

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee						
<i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
1	A. Bonvouloir	Sunnyvale, CA		x		"This proposal is an outrage. Making access to our Wilderness treasures an "elitist" experience available only to those who can afford to pay is offensive and counterproductive. Who gets the money?"
2	A. Pershnokov	Not provided		x		
3	Abi Queen	Petrolatum, CA		x		
4	Abi Queen <i>(Petition)</i>	Petrolatum, CA		x		Petition signed by 21 people at the Petrolia Store from Oct 15-18 requesting a "local resident" exception to the fee/permit requirement.
5	Adi Fairbank	Portland, OR		x		"I don't buy the argument that charging for access will keep out people who may not care for the wilderness as they should. People who would damage the wilderness wouldn't pay any fee anyway. All charging will do is change the public's relationship with their own land, making them feel they are not welcome and deterring them from enjoying it. This is the public's land, and everyone should have access to it."
6	Adrian Cerda	Not provided	x			"I am happy to pay for the backcountry and wilderness fee and increase for developed campgrounds proposed."
7	"A.J." <i>[Same comment submitted twice]</i>	Not provided		x		"The proposed fee would violate the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act, including protecting Wildernesses from commercialization and commodification."
8	Alan Fox	Fortune, CA	x			"I would like to see the King Range properly funded so that it can be kept as a safe place for people to hike and seek some 'alone-time'. I particularly don't want to be hiking along a nice trail and have to worry about being shot or attacked because of inadvertently wandering into an area where farming that supports illegal drug trade is occurring. I also don't want criminals fleeing the law coming to the King Range to hide for awhile. That's just plain dangerous for the rest of us 99.9% who use or would use the area if it were safer. I am a resident of Fortuna and Humboldt County, and support your proposed business plan."
9	Albert Wiebe	Not provided		x		
10	Al Hansen	Not provided		x		"The proposed BLM access fee for the King Range Wilderness's "business plan" is not only in violation of the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA) concerning undeveloped sites, but also violates the right of citizens to have access, not to mention it commercializes the BLM in collecting monies for access -- and that violates the Wilderness Act and a 2012 ruling by the US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals concerning the Mount Lemmon area in the Coronado National Forest. It makes one wonder. Yes, everyone's short of money, but some things deserve priority."
11	Ali Freedlund	Arcata, CA		x		
12	Amy Curry	River Vale, NJ		x		
13	Amy Gustin	Redway, CA		x		"I oppose the proposed fee hike in the King Range Conservation Area. To charge \$5 a night for wilderness camping and \$15 a night for your campgrounds, which are very primitive, is way out of line. Camping is supposed to be an inexpensive activity, and it used to be free on many public lands. Your fee hike would make it less accessible for working people. It would be discriminatory, which is wrong on public lands."
14	Andy Couturier	Santa Cruz, CA		x		"I want to comment that the King Range is NOT a business, and creating a price barrier to entry is not only ethically wrong from a class standpoint—it just makes people more angry and unhappy with the government—but it's bad economically for the BLM. How do tiny increases in fees ever pay for the cops to patrol and enforce them? Those cops need training, uniforms trucks, repairs on the trucks, firearms, insurance on those firearms, health insurance, pensions, etc. The BLM and the forest service lands are one of the few places left where American citizens, whose land it is already can go without having to rent their time there. Can't you just let people be in the forest?"
15	Andy Eatchel	Salt Lake City, UT		x		"I AM OPPOSED TO ANY ACCESS FEE for the King Range Wilderness. The proposed fees will allow access to the non-developed land at issue only by those who can pay the significant amount of money that will be required as per the proposal. This is not only unfair but also the FLREA does not permit such fees for access to designated Wilderness for noncommercial recreation. Such fees are a step toward privatization of OUR (i. e., public) lands. I wish to maintain my ability to access ALL Wilderness areas belonging to US, citizens of the United States of America."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
16	Ann & Paul Hill	Stanley, ID		x	"Once again we are baffled by some of the positions our Land, Forest, and Water managers are taking. Several efforts have occurred to charge fees to enter national forests, fees to park at trailheads, etc., and now fees to enter Wilderness areas. Is the motivation money? Are you planning to begin some activity in this Wilderness? Wilderness is a very special designation which has intrinsic components. Lack of roadways, lack of maintained facilities, lack of signs of encroaching civilization. These components are priceless, and once you begin charging fees for entry, you automatically defy the very attributes which make these areas so special. They are WILD! They are WILDERNESS! Please rethink this effort, which, in addition to all else, is against the law, and will result in litigation which could cost more than you might possibly bring in with fees. We are privileged to back up to the largest Wilderness in the lower 48 states, The Frank Church River of No Return Wilderness, and are committed to keeping it Wilderness, as we are with all others sharing the same designation. Please respect these very special places."
17	Anne Dal Vera	Not provided		x	
18	Anne Young	Not provided		x	
19	Carole Polasek Redwood Unit, Backcountry Horsemen of California President and Public Lands Chair	Not provided		x	"Redwood Unit, Backcountry Horsemen of California are writing in opposition to the new overnight use fee and the proposed backcountry and wilderness fee for the King Range National Conservation Area (NCA). We also oppose the increase in the fees at the Mattole, Honeydew Creek, Horse Mountain, Tolkan, Nadelos and Wailaki campgrounds from \$8 to \$15 per night."
20	Barbara Aronowitz	Not provided		x	
21	Barbara Baird	Not provided		x	"I oppose the wilderness access fee for the King Range National Conservation area in northern California. This fee would violate the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act which prohibits fees for parking, hiking, and camping in undeveloped federal sites. This fee also violates the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act. The KRNCA must be protected from commercialization."
22	Barbara Bond	Not provided		x	"I am opposed to any fees for hiking and backpacking access to wilderness areas. My two children, my husband and I backpacked in wilderness areas every summer that we were able to get to the West in particular. That experience was invaluable and should obviously be the REASON for having wilderness. No private company managed our trips, we did our own thing and without any damage or danger to the wilderness or to us. As a 77-year-old, I am weary of the government taking advantage of those people wishing to use that which belongs to all of us. And, by the way, get the private profit makers out of the business of running campgrounds in national parks. If electricity, showers, etc. are needed, let those private companies provide them on their property, not the nation's property. Grumpily yours,..."
23	Barbara Jacobsen on email ID but signed by Chris Monroe	Not provided		x	"The proposal by a federal bureaucratic entity, the BLM, to impose fees upon taxpaying Americans, and not an act of Congress, is to me an atrocity. What makes you think that you have the authority to do this? We taxpayers pay for the upkeep of this wilderness. We also pay your salaries to manage the King's Range in a way beneficial to the American people, which to me does not include user fees. Your allocated budget is more than enough to cover that as well as other wilderness areas in America."
24	Barbara Tonsberg	Not provided		x	"I oppose the wilderness access fee for the following reasons: 1. The proposed fee would violate the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA), which prohibits fees for parking at, hiking through, or camping in undeveloped federal sites such as Wildernesses. 2. The US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in a 2012 case involving the Mount Lemmon area on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona against the imposition of such fees for undeveloped areas. 3. The proposed fee would violate the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act, including protecting Wildernesses from commercialization and commodification. Please reconsider your decision, especially in light of item #3 above."
25	Barry Zuckerman	Not provided		x	
26	Benton Elliott	Not provided		x	No fees for access to the King Range Wilderness, or for access to any other public lands. This is our land, not your land.

