

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/8/2018 7:00:00 AM

First name: Keri

Last name: Green

Organization:

Title:

Comments: My comments have not changed substantially since I provided comments to a prior version of the Plan in 2015.

I support Alternative 3 for the reasons below.

OSV[rsquo]s should not be allowed in roadless areas.

The Forest Plan currently does not allow motorized use in the Pacific Valley and Eagle Roadless Areas. It was with careful thought that these areas were originally designated [ldquo]Roadless.[rdquo] Changing this designation puts at risk the values which the Forest intended to conserve for the needs of the land over the needs of people to use motors to recreate.

Snowmobiles should not have extensive access to critical habitat at higher elevations.

The OSV proposal is in direct conflict with the Forest Plan which states [ldquo]Near Natural[rdquo] areas are to be managed for semi-primitive non-motorized use. Remote areas should be maintained for the values of benefitting wildlife, natural environmental processes, and quiet recreation activities that do not threaten habitat and create a ruckus in the natural environment. The rare Sierra Nevada red fox and the American marten are two animals whose habitat will be jeopardized by motorized vehicle use in winter. The range of these animals includes the high elevation Sonora Pass which is also proposed for expanded snowmobile use.

Allowing proximate access to higher elevation wild areas increases the chances that OSVs will cross into true wilderness.

It[rsquo]s not possible to physically delineate wilderness boundaries in a snowy, winter environment. OSV users should not be given the benefit of the doubt when it comes to knowledge of boundaries. The USFS doesn[rsquo]t have the financial or staffing capability to patrol these areas, and people will take advantage of the opportunity before them. Whatever benefit might be obtained by a small number of OSV users will be a detriment to the values the Forest Service is entrusted to maintain for the larger good.

Multiple Use does not mean Special Use.

Snowmobilers are a small, but organized and vocal percentage of forest users. The OSV proposal suggests this interest group has successfully applied pressure within the Forest Service. I believe this proposal compromises the Forest Service[rsquo]s management philosophy and gives overly broad concessions to one industry/recreation user group. Forest visitors who wish to cross-country ski, snowshoe, and snowplay have limited areas in which to do so. Most of the areas along Highways 4 and 108 with the 12[rdquo] minimum amount of snow required for motorized use will be open for that use, compromising the availability of quiet places for other visitors.

Whatever we have left is gone.

When what is left of the small populations of wild animals is gone, they are gone for good. When what is left of the small parcels where one can find peace and quiet is gone, it is gone for good. Gasoline powered engine emissions are known to be a direct cause of climate change which is affecting the amount of snowfall and the elevations at which it occurs. It is ironic that OSV users seek expanded territory into higher elevations as their

activity alters the lower elevation experience.OSV users should accept climate change as a detrimental factor affecting their sport, and not expect the Forest Service to assist their pursuit by allowing further press into higher elevations where remaining sensitive habitats exist on a thread.By adopting Alternative 5, the Forest Service knowingly chooses an environmentally irresponsible action. The world needs quiet and protected places. I speak for the places inhabited by foxes and martens, where clean water is produced and natural processes function without human interference.

Motorized activities are simply unsuitable at higher elevations in the Sierras. OSV users should not receive special interest consideration.