

Mail comments to:
Allegheny National Forest
Plan Revision
PO Box 36
Warren, PA 16365

Fax comments to: 814-726-1465

E-mail to: r9_anf_fpr@fs.fed.us

Robert Towsey 8-21-06

Your name Robt. Towsey Title (if applicable) Supr.
Organization (if applicable) WARREN County Sch. Dist.
Address 185 Hospital Dr.
City WARREN State PA ZIP 16365
Email address robert.towsey@wsdpa.org

You may comment on any parts of the DEIS and PLRMP. The following topics will help you focus your comments and help us to better respond to your comments. You do not have to fill in every section in order to comment. At the end of the form, you will find a place to comment on other issues, alternatives, management direction and monitoring. Feel free to use additional pages.

Issues in the DEIS (please check the topics you are commenting on)

- ☐ Forest Vegetation ☐ Habitat Diversity ☒ Recreation
☐ Special Areas including Roadless Areas and Wilderness
☐ Other Concerns

The land designations contained in the preferred alternative C, or any of the four alternatives for that matter, do not specifically allow for the construction of a resort, or similar development, within any area of the Allegheny National Forest. This is the case even though a \$208,000 recreational study exploring the feasibility of such a resort at the Allegheny Reservoir has not been completed, and a previous study said that a resort on the Allegheny Reservoir was feasible.

By not specifically allowing for the construction of a resort, the Plan deters potential developers from seriously considering the construction of such a resort and ultimately precludes the counties and school districts from the potential for a significant amount of tax revenue that could be derived from such a resort.

For example, if 1/3 of the 90 miles of shoreline along the Allegheny Reservoir were to be developed, this would create a potential area in excess of 18,000 acres. Assuming hypothetically that the assessed value is \$25,000 per acre and that the area is developed one mile deep, this would create approximately \$4,106,250 in additional tax revenue for counties and approximately \$10,125,000 in additional tax revenue for school districts.

This revenue is much needed given the decreasing citizen and student populations throughout the four county areas that comprises the Forest, and these local needs should have been given much more weight during the planning process. By not clearly stating that the construction of a resort, or similar development, is permissible under the Proposed Plan, this is potential revenue that will likely never be realized because reputable developers will be deterred from considering the construction of such a resort.

Therefore, understanding that site specific factors will have to be taken into account at a later time, the Forest Service must recognize the extraordinary economic impact that such a development would have on local communities, and the Proposed Plan must be rescinded and revised so that it carries forward the decision in the 1986 Plan by specifically allowing for the development of a motel/restaurant. It should also be noted that such a designation would actually be an asset for the proposed recreation study for the remainder of the reservoir because one controversial aspect of reservoir development

will have been resolved, and the study can then simply focus on supplemental and complimentary developments for the resort.