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee					
<i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
27	Betsey Pollick	Not provided		x	The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has proposed a new wilderness access fee for the King Range Wilderness. Part of the King Range National Conservation Area, the 42,694-acre King Range Wilderness lies along the Pacific Coast in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties of northern California. In its "business plan" for the King Range Wilderness BLM wants to institute a first of its kind \$5/person/day fee to visit the area. I am opposed to this because: 1. The proposed fee would violate the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA), which prohibits fees for parking at, hiking through, or camping in undeveloped federal sites such as Wildernesses. 2. The US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in a 2012 case involving the Mount Lemmon area on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona against the imposition of such fees for undeveloped areas. 3. The proposed fee would violate the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act, including protecting Wildernesses from commercialization and commodification."
28	Betty Winholtz	Not provided		x	
29	Bill Evans	Roosevelt, AZ		x	"Please be advised of my EXTREME OBJECTION to subject action!!! Charging the public for use of public lands, especially where private concessionaires are placed in charge of setting and collecting said fees, is so WRONG!!! Do not allow this SAD ACTION to continue in our GREAT NATION!!!"
30	Bill Lydgate	Arcata, CA		x	"If over a third of the users are sometimes out of compliance with the free and non restrictive permits, then what might be the compliance rate for permits that suddenly cost money, restrict users and contribute towards one's annual limit? I anticipate that the mighty sting from a ranger's ticket book is going to be felt by an otherwise law abiding portion of the current user group. Surfers are going to find themselves shut out of the Lost Coast by heavy handed regulations aimed at maintaining solitude during peak use in the high summer season."
31	Bill Lydgate (2 Petitions – Note: Petitions were not included in FOIA response)	Arcata, CA		x	Email describing two petitions submitted by surfers against the proposal, with a total of 64 signatures, which he was planning to deliver to the Arcata FO. "While collecting signatures, I had the opportunity to talk with locals about their perspective on the Lost Coast, wilderness ethics and natural resource management philosophy. Very few of the people I interacted with were supportive of added rules, regulations, enforcement and fees proposed by the Business Plan, even though they were supportive of protecting public land from over use."
32	Bo Baggs	Port Arthur, TX		x	"I fully support you in raising fees/etc. to fund your necessary support in DEVELOPED areas. I DO NOT SUPPORT you instituting fees in undeveloped (Wilderness) areas. Please review the FLREA, the recent ruling on the Coronado Forest (2012), and abandon the idea of instituting such fees in the King Range Wilderness and in other wilderness – designated areas."
33	Brad Brown	Not provided		x	
34	Bradley Houseworth	Not provided		x	"I oppose the new wilderness access fee for the King Range Wilderness for the following reasons: 1. The proposed fee would violate the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act (FLREA), which prohibits fees for parking at, hiking through, or camping in undeveloped federal sites such as Wildernesses. 2. The US 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in a 2012 case involving the Mount Lemmon area on the Coronado National Forest in Arizona against the imposition of such fees for undeveloped areas. 3. The proposed fee would violate the intent and spirit of the Wilderness Act, including protecting Wildernesses from commercialization and commodification."
35	Brandon Ove	Southern Humboldt County		x	"Hello, my name is Brandon Ove and am a proud resident of Southern Humboldt County. I moved to this area primarily due to my interest in how area residents prefer to live remotely and avoid what has become of our contemporary society and the never-ending raises in fees and fines for EVERYTHING that comes with our culture. I enjoy long trips, over-night, single or multi-day, into the wilderness (King Range) because it is a temporary escape from the concept of money, taxes, fees and fines. Very seldom do I even bring a single penny with me because money is useless in the forest. I guess the point of my rant is I am vehemently AGAINST a new fee. Raising the fees for already existing, maintained campsites is unfavorable but understandable due to the rising costs of everything. A new fee for overnight camping will completely eliminate the amazing feeling of escape I get by venturing into the wilderness, therefore if a fee is imposed, I will refuse to pay it. Period. I will refuse to pay the fine for not paying the fee. Hit me with a stick or take my drivers license or whatever, I do not support this proposed fee and will not participate should it be imposed. Just out of curiosity, What is your proposed penalty for violators? There will be many. Then an innocent member of OUR community is penalized for what? Journeying in to the forest without paying? I understand you need money. So do we. A majority of the population that uses this park a just like me: broke as a joke, looking for something to do that does not involve money. I vote NO."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee					
[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments (Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)
36	Brandt Mannchen	Houston, TX		x	"I am opposed to the so-called "business plan" for the King Range Wilderness Area that proposes a \$5/person/day fee to visit the wilderness. I own this wilderness. I should not have to pay a fee to visit the King Range Wilderness Area especially since I will visit it in a low impact, compatible, fashion. The U.S. Congress agrees with me since the Federal Land Recreation Enhancement Act prohibits fees for parking at, hiking through, or camping in undeveloped federal sites including wilderness. The U.S. court system also agrees with me since the U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled in 2012 that a similar proposal by the U.S. Forest Service in the Coronado National Forest at Mount Lemmon in Arizona could not be implemented. The Wilderness Act prohibits the commercialization and commodification of wildernesses. This "business plan" would harm the King Range Wilderness Area and its wilderness condition by simply turning it into a money-making proposition. Just say no to a fee."
37	Brian Johnson	Petaluma, CA		x	"Camping is one of the last, inexpensive forms of recreation available to the public. BLM is funded by federal tax dollars. There is plenty of money available there, unlike CA state parks (or at least that is what the public was told). I'd suggest BLM apply for some of that "stimulus" cash, rather than raising fees on low income Americans."
38	Brian O'Hay	Not provided	x		"I don't mind the fee but the lost coast is a very rugged area and can handle a high volume of people. No limits on persons using camp area per day. When the surf is good we don't want a gun toting leo coming up to us in our wetsuit asking for a permit. Have an intern giving responsible camping info and help folks be low impact, that would be fine."
39	Brock Bluntzer	Not provided		x	
40	Bruce Grubbs	Not provided		x	"I strongly oppose the proposed fee for the King Range Wilderness. The Bureau of Land Management has the authority to charge fees under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, but not for access to wilderness areas. The proposed fees would break the law as clearly defined by FLREA, which allows fees to be charged only for specific recreation sites meeting specified criteria. If the BLM's purpose is to limit visitation and impacts to the wilderness, it certainly has the authority to do so my limiting the number of permits and the size of parties. However, using a fee for this purpose is not only illegal but undemocratic."
41	Cal Lash	Not provided		x	
42	Carmen Sanchez Sadal PhD	Los Angeles, CA		x	
43	Carol Collins	Dover, DE		x	
44	Carol Jagiello	Not provided		x	"Tell the ARC to take a hike! For Free- It is illegal to charge use fees for wilderness- why does everything these days have to have a business plan? Enough."
45	Carol Putnam	Not provided		x	"Wilderness areas belong to all of the American people. They are an irreplaceable birthright to all our citizens, open to all the public and not just those wealthy enough to pay additional fees. All citizens across the nation already own the Wildernesses in the NWPS and have paid for them with their taxes. It is simply unjust to charge people to visit the Wilderness they already own and just to park a car, hike, and camp at an undeveloped spot in the King Range Wilderness. User fees for accessing an undeveloped Wilderness strike at the heart of the ideals of freedom and anti-commercialism found in the 1964 Wilderness Act. These access fees for undeveloped designated Wilderness areas also discriminate against the lower strata of socio-economic groups in our society and is distinctly anti-democratic, a regressive double taxation, and ethically wrong."
46	Darrel & Carole Polasek	Ferndale, CA		x	"We are definitely opposed to any fees for access to public lands, including the King Range National Conservation Area (NCA). We have travelled this area for approximately 40 years, beginning way before it became a wilderness area. There are no amenities to charge the public for using this land. The parking lot is inadequate for anyone wishing to pack in using horses and mules. There is not enough room to park a truck and horse trailer, let alone turn around and leave. Adding fees to access this public land would inhibit those on limited incomes and make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to go here. We see no reason to add fees, or to implement a higher fee at the campgrounds included in the proposal."
47	Caroline Kipling	Not provided		x	
48	Caroline Salcido	Not provided		x	"My main concern is that fees are a barrier to access for low income children. When these kids grow up, they will be less appreciative of the environment."
49	Carolyn Knoll	Kailua, HI		x	
50	Caryn Cowin				

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
51	Cassie Barr, Chair, Sierra Club Wilderness Sub-Committee	Not provided		x	"In regards to BLM's staffer Robbins when he talked about protecting feelings of solitude in wilderness and requiring fees: If the purpose of the new proposal is to protect this feeling and limit visitor use, they can do that perfectly well without a fee by establishing a quota system, or visitor daily use limit. Fees are NOT the way to go. A quota system, so and so many per day is the way to go. Quota systems (without permit fees) have been highly successful in other popular California wilderness areas (such as in the Sierra Nevada) in protecting solitude, and other aspects of the wilderness experience for visitors. I agree with these statements by Vicky Hoover."
52	Cecelia Samp	Not provided		x	
53	Chad Mussey	Not provided		x	
54	Charles Woodward	Victor, ID		x	"Outdoor recreation needs to remain an activity people do, not a product they buy."
55	Chips Mercier	Not provided		x	"To Whom it may concern, I am an outdoor recreation person and belong to CAL4 and CORVA and I am opposed to any fee to access Public Lands. The title says it all "PUBLIC LANDS". You are in place to manage it for the public, but to charge me access to use it is criminal."
56	Chris Byknish, RN	Youngstown, OH		x	
57	Chris Timmerman	Tucson, AZ		x	
58	Christopher Turner	Arcata, CA	x		"I support proposed wilderness and campground fee increases. With increased usage over the decades combined with a rarely improving Federal budget, it's important BLM has the financial resources to effectively fund facility development and maintenance. We all love the King Range and it pays us back, in spades, every time we visit."
59	Christine Wells	Arroyo Seco, NM		x	
60	Christopher Lish	Olema, CA		x	
61	Clarke Guzzi, Founder, Surfers Public Access Restoration Coalition	Not provided		x	
62	Cliff Nellis	Not provided		x	"It is really noxious that you intend to use vendors or concessionaires to collect the fees. Where in the H are the true and noble rangers? We don't see them anymore. They are all replaced by fat ass bureaucrats and private vendors."
63	Connie Newman	Not provided		x	
64	Constance Lorig	Not provided		x	
65	Craig Huff	Not provided		x	
66	Dale Diehl	Not provided		x	"Don't allow fees for access to the King land to start, it will lead to a wall between Public lands and those who can not pay or are not willing to pay."
67	Dale Lacognata	Not provided		x	
68	Dan Lowry	Not provided		x	
69	Daniel Vallero	Not provided		x	
70	Darynne Jessler	Valley Village, CA		x	"Rethink this please. Rethink it as you keep in mind the insidious reputation the BLM has across the country for breaking the law. Citizens are so tired of suing this agency for illegal practices and this is more of the same."
71	Dave Gordon	Briceland, CA		x	"I don't like the idea of being woken up by police/rangers and being questioned about my legitimacy to be on public land."
72	Dave (no last name given)	Not provided		x	
73	David Adams	Penn Valley, CA		x	
74	David Hargrave	Fortuna, CA		x	
75	David Hoefer	Grand Junction, CO		x	"At one time I used to be in favor of wilderness fees when I worked for the Forest Service. Now I am against them."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
76	David Karagianis	Not provided	x			"Conditional" support if funds are used for enforcement of regulations.
77	David Lowrie	Not provided		x		
78	David Tvedt	Eugene, OR		x		
79	Delores Hascamp	Kneeland, CA		x		
80	Denise Bell	Not provided		x		
81	Dennis Davie	Capitola, CA		x		
82	Dennis Shumaker	Not provided		x		
83	Dick Forehand	Red Lodge, MT		x		
84	Dominique Dieken	Tehachapi, CA		x		
85	Don and Barbara Rosner	Placitas, NM		x		
86	Donald Casto	Not provided		x		
87	Donald Scott	Not provided		x		"The middle class gets little enough these days. One of the few great and necessary benefits of the public lands is fee-free access for working people with families who are living on tight day-to-day budgets. Collect fees, and you restrict the land owners' necessary re-creation on their own lands. Fees make land owners into customers, a nasty step on the way to privatization."
88	Donna Selquist	Port St Lucie, FL		x		
89	Ed Bloedel, Former Director of Wilderness for the US Forest Service	Corvallis, MT		x		"Folks, Wilderness is not a Recreation Area that you can consider charging access fees for its (use) like other recreation areas. Please read the Wilderness Act of 1964 and any subsequent Wilderness Acts pertaining to your BLM Wilderness Areas. Consider the definition of Wilderness in particular, which embodies leaving the Area alone to be "managed" primarily by nature(God) and is to be "protected" by its "managers" to preserve its value for the American people "as Wilderness". This also means freedom FOR visitors, "freedom from fees" or other stifling regulations that essentially transforms the Area into a "recreation area" controlling the American peoples use. Also by setting a "fee" for entering the Area you are setting a very bad precedence that only those that can afford it are entitled to "enter the Kings Land" this Wilderness belongs to all of us and there should NOT be any fee to enter ANY Wilderness in our Country America!!"
90	Ed Ryan	Piercy, CA	x			"Good to know that the BLM's Arcata & Whitethorn staff care about this King Rang NCA unit. Access & Camping fee increases are needed to support BLM's work & the public's access."
91	Edward Loosli, President, The Wildlife Trust	Not provided		x		"The Wildlife Trust strongly opposes the proposal to impose a new Wilderness and Backcountry access fee for the King Range Wilderness and King Range Backcountry."
92	Elizabeth Watts	Lynbrook, NY		x		
93	Emily Van Alyne	Not provided		x		
94	Eric Burr, retired NPS	Mazama, WA		x		"Wilderness entry fees are bad news paperwork"
95	Eric Edwards	Not provided		x		
96	Eric Jones	Not provided		x		
97	Eve Lurie	Not provided		x		
98	Evelyn Ball	Not provided		x		
99	Ford Barr	Not provided		x		
100	Frank Stawicki	Not provided		x		"Please to not limit my access to the King Range Wilderness by imposing any access fee. Costs sure limit my choices!"

