

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/29/2024 11:57:21 PM

First name: Margot

Last name: Tsakonas

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am pleased to see the agency taking a holistic approach to managing our public lands. This analysis of the Carbon River area is timely (if not overdue) as demands on the landscape continue to grow and organizational resources continue to be very thin.

My first comment is that for better management and for better public engagement, it seems necessary to establish some sort of logical dependencies (not necessarily with timing) for the proposed actions. There are some proposed actions that seem to be logically connected (for example, only improving the recreation facilities at Summit and Coplay lakes if the longevity of the 7810 bridge can be secured)-- while others seem to be logically independent-- for example, issuing a camping ban along the riverfront or remediating some damage at Evans Creek. It was not clear until I asked that the commercial thinning was necessary to fund the work at Evans Creek-- in the document, they seem somewhat independent.

Doing some of the habitat restoration/watershed restoration/beaver habitat/AOP etc / selective thinning on the north side seems to be independent of other parts of the project as well and should be prioritized.

These possibly independent actions should take place as soon as possible to help remediate damage, reduce fire risk, and improve habitat. Banning dispersed camping along the river would also remove a nuisance for private property owners who have to deal with the trash and bad behaviors, and would also remove a blight from the entrance to the national park. (assuming enforcement, and assuming the problem does not get re-located to private lands).

Improvements to recreational facilities seem secondary in both logic and priority.

My second comment is that the proposed action to relocate a portion of the FS 78 road (that is just west of the national park ) seems to be driving alot of the plan and yet there is not alot of information about the risks. I believe it says that hydrology forecasts show an "increased probability of a 25-year flood". Having been familiar with this area for decades, I have no doubt that the risk is increasing, and no doubt that the road/bridge abutment will be compromised. (again). But additional information about the risk and severity would be most welcome. Along those lines, if the proposal is to relocate the road south of private land owned by The Mountaineers, there should be something in the scoping regarding reconstruction of what is sure to be either damage to that property or temporary access restrictions. And, if that type of construction were to proceed, part of the scope needs to include a means of entry into the national park-- or at least an analysis of temporary entry routes.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment