

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
1	interest or concern	I believe we should make sure that the RV and chemical toilet dump sites are regulated, managed and documented properly according EPA in all of Alaska as well as Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHAs.
2	interest or concern	I want to leave Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats as they are! They need to be protected from any development. Please listen to the will of the people! This an important habitat, that should be portected!!!
2	recommended action	Keep the protections that are there now!
2	threatened/protected values	It is a valuable habitat and I FEEL IT IS BEING THREATENED!
2	other comments	Please listen to the people!
3	interest or concern	I reviewed the materials provided here, drafted comments, went back to one of the earlier tabs to check myself, and when I returned to complete my comments they were gone. I suggest you make commenting easier by not deleting draft comments, or at least warning commenters that you will do so if they leave the comment tab!!!! 2. It is difficult for an ordinary citizen like me to review the changes to the plan when there is no easy way to compare existing elements with proposed changes. Suggestion: publish a line-by-line comparison of the e siting and proposed plans, and extend the comment period so that the public has time to respond with knowledge.
3	recommended action	Act in accordance with the precautionary principle as we face already evident and increasing impacts of climate change. To do otherwise would be irresponsible.
3	threatened/protected values	It's natural state. Allowing more motorized uses, e.g., would dramatically alter that and drastically compromise its ability to sustain its wildlife.
4	interest or concern	I believe our waters are precious, and must be protected from contamination from any toxic substances, and habitat must be protected and preserved.
4	recommended action	I want us to protect our waters, and keep them sustainable for wildlife, sea life, and human life, and not to be mined, or polluted in any way whatsoever.
4	threatened/protected values	The waters around us must be kept as pristine and unpolluted as possible for posterity and life.
4	other comments	People and life come before profits. Always.
5	interest or concern	Several recent issues in the Kachemak Bay highlight my concerns about this CHA. 1) proposal to raise salmon fry in the Halibut Cove Lagoon. There are already too many pink salmon fry for the marine ecosystems in AK. The lagoon should not become another Tutka Bay.
5	interest or concern	2) Oil and gas leasing and drilling rigs. Having a drilling rig at the end of the Homer Spit was extremely concerning. First, for safety. Second, for the impact it would have on the economy which is tourist driven.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
5	interest or concern	3) Number of high speed boats using the bay, and old proposals to allow jet skis. Otters and seabirds are impacted all the time on the bay, and the increasing use of this protected area is concerning. This area is the one safe haven for many wintering animals, I would hope that it continues to be. We hope that more enforcement elements are added, and that concerns that have already had a public hearing are not put into the plan (skis, oil development).
5	interest or concern	4) Garbage: the overwhelming number of vessels from small boats to large tankers, their garbage and bilge dumping and all the impacts that come from them should be closely monitored and mitigated.
5	interest or concern	5) Ocean responses to climate change: we are all seeing changes in the bay, some very concerning.
5	interest or concern	6) Clamming: we need more restrictions on clamming, the number and size of clams are extremely concerning. Consider restricting clamming until levels improve.
5	interest or concern	We hope that the new management plan is not watered down to be a meaningless waste of paper in the next version. We hope that more enforcement elements are added, and that concerns that have already had a public hearing are not put into the plan (skis, oil development).
5	recommended action	Retain the language currently in the plan, and add to it rather than replace with potentially vague, non-enforceable wording. Do not allow permissions for proposals historically and publicly refused (jet skis, and oil development).
5	recommended action	Have more specific oil, debris, garbage, and waste disposal and mitigation language. Require actual cleanup, not just a 'plan'.
5	recommended action	Be conservative on leasing of Fox River Flats for cattle grazing, and require leased areas be returned to original, native plant status post use, and require prevention of non-native plant spreading.
5	recommended action	Manage Halibut Cove as part of the CHA, rather than like Tutka Bay where only the pink salmon output is considered. No salmon farming in HCL.
5	recommended action	Address protocols and mitigation efforts for climate change. How acidification will affect this critical bay is important, the state should plan and study this. Clamming should be cancelled until the size and population of clams returns to sustainable levels.
5	threatened/protected values	Marine wildlife, from otters to fish to seabirds to whales. Very concerned that human impacts are taking a big toll on our birds, otters, and other wildlife. Yes, I believe the populations of seabirds are nose-diving. Counts of seabirds in all the coves have seriously declined. Yet, you still allow a hunt. The state has no mechanism for knowing how many birds are out there, nor do they seem to care. Otters are having a horrible time of it, yet boats continue to harass and hit them. Vessel speeds continue to increase and the number of boats is the highest ever. Protecting our marine wildlife resources of this area should be the top concern for any CHA.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
5	other comments	The economic engine of this region is nature, not oil and gas. And always will be. When the gas and oil dry up, it will be the beauty, the wildlife, the fish that will keep people employed and able to sustain a life near the bay. Doing all the state can to protect these values is the only wise path to the future. Alaska's history tells us this...and those of us who have retained a relationship with this critical area for generations see big problems and are quite concerned.
6	interest or concern	My main concerns are the bias opinions of some of the public that a personal watercraft is some how different from any other boat used in the waters of Alaska when they are not. The only difference is you sit ON the watercraft as opposed to IN the watercraft. The four stroke engines on today's personal watercraft are cleaner and quieter than all the two stroke engines used on boats allowed in Kachemak Bay. To state some how that a personal watercraft conflicts with the "compatibility" of what the critical habitat was established for is nothing more than propaganda. A personal watercraft is a boat and where one boat can go so should a personal watercraft otherwise known as a pwc.
6	recommended action	I want to see the following administrative codes repealed and allow personal watercraft with four stroke engines in the bay. Maybe some of the shallower coves and smaller areas such as Halibut Cove can be restricted but where one boat is allowed so should others. The AK marine highway runs through the bay and you should not be allowed to ban one type of watercraft from using it. It's like saying motor cycles can't go on the Seward Highway. Repeal 11AAC20.115, 11AAC20.215 and 05AAC95.310
6	other comments	There are no true scientific studies done that prove a 4 stroke personal watercraft is harmful to any water environment. Personal watercraft, aka pwc, should be allowed in the 200,000 acres of Kachemak Bay. I think each critical habitat area should be studied separately and not on a one size fits all.
7	interest or concern	The main topic I would like addressed is PWC legalization. This is an outdated law with no factual backing and zero science. April 30, 2013 Cora Cambell (ADFG) and Ben Ellis (Division of Parks & Outdoor Recreation Director) in a documented meeting with the PWCA said this issue can only be addressed in a review of the management plan that is due in 3-4 years. Now we are told it may not be reviewed on this management plan. We have been pushed around department to department and lied to for years.

