Two of several y reasons for Opposing Current fee plan

Certainly the underlying problem is that budget appropriations for purposes of protecting wilderness are insufficient However, the proposed fees are not the solution. Here are just two of many reasons why this is the case:

.1**.If an object of the Plan is to limit impact on wilderness, then it does not make sense to exempt hunters. In** fact, their environmental impact tends to be the greatest, especially in terms of damage to the terrain by pack animals, the propensity of hunters to build (and abandon) large fire rings, and the amount of garbage many of them leave behind as game replaces cans and bottles they hauled in. Other ebris I've seen left by hunters includes lengths of rope hanging from racks they'd constructed and left, Feed bags for stock, and- in the case of those using firearms- spent shell casings.

The argument that hunters should be exempted because they pay license fees doesn't make sense either because none of their license fees benefit wilderness.

2. User fees make a certain amount of sense in some circumstances, but the fact is that **fees discourage use by those least affluent, limiting access to wilderness that supposedly belongs to all of us.** While the currently proposed fees are not exorbitant, we all know that they will increase once instituted, just as have Forest Service campground fees since those public properties were turned over to private concessionaire, most of whom soon doubled the price.

Thank you for this opportunity comment. I attemptedto do so earlier. The address printed in our local newspaper for submitting comments was incorrect. Thus my earlier submission- together with many others- ended up in the dead letter pile.

Suzanne Pepin
69425 Deer Ridge Road
Sisters, OR 97759
541-588-6070