

Comments	
	Other
1	The language in the proposal seems to be very one sided. There is a sense of "if there is a conflict, you will not be allowed to use the area". This seems wrong. Conflict in itself should not be the gating factor. We are all "owners" of this area and should be able to use it, given that that use does not destroy the natural area. Because someone yells louder does not make them right. How about looking at an economic study of the area? Which users groups are contributing more to the state (licenses, users fees, etc) and to the local economy? Maybe that should be a determining factor? But that doesn't seem quite right either.
2	Although I live out of state at the time, I was born and raised in Gaylord and have spent a lot of time in the Pigeon River State Forest. This is a quality area that continued snowmobile access as it is today will not harm. Thank you, Tony.
3	none.
4	<p>Instead of trying to manage through the use of edicts, the DNR should be leading by example. Just one example - restrictions requiring the use of electric motors except by the DNR. Presuming the restriction is reasonable, then all users should be using electric motors. The exception should be for emergencies rather than for DNR employees. I wonder how many electric boat motors, chain saws, on road vehicles, and heavy trucks the DNR is using in the forest? How about hybrids which the military is going to use to reduce noise on heavy vehicles? If the public is required to refit their equipment, why should the DNR be allowed to pollute under the guise of "management"? It shouldn't! The policies should be uniform and based on facts - this will help compliance. By the way, I believe the noisiest thing in the forest are the jet fighters. Where is that being addressed?</p> <p>The priorities in this document seem to have a total disregard for human safety. As more people who are less familiar with the forest visit, there is a need to provide for their safety. Where is there mention of better signage for the roads and trails so that people are less likely to get lost. Is barricading roads going to make it harder to conduct a search and rescue or survive a</p>
5	<p>Please consider carefully the changes you seek to make and protect the rights of the individuals (as the USA Government's primary purpose)instead of removing them to please the public's preception.</p> <p>Enjoy your day.</p>
6	I understand that with the popularity of the region growing there are going to be changes but the changes that are taking place are forcing everything that doesn't get shot, into other areas away from PRC and that is a shame. Someone needs to take a long hard look at what is going on between the hunting, the horses and the running of bear dogs. The people that make these decisions need to visit the PRC and stay for a while not just make the executive decision while sitting in Lansing. Listen to the people who knew what PRC was like in the past not those looking to fill a line item by imposing or raising fees or by how much money a group horse camp can make for the state.
7	There is a prejudice in the proposed management of the land for hunting, fishing, and timber cutting. If a "soft footprint" is the desired result, the people who visit and live at Song of the Morning Ranch have the least impact on the wildlife as there is no use of firearms, off-road vehicles, alcohol, tobacco, or loud activities permitted.
8	I have personally visited the Song of the Morning Ranch many times over the last 35 years and have found it to be in keeping with the values that the DNR professes to promote - those of healthy land use in harmony with the requirements of maintaining a beautiful natural environment. In addition, the friendly and peaceful people who live at Song of the Morning and visit there can only serve as a draw for the kind of visitors that the DNR desires-those who value and respect the beauty of nature and will put their energies into maintaining this beauty.Also, from a tourism standpoint and speaking as a Canadian I would point out the much needed dollars that the Michigan (and the local)economy needs. I have many friends and know of many other Canadians who visit Song of the Morning for extended stays and participate in a wide radius of tourism activities.

