

Shoshone National Forest Travel Management
Request for Public Input
Comment Form

Ranger District: Wind River

Comments on Current Proposals

1. Which proposal are you commenting on?

WR-29 and by default **WR-16, WR-32, WR-40, WR-43, WR-12, WR-14, and WR-27** on Maps 3 and 8

2. Provide comments below on the proposal: (continue on back if needed)

Please be specific and provide rationale for your position. In other words why do you like or dislike about the proposal.

WR-16: I am in favor of this proposal to close FSR 649. It will improve elk secure habitat a small amount and is trade-off for increasing the amount of loop routes (four) proposed with WR-27, WR-32, WR-12, and WR-14.

I also like the idea of establishing a seasonal closure on these routes (WR-29). Implementing our new forest plan for species of local concern, such as elk by placing emphasis on maintaining secure habitat within current ranges while trying to improve conditions in areas with low or very low secure habitat is important in this area of the Long Creek drainage. This can be partially accomplished by using seasonal closures where necessary in parturition areas to lower open road densities, limit disturbance from motorized use, and provide increased secure habitat during the spring. Apply seasonal restrictions as needed on motorized use of travelways to reduce disturbance in sensitive big game areas, such as birthing areas and winter range. (SPLC-GUIDE-09) I would suggest that the seasonal closure dates mirror the time frame used on FSR 513 near its junction with FSR 552.1H (April 1st thru June 30th).

A seasonal closure on those above routes is a good trade-off to the proposals to close FSR 549, 549.1C, and 548 beyond the upper crossing of the West Fork of Long Creek (WR-40 & 43). None of which I favor.

As for the motorized trail connections proposed in WR-14 and WR-32, I struggle with rewarding illegal behavior by making these user created routes part of the system routes; its sets a bad precedent, but because they are road-size connections and they have existed for a long time and most people who used them aren't aware that they aren't currently officially open to motorized use, I would support these proposals. But how will you size them down to make them only motorized trails segments for ORVs?. I would suggest that you will struggle with limiting their use to only ATVs when they were pioneered by full size vehicles and that you not limit them to only narrower vehicles such as ORVs or motorcycles.

The proposed loop connections in WR-12 and WR-27 involve some new construction and thus it may be easier to restrict travel on these proposed motorized trail loop connection to ORVs. However these motorized routes will decrease elk secure habitat by increasing the miles of open motorized routes per square mile and create 4 loops of various lengths that cross and connect a tremendous amount of terrain from East Fork of Long Creek all the way to the West Fork of Long Creek. I would support those motorized trail loop connections if the proposal to seasonal close all of these routes north and west of FSR 513 is also implemented.

Mark Hinschberger