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
101	Frank Tehan	Kensington, CA		x	
102	Fred Allebach	Vineburg, CA		x	"The management issues the BLM has in the King Range are real and necessary however making citizens pay to use their own public lands is disturbing and unfair. Citizens in many cases have to pay twice for public lands, once on their taxes and twice at point of entry. The whole thrust of my opinion here is to encourage the King Range BLM to stand up against this trend of privatization, make national news and insist that government pay for its own operations on public lands."
103	Fritz Milas	Long Beach, CA		x	
104	Galen Davis	Northern CA – not specific		x	
105	Gary Dielman	Baker City, OR		x	"Your fee proposal will result in an immediate lawsuit in Federal Court. I will support such a lawsuit, which I'm sure BLM will lose. I'm a retired former employee of the U.S. Forest Service and also have sixteen years in law enforcement."
106	Geoffrey Churchill	Not provided		x	"The proposed fees are another sign of over management and misuse of funds. The kings range has been fine for 100 years. I go there every year to deer hunt. I see no trash, and have never seen a group of 23 people arguing with a group of 15 people for a campsite. Its first come first serve. People hike these trails for the remoteness and expense of the experience. Think of how many family's and hunters that are scraping by to be able to afford one simple weekend in the woods, now to be burdened with fees and laws that do nothing to brighten their experience. If it costs us more and more money each year to visit public lands we will seek alternatives. The end result will be worse for all. Please leave the kings range untouched for all to enjoy, not just the fortunate few."
107	George Alderson, retired BLM	Catonsville, MD	x		"Although we live far from the area, my sister lives near you in southern Oregon and several of my co-workers studied at Humboldt State University and visited the King Range. We heartily support the fees proposed in this business plan."
108	George Svos	Not provided		x	
109	Grant Barnard	Red Lodge, MT		x	
110	Greg Lewis	Tucson, AZ		x	"Having camped and backpacked along the Lost Coast for two of the last three summers, I can see no need at this time. Bringing in a private, for profit reservation system is another step toward taking public lands out of public hands. Please don't allow it"
111	Gregg Matson	Not provided		x	
112	Greg & Susan Krawczyk	Princeton Junction, NJ		x	"The Pacific Coast in northern California is among our favorite areas. I am opposed and would respectfully ask that you reconsider and avoid implementing this unnecessary fee. The beauty of our nation should not be for sale. As someone once said 'Not everything that counts, can be counted'."
113	Hank Stoffers	Samoa, CA		x	
114	Harry Hudson	Not provided		x	
115	Info only request	Shelter Cove, CA			x
116	Jack Brown	Petrolia, CA		x	
117	Jack Marcus	New York, NY		x	
118	Jake Hodie	Aspen, CO		x	
119	James Niemann	Not provided		x	"The initiation of fees into non developed areas is not in keeping with BLM tradition. Merely to say that the area sees a lot of visitors does not justify charging them money on top of the tax burden they already pay to keep public lands."
120	James Wheeler, Park Ranger/Interpreter, Redwood National and State Parks	Orick, CA		x	"A wilderness experience is not a business unless one signs up with a private guide, and the BLM is already funded with our tax dollars, so why should we pay twice?"
121	Jan Holt	Durango, CO		x	"Public lands belong to all of us, and no one should be turned away because of their financial situation."
122	Jana Perinchief	Not provided		x	