9	<p>I am amazed at the attitude of the MDNR in that during years of continuing decline of fishing and hunting licensing across the state there is still a continued propensity to assault the Golden Lotus organization in Vanderbilt, and their peaceful, spiritual, and conservation oriented principles, when the efforts of the MDNR would be better served by focusing on issues that are truly in its interest. The present proposal and its misconstrued claims against Golden Lotus is at best against the higher interest of the MDNR. You would be well advised to adhere to the truth in the process of carrying out the duties ascribed to the MDNR, as opposed to the obvious deviation from veracity in the present proposal, pointed out to you by Mr. in his letter of September 10, 2007, which I have reproduced below.</p> <p>The issues are simple. Should the DNR essentially confiscate private property (mineral rights) to achieve goals driven by special interest hunting and fishing groups? I am suggesting that the DNR develop policies that honor the Constitution of the United States of America by respecting the rights of private property owners.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>I have read with interest your proposed Concept of Management for the Pidgeon River Country. I would specifically like to add</p> <p>From Page 11 Lines 15 and 16.</p> <p>“The true proximate cause of damage to the Pidgeon River was the MDNR’s faultily-premised permit and its faulty sup</p> <p>From Page 12 Lines 20 and 21.</p> <p>“ . . . It is clear that Golden Lotus did not violate the 1 foot requirement of the permit” (This is in reference to the rate of</p> <p>From Page 17 Lines 6-8.</p> <p>“In other words, defendant’s responsibility, if any, is limited to 25% of the total fish kill” (Thus the MDNR was resp</p> <p>In the interest of truth and fairness, I suggest you obtain a copy of the court’s ruling and make the appropriate corrections</p> <p>With respect to other areas of your document I do not believe we should achieve the objective maintaining a “Wild” env</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding my position, please to not hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Most Sincerely,</p>
10	<p>As a horseback rider the PRC is one of our favorite places to go. For the last 20+ yrs we have gone once or twice a year to ride the country and look for elk or just enjoy the scenery. I count them all as very special memories. I hope that during the concept of management update all remember that as a resident of the state of Michigan we are all entitled to access to the PRC. I look forward to the day that I can take my children on horseback to look for elk.</p>

11	<p>Upon reading your proposed Concept of Management for the Pigeon River Country, I would like to make a few comments. There have been some terrible mistakes in the representation of Song Of The Morning Ranch (Golden Lotus, Inc.) which I feel should be corrected.</p> <p>With the PUD that was drawn up in the past few years it shows that the ranch is only proposing approximately seventy four homes to possibly be built in the future. The total estimated number of residents would likely be closer to 150-200 rather than the "tens of thousands" as described in the update.</p> <p>There have been a few mis-quotes regarding the dam spill of the 1980s. Golden Lotus did not violate the permit in any way, nor were they responsible for any more than only 25% of the fish kill, leaving the DNR responsible for the other 75%.</p> <p>Song of the Morning Ranch has been a private property owner with mineral rights in the Pigeon River Country long before there was such a designated wild area. Why should any private property owner be disallowed the right to dig wells, be it oil or gas, while the state forest has many of them scattered all through it. It seems you are punishing the ranch or any other mineral owners.</p> <p>Members of Song of the Morning are great respecters of nature. They would be very happy to work with you on projects dealing with the forest.</p> <p>Would you please explain why you want to put up a wall between the ranch and the DNR when you could never find a more cooperative landowner?</p> <p>If you have any questions, comments or concerns, please contact us.</p>
12	<p>As a lifelong resident of Michigan that camps in the summer near Gaylord and snowmobiles in the winter in the northern lower peninsula and the U.P. I beg you to keep access open for snowmobiling in the forest and agree with others that to make a designated trail would do way more harm than good and we want to preserve the forest as much as the trail hikers, horseback riders and everyone else we do NOT want to see our trees and wildlife cut out or thrown for the forest but leave it be as a serene and beautiful landscape for all to enjoy.</p>
13	<p>please continue to allow horses on existing roads/two tracks. We as horse people are willing and able to share access with all other users. There is no need for more access roads just to separate the horses from others. This is a wild area to be used by all. Horseback riding is one of the least invasive ways to enjoy our great outdoors. Access is already limited by the number of camp sites. Hunters in other areas of the country use horses to access hunting areas.</p>
14	<p>I find it appalling that in these hard economic times the DNR would even consider administering more restrictions which has the potential to discourage tourists coming to Michigan to enjoy a quiet ride in The Pigeon River State Forest. Why should the entire snowmobile industry be punished for the offenses of a few who might abuse this privilege to ride in such a beautiful surroundings? This is similar to closing I-75 because some drivers go over the speed limit and lose control.</p> <p>Michigan should be expanding access to wilderness areas to attract those who would come to see the beauty of this State, from Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Ontario, and to encourage Michigan residents to stay home and ride.</p> <p>Please consider this letter to be a no vote on more restrictions to the Pigeon River State Forest, and a yes vote to tourist dollars, and income production for the businesses whose very survival are at stake with each restriction that gets enacted by the DNR, and legislature.</p>
15	<p>I am a 4th generation user of the forest. I have enjoyed the forest for 40 years and have shared it with my family and friends. I have adjusted to the vehicle access plan, however I do not like it. I would be extremely disappointed if snowmobile travel were to fall victim to the same restrictions. The forest belongs to us all and should be shared. Non motorized recreation already has portions of the forest to itself.</p>