Committer ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
7	recommended action	<p>Legalize PWCs, we would be fine with only allowing 4 stroke PWCs, as a stand for cleaner waters. key points. 1.) Denying equal access needs to have explanation and reason, its our right. 2.) since the outlaw of PWCs in Kbay, manufactures have all put speed limitations on PWC's, 67mph, there are 30's boats left and right in the harbor that do 50+ mph tell me how a vessel that size going that fast is any safer. 3.) no facts or science to back the current regulation 4.) current regs. define them only by sitting on them instead of inside them ( you can have an identical drive system in a boat and its ok) 5.) PWCs cost \$10k + nobody is going to drive their expensive machine through critical tidal flats, as if props do any less damage. (Skiffs have more reason to go into flats then PWCs anyways, camping, hunting, hiking). 6.) Prince William Sound has PWCs legal, you might see 3 of them on a sunny July Weekend, and they are next to Anchorage.</p>
7	threatened/protected values	<p>I was born in Homer, I have lived here for 28 years. Im raising my family here and will never leave. I value kachemak bay and surrounding areas more then any other place in the world. I want equal access to our beautiful waters. I don't want a single user group to be able to work the system and ban another user group. There was ~300 signatures that got the ban on PWCs. A petition with ~1300 signatures of AK residents was submitted to the state to repeal the ban... If I get a group of a few hundred people together to ban kayaks with argument that they are too low in the water and I don't want the risk of running one over is it going to happen? .... I hope not I want everyone to be able to have access to kbay.</p>
7	other comments	<p>There is no facts or science behind outlawing PWC's. Every other decision is made by studies done by biologist and factual evidence. The marine vessels that are legal to operate in KBay right now are worse for the "environment" in every way. Bigger jets , more HP, 2 Stroke, same speed, We have people pulling jet and power systems out of PWC's and installing them into a small boat. Because the only definition in the regulation is that you are sitting on it instead of in it. This management plan can include PWC discussion, it is about vehicle access. All the agencies and people involved that have pushed this topic off on another department are forcing legal action to happen. Its our constitutional right to have equal access on public waters.</p>
8	interest or concern	<p>ALLOW PWCs on this discussion 1.) no facts or science with this ban 2.) PWCs have changed and follow the most strict EPA requirements 3.) Legalize only 4 stroke PWCs and remove any dirty motor argument</p>
8	recommended action	<p>allow pwc discussion on the management plan and lift an out dated regulation</p>
8	threatened/protected values	<p>I am a life long resident to Homer (55 years). I don't want user groups singled out of areas with not factual backing or science.</p>
8	other comments	<p>The state has ignored the people on this matter. There have been documented meetings with the ADFG commissioner 3 years ago, stating that this is the only time this issue can be addressed. If the state ignores the issue they are setting themselves up for a legal battle.</p>

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
9	interest or concern	The current ban on PWC's is completely outdated and unnecessary
9	recommended action	I want to see the pwc ban in Kachemac bay lifted
9	other comments	I have been to 16 different islands in the Caribbean, all of which rent PWC's by the hundreds. There's more hours spent off those coast lines on pwc's than there ever will be in Kachemac due to weather and there are no ill effects on wildlife. There's world class reefs and snorkeling. Your current ban is completely out dated and unacceptable with the current pwc EPA regulations. You can't in good faith tell me a pwc does more damage than a jet powered 33' Russian fishing vessel going 50mph through the bay...
10	interest or concern	It would be amazing to acces the Bay Area with pwc we live in such a beautiful state and restrictions on the way we access our state is unfortunatnite
10	recommended action	Lifting the ban on pwc
10	threatened/protected values	I value being able to access our state and having bans lifted more freedoms to enjoy our state however we choose
10	other comments	Less restrictions more freedom and thanks for your time
11	interest or concern	PWC should be allowed to be operated in all water ways that other boats and ships are as long as the follow the same rules and laws the are fitting to small craft. What damages are they causing to the environment? What is the main reason they are not allowed? We use them in Hawaii and Costa Rica and they are less destructive than most other small boats or ships.
11	recommended action	Please allow pwc to be used in fox river flats and Kachemak bay
11	threatened/protected values	We who like to be out doors like to be able to see the land up close and fish and hunt. The camping is unlike anything I have experienced anywhere in the world.
12	interest or concern	You should consider removing the ban on personal watercraft.
12	recommended action	Remove the ban on jet skis.
12	threatened/protected values	I value personal freedom. I value unrestricted access. I value less government and less regulation which promotes industry. Removing the unnecessary ban on jet skis would promote industry and tourism in kachemak Bay. Alaska is not California. It is the last frontier. We hunt, fish, and live for outdoor activities. Let Alaska be alaska.
13	interest or concern	I'd like to see Kachemak Bay open to all forms of watercraft and an end to the unfounded bias against personal water crafts, which are no more polluting (less so than the majority) than other vessels that are permitted for use in the bay. I feel like the number of PWCs that would utilize the bay would have zero additional impact on the wildlife and aesthetics of the bay, but would provide additional transportation for individuals and small groups that do not want to, nor may not have the means to use a full sized vessel for transportation within Kachemak Bay.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
13	recommended action	Lifting the ban on personal watercrafts. I can see compromising by requiring them to meet modern emissions standards such as being a four stroke or a direct injection two stroke, such as an e-tech, even though I still find that a bit hypocritical since those same rules do not apply to larger vessels. I think the "environmental impact" argument for PWCs is completely unfounded to anyone with the most basic critical thinking abilities, knowledge of of marine vessels, and the use of them in Kachemak Bay.
13	threatened/protected values	Having access to the waterways for all people, not just those that can afford a larger vessel, or feel that their subjective opinion on aesthetics should regulate which type of watercraft is acceptable to access the waterways; which belong to all citizens.
14	interest or concern	Less regulations and allow personal watercraft again. I don't know why watercraft can't be used in a safe and environmentally friendly way.
14	recommended action	Reinstate the use of watercraft.
14	threatened/protected values	Going halibut fishing and enjoying the great outdoors how I see fit as long as it's safe and not harming the environment.
14	other comments	Bringing watercraft back to the homer area will only help local businesses and I see no harm they do to the environment.
15	interest or concern	there needs to be no revision.none, more rules and regulations do not help anyone, it restricts access to his beautiful land, were not living in California , lets remember that, so lets not make homer like California. NO MORE RULES!!!!
15	recommended action	none, more rules and regulations do not help anyone, it restricts access to his beautiful land, were not living in California , lets remember that, so lets not make homer like California. NO MORE RULES!!!!
15	threatened/protected values	none, more rules and regulations do not help anyone, it restricts access to his beautiful land, were not living in California , lets remember that, so lets not make homer like California. NO MORE RULES!!!!
15	other comments	none, more rules and regulations do not help anyone, it restricts access to his beautiful land, were not living in California , lets remember that, so lets not make homer like California. NO MORE RULES!!!!
16	interest or concern	My interests in these areas are purely recreational and as such I am concerned with "over-regulation!"! As a 26 year resident and having grown up here I have learned that one of Alaskas greatest gifts is her people! And the people who live here year round and use these areas (and have used these areas for generations) should not be considered a threat to the CHA&'s but another member of the cycle that's been perpetuating for over a century now. I believe it is this councils responsibility to REPEAL THE PWC IN ALL AREAS OF KACHEMAK BAY IMMEDIATELY...

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
16	recommended action	Repeal the ban on PWC in Kachemak bay and Fox River flats... The infringement upon this personal liberty flies in the face of the spirit of Alaska and is supported by absurd ideas of "habitat damage." The sheer volume of all types of small boat traffic in ALL areas of Kachemak bay completely nullifies the argument set forth at inception of this ban on PWC. The idea that they do more damage or harass wildlife more than any other type of watercraft is ludicrous. Give the people this Freedom back!
