

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/26/2024 4:35:54 PM

First name: Jeni

Last name: Chan

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear US Forest Service,

I am a recreational backcountry skier who has respectfully and gratefully explored the North Cascades by foot and ski for the past 7 years. Although I am new to the scene, I am familiar with the history and terrain. In my days of exploring, I have encountered all types of adventurers, from those who value progress in outdoor exploration through technology (ie drones, Strava), to those who value self-sufficiency and the lessons learned from "getting lost". Regardless of these disparate opinions, I believe most agree on one thing: this wilderness is sacred because it is wild.

The proposal to install "temporary" huts and shelters at very public and popular trailheads is a poor choice. We know that all human activity and traffic is not "temporary" and can have lasting effects on both wilderness and society. I stand by the following arguments:

1) The installation of temporary shelters will introduce a broader range of impacts not previously seen in these areas that will affect the health of the environment. Programs that will take place at these shelters will introduce more human waste, trash, snowmobile engine oil, and sound pollution. This will introduce pollutants to our watershed and affect wildlife. In previous cases where private companies are trusted to remove waste with little oversight, waste has inevitably been left in the environment for wildlife to interact with. The current status of some of these trailheads already carry evidence of trash and waste from humans and their pets; an introduction to seasonal temporary structures, which encourage longer stays, will only increase the amount of trash available to be left behind. Plastic wrappers, human waste, and petrol byproducts are examples of what can be left behind that will impact our environment. I have seen time and time again as a backcountry ranger guides who do not teach their clients proper Leave-No-Trace etiquette, giving their clients only the bragging rights of travelling without much knowledge or courage.

2) The installation of temporary shelters will increase traffic that does not benefit the general public, affecting public access. The private guiding services may move towards employing snowmobiles to transport goods for their clients thereby affecting the ethics of backcountry wilderness travel and increasing travel by those who are by foot or ski. This is due to snowmobile ruts on roads, snowmobiles travelling at high speeds past skiers, motor oil left on the snow, and reduction in parking spaces that will be dedicated to trucks and their snowmobile trailers.

3) The installation of temporary shelters will affect the constitution behind Gifford Pinchot's movement to conserve land to allow "the greatest good for the greatest number of people for the longest time". We agree, this is not the same as Muir's preservationist theories saved for national parks. However, the heart of the Forest Service focuses on preserving land that will benefit the greater good and general public. A delicate balance is kept between logging companies, mining companies, and recreationalists. However, these users are not reaping from the land for a small percentage of users. Loggers are not logging to build Elon Musk's private bridge. Private guiding companies are NOT serving the general public, despite their proposal that the shelter's are available to the general public "during the day". (Most shelters are needed when available light is unavailable aka the night time). Private companies are serving those who can afford private guiding services, a cost that only a small percentage of backcountry travelers can afford. Private guiding companies are using the free gifts of wilderness to benefit only the wealthy and for their private companies.

The argument that this increases job opportunities, and the local economy is moot. The initial cost to break into the guiding world is so high that only those with inherited wealth or fortunate circumstances can afford to pursue certification towards employment. The guiding world is privileged and homogenous, and only serves the

privileged and homogenous. For the government to comply to construction on tax-payer land by private companies fed by the privileged is unconstitutional.

If this proposal passes through the first stage of comments, my first proposal is that these shelters are offered FOR FREE for the public to reserve, while their clients will have to pay for services and accommodations. The taxpayer pays for the land these shelters sit on- they are thereby intruding on the tax-payer's land and all structures emplaced are thereby tax-payer structures. However, the services do not stay on the land, so tax-payers will not benefit from them.

Thank you for reading my comment and I am hopeful that the right decision will be made for the greater good.