16	<p>It is all of our interests to protect both the natural world as well as our constitutional rights as land owners. The DNR and DEQ should be able to work hand in hand with private land owners. Passing laws to try to steal land, or the use of land, or the rights of land owners for agenda's within the DNR or the DEQ, under any guise, is shameful.</p> <p>Please protect our forests as well as our rights as Americans. We are the Land of the Free for a reason! Do not shame the sacrifice of our brothers and sisters fighting for our freedom abroad by violating basic rights of Americans at home.</p> <p>Pertaining to to Golden Lotus Inc - please be fair and reasonable for this is a group that has done much to promote ecology and peace in our world. Simply because people disagree is not reason enough to change laws to exploit one another. In an age of intolerance and hatred it is our duty to find constructive ways to communicate and achieve mutually beneficial goals.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
17	<p>I would like to see legal evidence of you payment and public costs. Present this to the public.</p> <p>I would also like the haressment to Golden Lotus to stop! And admitt your responsibily and negligence.</p> <p>I also feel this and other comments should be published in the Gaylord Times, Detroit New, Newyork Times,and the Wall Street journal.</p>
18	<p>I would like to see legal evidence of your payment and public cost.</p> <p>I would like to see this published in the Gaylord Herald, the Detroit New, the New York Times, and the Wallstreet Journal.</p>
19	<p>The section on bicycling is somewhat ambigious with regards to the language used and the methodology to measure impact. How exactly will you measure impact? How will you measure user conflict? If someone passes a petition around, is something that simple going to qualify as accurate measurement of user conflict? Is there a written set of guidelines that are already established to aid in this process? I would sorely miss the opportunity to bicycle in this areas trails and roadways.</p>
20	<p>Minor corrections (including replacing "practicable", an ugly word):</p> <p>p. 16, l.6 up: should read "are retained should result"</p> <p>p. 17, l. 10-11 down: should read "disposed of as soon as practical"</p> <p>p. 19, l. 15 up: should read "soft-engineering techniques when possible, and "</p> <p>p. 20, l. 2 down: should read "sources is not feasible."</p> <p>p. 20, l. 10 up: should read "to the extent feasible."</p> <p>p. 27, l. 4 up: should read "disposed of as soon as possible."</p> <p>p. 29, l. 15 up: should read "Antrim Formation has replaced the"</p> <p>p. 30, l. 6 up: should read "PRC boundary). There"</p> <p>p. 31, l. 20 up: should read "plans of development that minimize"</p> <p>p. 35, l. 9 down: should read "found in the PRC to"</p>

21	<p>Accurately describing the Pigeon River Country has been a serious problem because of the changes in possible descriptions. Some changes are caused by DNR management changes, i.e. the addition of acreage in the NE corner; some by purchases, i.e. Blue Lakes, Green Timbers. The map on p. 3 and the description on p. 4 do not coincide which makes it difficult to identify exactly where the Concept of Management applies.</p> <p>I urge first that the Concept of Management contain a clear definition of the boundaries of the PRC and show them on a map. Second, and even more important, it should contain a procedure for adding areas to the PRC which will be subject to this Concept of Management. This would strengthen the idea that the PRC with its wild characteristics is a special management unit being protected for future generations of Michigan residents.</p>
22	<p>research page 35 para one-time for another user survey.</p> <p>Bud and his crew did a great job on the history portion!</p> <p>Somewhere you need to add about Forest Certification, the Work Instructions, the impacts of the work instructions, and the audit history.</p> <p>Thanks for providing an opportunity to comment!</p>
23	<p>It looks like the DNR is taking a reasoned approach to this, but I want to be sure that mountain bikers are not singled out for review over other user groups. As a hiker, cross country skier and a mountain biker I make frequent use of Michigan trails and want to be sure we *expand* opportunities for all three sports. Properly built and maintained trails are not more adversely affected by one sport more than another.</p>

