Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/26/2018 8:03:55 PM First name: Michael Last name: Hendricks Organization: Title: Comments: Greetings,

I was born in Alaska and have spent most of my adult life living in this great state. Having many fond memories of spending time with my father and uncles enjoying the Chugach range and later spending time with my own son there I find this revision unacceptable. Alaska already has more protected land than any other state or region in the united states. Limiting access for hunting and fishing, both of which my family does to put food on our table not only affects our recreational opportunities but our ability to provide for our families.

Furthermore, I find it ridiculous that the majority of those that are in favor of this revision are not even living within the state, who are they to tell us how we are to manage our land. We as Alaskans pride ourselves on not being like the rest of the lower 48 so why would we allow those that have no idea what it means to be an Alaskan to have any say in how we live.

In fact, I feel that our access is already limited to the point that unless you are very well equipped a person cannot access the beautiful back country that Alaska has to offer. Proper management of the lands does not mean shutting off access to people as to preserve it, if there is no access what are we preserving? I guess you can fly over it and say ooo and ahhh... Perhaps allowing access and managing good and thoughtful use of the land is more appropriate, this can be accomplished.

The argument can be made that the noise levels and carbon imprint of snow machines and other vehicles is damaging these resources but that can be said of any location and of any mode of transportation. I would like to point out that modern snow machines are quieter and more fuel efficient than ever before. Capable of traversing terrain that past machines could not and doing so with ease. Previous machines would dig and plow through the snow where modern machines are capable of floating across the snow with ease. This is done through advancement and understanding of what is needed, something I feel is lacking with this revision. Alternatives C and D are not the solution to land management, proper land use and education of the users is the solution.

This is not a recreational use only issue either, this is a limitation to access for all. Many trails are used to provide emergency services, this includes firefighting operation. It was not too long ago it seemed the entire state was on fire, access was made through these trails we use. The efforts made were incredible to fight these wildfires, imagine if they had to create their own trails to gain access.

There have been no solutions provided to our lands regarding access and preserving it, only restricting access to the land. Just close it off, shut it down. How does this provide a solution? The continuing loss of tourism income due to regulation set in place has greatly hurt our state and this revision will kill off much of winter income. This is not a step in the right way for Alaska's economy. Limiting access will further drive residents from the state and that will additionally hurt our economy. But perhaps through appropriate use and implementing fees to maintain our trails and land we can start to earn money again. Money that can be used to provide education and maintenance of our land for all to enjoy.

How much land must be set aside to suffice everyone's needs to preserve? As stated before Alaska has preserved land in excess of the size of some states. That is incredible, but it's enough. Preserving all of Alaska will not fix the damage done by other states that cut down every tree in their path to build a mini mall. Alaskans have preserved their land better than any other state and maintained its beauty. But even with that we are facing more restrictions? This cannot stand and will be fought by every true Alaskan. There is no need for further regulation, it is time for education, something many of the supporters of this revision need.