

BD Recreation Consultants Jeff Halligan PO Box 198 McCall, Idaho 83638

3/23/2021

District Ranger Erin Phelps New Meadows Ranger District New Meadows Idaho

RE: Rapid River Management Plan

Dear Ranger Phelps,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Rapid River Management Plan. I have read through the 3 different alternatives and the only option I can support that does not degrade the current conditions of the management of Rapid River is the Non-Motorized alternative. The current management direction was brought about because the Rapid River area was identified as having unique and special characteristics. This includes critical fish and wildlife habitat, along with opportunities to find quiet and seclusion for recreationists. The Rapid River area remains wild because it is large enough to hold healthy elk, deer, anadromous fish and predator numbers without a lot of negative impacts from high numbers of recreation uses. The drainage is a critical area for Anadromous fish as is evident with the Hatchery in the drainage. Motorized disturbance to this drainage could be detrimental to the fish and wildlife in this area. The wildlife has been relocated several times, pushed out of Boulder Creek and surrounding areas from motorized and management uses and into Rapid River where they find security and room to live and roam. Most of the public lands around this area are open to motorized uses and Rapid River serves as a final sanctuary from this. Providing even a small number of motorized miles in this area is unacceptable, the non-motorized experience for both wildlife and recreationist is shrinking on all public lands. Areas like these are getting harder to find and preserve as today's technologies improve and the different user groups fight to attain access wherever they are not allowed. The Rapid River area is one of the few remaining places that hikers and horseback riders can access and have a wild and quiet experience close to home.

I do not believe the *preferred alternative* is sufficient to provide habitat and security to the area. The *preferred alternative* is just inviting conflicts and is not enforceable. The *non-motorized alternative* provides the best overall outcome for the resources of soil, botany, water, fish and wildlife and also for the recreating public.

Sincerely,