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
123	Jane Beattie	Not provided		x		
124	Jason Kaas	Not provided		x		
125	JC Bower	Sumner, WA		x		
126	Jean Public	Not provided		x		
127	Jeff Smith	Missoula, MT		x		
128	Jeffrey Sanders	Not provided		x		
129	Jeffrey White	Forest Grove, OR		x		
130	Jennifer Hayes	Not provided		x		"Under the proposed fee, a commercial for-profit business (recreation.gov) will benefit commercially from the fee, and this further commercializes and commodifies the Wilderness, and builds in an incentive to continue commercializing and commodifying Wildernesses."
131	Jeremy Dugan	Not provided		x		"It is criminal that I have to pay a fee to hike with my children - ages 4 and 6. This is NOT what our forefathers had envisioned when they fought for our freedom."
132	Jerome Walker	Decatur, GA		x		"It was the intention of the framers of the Act that all the American public should have access to wilderness on public land, regardless of ability to pay, and not just the more affluent members of society."
133	Jerry Bloomer	Hot Springs, SD		x		
134	Jessica Little	Not provided	x			
135	Jim Goes	Cottage Grove, OR		x		
136	Jim Pierson	Charleston, SC		x		
137	Jim Roberts	Palouse, WA		x		
138	Jim Yarbrough	Newbury Park, CA		x		
139	Jitka Mencik	Not provided		x		
140	John Donaldson	Not provided		x		
141	John Moore	Sacramento, CA	x			
142	John Roark	Hemet, CA		x		
143	John Ross	Montrose, CO		x		
144	John Thayer	Globe, AZ		x		"When I was a member of Monterey Boy Scout Troop 2 we would hike from Big Sur into the wilderness at Barlow Flats, where we would camp, swim and fish for a week every year. It would have been a hardship to have to pay over and above the cost of food and supplies to have that adventure. I'm sure having to pay to hike, ride or backpack in the King Range Wilderness will have the effect of deterring young people from partaking of such wholesome recreation."
145	John White	Not provided		x		
146	John Wilson	Magdalena, NM		x		
147	Joseph Paquet	Whitethorn, CA		x		"The BLM IS NOT a BUSINESS and the public land (my land) is not for sale. The mere suggestion that these comments are for a business plan is bogus and wrong! These comments should be for a 'Management Plan!'"
148	Judith Haglund	Not provided		x		
149	June Cattell	Not provided		x		
150	Justin Barnett	San Rafael, CA		x		"Were I to take my Scout Troop on a 50 Miler there accessing the wilderness for 9 days with 12 people, I would pay out \$540 dollars, an unheard of sum to spend time in our National Lands."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
151	K Caruso	Not provided		x	"As you I'm sure you are aware, a large proportion of users are the surfing community, particularly in the winter months- By nature (no pun intended), North Pacific swells do not always coincide with a reservation format- often spontaneous decisions are necessary; this will indeed be a serious conflict.
152	Karen Orso [Two duplicate comments submitted same day]	Wilseyville, CA	x		
153	Kate Juliana	Redway, CA		x	
154	Kathleen Helmer	Not provided		x	
155	Kathleen O'Nan	Not provided		x	
156	Kay Graves, ex-USFS employee including wilderness patrol	Not provided		x	"If your plan is just to make some money; then forget it. The bureaucracy of managing a new 'fee' always costs more than the fees, even if you jack it up to \$20 per night."
157	Kelly Morton	Not provided		x	
158	Ken Bone	Not provided		x	
159	Ken Thompson	Not provided	x		
160	Kenneth Ruby	Salem, NH		x	
161	Kevin Newman	Not provided		x	"I'm an avid user of The Lost Coast. I mainly hunt the coast. It is a wonderful place and a place you can get away from people. Well, where I go, I understand the concept of thought of limiting the use but don't agree with it. I go to the mountains. I do not believe that I should be punished for the over backpacking of the coast."
162	Kevin Proescholdt, Conservation Director, Wilderness Watch	Minneapolis, MN		x	"Wilderness Watch strongly opposes the proposal to impose a new Wilderness and Backcountry access fee for the King Range Wilderness and King Range NCA Backcountry."
163	Kevin Toney	Not provided		x	
164	Kim Springer	Not provided		x	
165	Kitty Benzar	Durango, CO		x	"While the BLM has full authority to use a permit system to limit and allocate use to protect Wilderness resources, it does not have legal authority to charge a fee for such permits to private, non-commercial visitors."
166	Laura Koskinen	"third generation local of southern humboldt county."	x		
167	Laurenc DeVita	Bayside, CA		x	"Pull down your signs, pull out your improvements, curtail fees; in short, give the coast back to the locals. We took care of it."
168	Lawrence Ribnick	Crawford, CO		x	
169	Lee Perry	Not provided		x	
170	Lia Stoffers	Samoa, CA			x
171	Linda Granato	Not provided		x	
172	Lisa Koehl	Not provided		x	
173	Lori Patin	Parlin, CO		x	
174	Maggie Carey	Whitethorn, CA		x	
175	Joe Collins (quoted in comment by Maggie Carey above)	Shelter Cove, CA		x	
176	Mallika Henry	Not provided		x	
177	Maradel Gale	Bainbridge Island, WA		x	"The very title of your report, "King Range Business Plan," indicates a serious lack of understanding of the inherent values of wilderness areas. These are not areas to be made commercial to serve the BLM's interests nor those of any contracted vendors who might be or become involved."
178	Marcy Gustafson	Not provided		x	"My students are now keeping a close watch on who is doing what to our world. Nature is ours to share, to preserve, to, in fact, value. It is not a money generating scheme."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
179	Margaret Eisenberger, Science/Travel Director, Friends of the Children's Eternal Rainforest	Not provided		x		"I am writing, as a professional ecologist, to oppose the wilderness access fee being considered for the King Range Business Plan."
180	Marie Wakefield	Newport, OR		x		
181	Marrietta Montaine	Harrisburg, PA	x			"Usage fees for all public lands and parks would make people appreciate them more, and take better care of them."
182	Marilyn Cottrell	Humboldt County Resident	x			"I feel that a flat fee up to \$12.00 person for backpacking wilderness permit is acceptable, but not a daily tab."
183	Marilyn Evenson	Not provided		x		
184	Marilyn Snyder	Not provided		x		"I can't afford to do anything anymore except stay home!"
185	Marilyn Yelle	Garberville, CA	x			
186	Mark Gall	Not provided		x		"I'm a retired law enforcement ranger who worked for the National Park Service and BLM, as well being a Viet Nam vet. I am being 100% honest when I say that your proposed fee would prevent me from accessing the wilderness area. My retirement amount from the Federal Govt would simply not allow my wife and myself to spend a week backpacking there. Sure, there are other areas that we could go to, but wilderness areas have a very unique Appeal."
187	Mark Hallett	Not provided		x		
188	Mark Mellander	Not provided		x		
189	Martha Eberle	Dripping Springs, TX		x		
190	Mary Switlik	Not provided		x		
191	Melissa Mason	Nipomo, CA		x		
192	Michael Feran	Not provided		x		
193	Michael Norden	Not provided		x		
194	Michelle Benes	Not provided		x		
195	Michelle Ognjanovic	Not provided		x		
196	Mike Kohlbaker, President, Backcountry Horsemen of California	Not provided		x		"HIKING, BACKPACKING, OR HORSEBACK RIDING THROUGH A DESIGNATED WILDERNESS BY PRIVATE, NONCOMMERCIAL INDIVIDUALS IS NOT A 'SPECIALIZED USE'. Therefore no fees should be charged."
197	M'lou Christ	Not provided		x		
198	Molly Campbell	Huntsville, TX		x		"I have four great grandchildren and I fear for the kind of world they will grow up to live. Please consider before adding the fee. We want all to afford to explore our beautiful wildernesses."
199	Nancy Beavers	Not provided		x		
200	Nancy Lowell	Not provided		x		
201	Nathan Young	McKinleyville, CA	x			I would like it to be known that I am not opposed to requiring a camping permit/fee, however I am opposed to any reservation requirements and/or limitations on the amount of campers from Oct-April."
202	"Newsyfoils"	Not provided		x		
203	Nick Guest	Not provided		x		
204	Nike Stevens	Bozeman, MT		x		"I have inlaws who have a cabin in northern CA and have visited them and the King Range Wilderness and found it an amazing area of incredible beauty and ecological diversity and peace - so needed in hectic CA. Everyone - rich or poor, traveller or native has a right to access to our wildernesses."
205	Norm Henderson	Not provided		x		"I believe that demanding and collecting such fees solely for access to be illegal (as specified in FLREA) and shows an agency desperate to supplement its waning/sequestered appropriated budget. In its desperation the agency has become morally and ethically bankrupt. It has shown lately that it will go to any lengths to bring in additional revenue to support existing staff and programs. It does this by ignoring the will of the people as articulated in the spirit and letter of the underlying fee authority legislation."
206	Oliver Hazard	Not provided		x		"This is a bad idea that is unenforceable and will create a huge problem for you and the community that uses this place. We all love this space and want to see it stay the way it is, wildly beautiful with no in your face bureaucracy."
207	Pamela Bell	Arcata, CA			x	
208	Pamela Scoville	Not provided		x		