24	<p>History</p> <p>More Recent Development</p> <p>Page 10: At the end of the Fifth Paragraph ADD the following DNR policy.</p> <p>DNR Law Enforcement Division "Regulation of Lands Administered by the Department of Natural Resources, revised April 4, 2006.</p> <p>Concept of Management Update Steering Committee</p> <p>Page 35: One addition and one revision.</p> <p>Resource Management Deputy Mindy Koch " (Not included)</p> <p>MI Conservation Foundation President Bob Jacobson " (Revise last entry)</p> <p>Bibliography</p> <p>Page 37: Item 17. REMOVE 5/08/90 and REPLACE with revised 6/94.</p> <p>REASON: Copy of the revised map dated 6/94 was provided to me in 2006 by Brian Mastenbrook, DNR Wildlife Biologist.</p> <p>Pages 37 and 38 DNR Policy Standards: SUGGEST the DNR list the latest revision date along with the designation to identify the standards pertaining to the Updated Concept.</p> <p>Example: Fisheries Orders 206.05 (date), 213 (date), 244 (date) etc., when listing Policy Standards that are to be adhered too.</p>
25	<p>At a time when Michigan needs more access to the backcountry, this is NOT a good time to slap even more restrictions on "the fun" of snowmobiling. Please do not change the use of riding in the Pigeon River State Forest.</p>
26	<p>As a soon-to-be-resident of the Golden Lotus Community, I am especially interested in your document. You mention that most of the private land in Pigeon River Country coordinates with the idea of "the big wild" character of the forest. We member of Golden Lotus Community share the desire to maintain the wild and scenic character of the area. There is a tone of unfairness, however, when you mention "strategies" to potentially choke off ongoing and long-established Golden Lotus activities. Some might interpret such remarks, especially in light of your past actions toward us, as antagonistic and mean. At the end of the day, we residents and soon-to-be-residents of the Golden Lotus Community will not tolerate such injustice. We hope it will come about that relations between us will be coordinated and friendly rather than acrimonious. We share common goals. We can and will be good neighbors--in fact, if you think about, you couldn't ask for better neighbors! We offer a caring attitude toward the land and a cultural and spiritual benefit to the whole area of Northern Michigan, the midwest, and the country. I personally ask that you remove language with hints of future disruption and keep in close touch with us in a</p>
27	<p>The Pigeon River Country State Forest (PRCSF) was introduced to me several years ago, by a friend, through snowmobiling. The PRCSF is a very special place in Michigan and I have respected my ability to be able to ride snowmobiles there. I now have a family, that I introduced to snowmobiling and the forest is of their favorite area to ride. The PRCSF does provide a beautiful and most of all, a safe place to enjoy snowmobiling as a family outing. Restricting snowmobiles to road riding only, greatly reduces the PRCSF experience. Please keep the PRCSF open to snowmobiling.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>

28	I would like to correct a statement I read in the draft on page 9 the repair on the lake dam was done with a permit from the dnr. the dam was repaired and ready to close the gates but a court order by the dnr kept them open causing the majority of the damage. this is backed by the court records.
29	Overall, I am pleased with the recreational aspects of this plan. My only suggestion to emphasize partnering with volunteer groups such as the MMBA to help with trail/pathway design, development, and stewardship.
30	Why do I feel like I am one of the few voices crying out for all wildlife. I am not interested in my own personal interests. I don't care what a forest looks like (visually) I only care that it is at peak health so in the middle of winter I know the creatures have an honest chance at survival.