

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 5/2/2024 7:01:55 PM

First name: Anon

Last name: Anon

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My primary question on these proposals is do these increase public accessibility to public land? Is there benefit enough to the public, and not just the for-profit groups to consider them? If they don't, there is no reason for the NFS to consider them. Full stop.

Additionally, there is a huge lack of detail in these proposals, specifically in terms of if these huts will be available for the general public, what percentage of nights will be unguided, what cost, etc? These are all important considerations. From the meeting, and direct communication with some of the parties involved, I've gotten more detail, but it's not publicly available. I'm primarily a skier, intimately familiar with all these areas except Anderson-Watson, and know some of the parties involved. It's a small community (thus the anonymous submission)

The snowmobile hut. I'm not a snowmobiler, but this club has a history of being great stewards and I believe this is day-use only and available for anyone, if that's the case then I think it meets the above. And it's pulled in and out and essentially on a summer road for location (low impact). This seems pretty darn reasonable to me.

The Sisters hut. From my understanding, this is a guided-only situation. No nights set aside for the public. This is already a pretty exclusive area due to the gated access behind Hampton Forest lands. This DOES NOT increase public accessibility to public lands, except only the affluent that can afford a guided overnight trip. This is not in the best interest of the public and our National Forest lands. Additionally, it's not in what is essentially summer parking lot, but in a pretty incredible and fragile ecosystem. This one is a non-starter for me. Honestly, instead of using NFS resources to consider these proposals a second time, the energy (in this case anyhow) would be much better spent working on an easement with Hampton Forests in some form.

Heliotrope - This is on low impact grounds, which is appealing. However I don't see any detail on how many nights will be available to the general public unguided, costs, etc. Depending on that detail, it *may* increase public accessibility to public lands. I'd love more info

Anderson - Watson - This is the one area I'm not familiar with and I'm not confident that my comment holds any weight. Again, I'd love to know the breakdown of nights for the unguided public, costs, etc.

In general, I applaud groups for trying to make some of this happen, but private huts on public lands are really hard to pull off making both the public owners of those public lands and the for-profit groups happy. The model used in Canada is much preferred.