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
209	Patricia Parsley	Not provided		x		
210	Patrick Turney	Not provided		x		
211	Patsy Shafchuk	Florida		x		
212	Paul Bulger	Santa Rosa, CA		x		
213	Paul Cowden	Not provided		x		
214	Paul Edwards	Not provided		x		"At age 71 I am not an "armchair philosopher." I am a retired from the USFS in recreation management. (25 years) I earned a Master's degree in recreation management from Utah State University School of Natural Resources. (1967) What I have learned is that this cancerous "fee monster" is dead- WRONG on multiple levels."
215	Paul Franzmann	Walla Walla, WA		x		
216	Paul Stonehouse PhD, Assoc. Professor of Outdoor Leadership, Simpson University	Redding, CA	x			"I am in full support of issuing a \$5/person/day fee for backcountry use along the Lost Coast Trail. I also fully endorse the \$7 increase in developed campground fees. However, I would like to register my strong disapproval of the King Range BLM's practice of lumping not-for-profit educational institutions in with their commercial special use permit application."
217	Paul Wittrock	Eureka, CA		x		
218	Paula Grande	New York, NY		x		
219	Peter Wiechers	Kernville, CA		x		
220	Phil Farrell	Palo Alto, CA		x		
221	Paul Palla	Not provided		x		
222	Priscilla Neher	Not provided	x			
223	Ralph Oberg	Montrose, CO		x		
224	Ralph Shannon	Not provided			x	
225	Ramona Skidmore	Not provided		x		
226	Rebecca Barker	"California Voter"		x		
227	Rhonda O'Kane	Rio Dell, CA			x	
228	Rich Moser	San Bernardino, CA		x		
229	Rich Sharloch	Not provided		x		
230	Richard Bentley	Not provided		x		
231	Richard Gorringer	Portland, OR		x		
232	Richard Hardack	Not provided		x		
233	Richard Low	Not provided		x		
234	Richard Stuckey	Chicago, IL		x		
235	Rick Tolley	Blue Lake, CA	x			
236	Rita Lewis	Newton, WV		x		
237	"rk19763"	Not provided		x		
238	Robert Johnston	San Rafael, CA		x		
239	Robert Smoak	Arcata, CA		x		
240	Robert Sutherland	"neighbor and long-time user from time before it was an NCA"		x		
241	Ronnit Corey	Not provided		x		
242	Rory Howland	Not provided		x		
243	Rose Chilcoat, Associate Director, Great Old Broads For Wilderness	Durango, CO		x		"While we support management that protects wilderness character and especially opportunities for solitude, Great Old Broads for Wilderness strongly opposes the proposal to impose a new Wilderness and Backcountry access fee for the King Range Wilderness and King Range NCA Backcountry."
244	Roxanne Beijan	Not provided		x		
245	Sadira Tash	Not provided		x		
246	Sandra Laase	Not provided		x		

