, to get them involved in this process. Posting here so others checking out the video can see. I'm trying not to be negative because you were all so polite and friendly, but this townhall felt like a check-the-box requirement to receive comments and then go ahead with the plan anyway. Bottom line up front, if you are a user of public trails in US forest service land in WA, I strongly urge you to make comments to the FS and ask them pointed questions ASAP about why the fees are higher at OHV trailheads, why plated bikes are seemingly exempt, how funds will be collected and at what cost, why there isn't a family option, how the passes will be purchased and how proof of

purchase works, what is being done to create the loop by joining to two sides of the valley, why volunteer hours count for so little, and more. This meeting did absolutely nothing to explain "what's in it for me" for OHV users. There was a vague hand-wave about improvements but no specifics on timeline or geography. They still have not produced a higher resolution map I requested which details the table of changes listed for phase 2. FS communicated nothing of value and did not acknowledge comments that it will alienate users under these proposed changes if they cannot explain the benefits. We know that new trails take years if not a decade to come to fruition, and we know that the majority of maintenance to OHV trails is already done by users and volunteers. So why should a user pay more for trail access? And it's not just a little more, it's a lot. No substantive, effective answer provided. - There is a 3 year window to emplace fees after public comment. - FS Initially stated that fees would not be implemented until amenities are in place. However, they later stated that since the trails already exist, that only applies to areas like campsites and shelters, so fees can be levied as soon as approved. - Proposed fees are allegedly based on market analysis of similar places nearby. I know of nothing else like this in WA and no location was specified even after asking. Does anyone know of a place in WA that charges \$10 (and later \$20) per OHV on top of other passes? - When asked if money goes to a General Fund or stays at each individual site, FS answered that OHV fees will be fenced for use in OHV areas. Our funds won't be diverted to hiking areas or shelters. I would like to see this in writing. Initially, they basically said yes it goes to the site but we have the flexibility for it to go elsewhere. That sounds like General Fund. A later reply from the FS to a question said "those [OHV] fees would actually go into the trail system there and developed areas within the proposed area." With the low resolution of the mapping products, this would appear to allow OHV funds from Cat Creek OHV to be used on Cat Creek CG. The same thing for Blue Lake OHV and Blue Lake CG. - The fees will be per OHV (per user 16 and older). I There was confusion for a moment because clearly none of the speakers is an OHV rider and thought my "per vehicle" question was about OHVs. After I clarified that "per vehicle" means a truck or van or other carrier vehicle, FS confirmed that the fees are per OHV. There is no consideration of a family or group pass option to reduce costs. This is unacceptable. A family with older teenagers would be liable for hundreds of dollars for annual passes. This will result in decreased revenue under the proposed fee schedule because 1 of 2 things will generally happen. Families will go elsewhere, or they will consider the odds of enforcement and simply ride without paying. Any tickets written will only send revenue to the national fund in Washington DC, which means GPNF will see very little income. - No answer from FS on how fees will be collected or how each user will be required to provide proof of purchase. - No answer from FS on whether fees will apply to plated riders. They're technically not OHVs but they use the trails. - No answer from FS on what it will cost to collect the fees. Mike Clough had a great point that at Lake Powell when they started collecting fees for the demonstration program, 80% of the fees went to support collecting fees. IIRC, the \$2 parking passes that were recently enacted generate zero revenue for the FS and serve only to reduce usage. - FS did not address my question about how to balance access for less fortunate users once they implement high fees (\$75 to 100!) for some of the cabins and shelters. - FS did not answer my request for higher resolution maps which actually illustrate the multi-use road proposals (basically opening roads to OHVs) in phase 2. The table of changes does not describe where they will occur on most roads. Another question I did not think to ask. Will this be used to justify fee implementation among the other national forests in WA? They're already citing fees at comparable locations (of which we know none), so will that be the justification in 7 over national forests? There was no substantive discussion about using volunteer hours to offset the fee costs. Current intent is to fight users with free passes if they put in 40hrs of volunteer work.

Assuming a rate of \$20/hr for volunteer work, 40 hours of volunteer work is worth 8 to 16 times what an annual pass will cost in phase 1 (\$50) and 2 (\$100).

194. While we all have our pet projects, would it not be better to have fees go to a general fund for the GP exclusively that at least benefits us all in some way?

195. Will we be paying the new proposed new fee on top of the annual/lifetime national park pass?

196. Nothing to learn other than it will cost more money to visit the woods-

197. Where's the 5 or 10 year budget data showing this growing gap /negative trend? Is there a link so we can understand the gap you mentioned? Thanks

198. I am a dispersed camper visiting Gifford often. I've seen the garbage left behind and it really makes me mad. I thank the forest department for cleaning this up for the rest of us. I know it's expensive to clean up. I really think a fee should be required for dispersed camping. Even if it's just \$5 per vehicle. I know that this will make a lot of people mad. But for anyone who has left garbage behind, think of the money you have cost the forest.

