



**Alternative C is best for motorized and over the snow travel.** This is the only alternative that arguably complies with President Biden’s EO 14008 to improve recreational access and goals of the USFS national and regional sustainable trails strategy. Proposed trail densities caps lack consistency with best available science and are not justified based on wildlife population counts published by CPW.  Even this alternative needs a lot more flexibility and clarity around existing usages such as specific protection of routes previously approved in site specific travel management and would now be in areas where motorized usage would not be allowed.   We also have a critical need for expansion of access on the forest. We are asking that the foundational issues in the Proposal be corrected and then the public is provided a revised draft plan to comment on.

**Strongly opposed to alternative D.** Simply WAY too many closures and restrictions- increases roadless/wilderness on the forest from 50% to 77%.  There has been a huge investment by volunteers and state and local money for trail use, logistics, and maintenance to simply close lands accessed by OHV’s. This alternative is simply a nonstarter for us given the crushing impacts it would have on recreational access.

Demand in the backcountry is growing at a rapid pace and to help alleviate the pressure from users, we are going to need more land access or at least keep what is currently available. While Alternative C moves that direction, it fails to go far enough. Only Alt C comes close to the flexibility in needed on all types of issues like fires, floods, landslides and recreation etc.  Recent intense fires are going to become the norm and USFS now estimates that these areas could take hundreds of years to return to normal due to combined effect of drought, pine beetle and then fire. Given the rapid evolution of this issue, flexibility is the only answer in the RMP. Short-and long-term impacts of these fires will be a major barrier to any activity on the GMUG.

There is simply not enough accurate information available to create an accurate analysis for winter motorized travel on the GMUG.  We are requesting that any analysis of winter travel issues be conducted in subsequent winter travel plan updates.  This will allow for a more meaningful analysis of winter travel in the update process.  Any decisions based on current data would simply be inaccurate as data is not available at this time and in our experience any efforts to resolve questions like this at the forest level have been highly unsuccessful.

After collaboration with the United Snowmobile Alliance we support there concerns as they have been addressed in there comment. As stated above, backcountry access in the mountain west states has become more popular. The need to carefully implement a plan in favor or more access is more important now, than it has ever been. Plz take into consideration working with the local communities, snowmobile associations/clubs and state park divisions when planning for snowmobile travel.
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