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>						
	Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
247	Sandy Farrell	Not provided		x		
248	Sarah Jane Beard	Not provided		x		
249	Scott Phillips	Hailey, ID		x		
250	Scott Silver, Executive Director, Wild Wilderness	Bend, OR		x		"In the business plan you'll see that one of the main justifications for these fees is "to protect wilderness character." Though not explicitly stated in this document, I have elsewhere seen it stated that the imposition of access fees is being done with the INTENTION of creating a barrier to use so as to diffuse visitors into lesser-used areas."
251	Scott Stellar	Not provided		x		
252	Scott Stephens	Samoa, CA		x		
253	Seth Zuckerman	Petrolia, CA	x			
254	Sheri Snyder	Not provided		x		
255	Stassia Samuels	Bayside, CA		x		
256	Stephanie Gunn	Not provided		x		
257	Stephen Bamford	Tallahassee, FL		x		
258	Stephen Fleming	Not provided		x		
259	Stephen Krest	Marvel, CO		x		
260	Stephen Sample	Not provided		x		
261	Stephen Weitz	Oakland, CA		x		
262	Steve McHaney	Not provided		x		
263	Steve Robey	Berkeley, CA		x		
264	Sue Taylor	Camino, CA		x		
265	Susan Michetti	Mt Horeb, WI		x		
266	Susan Perry	Big Sur, CA		x		
267	Susannah Dingman	Not provided		x		
268	Susie Fogg	Walnut Creek, CA		x		
269	Sybil Carof	Not provided		x		
270	Sybil Schlesinger	Natick, MA		x		
271	Terry Gruzebeck	Not provided		x		
272	Tim Gomersall	Eureka, CA			x	
273	Tina Cox	Not provided		x		
274	"tjedp"	Not provided		x		
275	Todd Monson	Not provided		x		
276	Tom Budlong	Los Angeles, CA		x		
277	Tom Floyd	Not provided		x		
278	Tom Kovalicky, Forest Supervisor, Nez Perce NF, Retired	Not provided		x		
279	Tom Morrow	San Francisco, CA		x		
280	Tom Rust	Not provided		x		
281	Tom Sanchez	Los Angeles, CA		x		
282	Tony Marra	Not provided		x		
283	Valerie Sanfilippo	San Diego, CA		x		
284	Vicky Hoover, Chair, Sierra Club California/Nevada Wilderness Committee	Not provided		x		"The area is part of the BLM's National Landscape Conservation System. This new System represents BLM's opportunity to demonstrate and implement its conservation mission for the 21st century. Don't undo the good you have been done in promoting and highlighting the NLCS by this ill-advised proposal."
285	Victor and Merrilyn Delius	Not provided		x		"As horseback riders, we use the wilderness areas as our only recreation that we can afford. We are 70 and 75 years old and hope to keep these areas open and available to generations to come."