16	threatened/protected values	The freedom to enjoy them in any fashion Humanly possible. I don't seek to harm the natural habitat but as humans we disturb it with only our physical presence on foot! As do any animal living in it! We need to remember that nature accounts for this on a grand scale and our impacts are minuscule compared to natural events such as spring thaw or ice sheet movements, tidal cycles, storms or even flooding and any other natural event out of our control. The reasonable person understands the difference between "enjoying" and "destroying" our wonderful area. The burden of that accountability belongs to us all. To educate the younger users of these areas is our responsibility. To also remind our peers and hold them accountable to following the laws and regulations. And if necessary provide the proper authority (law enforcement, park rangers etc..) with the information to follow through with the consequences of such behavior. Return to us the liberty to enjoy this resource in this manner if we so choose and hold us accountable for the education and actions of one another instead of blindly creating laws to encumber the free exploration and enjoyment of this natural wonder.
17	interest or concern	I would like to see the opportunity for personal watercraft to be used in kachemak bay.
17	recommended action	I would like to see responsible use for all user groups in the CHA.
17	threatened/protected values	The ability to use the land is what I value the most and I believe we should have more access to the land.
17	other comments	I would especially like to see the waters opened up to four stroke personal watercraft. They are very clean running machines and have little impact on the environment.
18	interest or concern	I, as well as many other people, have concerns over the critical habitat areas but personal watercraft isn't one of them. PWC's are safe, clean, and reliable transportation that have been preyed upon in the past. There is no reason for these to be banned from Kachemak Bay.
18	recommended action	Allow four stroke personal watercraft full access to Kachemak Bay and it's navigable waters just as any other boat.
18	threatened/protected values	I love the bay and the all of the resources that it provides. I feel that it should be available to all to enjoy. That includes personal watercraft. There is no threat caused by these and they are held to the strictest EPA requirements, so as far as pollution goes, they are the LAST watercraft you need to worry about..
18	other comments	Legalize personal watercraft in Kachemak Bay and let everyone enjoy the bay equally.. Thank you for your consideration. Bill Brock Anchor Point

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
19	interest or concern	<p>There are many topics that I feel should be considered, but most of them will probably be brought up by others. However, one topic that I have quite a bit of expertise in , is Marine Invasive species. I have worked with this topic for the past 7 years, specifically in Kachemak Bay. In multiple cases in more southern waters habitats, fisheries and even ecosystems have been altered irreparably by the introduction of marine invasive species. Often when an invasive has become prevalent in a marine ecosystem the biodiversity is severely compromised, and a monoculture becomes the norm in areas the invasive flourishes. It is almost impossible to eradicate most problematic saltwater invasives once they become established. Because of this, prevention and early detection are the most effective tools. Research shows that most marine invasive species are introduced into West coast nearshore areas come by moving structures that sat in the water in one location to another new location. Possible Invasive Marine invertebrates that are growing on structures are then spread to new areas. Harbor docks, mariculture equipment, delict boats are all known vectors. Another well known vector for marine invasive species is ballast water. Kachemak Bay has some ship traffic and thus is vulnerable to marine invasive species being introduced by a ship dumping ballast water that was taken up in an area known to host marine invasive species. Fisheries and the seafood industry can also become a vector with live seafood being dumped in new waters or fishing gear not being cleaned, drained, dried, before use in a new area.</p>
19	recommended action	<p>I would like to see the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHA management plan include best practices for the prevention of marine invasive species in Kachemak BAY and Fox River Flats. I would also like to explore the possibility of including regulations / recommendations that must be met before certain structures, vessels or live seafood is brought into the area.</p>
19	threatened/protected values	<p>I value the biological diversity of this area. I believe the marine resources are not adequately being protected in the face of large upcoming threats of more human usage, global warming and the spread of invasive species. Yes, I feel the biodiversity and health of Kachemak Bay faces the aforementioned threats.</p>
20	interest or concern	<p>Legalize pwc</p>
20	recommended action	<p>Legalize pwc</p>
21	interest or concern	<p>Please end the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.</p>
21	recommended action	<p>Please end the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.</p>
21	other comments	<p>Please end the ban on PWC in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats.</p>
22	interest or concern	<p>Open it to PWC. Much less impact than large boats</p>
23	interest or concern	<p>I would like to see the PWC ban be eliminated from the master plan.</p>



Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
23	threatened/protected values	The values are fair treatment and access to all types of users. To limit or ban one from the other is discrimination in all its glory. One user group is not better than the other, different forms of travel shouldn't be regulated by personal opinions or agendas, access to all is fair.
24	interest or concern	the use of atvs in the fox river valley allowing more access to motorized vehicles, and the use of pwc in kachemak bay
24	recommended action	more access to the valley and the use of clean 4stroke pwc in kachemak bay
24	threatened/protected values	being able to access areas for hunting and fishing
25	threatened/protected values	I feel that I cannot not enjoy them to their fullest. A PWC would allow many others to enjoy the area.
26	recommended action	I am concerned about the seemingly ever growing otter population. How will they be managed?
26	threatened/protected values	Well, I am concerned about the shell fish population. We can no longer take shrimp, dungeness crab and now clams. It appears it is not being managed well enough as we no longer get to enjoy these for personal use.
26	other comments	I don't see why the bay needs to be protected from personal watercraft. The # of pwc is minimal and I think allowing them again should be considered.
27	interest or concern	Every body has the right to use the water No ban
28	interest or concern	I'd like to see PWC'S allowed back because there is no logical reason for them to not be allowed.
29	interest or concern	My concern is that all users are not given equal rights to use the area. For example PWC.
29	recommended action	Lift bans on PWC and other recreational motor boats.
30	interest or concern	I hunt and fish on my PWC and provide food for my family. I do not feel there is any difference between a PWC and a boat.
30	recommended action	Allowing PWC
30	threatened/protected values	I am not allowed to use my PWC to hunt and fish. This is taking food out of my family's mouth.
31	interest or concern	Permit the use of PWCs.
31	recommended action	Reinstating the use of PWCs
31	threatened/protected values	I enjoy the sea life and fishing. I never understood how the use of PWCs effected these things.
31	other comments	Amend the current ban on PWCs if n the area
32	interest or concern	Sea otters have decimated the shellfish population in Kachemak bay. Some type of management plan needs to include sea otter control. Maybe a bounty on them paid to native hunters as they are the only people legally allowed to harvest. Something....Anything....

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
32	threatened/protected values	Kachemac bay crab. Otters are killing them off!
33	interest or concern	It should be open to all that have watercraft that are coastguard registered
33	recommended action	Opening it to pwc use
33	threatened/protected values	Not letting us use a pwc on a navigatable water is just not right
33	other comments	A pwc is a useful tool and great safe transportation
34	interest or concern	Personal watercraft use in Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHAs.
