

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 1/30/2024 9:32:50 PM

First name: Arne

Last name: Johanson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Generally, I am in favor of outfitting and outfitters. At the same time, I do not like the negative consequences they cause. Erosion, weeds and human effluents are my major concerns. All can be mitigated by the outfitters without imposing major work on limited forest staff.

Put in the contracts that all areas must be kept or restored to a pristine state. That is, non-native weeds must be removed. Trails must be maintained to limit erosion and their visual impact. Toilet facilities must be maintained by the outfitter to limit human and animal effluents impacting the forest and waters.

Incremental maintenance can be done by outfitter and clients to bring back areas to pristine state over a period of years. Failure to accomplish these goals should then disqualify the outfitter and any associates from any further contracts.

Any degraded area should be pulled from any future outfitting considerations without a plan for restoring the area.

Bonds should be required to ensure compliance.

Compliance with regulations can be assessed by outside groups like the Nature Conservancy under contract.

Standards can include: water quality testing, percent cover by non-native plants in most used areas, non-native plant occurrence more broadly, condition of trails and any other visual disturbances to area.