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Public Comment Summary – King Range Wilderness Access Fee <i>[Complete text of all comments, obtained from BLM under the Freedom of Information Act, is available on request.]</i>					
Name	City, State	Supports	Opposes	Ambiguous or No Opinion*	Selected Excerpts From Comments <i>(Chosen to show that comments were substantive and to demonstrate their tone and tenor without being overly repetitive.)</i>
286	Vimal Golding	Petrolia, CA		x	"I work as a seasonal biological technician with diverse groups including the US Forest Service, Mattole Restoration Council, Smith River Alliance and others. . . .People go into the wilderness for many reasons, we already pay with our tax dollars for our public lands. No one who is willing to seek a wilderness experience on their own should have to purchase it. Doing so degrades the experience, prevents lower income families and individuals, and may even be illegal (see the Wilderness Watch Petition). Such a legal liability can be far more expensive than any revenues that would be produced."
287	Warren Woodward	Not provided		x	
288	Wes Smith, Vice Chair, and Jennifer Savage, Chair, Humboldt Chapter of Surfrider Foundation	Arcata, CA		x	
289	William Sweetling	Not provided		x	
Total Support/Oppose			20	259	9
			7.2%	92.8%	Note: Only comments categorized as Support or Oppose are included in the percentage calculation.

* The BLM proposal has several components. Not everyone commented about the Wilderness access fee. Those who addressed only other issues or whose opinion about the Wilderness fee could not be discerned were categorized as "No Opinion or Ambiguous" for the purposes of this chart. That should not be taken to imply that their comment was not substantive on other topics.

Geographic Distribution by State

Not all commenters provided their state of residence, but a tally of those who did shows that interest in the proposal is geographically broad.

There are 26 states identified from which comments were submitted.

	State of Residence (if provided)	No. Of Comments That Identified That State
1	Arizona	4
2	California	75
3	Colorado	9
4	Delaware	1
5	Florida	2
6	Hawaii	1
7	Idaho	3
8	Illinois	1
9	Maryland	1
10	Massachusetts	1
11	Minnesota	1
12	Montana	5
13	New Hampshire	1
14	New Jersey	2
15	New Mexico	3
16	New York	3
17	Ohio	1
18	Oregon	8
19	Pennsylvania	1
20	South Carolina	1
21	South Dakota	1
22	Texas	4
23	Utah	1
24	Washington	5
25	West Virginia	1
26	Wisconsin	1

Frequent Themes

Seven recurring, substantive issues appeared in a significant number of comments.

- 1 Hiking into designated wilderness by private, non-commercial visitors is not a “specialized recreation use,” hence charging a fee for hiking permits is not authorized under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act.
- 2 Paying money for access is a commercial transaction that has a negative effect on the individual’s wilderness experience and violates the Wilderness Act.
- 3 Allowing a commercial, for-profit reservation service to benefit from access fees further commercializes and privatizes public lands
- 4 The proposed limits on the number of daily visitors are based on flawed surveys and do not reflect seasonal fluctuations. People who visit in the off-season (especially surfers) would be disproportionately and negatively impacted by unnecessarily low visitation limits.
- 5 Fees for access would have a disproportionate impact on families and low-income visitors.
- 6 The cost of enforcement is likely to exceed the revenue gained, and additional revenue is likely to be offset by cuts in appropriated funding.
- 7 Numerous commenters offered suggestions other than charging fees to address resource management problems.