

**From:** [Salzmann, Kristie L -FS](#)  
**To:** [Robertson, Robert N -FS](#)  
**Cc:** [Troxel, Olga -FS](#)  
**Subject:** FW: WWW Mail: comments on travel scoping not deliverable  
**Date:** Thursday, July 28, 2016 8:08:50 AM

---

Comments that came in through website last night.

Kristie Salzmann  
Public Affairs Officer  
Forest Service  
Shoshone National Forest  
p: 307-578-5232  
[klsalzmann@fs.fed.us](mailto:klsalzmann@fs.fed.us)  
808 Meadow Lane Avenue  
Cody, WY 82414  
[www.fs.fed.us](http://www.fs.fed.us)

Caring for the land and serving people

-----Original Message-----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2016 9:49 PM  
**To:** Salzmann, Kristie L -FS <[klsalzmann@fs.fed.us](mailto:klsalzmann@fs.fed.us)>  
**Subject:** WWW Mail: comments on travel scoping not deliverable

I tried to email my comments today on the Travel Plan ([travel\\_management\\_comments@fs.fed.us](mailto:travel_management_comments@fs.fed.us)) but they were returned as 'undeliverable'.

Please forward my comments to the right person:

**From:** Debra Patla, [REDACTED]

7/27/16

You can verify if necessary by emailing me at this address [REDACTED].

The scoping document is poor in quality and short on details. It is impossible to see the actual length and characteristics of proposed segments; e.g. WR-13 looks steep and long but I could find no real information about it. The text in table 7 says that it "provides legal access to an area currently without it". This suggests that a route might already be there and SNF want to reward the illegal use by improving the road. If so, this is a dangerous course of action for a land management agency.

The Proposed Action map is poor quality and hard to use. The detailed maps (listed on the web site) are better but there is not a way to easily see which map has which routes.

I request that you re-do and re-issue a more intelligible scoping for the Travel Plan. I am very frustrated with trying to learn about your proposal from the materials provided. The USFS should do better than this.

I am deeply concerned by the proposal to extensively add to the motorized loop system mileage and increase the width of some routes on the Wind River District, for the benefit of “a growing user group”. There is no evidence presented that this group is growing more than other types of users, such as hikers and equestrians, which do not enjoy or tolerate OHVs. Lacking such evidence, the proposal for a large increase in motorized amenities strongly suggests a bias by USFS staff in favor of motorized use and at the expense of other users and SNF responsibilities.

I strongly object to creating or allowing motorized routes in roadless areas, Wilderness areas, and the Dunoir special management area.

The claim that “SNF recognizes the value of these (roadless) areas” is belied by the proposal to add 7.2 miles of new motorized trail there. The promised closure of 6.3 miles is hard to accept given the Shoshone NF’s poor record of effectively enforcing closures (summer and winter). I think the most likely outcome is an increase in motorized use in roadless areas, with the SNF lacking the resources to control it.

The focus on loops is hard for me to understand. Are motorized users afraid of boredom if they go down the same road they went up? The frivolous idea that users must be provided with loops should be examined rationally by a federal agency that is chronically short of funds and unable to keep up with even the existing situations (illegal and damaging use by OHVs). Please consider the fact that loops can be particularly hard on wildlife due to increased disturbance.

I have backpacked on a number of occasions into the Fitzpatrick Wilderness from the Union Pass area. We have been discouraged by the number of OHV users that we must see and smell en route, and I object to the idea that there will be large increases in their number. Places where we have had to walk on an OHV trail to access wilderness trailheads (e.g., at Moon Lake and Seven Lakes) have been some of our worst hiking experiences in 40 years of backpacking.

I also object to the trespass into the Wilderness that occurs southeast of Union Peak. SNF has shown itself unwilling or unable to defend the Wilderness from incursions in this area, and I fear there could be a considerable number of these situations.

Union Pass is extremely important for wildlife migrations, including pronghorn, deer, elk, and predators. I am concerned that SNF is not giving adequate thought and consideration of what must be done to protect and enhance wildlife migration routes. The Travel Plan needs a thorough vetting by biologists. Given the importance of the area and public knowledge that Forest Service biologists are often ignored, it is critical that you broaden the discussion to include biologists from other agencies and non-profit groups.

In summary:

--Please significantly reduce the proposed increase in motorized routes and loops on the Wind River District.

--Please increase enforcement and the effectiveness of closures. No new routes or roads should be built if SNF cannot manage the existing situation.

--Increase your attention and expertise regarding the problems that motorized use presents for wildlife, watershed, wildfire ignitions, air quality, and other recreational users.

--Increase your attention to the level of money and personnel you would need for the proposed actions. Do not tell the public you can close routes if you cannot. Ensure this is not a gimmick to justify making new roads or routes for the benefit of a favored user group.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Debra Patla



