

How do we provide safe upland hunting opportunities at Lake Lowell Unit?

	Strategy 1:	Strategy 2:	Strategy 3:	Strategy 4:	Additional Strategy
	Are proposed upland hunt areas sufficient in size and location in each alternative?	Separate upland bird and waterfowl hunting areas.	Upland hunting excluded from Leavitt Tract.	Allow other users in hunt area during the hunt season when upland hunting does not overlap with waterfowl hunting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confusing 	1)Start upland hunting at noon to reduce conflicts w/waterfowl. Reduce in time/not space 2) Close north-side recreation area to hunters and move south-side trail to north-side recreation area 3)During hunting season, close upper rec area to non-hunters 4)split upper recreation area
Ability of strategy to address issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too much of a reduction of acreage for hunting If southside is "poor" for upland game hunting, perhaps it is self-regulating and people won't hunt there anyway How many people are actually complaining about a conflict between upland and waterfowl hunters? Alt. 2-4 don't meet goal because they are so restrictive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created more conflict between upland hunters by reducing area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy seems out of place. What is the issue with the Leavitt tract? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does this provide safe upland opportunities No Don't understand. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put interpretive trail in already closed area rather than reducing hunt area
Anticipated impacts to hunters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SQ – no new until additional users Reduced hunting area more conflict/safety concerns No hunting at all Status quo – no new impacts Status quo – only impacts would be from possible increased number of hunters creating additional conflicts. Other alts – reduced areas for hunting would increase conflicts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Negative impact to upland and impact to waterfowl Unsafe Cramming Taking away an area where they can hunt Putting more hunters in other areas, creating additional safety issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing more land for no purpose Closes an area currently open, focus more hunters into other areas, increases safety issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maybe there should be no upland hunting at all. Open additional areas to upland hunting
Strength of science to support using this technique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not much science needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use examples of separating times of hunts used by other Refuges 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No science Out of place 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">

Please provide any additional scientific resources or comments below:

- Why do hunters get to have off trail access and photographers/observers don't when they are supposed to get equal treatment?

How do we provide quality shrub-steppe habitats for migratory birds and other wildlife?

	Strategy 1:	Strategy 2:	Strategy 3:	Strategy 4:	Additional Strategy
	Seeding and planting of native shrubs, forbs and bunchgrasses adjacent to previously restored areas	Partner with biologists interested in researching cheatgrass reduction (opportunities for on-site research)	Remove and rehabilitate unnecessary internal fire breaks through green stripping.	Restrict travel to designated roads and trails	
Ability of strategy to address issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, has the ability to address the issue. • Providing irrigation would help the situation. • Also, North field 5 would be irrigated. • Don't get hamstrung by only using natives • Some non-native beneficial • Possible to irrigate Field 5 north? • Success irrigating shrub-steppe? • Partner with Jenkins • Good opportunities for enhancement on north side near Lower Dam • Get established shrub-steppe is advantage to irrigating. Just need to be temporary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add area North of field 5 – focus here because it is high visibility • Yes • Make sure partners know research plots are available on Deer Flat NWR N. Field 5 high visibility. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is green-stripping meant to enhance/maintain habitat or protect from fire? • Instead of maintaining a fire-break, plant a crop that doesn't dry out. • Once green strip is established, it doesn't need continued maintenance – forage kochai. • Re-word strategy to say change current techniques for managing fires. • Remove unnecessary fire-breaks and replace bare-earth breaks w/green stripping (ie plant w/forage that benefits shrub-steppe) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much activity are we talking about? • Depends on the scale. • Does control become overbearing because of existing natural conditions? • Depends on how much travel/access is occurring now – if small, the restrictions may not matter – if high, the restrictions may make a difference • Strategy may not be effective if other uses that will be allowed or naturally occurring events have the same or higher potential to spread invasive species. 	Partner with landowners to provide waater source to area N of field 5
Ability of the benefits to outweigh the costs of the strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, wildlife species will benefit, education/research • What are we benefitting? • It is heavily fragmented, so which species are we benefitting? • It would benefit most wildlife out there. • It would benefit neighbors, local research and environmental education. • Would benefit public relations by reducing noxious weeds • There is potential to introduce non-native desirable species without a lot of effort, so it is likely the benefits outweigh the costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Partnering with others often opens other funding sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits for fire – control are high • Benefits for improving habitat are unknown • Yes, reduce disking significantly • - Maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. • Cost of no access outweighs benefits • How is hunting less impact than photography. • The monetary cost to close the road may not be high, but the cost of enforcing it would be higher • Benefits are questionable. • The wind may bring in and spread weed see more than individuals, vehicles and pets • It may be that in restricting travel, the benefits will not outweigh the costs of the strategy 	•
Strength of science to support using this technique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration no important for steppe habitat as whole. Should focus more on local weed control, education, and research • Current science supports using this technique. If it has worked in other areas, it is likely to work here. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historically, using partnerships to improve habitat has worked well • Add more science on benefits of restoring SS habitat missing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not even addressed. Need more science on green stripping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need more off trail science • Need more threshold focus • Most people don't want to walk off trail. • If you are concerned with impacts of off-road and off-trail travel you should restrict all users, not just some. • Science to support using this technique could be stronger. The science supports some of the technique, but not all of it. • You might not want to mention that off-trail travel causes the spread of invasive species, and then allow one or more user groups to travel off-trail. • Would be nice if science supported a specific threshold regarding how many people or how much use is problematic. 	•