34	recommended action	The ban on personal water craft needs to be eliminated. This ban is completely unreasonable in singling out a specific type of watercraft and watercraft user to discriminate against in the use of Alaska's resources. If there are safety or other concerns in specific areas, such as around commercial properties or harbors, other reasonable restrictions, such as no wake zones or speed limits can be used to address these concerns. These watercraft are less egregious or polluting in their operation than commercial fishing boats, large charter boats and other users that use these waters daily. In a real sense, kayakers, with their low profile and inability to move quickly in response to a hazard are a greater safety hazard than personal water craft. While I don't advocate banning kayakers, either, I believe the Alaska waters should be either equally open to all users or equally closed. Thank you.
34	threatened/protected values	I value access to Alaska waters and land. Access is being threatened every day by special interest groups and state land and water managers who think they have priority in deciding who should be allowed to access an area.
34	other comments	It is very sad that we have public land and water management today in Alaska so irresponsible that I have to actually comment on a restriction such as the PWC restriction in Kachemak Bay Area.
35	interest or concern	I think it's important that we keep access open (at least a reasonable amount) and the grazing leases stay active. It's OUR land... sometimes we forget that... and as for the leases.. what an amazing way to preserve large pieces of recreational land without "locking them up" in parks or selling them off for development.
35	recommended action	Please address the dead vehicles in the tidal areas that are likely leaking fluids into the bay. As well as the beach at the bottom of the switch back to the right being used as a party zone and garbage dumping zone by some of the locals.
35	threatened/protected values	I value the grazing lease as an important part of our history and local economy as well as being able to access the flats for hunting.
36	interest or concern	Lift the ban on the use of personal watercraft (pwc) in Kachemak Bay.
36	recommended action	Allow the use of personal watercraft (pwc) in Kachemak Bay.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
36	threatened/protected values	A person using a personal watercraft (pwc) should have equal rights to explore and enjoy this state just like every other user on the water using whatever means possible. I do not see the difference between a personal watercraft (pwc) and any other watercraft.
36	other comments	N/A
37	interest or concern	I feel it is worth revisiting the ban on PWC in Kachemak bay. If a ban on watercraft is necessary it should be based on the impact vs size and horsepower in a practical manner. The difference between small boats and wave-runner/jetski's of similar size and horsepower are inconsequential.
37	recommended action	Either lift the ban or clarify the restrictions to all watercraft of that size and horsepower.... Usage should be limited to only in the waters of Kachemak Bay, not in the rivers and tributaries...
37	threatened/protected values	Preservation of Kachemak Bay with development for recreation and tourism.
38	interest or concern	I would prefer each area to be as nearly non-motorized as possible! Especially, no "jet-ski" type water craft use in Kachemak bay! Thank you for your consideration!
38	recommended action	I would prefer each area to be as nearly non-motorized as possible! Especially, no "jet-ski" type water craft use in Kachemak bay! Thank you for your consideration!
38	threatened/protected values	I most value these areas as wild spaces, without aggressive motorised intrusion.
38	other comments	Thank you
39	interest or concern	Please open kachemak bay back to personal water craft! This would be great for our family! There's no reason this shouldn't be open. Thank you
39	recommended action	Open Kachemak Bay to Personal Watercraft
40	other comments	Lift the ban on pwc's
41	interest or concern	I would like to see shrimp, crab, clams, and sea duck return to the area. I am concerned that overharvesting by commercial and public entities has devastated population. To manage for maximum sustained yields and now there are years of closures? No more commercial harvesting in k-bay.
41	recommended action	Enforcement
41	threatened/protected values	The way it looks with minimal development. It is getting more difficult to find peaceful bays.
42	interest or concern	I do not like pink salmon. Nor does anyone else in alaska. How can we have a critical habitat area, which has been identified for its productivity, only to raise pink salmon. If we ever want our other species to return the hatchery needs to go.
42	recommended action	Get rid of the hatchery. Create sanctuaries for wildlife to reproduce.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
42	threatened/protected values	Fishing and hunting. These values are being lost. Too much harvesting is taking place. Every year I go farther and farther out to find halibut. This year they were all starving, gray mushy meat with nothing in their stomachs. Where have all the ducks gone? I used to see 10s of 1000s now only small flocks.
43	interest or concern	The plan should include the use of all types of vessels in those areas that allow vessels now; specifically Personal Water Craft (PWC) are prohibited by 05AAC95.310, 11AAC20.115 and 11AAC20.215. The prohibition of PWC was originally based on non-scientific "evidence" ...revisit the applicable AAC please!
43	recommended action	Repeal (or support the repeal of) 05AAC95.310, 11AAC20.115 and 11AAC20.215.
43	threatened/protected values	All of them; K-Bay & Fox River are some of many Alaskan treasures to be enjoyed with equal access by responsible users. The management plan process reflects the public's concerns and intent; please consider reasonable and equitable access by all members of the public.
44	interest or concern	The implementation of rules and guidelines that safeguard the health of the habitat.
44	recommended action	Increase monitoring and planning efforts so as to act proactively in response to possible effects of climate change and in response to increased activity in the area.
44	threatened/protected values	The ecological services it provides, especially as a nursery for juvenile salmon and other beloved fish.
44	other comments	I'd like ADF&G to consider more the watersheds within Kachemak Bay including the Fox River Flats because those waters are connected to the landscape and feed directly into the bay.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
45	interest or concern	<p>My concern is the appearance of injustice and discrimination between modes of watercraft transportation. The highway to Homer is traveled by locals and tourists whether they are driving a truck, motorhome, car or motorcycle. Vehicles are allowed to travel along state and federal roads in Alaska as they do along the roadway systems in the rest of the United States of America. Not only Homer funds are used but state and federal funds have and are being used to develop and maintain these systems, to include the harbor of Homer. There are basic limitations for these types of transportation to frequent roadways or other areas that are used by that type of vehicle and are considered acceptable in the United States of America. None of these though restrict them from using the highway or roadway systems to travel on if utilizing a car, truck or motorcycle. Travel on the marine highway is subject to similar stipulations; however, restricting one type of transportation over another is discriminatory. All forms of watercraft should be allowed to navigate marine waterways to include shipping lanes. If I have a boat that is 10 feet long or the state ferry M/V Tustamena, we should both be allowed to travel and navigate in federally funded waterways of America, to include all shipping lanes. My family and I are lifelong Alaskans of Homer, Alaska and it troubles me that a few community members have arbitrarily distinguished one watercraft from another and incorrectly determined which vessel is a form of transportation. Alaskans and mariners should be able to navigate and utilize these waterways and established shipping lanes which have been used for many years for trade, subsistence &amp; travel. It is absurd to deny a particular style of boat or watercraft from seeking the safest route of travel or even shelter from unexpected Alaskan weather.</p>
45	recommended action	<p>Safe passage for small vessels requires fuel stops. Marine travel from Cook Inlet to Kodiak or Seward requires fuels stop(s). This regulation is prohibiting safe navigation by targeting specific marine vessels from navigating these waterways approaching Homer and/or Seldovia for fuel, supplies, repair, or safe harbor. This current discriminatory act of disallowing certain motor vessels from utilizing or navigating upon the safe routes is putting the operators and passengers at undue risk or even death. The best and only appropriate action would be to allow all marine motor vessels equal and fair travel on the same routes as designated by State, Federal and NOAA publications.</p>
45	threatened/protected values	<p>We all want safety and to protect our land, fish, wildlife and heritage. My value is based on wanting a fair and non-discriminatory act in place to protect these areas that are being discussed without sacrificing our Alaskan rights to safely navigate these waters.</p>
45	other comments	<p>I vote we change and update this rule to include all marine motor vessels without discrimination.</p>
46	interest or concern	<p>I would like to see the water reopened to personal watercraft, since it was closed without public notice.</p>
46	recommended action	<p>Reopen to personal watercraft. They are just like a boat but much cleaner and quieter.</p>
46	threatened/protected values	<p>The scenery and wildlife are awesome. Would like to be able to enjoy it by personal watercraft.</p>

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
47	interest or concern	Stewardship of the Kachemak Bay CHA needs to be continued and strengthened. Those of us who live on the Bay consider it home, and it needs to be protected and cherished for all that it is and can be. Some people see the Bay and CHA as an economic development area. They want to see a loosening of constraints and to make exploitation of this habitat and the accompanying resources easier. This should not be allowed to happen.
