Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/6/2022 4:22:16 PM First name: Carol Last name: Beckman Organization: Title: Comments: Thank you for addressing the environmental issues in the Blue Lakes area. Dividing areas by degree of impact seems like a good idea.

## A few thoughts:

Motorized vehicles should be restricted to roads and trails on the MVUM. Enforcement is needed.

A ban on open fires is a good idea. Even when not in drought conditions, a backcountry fire ban makes sense.

A ban on dogs makes sense, unless enforcement of having dogs on-leash works. Allowing dogs "under direct verbal control" does not work -- everyone says their off-leash dog is under control. Few off-leash dogs we've encountered are actually under control.

Overnight permits should be for a particular designated site, not just, say, 4 permits for 4 sites. It would be better for people with an overnight permit to know which site to go to rather than to have to check each site to find an open site.

Number of permits available should be adjusted up, after experience with the system, to account for the no-show rates. Having a limit on number of permits per person is good, but someone could still take 4 permits with the intent of using only one, based on weather forecast or other factors. Adjusting for the no-show rate is difficult for overnight permits, but quite feasible for day-use permits. Trying to reduce no-shows by making the reservation fee high just gives preference to users that don't mind the cost.

It's not clear from what I read whether the permits will have fees. Clarifying which will have fees and which will be free would be good, and what the fees would be. Including specifics on initial fees and how those might change would be good.

Any fees should go back into the area that generated them, for enforcement, maintenance, improvements, etc. "free" permits should be really free, with no vendor fee. (A recent reservation system announced "free" reservations with a \$2 fee.)

If most permits are taken quickly, it would be good to include going to a lottery system, like some other areas use, as a possible adjustment based on experience.

The permit system (and lottery system if that's a possibility) should be fair and open to everyone. It should not be designed, intentionally or unintentionally, to prefer people near the area.

The number of violations in a year that would trigger a ban on overnight use seems much too low. Enforcement and ticketing of individual violators would be a better approach, rather than banning everyone who is following the rules.

Finally, all restrictions, permits, fees, etc., should apply to everyone. There should be no preferential system for residents of the area. This is federal land. It belongs to everyone. Local people should have to make reservations, pay fees, etc., just like everyone else.

Thanks.