

From: [X](#)
To: [FS-travel-comments-rocky-mountain-shoshone](#)
Subject: Travel management comments
Date: Thursday, June 16, 2016 10:05:36 PM

Shoshone National Forest
Travel management comments
Wind River District
6-13-16

The Forest Service claims to be managing as a backcountry forest. If this were true there would be no road closures as some roads contribute to the back country character and they are vital to the health and productivity of the forest, also there would be no unpermitted livestock allowed in the back country, they not being part of this ecosystem are a main cause of some irreversible resource damage.

It looks like the original mission of the Forest Service has been lost which was originally authorized to protect the lands, preserve water flows, and provide timber. These purposes were expanded in the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960.¹⁹ This act added recreation, livestock grazing, and wildlife and fish habitat as purposes of the national forests, with wilderness added in 1964.²⁰ The act directed that these multiple uses be managed in a "harmonious and coordinated" manner "in the combination that will best meet the needs of the American people." The act also directed sustained yield—a high level of resource outputs in perpetuity, without impairing the productivity of the lands. In other words, manage for a productive and healthy forest by keeping all roads open. We see this is not happening. In addition, the 2005 travel management rule says to manage to enhance motorized recreation not suppress it. It also says to designate routes not delete routes. Studies have shown that suppression leads to depression in people and animals. Free unrestricted recreation or play in people and animals produces amazing health benefits.

In the recent plan revision and travel management proposals, we see signs of a failed agency that can no longer fulfill its purpose sufficiently. **(1)** Road closures without equivalent replacements, **(2)** motorized trail restrictions, **(3)** expanding wilderness type areas, **(4)** creating defacto wilderness areas, **(5)** giving motorized areas to non-motorized recreationists when they already have 1.8 million acres of wilderness. **(6)** Ridiculously excessively long seasonal road closures, **(7)** the need to use law enforcement to suppress motorized recreationists by forcing us to obey these fraudulent restrictions, while specific non-profit non-motorized recreationists remain unnoticed and unaffected by restrictions or law enforcement even though they are then ones causing most of the problems. It looks like the Forest Service has become a crowd control agency instead of a land management agency. If the Forest Service were managing correctly with compatible rules, they wouldn't need so much law enforcement.

What appears to be happening is a movement to gradually phase out motorized recreation, which is being pushed by specific non-profit non-motorized recreationists who seem to want public land all for themselves because this is how they make their money. Doing this will compound the problem. The Forest Service needs to swing the

other way and expand motorized use, decrease wilderness, roadless areas and habitat areas as these classifications are being used to close roads which results in a non productive unhealthy forest which leads to unhealthy economies which leads to unhealthy societies, which is what most of us don't want. -----

--

There are too many road closure proposals to go through each one so to be more specific all but one are fraudulent closures probably being done as a distraction from the real problem. The only reasonable closure is WR-16, duplicate road is the only justifiable rational for change if there is a reason to eliminate one of those roads. All these other roads have a need and purpose that is beneficial to society. Examples of why the other closure proposals are fraudulent are, WR-20 rationale is a lie, this is not a true dead end, there are several dispersed camping places along this road and how do you justify offsetting the mileage of a ATV only trail by closing a multiuse road. Or WR-15 appears to be the entrance of an old 4wd road to two ocean mountain, and who cares about previous utility lines, that has nothing to do with closing the road. In addition, this spur can be used as a temporary dispersed area for the day or night. And why close WR27a & 43, maybe somebody wants to spend the day in a meadow to study flowers. And WR-55 is a multiuse road that cannot offset the mileage of an ATV only trail (WR-11) there is no comparison; we don't want to give up our multiuse roads for restricted trails. This particular good useable road is surrounded by roadless classification (RARE II). Most likely this road was here first.

Misclassified areas like this or habitat areas where animals don't really live should be reclassified to what they were before. If the Forest Service were operating on the level they would keep the road and change the classification. These kinds of classifications are being used to close roads. This road has a lot to offer the motorized recreationists. This road shortcuts directly to 531, is scenic and offers quiet camping and interesting hiking. If it was closed that could open the door for a lawsuit. Proposals to close entire roads like WR-53, 59, 61, 56, 50, 52, 38, 37, 45, 18, 512.1b, etc. are out of the question, there is no rationale for closing entire roads. Closing tail ends of roads like WR-41 serves no purpose. These roads need to be kept as long as possible to provide better access for those who can't walk as far or anyone else. These kinds of fraud against the public are lawsuits waiting to happen. It is not ok for the Forest Service to fraud the public land users. And the 3 month long seasonal closures – (4-1 to 6-30), warm springs loop roads possibly labeled WR-24, 64, burroughs creek. Loop roads –512, 510 (WR-25), WR-29 are unacceptable. Part of their rationale has to do with mud during rainy season. We don't have a 3 month long rainy season. This long of a closure is just about half of our motorized summer season. This is obviously more trickery to push out motorized recreation. We have approximately a two week rain period usually in April, when the rain stops the seasonal closure should also stop. Therefore, a seasonal closure for this purpose must have a flexible time span not a ridged set time period. The bogus excuses of wildlife disturbance or resource damage is mostly caused by unregistered livestock used by specific non-profit – non-motorized recreationists who are not being held responsible, not motorized use. A rubber tire can't cause the damage a hoofed animal can. The manure from livestock is too acidic and full of bacteria for the back country ecosystem and ends up in the waterways. In addition, hoofed animals can beat the heck out of the trails and meadows. They should be held accountable. -----

Converting multiuse roads to restricted motorized trails is not a fair exchange. It is a good way to squeeze out full size vehicles, (WR-26). Is the Forest Service favoring ATV's over full size vehicles or are they trying to phase out motorized rec. Starting with the biggest vehicle. Or maybe they just don't have the necessary skills to fix the problem. Motorized trails should not have weight and size restrictions everywhere. -----

The other fraudulent act against the public are the two so called cross country ski areas 1354 acres that they want to close to motorized use. WR-02w & WR-03w, falls and pinnacles are motorized areas that some skiers want for themselves, non-motorized rec. only. Taking away what little motorized areas there are to give to non-motorized rec. when they have 1.8 million acres of wilderness doesn't seem like a fair deal. -----

Restricting over snow vehicles larger than UTV's on the entire forest is fraudulent because there has never been an incident to prove any safety issues. There are several specific main roads with good visibility and room to move over that any size vehicle can use with minimal problems, possibly roads like horse creek road, union pass road, Sheridan loop road, And others. So there's no need for forest wide restrictions on this. Maybe we should stop restricting motorized use and start restricting unpermitted livestock use. -----

The purpose statement under proposed action is a bit deceptive because the roads and trails are already here; they just need to be opened for use. If all the gates were opened, motorized rec. would be expanded to a more comfortable level.

To sum things up instead of allowing the federal land management agencies to reduce humanity by reducing the economy by reducing forest products by reducing motorized access, maybe we should reduce the federal land management agencies to a manageable size like a small percentage of what they are now. That way there would be fewer burdens for the agency then they might be more efficient and manage the land correctly. The rest of the public land should be given to the states or local residents like was originally intended once the states became organized.

Thanks for listening. -----

Fremont County area resident.