47	recommended action	The state Legislature created the CHAs in 1972 with the specific focus “to protect and preserve habitat areas especially crucial to the perpetuation of fish and wildlife, and to restrict all other uses not compatible with that primary purpose.” All of the original protections need to be kept in place, and clarification and justification for further limitations need to be included. Since enforcement is limited due to resource constraints, greater emphasis in the new management plan needs to be focused on educating users. More signage in heavy use areas, stating what restrictions there are, why the restrictions are in place, and suggestions for how individual users can go beyond those limits to help ensure a great viability of the Bay’s critical areas.
47	threatened/protected values	I value the natural beauty and managed resources of the KB CHA. I would love to see the Bay return to the productivity of 30 years ago, when crabbing, shrimping, and clamming was possible. Protecting the CHA from over-use, exploitation, and disregard is of utmost importance. The wildlife and the sources of sustenance and reproductive areas for the wildlife needs to be protected and conserved.
47	other comments	"Personal watercraft" or jet skis should not be allowed in the Bay. This may be beyond the scope of the management plan, but if there is some way to incorporate this into the plan it needs to be there. There is already enough boat traffic in the Bay. Having retrieved numerous sea otter carcasses from the beaches as part of the ASLC stranding network I can attest to the ill effects of speed and boat traffic on wildlife. Disrupting birds, otters, and other sea life with jet skis zipping around the Bay will not "protect and preserve habitat..." They are also another source of pollution and noise in an already busy waterway.
48	interest or concern	I am life long Kenai Peninsula resident
48	recommended action	you need to lift the pwc ban in cook inlet this is an antiquated law that has no place with today's new clean pwc technology
48	threatened/protected values	I want to be able to ride my pwc to Seldovia this is absolutely ridiculous that you let special interest groups like cook inlet keeper dictate which user groups benefit from public waters. there is no damaged caused by pwcs
48	other comments	quit letting outside special interest groups dictate what Alaska lands and waters are open for public use
49	interest or concern	Repeal the ban on person watercraft

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
49	recommended action	Hold new public meetings for fact gathering and public input. There was lack of public input and facts when the ban was put into place. There was a large petition against the ban when the original ban was put into place and it was not given true consideration .
49	threatened/protected values	The bay offers residents and visitors a great place recreation and a place to fish and hunt. Proper management will keep this resource available for many generations. I believe we can loosen up a few restrictions and still maintain this balance..
50	interest or concern	I would love for this to be open to PWC. It is no more harmful than charter and personal boats out there 24-7
50	recommended action	Please open PWC.
51	interest or concern	Please open the waters to jet skis. It is a public water way anyone should be able to use it with whatever type of watercraft they choose
51	recommended action	I would like to see you remove the PWC ban
51	threatened/protected values	The ability for everyone to use them and currently there are groups of us that can not.
52	other comments	These waters should be open to all users.
53	interest or concern	Hello, I have a concern with the PWC ban in Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats CHAs. I feel this ban needs to be repealed and revisited. The ban is based off of zero scientific effective local area studies. A study in California or an already polluted lake in Arizona has no bearing on our waters. The commercial and sport marine vessels that navigate Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats CHAs without a doubt distribute more pollutants into the CHAs than PWCs and are utilized much more frequently than PWCs in Alaska. In congruent lines with our state and national Constitutions and every Alaska Residents rights of recreation and subsistence in the CHAs if PWCs are banned than so to should be every sport and commercial gasoline or diesel powered vessel.
53	recommended action	I feel the PWC ban should be repealed and revisited.
53	threatened/protected values	I value the diverse types of marine and wild life found in the CHAs. I value calling the richest estuary in the world my home. I value Alaska Residents responsibly enjoying the CHAs through sport, recreation and subsistence. I feel these values are being protected.
53	other comments	I feel that Alaska Residents who enjoy PWCs should be allowed to use them in Kachemak Bay. I feel that the current PWC ban holds no merit and should be repealed and revisited. I also feel that with similar regulations to sport and commercial vessels and atvs PWCs are not dangerous in any way to the CHAs. Thank you for reading my comments.
54	interest or concern	I think jet skis should be allowed in kachemak bay. There is no reason for a ban. Large vessels inherently harass marine mammals, jet skis do not. They are now very fish efficient and quiet.
54	recommended action	Open kachemak bay to jet skis.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
54	threatened/protected values	I love the ebb and flow of kachemak bay. All of it. Surfing, sailing ,sea kayaking ,paddle boarding, commercial fishing, sport fishing, birding, marine mammal observing, power boating. I feel that my values are being protected.
54	other comments	I do hope the jet ski ban in kachemak bay is lifted. Thanks for listening.
55	interest or concern	I feel that Kachemak Bay should be open to all powerboats including pwc. They are no louder or pollute any more than any other class of vessel in the Bay.
55	recommended action	Over turn the ban on pwc in Kachemak Bay
55	threatened/protected values	These waters have many eyes monitoring them and I feel that they are no way threatened by any one class of vessel. Leave it open for all to enjoy until science proves otherwise.
56	interest or concern	Jet skis should be allowed.
56	recommended action	Pwc (jet skis) should be allowed.
56	threatened/protected values	Duck hunting, i do not feel they are threatened
57	interest or concern	I'm concerned that regulations (against personal water craft) are being based on some peoples feelings rather than rational judgement.
57	recommended action	I believe I should be able to carry a PWC on my boat for a runabout. I can carry a zodiac with an outboard. I think the current regulations are completely irrational in today's times. New PWC are as quiet or quieter than boats and create less wake. Some peoples distaste for PWC shouldn't constitute regulations against them.
57	threatened/protected values	Hunting, fishing, camping, etc,.... Just like any other place in the state; it's the reason we live here. Why should one boat be regulated against because you set on top of it? PWC's make less impact than a lot of runabouts.
57	other comments	I believe PWC's should be treated like anyother water craft. I think the regulations against PWC are outdated and are based on nothing more than some people pet peeves.
58	interest or concern	The inability of all user groups to enjoy these areas.
58	recommended action	Remove the Personal watercraft restriction for kachemak bay but put a restriction in place for fresh waters of k-bay and fox river.