199. Is the fee required per person if accessing Mt. Margaret backcountry or the Loowit trail? This is never made clear to the public

200. There are a multitude of passes already, why propose a new pass? And have an expiration?

201. This seems like duplicitous passes, very confusing for the public

202. Definitely a good question. If fees (if approved) will not be enacted until after amenities are added and there is already a backlog just for maintenance, what is a realistic timeline?

203. Does the money collected go to the general fund or to each individual site?

204. These new ORV fees are a bad idea. Please use one of the methods that exist already to fund maintenance of trails. And consider privatizing the actual trail work since this has been found to be more efficient. I understand that the USFS has an existing directive to go that route.

205. A Mt St Helens volcanic pass, a NW Forest pass, some other new pass and whatever that current parking pass is in a couple crowded areas that doesn't make any real sense since you can't buy one online by the time you arrive to the area

206. NWFP & Monument Pass—one is good for a year vs 7 days. Why have two passes valid at the same place? The public already deals with state passes for both states, snowpark for both states, a new pass just for the monument that expires in 7 days but costs about the same as Northwest Forest Pass, how does this help the public?

207. \$50.00 and \$100.00 per night is priced too high !

208. My point exactly! It's exploitation, of one of the most beautiful places on earth.... grrrr

209. People camp to enjoy and get away , not spend allotted money used for utilities

210. That's double the price !

211. These are the highest fees I've seen for lookouts throughout the Pacific Northwest. Have any improvements been made to Burley Mountain? It's in horrible shape for \$90/night.

212. Why was the volunteer work on Red Mountain lookout disregarded for over a decade while the lookout deteriorated?

213. Can you guarantee improvement in grounds with the price hikes ?

214. What are examples of comparables for similar opportunities for climbers or OHV users?

215. Everyone wants to pad their pockets at our expense.

216. I'm looking at rates in the \$85 and \$100 a night range here at some of the shelters. How does this square with allowing people with reduced means to still enjoy our national forest?
217. You mentioned that proposed fees are based on market analysis of similar places nearby. Where? I know of nothing else like this in WA. I'm specifically looking at Cat Creek and Blue Lake trailheads as an OHV rider. Maybe it's not coming to mind, but I don't know of anywhere with trailheads charging \$10 and later \$20 a head and separate from every other pass we already pay for.
218. When you say "specialized trails", you're referring to the multi-use trails that OHV's currently share with others, right?
219. You are proposing fees at Cat Creek of \$10/day per rider. \$20 after phase 2. If I show up with my 3 teenagers, it will literally cost me either \$40 or \$80 to park for a day.
220. Do "highway legal" OHVs NOT have to possess the new Cat Creek permit?
221. It's my understanding that all fees must go through a Resource Advisory Committee for review and recommendation to the regional Forester. The GPNF is using a RAC from Secure Rural Schools, and the members for SRS RACs seem focused on economic development. Why is GPNF not using a Recreational Resource Advisory Committee for reviewing cost changes on recreational fee changes. Where can the committee members be seen for the SRS committee? When will they meet? Will their meeting be public?
222. Please don't add fees and reservations to Twin Falls CG. So small and out there. First come first serve way to go. Consider also opening back side of the CG too for sites since bridge not there no more.
223. You stated earlier that until amenities were in place, fees would not be emplaced. A minute ago, you said fees could immediately be enacted at Cat Creek. Is there an expectation of other amenities there or no?
224. The proposed fees for Cat creek and Blue ohv are too high and not comparable to others.
225. How are the fees set?
226. Is there any consideration of a family fee or group fee for Cat Creek and Blue Lake for OHV? Why not a per-vehicle fee? As I said above, the fees are enormous for a family with multiple riders 16 and older. Does anyone here honestly think it's fair to charge \$400 for a family of 4 people's season passes under phase 2? Honestly, that's outrageous.
227. Also can canyon creek CG be restored again and outhouse put back into commission since the washout situation on 54 resolved? The outhouse is safety hazard in current condition and overflowing and was vandalized.
228. The maps I've seen were too low of resolution to understand what will become multi-use roads under phase 2. Where is the higher-resolution map so we can look at the table of proposed changes and mileage and see it?
229. My biggest question is, what are we going to be getting, maintenance and improvements wise for proposed rate hikes?
230. exactly. There will be far less resistance from the OHV community if there is actually a benefit described. Messaging really, REALLY matters here.
231. How will ohv areas be improved with these proposed fees?
232. Is it a fee to park at JRO and hike to the blast zone, per person??
233. How will all the comments be taken into consideration? Who reads them or how ar they used?

