Dear Mr. Foster,

Being an avid snowmobiler, I have a few requests to help improve the OSV management in Alternative 4. I find that I support Alternative 4 compared to Alternative 3. I stand firmly opposed to Alternative 3.

**Proposed Ungroomed Trail Additions –**

I am grateful for and fully support the addition of the ungroomed snowmobile trail (WR-06w) included in the preferred alternative. The Sublette Pass trail has been in existence for decades and provides important access to backcountry riding areas north of the Togwotee Pass Highway; it is appropriate that this trail be added to the system.

**Opposed to allowing Class 2 Over-Snow Vehicles (OSVs) on most designated OSV trails -**

I am absolutely opposed to allowing Class 2 OSVs (full-sized trucks and SUVs equipped with

track conversions) on almost all OSV trails maintained by the State of Wyoming across the SNF.

I request that Class 2 OSV management guidelines be revised as follows, using ‘class of

vehicle’ regulation authority provided under Subpart C:

• Groomed Trails – Class 2 OSV use should be excluded from all trails groomed by the State

of Wyoming on the SNF; specific exceptions for special circumstances like access to Brooks

Lake Lodge can be granted by the appropriate District Ranger.

• Ungroomed Trails – Class 2 OSV use should be excluded from all OSV trails maintained in

an ungroomed status by the State of Wyoming. EXCEPTION: all ungroomed OSV trails

located in the greater Burroughs Creek/Horse Creek area north of Dubois should be

designated ‘open’ to Class 2 OSV use.

• Other Motorized Routes – Class 2 OSV use should be allowed on all other motorized roads

and trails designated ‘open’ to motorized vehicle travel by the MVUM, but not when being

utilized as managed (groomed or ungroomed) OSV routes during an area’s corresponding

OSV use season.

Full-size tracked vehicles do not belong on the managed national forest snowmobile/Class 1

OSV trails because they are simply too wide, too tall, too slow and too heavy. They create a

safety hazard due to their width and slower operational speeds – particularly on many trails

which are narrow. Class 2 OSVs are also much heavier with significantly higher weight

displacement compared to all Class 1 OHVs including trail groomers. Their heavy weight creates

much greater potential for trail rutting due to insufficient trail compaction to support their weight.

**Proposed Cross-Country Ski Trail Closures –**

I feel those non-motorized users that require absolute solitude and do not support multiple use can find that opportunity close by in the thousands of acres of wilderness that have been off limits to OSV since the inception of the wilderness act. Therefor I will be firmly opposed to any additional proposed OSV use closures that may surface as this travel planning process moves forward.

**Objection to Buffer Zones used in Motorized Trail Analysis -**

I believe it was inappropriate in respect to Wilderness, that 1⁄2 mile and 5-mile “buffer zones” were used in analysis of potential user conflict in this EA’s analysis. The Wyoming Wilderness Act of 1984 specifically prohibits buffer zones adjacent to Wilderness Areas.

**Opposed to the use of Minimum Snow Depths -**

Your analysis of alternatives improperly uses ’12 to 18 inches’ as a minimum threshold when, in

fact, much less snow depth in the range of 4 to 6 inches has proven to provide adequate snow cover to protect land from snowmobile operation. The statement on page 338 of the EA that “minimum snow depths required for protecting these areas range from 12 to 18 inches” is clearly unsubstantiated.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to comment and give feedback I look forward to the collaboration with the Shoshone National Forest Travel Management team.

Sincerely,

Holly Sinclair