58	threatened/protected values	The ability for most user groups to use then but by having a pwc ban it prevents people from other regions that have access to personal watercraft a from using this has they have money invested in these means of transportation but are unable to use them. Due to them having money tied up in something they are not able to use in our areas they are unable to come and experience them.
58	other comments	Personal water crafts are used all over the world in other environmentally sensitive areas, Florida keys, prince William sound. The ability to use them in these areas open up the public lands for more to enjoy and experience.



Committer ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
59	interest or concern	I feel it should be open to all groups to use
60	interest or concern	The update of the management plan is taking place after considerable new research has been conducted on the northern Gulf of Alaska ecosystem and the initiation of a long-term monitoring program to document recovery of the ecosystem and human uses of its resources following the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989. Following the designation of the Kachemak Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve (KBRR), the nearshore and benthic habitats and waters within the Critical Habitat Area have become a scientifically-significant area for the detection of the impacts of human activities including human-caused climate change. These impacts can be expected to continue and influence the productivity of the fish and wildlife populations and their uses for which the CHA’s protective designation was made. For this reason, applications to conduct activities within the CHA require greater scrutiny than under the conditions under which the management plan was originally developed. The characterization of the ecology of Kachemak Bay, as developed by the KBRR and updated through more recent research, should be incorporated into the management plan as the basis for managing human uses within the CHA.
60	interest or concern	The impacts of increased sedimentation rates from glacial melt and the impacts of erosion of shoreline habitats should also be considered. New metrics are needed to track “healthy” fish and wildlife populations and habitats in an ecosystem context, including the monitoring of invasive species, changes in species range, and declines in species of ecological concern.
60	recommended action	I recommend the review of the status of the issues be considered in the planning process and policies be developed to protect of juvenile salmon habitat in Fox River Flats from impacts of human access and pollution,
60	recommended action	address impacts of aquaculture operations on wild salmon stocks (including genetic impacts and competition) and food web competition from releases of large number of hatchery and net pen-reared salmon, address impacts of mariculture (including on-bottom clam restoration projects) on natural populations,
60	recommended action	include a process of adaptation planning for responses to invasive species, oil spills and other types of pollution;
60	recommended action	protect intertidal communities with diverse rocky intertidal habitats in China Poot, Peterson, Jakalof, Halibut Cove and Kasitsna Bays, as well as Sadie Cove, which are used for education and recreation; address the potential impacts of ecotourism access and bicycle use of beaches with intertidal communities vulnerable to impact from traffic and illegal collections;
60	recommended action	develop measures to reduce boat strikes on sea otters (one of the leading causes of mortality).
60	recommended action	Finally, the impact of noise on sensitive wildlife species should be considered - the prohibition on jet skis should remain in place and restrictions placed on other sources of noise likely to disturb wildlife.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
60	recommended action	Enforceable policies and specific permitting decisions need to be undertaken in the context of the management of a dynamic ecosystem. Due to the rate of ecological change, some process is needed to continue updating the scientific and local knowledge base during the life of the plan and to re-visit the management policies more often than several decades in the future.
60	threatened/protected values	I value the diversity and abundance of wildlife that is viewable on and around the bay and the diversity and abundance of rocky intertidal communities which are limited in extent in the Bay. I also value the relatively quiet, uncrowded nature of the south shore of the Bay. Most of all, I value my participation in a healthy ecosystem and a human community that can be resilient through the responsible management of the Kachemak Bay/Fox River Flats CHA.
60	other comments	Thank you for taking a new look at the management plan. Please work closely with the staff of the KBRR to ensure all the current science is included in consideration of how best to "protect and manage" fish and wildlife populations and habitats in an ecosystem context.
61	interest or concern	None
61	recommended action	Open the waters to personal water crafts
61	threatened/protected values	The fisheries. I believe how the fisheries are managed make the biggest impact than the types of boats on them
61	other comments	I would like to see kachemak bay open to pew. I do not believe a small inboard motor is any more deadly then a boat propeller
62	interest or concern	Please open the Bay back up to PWC's
62	recommended action	Please open the Bay back up to PWC's
62	threatened/protected values	Fishing and Sight seeing
62	other comments	Please open the Bay back up to PWC's
63	interest or concern	I feel it is unfair that access to Kachemak Bay is restricted to more wealthy people and tourists. The method of transportation to visit these areas should not be regulated so heavily. I heard from a law enforcement officer from Homer that the area was shut down to some methods of transportation because of the actions of a few irresponsible individuals and some of the reasons used are not particular to the method of transportation used by these individuals; the noise from a Personal WaterCraft is quieter than many of the power boats and tour boats that come out of the Homer boat harbor on any day, the maneuvering of PWC's is not much different than many power boats and PWC's, because of their size, make a much smaller wake than most powerboats. The ban of use of PWC's in Kachemak Bay must be lifted so that all may enjoy the area, controlling the actions of all users must be done more accurately.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
63	recommended action	Open the area to PWC use, have stringent inspection of equipment and operators aptitude done before leaving land, more high speed patrolling capabilities.
63	threatened/protected values	Being able to view the natural resources that are abundant in the area at one's leisure without being restricted to a "far off, caged" experience. By making them unavailable they are being over protected, if they are unavailable why have them?
64	interest or concern	My major concern about the Fox River Flats is the destruction that is taking place to the habitat due to the increase in use by off road vehicles. Ever since the trail access was illegally turned into a road, mainly for access to the village of Kachemak Selo, there has been an increase in vehicle using it to explore the flats for pleasure, hunting, and fishing. It may also correlate with the develop of a wheeler trail that extends beyond the old village of Dolena to the edge of the wildlife refuge. Either way there is a huge increase of the number and types of vehicles traveling across the mudflats. There was a time that Fish and Game tried to force the use of the inland trail that parallels the flats. However, there is really no way to enforce this. Plus it is complicated by the fact that the trail is often impassable. Maybe there is a way to concentrate the use along the high tide line rather than all over the mudflats.
64	recommended action	Either improve the inland trail, or try to educate the public to following along the upper edge of the tide flats.
64	threatened/protected values	The solitude,the quiet, the views. The views are not compromised, but the solitude and quiet is often gone.
64	other comments	Even though this area is remote I think it is essential that we not forget its importance. I wish we could go back in time and get the access back to a switchback trail, but we can't.
65	interest or concern	My primary concern is biological integrity, but very close behind that is access to this public land. Without scientific justification, current regulation prohibits one type of watercraft from accessing KB and FRF CHA. It is hard to believe, with all of the marine traffic in these areas, that one type of watercraft - but none of the others - would cause habitat degradation or threaten wildlife. This is another example of ADFG becoming possessive of public resources, and limiting the public from using public resources simply because ADFG doesn't like it. If you applied scientific principles to the restriction the net would be cast too wide and you would catch (and have to restrict) marine vessels that you DO like, therefore, you continue to unjustifiably single out personal watercraft, simply because you can
65	recommended action	Treat all watercraft users fairly and equitably.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
65	threatened/protected values	We value the wildness and eco-diversity. They are not threatened. Pressured, but not threatened (I mean c'mon...you've got oil drilling ships parked in the middle of it). What is being threatened is equal public access. A small group of locals, aided by a handful of state bureaucrats, are trying to manage the KB and FRF CHA's according to their own values, as opposed to the values the interested public is demanding.
