

I am a member of the Ferry County Motorized Recreation Committee (MTR), providing citizen input to the Ferry County Commissioners on motorized recreation issues. I support more access to the forest and no additional wilderness.

After reviewing the Forest Plan Revision I do not support adding more wilderness.

I feel the following:

- There is adequate existing wilderness.
- There is no “need” for additional wilderness, adding wilderness will not enhance the quality of life for current or future generations of Washington State residents.
- Wilderness is “no use” and benefits no one - for eternity.
- Wilderness is permanent, taking all options off the table in perpetuity.
- Wilderness is detrimental to the economy.
- Current environmental laws adequately protect all lands, including our public lands.
- The endangered species act adequately protects wildlife.
- In 1984 Washington State did a survey and reported that there were no additional lands that qualified for wilderness status.

I support the no action alternative, with an amendment to eliminate the 21 inch DBH cap.

I want more and EQUAL access to our public lands. I want the Forest Service to recognize all existing Washington State motor vehicle laws by allowing WATV's (Wheeled All Terrain Vehicles) the privileges they are entitled to under Washington State law. Under Washington State law, WATV's are entitled to the same privileges as two and three wheeled motorcycles, passenger cars, pickup trucks, off-road vehicles (4WD Jeeps), and heavy trucks.

The Forest Service needs to recognize that creating more wilderness comes at the expense of other user groups. These other user groups are entitled to have their needs given serious consideration. There are costs to the citizens of Washington State of adding more wilderness. Creating more wilderness is not free, it is not a zero sum process, there are clear losers, and the losses incurred are - for eternity.

Some of the alternatives in the Forest Plan Revision offer restrictions on motorized access. These restrictions *are not appropriate* in the Forest Plan Revision. Any discussion of motorized access should only be in the Travel Management Plan. Any Forest Plan Revision alternative containing motorized access issues should be removed from consideration as an alternative. There are good reasons why the Forest Service divides the revision process into two separate plans, that separation needs to be maintained and enforced. Reference: FSH 7709.55, Chapter 10, 11.2 - Land Management Plans (3.)

Member Motorized Recreation Committee

Ken Muggli
Republic, WA