

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/21/2023 2:52:41 PM

First name: Annika

Last name: Heumann

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I certainly understand the desire to try and reduce traffic in the Blue Lakes area in order to reduce the environmental impact being had, but the permit system seems overly restrictive. I'm concerned that the Forest Service may be jumping to the strictest solution before trying other solutions that would benefit/protect the area while still allowing lots of people to enjoy it. For example, why not put a pit toilet up at lower Blue Lakes first, rather than this being Phase 3 of the possible Management Actions? Additionally, why not better sign and define the trail(s) at the lakes and close social trails first and see if that alone helps restore habitat? It seems extreme to jump straight to a permit system without implementing other actions first.

Limiting access to Blue Lakes in this way will likely be to the detriment of other areas (ex. Ice Lake, Columbine Lake, Hope Lake, etc). It's easy enough to predict the articles that will pop up - "Don't have a permit for Blue Lakes? Consider these other options in the area". So, again, why not try other options first before severely limiting access and potentially driving high traffic to other areas (and, in turn, having these issues crop up elsewhere)?

Another thing to consider. Right now, the hike to Lower Blue Lakes is only ~6 miles, which is very approachable. Why not move the trailhead back 2 miles to make this a 10 mile hike (or more). This would cut down on traffic since many people may not want to hike this distance.