66	interest or concern	There is no reason Personal Watercraft should be banned. Banning of PWCs is from a small yet vocal group of people who want public land and resources for themselves and their interests without regard for anyone else. People local to areas get blocked from accessing land they could use regularly by people who rarely if ever visit, disregarding the fact all could use it together. People banning PWCs insist the only way they can use such areas is alone, while PWC users welcome everyone.
66	recommended action	Ignore proposals to ban PWCs
66	threatened/protected values	Access to the bay, and yes, I feel they are threatened.
66	other comments	Bans like the ones against PWCs are very hard to reverse in any timely manner and are fundamentally unfair.
67	interest or concern	Being local recreational fishers and users of the bay, my family is concerned about the future health of Kachemak Bay, As we saw on the Kenai River, increased use has detrimental affects on the sustainability of the resource. I have learned that Fox River Flats includes off channels that sustain juvenile salmon. The current approved access to this area is an unsafe trail, which is seldom used. And there is no enforcement. With increased population, growing numbers of 4 wheelers are using an area, which can adversely affect salmon habitat.
67	recommended action	The plan must be more comprehensive to include estuaries and rivers – but be a “living document” to be adaptable to things such as climate change, pollution, and increased use, all of which could again change the salmon spawning locale. Enforcement is very difficult currently due to reduced personnel, so I encourage a robust education program. Reaching out to community members, and especially children, can help raise appreciation and concern for these fragile areas.
68	recommended action	I would like to see the ban on Personal Watercraft lifted. Lifting the ban would provide equal access.
69	interest or concern	I feel that the existing CHA plans are well written, and cover a wide range of activities. However there is a need to update the plans with current research and information that has been gained about the human uses, fish and wildlife over the past 20+ years since the plan was first published. I feel strongly that there is a great need for better enforcement of existing policies in the plan, and a huge need for education that will hopefully lead the people who use the CHA to make good decisions.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
69	recommended action	The updated plan should encompass adaptive planning approaches so that future conditions that can't be foreseen can be addressed. The plan should be addressed- it is a huge issue, especially in the Fox River CHA.
69	threatened/protected values	I value the fish and wildlife, and their habitats most. As the population in Kachemak Bay area grows, there is increasing pressure on these resources and habitats, and in some cases- for example at the head of the Bay, they are not being adequately protected.
70	interest or concern	I think the CHA should remain open to grazing and accessible to users such as hunters, hikers and bikers.
70	recommended action	Better signage. Folks might stay on the trail if they knew where it was - also if folks are required to use the bluff trail, - a days work brushing it out would go a long way.
70	threatened/protected values	I think the value as grazing and recreational land is incredible. It would be a terrible shame to lose this land to a "park" or some other protected land. I don't like seeing the wheelies and donuts spun by morons on their wheelers but sometimes I feel like that's the price of progress in our modern world. Not everyone is going to follow the rules and it's a drag we have those nignogs who give the rest of us a bad name. No number can be placed on the value of this place and closing it to cows and hunters isn't going to stop the donut spinning idiots.
70	other comments	Is any of this hype related to the Kilcher's TV show?
71	interest or concern	I feel like PWC should be allowed to operate in the area.
71	recommended action	Possible time restrictions?
71	threatened/protected values	I don't feel that they are any more affected by PWC's than a 32' fishing boat doing 40knts.
72	interest or concern	Keep the shit natural
72	recommended action	Grow weed
72	other comments	Suck my balls

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
73	interest or concern	For the Kachemak Bay and Fox River Flats CHAs I have the following concerns and interests: - A primary concern is that there remains a management priority to sustain the abundance, health and diversity of the upland, intertidal and subtidal habitats and fish, shellfish, bird, and marine mammal resources in Kachemak Bay and the Fox River Flats. A healthy, diverse ecosystem is key to sustaining marine resources for harvest and ecotourism now and into the future. Taking an ecosystem approach is also important, including consideration of potential climate change impacts and effects on the marine food web effects from resource harvests and aquaculture operations. - I also believe it is important that CHA management considers not only what resources we currently have in the bay, but the fish, shellfish and bird resources that used to be abundant in the bay but are no longer, due to both past harvest pressure and climate change, such as crab, shrimp, herring, seaducks and more recently clams. CHA management should consider potential restoration actions, including protection of potential habitat, for these species. Historic information should be incorporated into the plan to help avoid the problem of shifting baselines. -For Fox River Flats, recent research by the Kachemak Bay Research Reserve and other scientists has demonstrated extensive use of estuary habitat throughout this area by early life stages of salmon. Managing to preserve habitat for salmon should be considered in the management plan. The management plan could consider ways to help prevent stream habitat erosion from ATV use, which could include a trail that accommodates changing river patterns and permit enforcement. - I think the interagency coordination between ADFG and the Kachemak Bay State Park in areas of overlapping jurisdiction is important and should be maintained.
73	recommended action	- Include a management priority to maintain wild salmon runs in the CHA. - Incorporate data and scientific findings from other agency and university research, monitoring and mapping in the area into management of the CHA (e.g. NOAA, KBRR, UAF, UAA, etc). Encourage coordination with these organizations to develop habitat maps, essential habitat areas for specific species, vulnerability assessments, etc. -Promote environmental stewardship education efforts and development of best practices guides for marine resource uses.
73	threatened/protected values	-Maintain health and diversity of the marine ecosystem
74	interest or concern	Allow pwc on the waterways.
74	recommended action	Allowed personal watercraft
74	threatened/protected values	My freedoms of using my only boat. Pwc is banned.
74	other comments	With less damage to the environment, I don't understand why jetskis are banned. Some people can only afford a jetski and they are banned on lakes and waterways because of why.. only complaint is have heard is noise.. the large jet boats have just as much.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
75	interest or concern	Interested in fishing, atv useage, hunting, ability to run livestock on it. Concerns are that these compatible activities will be lost.
75	recommended action	Continue the current useages. Make net harvest on Fox river not available. In otherwords, no nets in the river. It is destroying the silver SalMon run.
75	threatened/protected values	Duck hunting, fishing in Fox river, and atv useage along with grazing animals make this a prime use area.
76	interest or concern	Cattle have been an important part of the ecology in this area. Over and over we notice while duck hunting there in the fall that the birds hang out in areas that are well grazed so they can see the predators and the freshly clipped grass appears to be more to their liking than the tall grasses. It's important to the culture of the area to preserve the right to use these productive grasslands for grazing. Management or lack of, is a concern. I've watched the flats take the annual beating from wheelers in the fall due to not being held to using a specific trail. Now the wheelers have found out they can drive safely across Fox River in the fall and they are abusing that area in the same thoughtless way. I've watched as the fall returns of silvers to Swift Creek has disappeared due to nets being used to catch the last of the runs and the moose population dump due to illegal hunting practices.