234. If I have a lifetime America The Beautiful pass, do I still need a Northwest Forest Pass. Do I still get my senior discount on fee based sites?
235. What a croc they keep talking about these fees at trailheads and right on the main FS website it specifically states you can not charge day use fees unless certain services are provided.
236. You don't need a NW Forest Pass if you have America The Beautiful Pass
237. Will these fees go towards actual improvement or the policing of areas for more fees?
238. Why don't you guys read out the 9th district court ruling on most of these fees which most of that your are proposing are illegal
239. The question is whether the fees from Cat Creek OHV will get used for work elsewhere in the forest. I have seen all kinds of shady dealings from the WA DNR mis-allocating funds, so that is the concern. I want to see fees levied on OHV users to go to OHV areas
240. Define "guard station"
241. How and and what time frame?
242. Any chance of making Red Mountain Lookout a rental to stay on future for us Southern GPNF folks by Goose Lake?
243. Thanks. I've said it elsewhere, but you are less likely to run into virtual torches and pitchforks if you can actually communicate how these proposed fees would actually improve the experience. THus far, I am only seeing vague answers that there will be improvements. That doesn't sell it very well.
244. Do you have charts/tables etc showing how climbing fees at Helens and Adams are spent? What justifies the propose increase? Why is a fee "necessary" for Mt Margaret backcountry? What is the public receiving at that location that they do not receive at other backcountry camping locations?
245. Stop the sale of mushrooms and berries on federal land unless you buy a seller permit
246. Are there any changes proposed for Green River Horse Camp? I looked at 2019 Rec. site scope of work but didn't find it there, nor in the Fee proposal. Just curious as it is a very useful hub for volunteer event staging.
247. Regarding the Cat Creek/Blue Lake area, if the fee isn't a parking fee but a trail use fee then why aren't plated bikes charged for trail use?
248. Is dispersed recreation really considered special recreation? That seems like a real stretch of the English language.
249. Seeing the chat I'm unclear whether the fees are per vehicle (parking permit) or per user? If per user, how would this be enforced/administered?
250. Are the user fees in addition to the NW Forest Pass or other America Beautiful-type passes?
251. Additional
252. Where in the FLREA does it name the uses that you state under special permit? As you stated, please follow up with the specific FLREA wording or any other administrative rule you refer to. Doesn't the fee at the Helens and Admas Trailhead already cover the toilet and amenities there? Why the double charge?
253. Who is on the Secure Rural Schools RAC? This is supposed to be publicly available information. These people are supposed to represent the public's interest. Why is it so difficult to find any information about this committee?
254. How much is it going to cost for the infrastructure and enforcement to collect the fees?

255. Per ohv? That's ridiculous
256. Why would you look to complicate things when it seems difficult for you to do basic things?
257. What's the proposed fee? How much?
258. When will the SRS RAC meet? Is this meeting public? Please provide the information to the public.
259. why aren't plated bikes charged for trail use?
260. Charging ohv users at cat creek that much is way way overboard.
261. Theft at its finest. What an absolute joke.
262. So even though we have ohv tags we are still going to be charged? If we decide to ride at cat creek/blue lake?
263. We honestly aren't going to see any value. We're seeing overreach and increases. We are not confident that the money will be used correctly.
264. *handwaving* "maybe new trails"
265. You are going to have a very difficult time convincing families that you are providing enough improvements and amenities to the OHV areas to justify fees that are levied per person (per OHV since they are really all single-user). What are the projected OHV improvements?
266. Fees are pay to play
267. Every booking through recreation.gov makes money for the federal contractor who runs it, Booz Allen Hamilton. Privatizing profits from the public's access to public lands. That will always be deplorable and unacceptable to me.
268. Are the other forests in the state also proposing passes in addition to the NW Forest Pass ... and are you coordinating with them?
269. When will we see new trails being made?
270. When you mention usable do you mean to actually use the bathroom or for people to shoot up?
271. Exactly. We are not hearing answers on the most important questions that will make or break this proposal. "What is in it for me?"
272. It would be interesting to have recreation groups meet annually to learn about the amount of fee money generated and help shape priorities in a similar way to how Forest Collaboratives have public representatives provide guidance on the use of retained receipts from stewardship projects.
273. How often will just get audited?
274. Please provide the member list. Why are timber or mineral interests having any input at all on fees for recreation?
275. Please let me know where I can get a copy all receipts and expenditures per year for the GPNF, inclusive of logging, recreation, etc.
276. With these fees imposed on ohv people I feel we are being treated unfairly. We already pay for park passes, registration, and ohv tabs. Now we have to pay this also. I feel it's only going to alienate ohv users and allow for restrictions and future fees to be forced.
277. I'll tell you right now, you'll lose money from families on the proposed OHV fees. One of two things will happen when we're faced with annual fees in the hundreds of dollars. 1. We'll go elsewhere. 2. We'll simply take our chances with non-compliance. How much are you planning to

spend on enforcement? The revenue from parking tickets isn't going to GPNF, it goes to national I like to think I'm a pretty responsible user and I give back, but I won't pay that much.

278. Why don't you use a Recreation Resource Advisory Committee for recreational improvements? My head is gonna explode that timber interests can even let out a fart of an opinion about fees for lookout towers and hiking trailheads

www.fs.usda.gov/giffordpinchot | www.facebook.com/giffordpinchot | Twitter @gpnf

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.