

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/6/2024 8:35:57 PM

First name: Bill

Last name: Tremblay

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern;

I strongly disagree with changing the policies for managing temporary cabins on National Forest System lands. There are many reasons for this, including;

- Most of these cabins were not permitted or authorized before ANILCA was passed, which made them trespass cabins. To allow them a long-term, rather than a temporary status, could be considered at taking of National Forest System lands.
- Even cabins that were permitted under the Forest Service process for recreation residence, are subject to removal as needed in the best public interest. I don't see where you've identified a process to remove these cabins at any time in the future.
- As Section 1303 applies to both the National Forest System Lands and National Park Service Lands, where is the communication between agencies regarding how this decision would effect the management of their resources? (They were VERY concerned when the Forest Service considered allowing Helicopters in Wilderness and even provided comments.)
- The implementation of the current policy has already successfully been used for the removal of other cabins; would those cabin owners be allowed to replace their cabins or request restitution?
- The Wilderness Act says these areas shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as will leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness, and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness. Continuing to allow these cabins within Congressionally Designated Wilderness Areas, would be unlawful as the Forest Service would not leave these areas unimpaired for future use.
- If the policy is changed, what is the timeline for the Environmental Impact Statement to consider whether or not these cabins meet the current purpose or need for the management of the areas where they now reside? A recreation residence can be removed (and have been removed) by a decision in a Forest Plan. Are you proposing an amendment to the current Forest Plan?
- The justification of allowing these cabins for customary and traditional uses doesn't hold water. People can still participate in all of the activities for uses on National Forest System lands where they "legally" could in the past. Most of the cabins identified as "isolated cabins" were built in TRESSPASS and not a legal use of National Forest System lands before ANILCA was signed?

In summary, I know there are political pressures to change this policy to accommodate the few who think they've "earned" the right to continue uses their families enjoyed. However, it comes down to this, when does someone's past illegal act become a privileges to others on lands that are owned by all of the American people. As previously noted, these people were not invited to build cabins like many were when the Forest Service created tracks for Recreation Residences. These building were built illegally without consultation and the owners have signed permits knowing these cabins WILL eventually be removed.