76	recommended action	A plan to handle the increasing wheeler traffic and absolutely make it un-lawful to cross the Fox River on any wheeler - thus at least preserving those areas beyond the Fox for foot or horse back travel. (at least in the summer) Wheelers create lasting damage to the terrain if used when the ground is not frozen. Free grazers is a problem. The Fox River Cattleman's Association is held to a high standard to maintain the grass height and to mitigate erosion. Their hands are tied regarding managing the neighbors horses and cattle that are allowed to roam freely during times the Flats is supposed to be reserved for winter moose browse. The Association pays fees to use the land for grazing, free grazers are not held to the same standard. Not fair.
76	threatened/protected values	Horses are part of my culture and I value an open space that is suitable for horse travel being made available for me to enjoy. I feel that wheeler traffic do threaten this activity by being allowed to cross the Fox River. I recognize the need to transport land owners and hunters on the Homer side of the River but there is no need for them to expand to take over between the rivers. Grazing rights should be preserved. If the Cattleman's Assoc. had not been around for the last 60+ years observing changes in this area and helping making management decisions I'm afraid the Flats would have had to be "locked up" to protect it from bad users. Who else would manage a piece of land this large better than those that truly are trying to make a living off of it? Don't settle for making any of this area a "sacrifice area" like I feel the Swift Creek has.

Committer ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
76	other comments	<p>I get very emotional about this area as I spent many summers growing up at the Milton Lewis place (now part of Dolena) so have a lot of family history there as I'm sure lots of other commenters have. It's a special place and just building the Switchback Road (on a trail that is for foot/horse use only by State law??) has created enough changes for a couple of lifetimes!! And then for the Borough to spend my tax dollars to make said improvements is beyond belief. We have to draw the line some place. People opt to live in this remote area for the simple reason that it is remote. As generations evolve, new demands are made for schools, improved roads, etc. I'm in favor of a very long term plan that outlines the immediate needs and future needs as well as can be predicted. I am very appreciative that this process is underway and thankful for the opportunity to be involved. There is no other accessible place like the Head of the Bay. It is important to preserve the values that we think are important: recreation, grazing, place to teach the next generation about wild things and places and hunting.</p>



Committer ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
77	interest or concern	<p>My husband and I own Jakolof Bay Oyster Company in Kachemak Bay, and I am also president of the Alaska Shellfish Grower’s Association. I would like to encourage the Department of Fish and Game to remain open to mariculture in Kachemak Bay. Shellfish farming is a zero input activity -- we add zero water, zero feed and zero fertilizer. Instead the products we farm give back to the environment providing a variety of ecosystem services in four broad categories: provisioning our community with nutritious foods, regulating water quality, supporting nutrient cycling and nursery habitats, and culturally enhancing recreational activities, tourism and employment in our community. At a time when tax dollars are being spent on research into coastal resiliency, shellfish farming is a low impact industry with a high benefit to resiliency. Provisioning: Not only are shellfish a nutritious and delicious low carbon footprint protein, land farmers in the community are using shells and kelp from our lines to enrich their soils providing them with organic alternatives that are not shipped up from outside. Kelp and shellfish can play an important role in carbon sequestration, and some countries are actually beginning to pay their growers for this service through carbon credit systems. Regulating: A single oyster is capable of filtering 50 gallons of water per day, reducing nitrogen, phytoplankton and inorganic particles in surrounding waters helping to control overall abundance of phytoplankton. This nutrient cycling is critical at a time when we are seeing drastic reduction in intertidal clam populations, which provided that ecosystem service to the bay in the past. Studies have shown that robust populations of shellfish can suppress and modulate harmful blooms of phytoplankton. This is an important ecosystem service, now that we are seeing warmer water temperatures here, and it is a service to all wildlife in the bay. Supporting Habitat: Kelp grows very dense close to the nutrients provided by our shellfish, and along with the gear in the water shellfish farmsites provide a rich nursery habitat for a wide diversity of vertebrate and invertebrate organisms -- worms, snails, sea squirts, sponges, crabs, shrimp and juvenile fish. The overall ecological result is greatly enhanced biodiversity in shellfish habitat compared to surrounding areas of the seabed. Cultural Services: There are many restaurants in Homer that serve local shellfish; it is one of the few non-frozen local seafoods available year-round. Fishermen and kayakers recognize the habitat benefits, as they are frequently attracted to come close to farms where fishing, otter and diving duck photography is best. And having commercially grown shellfish readily available can relieve pressure on wild clam harvests. Lastly, Alaska desperately needs economic diversification. The Governor has a new mariculture task force to explore ways to grow the industry from it’s current nascent state. Over half of statewide production is in southcentral Alaska -- with 14 farms in Kachemak Bay and 4 in Prince William Sound, Kachemak Bay is an important contribution. The stated purpose</p>
77	recommended action	Encourage and support mariculture in Kacehmak Bay.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
77	threatened/protected values	Clean water is the single most important resource. But the management plan has little/no jurisdiction or enforcement solutions over threats to clean water here (threats like: unaccompanied tanker traffic, oil & gas development outside Kachemak Bay, upland sewage system issues, shipping and boating discharges, etc), so the focus of the habitat division ends up being on permitting of docks, bouys, lines which may be a visual concern to tourists or upland landowners, but can actually provide rich habitat for sea life, which can improve water quality (styrofoam is already restricted, and being phased out, the biggest input of Styrofoam recently came not from permittees, but from the city of Homer, and a significant quantity enters the bay as marine debris from outside -- all outside of the division's control).
240	interest or concern	I live in Halibut Cove and my primary concern is that unreasonable limits and prohibitions will be imposed on those who live and work within the two critical habitat areas. I would strongly encourage a balanced interpretation of published goals within the management plan. The safeguarding of "public use" should be pursued with the same zeal as protecting fish and wildlife. In that regard, I ask that the designated corridors for off road vehicle use to gather coal in the Homer and Anchor Point tidelands continue to be permitted. These are among the very few accessible areas to collect coal for those who rely on coal to heat their homes.
240	recommended action	Again I would argue that all proposed changes be undergirded by common sense, and that any curtailment of human activity deemed a threat to the habitat, pass the strictest test before being adopted.
240	threatened/protected values	What I value most in the opportunity to pursue life and liberty with minimal interference from the legion of folks who seem to know better than I how life should be lived. Some regulation is necessary but if those in charge keep planting a "stop" sign every 10 feet, no one will be able to do anything
240	other comments	Only one. The appropriate agency needs to initiate a rehabilitation program for the seaotters. They are destroying the tidal areas and killing every last clam and crab in the bay. They don't share nice with the people.
242	interest or concern	Take more research from nonfederal agencies seriously. All agencies who have jurisdiction in the CHA need to have to read this the same.
242	recommended action	When there are projects proposed that will bring back or maybe make current populations come back to sustainable levels the agencies might work with those project leaders and maybe even support them with staff resources or even just letters of support.
242	threatened/protected values	Clam population decline, crab and shrimp declines salmon, halibut declines and not being allowed to work on these populations to bring them back up to sustainable standards. ADF&G has been the biggest road block in getting this work done.

Commenter ID	Question # from Scoping Comment Form	Comment
242	other comments	There has been way too much self interpretation of this document by people who either have or perceive they have authority. There should be one clear understanding to it and work that benefits people and the CHA of Kachemak Bay should be encouraged and supported by all agencies who have opposed this in the past.