Please provide any additional scientific resources below:

- Kochia
- Sometimes it is difficult to establish and keep natives. Suggest putting in high-value (desirable) non-natives in the interim to improve the situation immediately. The natives could then be established over time.

How do we provide quality wildlife observation, photography and bank fishing experiences at the Lake Lowell Unit?

	Strategy 1:	Strategy 2:	Strategy 3:	Strategy 4:	Additional Strategy
	Viewing/photography blinds on east end mudflats and Upper Dam Marsh	Only jogging and walking allowed in uplands to reduce impacts to wildlife and wildlife-dependent recreators, i.e., no horseback riding, biking or dog walking	Boardwalk trail between Parking Lots 1 & 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bad idea 	Open Gotts point to vehicular access to increase bank fishing opportunities	1) What happened to ice skating? 2) Pier, or vista rather than a boardwalk 3) Gotts lower parking open to handicapped only
Ability of strategy to address issue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes • Provides additional opportunity • Yes, this directly addresses the issue. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, will likely provide better quality • If you eliminate these activities, it is going to make for a more quality experience to photographers and wildlife observers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be counterproductive • Won't meet expectations • Too many people • May have a negative impact to photography and observing • Might increase use and therefore decrease amount of wildlife. • Would increase accessibility to some people • If you restrict photographers to the boardwalk you limit the areas where they can photograph, you limit their ability to create a unique composition and you introduce problems with them being able to create good photos. • Part of the experience of photographing is solitude – if you put everyone on a boardwalk you restrict opportunities for solitude. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. • Yes, it does increase bank fishing opportunities • May also be a more quality experience • It would be better to provide an opportunity to a greater # of people than to keep it a more tranquil experience to fewer people 	•
Strength of science to support using this technique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No science – may not need any • Blinds work extremely well to provide wildlife viewing/photographic opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Try to find more literature on disturbance effects on productivity • Anecdotal evidence supports this strategy, but I see nothing to show scientific evidence supports • Scientific evidence would be good to have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not. • Need more on trails and other areas • Not aware of any science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NA • If you create specific areas for people to fish, they will go there. If you don't, they will disperse everywhere and possibly cause more impact. 	•
Ability of this strategy to reduce disturbance to wildlife and habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May increase disturbance to certain areas • May decrease disturbance to other areas • Increase in people could increase disturbance, but concentrating people to an area where they are not visible could reduce disturbance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitely dogs • Makes observation opportunities better • Depends on how much use • Yes, it is likely to reduce disturbance to wildlife, but not much. • Isn't the strategy focusing on providing a quality experience to photographers and wildlife observers? • I guess reducing disturbance to wildlife would increase the quality of the experience to observers/photographers • Possible to see more wildlife on horseback than walking – observe more with less distractions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No. If you build it they will come • More disturbance • May reduce disturbance to habitat, but not necessarily to wildlife because it puts more people in an area • Doesn't necessarily support photography and observing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus opportunities in specific areas will reduce impact footprint on the refuge • Has potential to reduce disturbance. 	•

Please provide any additional scientific resources or comments below:

- Make a fishing dock at the upper Dam rather than banning swimming
- Why would you restrict access to one group of users while allowing much greater access to another group of users. Under the example of upland hunters and photographers, both activities are virtually the

Group 1

same. With one, you end up pulling a trigger and with another you end up pushing a shutter button. So, why restrict one and not the other?