

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 3/3/2023 12:35:24 AM

First name: Carol

Last name: Beckman

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thanks for your work trying to manage impacts while still providing camping opportunities.

I really appreciate the need and objective to maximize VBDC opportunities while minimizing impacts to forest resources.

A few comments:

Install more toilet facilities, not just at campgrounds but also at trailheads. Toilet facilities could be a pit toilet, port-a-potties, whatever works best for a location. People at dispersed campsites could use facilities at trailheads, and day-use users would also use them, which also would reduce human waste in the environment. Reducing human waste, whether it is from campers or day-use people, reduces total waste in the environment.

For each area, it's important to end up with more campsites, whether those campsites are in developed campgrounds or dispersed sites. If sites used for dispersed camping are closed, at least as many campsites should be added in new or existing campgrounds.

Constructing more developed campgrounds and more primitive campgrounds are both good. Concentrating human activity like that should help plants and wildlife, and reduce problems with human waste, with toilet facilities. Even primitive campgrounds should have toilet facilities and fire rings, which help address 2 existing problems.

It is o.k. for dispersed campsites to be as close together as campsites in a developed campground. People do not need more space from other people in a campsite along a road compared to a campsite in a campground.

Camping at trailheads should be allowed. The trailhead is already a disturbed site, and a site with human activity, so allowing camping there reduces human impact. Camping at a trailhead does not disturb people who are just hiking from there, so does not impact day users. The people impacted are the people who choose to camp at a trailhead, with the additional noise and activity there, and those chose it.

A question that seems to often arise is whether sleeping in cars is o.k. Most people think that having a car parked there empty or with someone sleeping inside has the same impact, so if parking is o.k., sleeping should be o.k. This makes sense, other than the issue of toilet facilities. An empty car does not generate waste, while someone sleeping there overnight likely will. So allowing sleeping in cars at trailheads with toilet facilities solves that problem. Every popular trailhead should have toilet facilities anyway. Also, someone sleeping in car has less impact than someone hiking in 1000 feet (say) and camping, which will disturb plants, wildlife, and will likely put human waste into the environment. Sleeping in cars at trailheads, at least at trailheads with toilet facilities, should be allowed.

A problem I have seen in another area with designated dispersed campsites is sign vandalism. I've seen a site that looked like it must be an approved campsite, but with no sign, so it looked like someone had just broken off or removed the brown carsonite sign for that site. If someone removes a sign from a designated site, other people looking for a legal site won't know it is available.

Accommodating the demand for camping is important. Reducing available sites will push people into other areas, creating or increasing impacts in those areas. Increasing the total number of available sites is needed -- maximize camping opportunities, but control the impacts.

Thanks.