

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/20/2020 7:00:00 AM

First name: Colin

Last name: Priebe

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Here is my letter requesting Alternative Z with minor amendments to be implemented allowing for mechanized use in all designations except federally designated wilderness.

Thank you for your time, your teams time and all others working in this forest. You do wonderful things for the public and local communities.

I hope you can find a plan similar to Colville National Forest's recent plan.

Colin Priebe

ATTACHMENT BELOW

Zach Peterson
Nez Perce Clearwater National Forest
Forest Plan Revision Team
Thank you for the opportunities provided to be involved in the forest revision process. You and your team have been wonderful, so very helpful, and perfectly willing to listen to all the people I have witnessed at your meetings. I have been lucky enough to use and enjoy this forest for the entirety of my life and I am very pleased to have been involved in forming the new plan since the working groups early in the process. I was born and raised in the region. I have rafted rivers, climbed mountains and camped throughout the forest. I am now raising my son here and I hope he gets the opportunity to see our forests as an opportunity to help the local economies of the area as well as a place for us as a group to help create a sustainable environmental future. I foresee a forest where we protect our waterways, create recreational opportunities, and work the forest in sustainable fashion to support a local logging industry. I see a forest that appropriately implements the Multiple-Use Sustainable-Yields Act, balancing administration for outdoor recreation, range, timber, watershed, and wildlife and fish purposes. I am an outdoor enthusiast. Particularly I am a mountain bicyclist. I use the singletrack trails quietly and under my own power. I am worried that certain [environmental] groups are trying to reduce my ability to use this forest. Currently we have a significant amount of our forest federally designated as Wilderness. If we continue on this path there can be a time where I, as well as motorized recreation, hang gliders, and numerous other user groups will not be able to access over half of this forest, our forest. This does not seem like a balanced approach to forest management. I have attended meetings with the Forest Revision Team that were productive in creating plans and ideas of how to use the forest to keep the small communities surrounding the forest alive. I have talked with county commissioners, fellow recreational users, and local residents. None of these people want to limit more of the forest from recreation as a whole. I have also been at meetings taken over by private groups, yelling about how the Forest Supervisor is selling our forest to the corporations, talking over all other members of the public attending the meeting. These groups have disrespected the process and have disrespected their neighbors. As far as the forest revisions are concerned I have had the chance to look over each and I have some particular opinions. The Alternative Z which creates more Recommended Wilderness than most of the alternatives is pleasing to me due to the allowing of mechanized travel in the Recommended Wilderness as well as protecting far more rivers and streams by recommending them for wild and scenic river inclusion. I particularly like this Alternative because I can continue to use trails I have enjoyed in the past as well as allowing me access on bicycle to trails I was historically allowed to use, but limited away from in the last few decades. I recommend using Alternative Z as an example of how to allow mechanized travel in the forest and how to protect the rivers and streams. I do have my concerns about this plan as well for restricting singletrack motorized travel from much of the forest. Particularly the exclusion of motorized use on a well established Pot Mountain Trail. I look at this trail as a great way to implement appropriate usage by single track motorized travel. The revision team included many routes and loops through the forest for motorized singletrack use, but limited the use off the trails selected.

This can create a balance that allows this usage throughout the forest while keeping most trails in the Recommended Wilderness non motorized. Motorized use can allow for easy access for trail work and getting tools in and out of the forest. Keeping a set of routes through all regions singletrack motorized accessible will keep the trails usable for years to come. The most significant aspect of this plan to me is continuing and increasing mechanized use in the forest. I recommend looking to Colville National Forest's recently revised plan as an example of how to properly allow mechanized use. The plan allowed for mechanized travel in all Recommended Wilderness. I agree with this step they made and I hope you do this as well. Currently I mountain bike trails in many regions in this forest. One of my favorite rides is looping from the Junction Mountain Pack Bridge to Fourth of July Pack Bridge via Junction Mountain and Cook Mountain. Another great ride is Pot Mountain Trail. Riding along Lochsa Slope and The Selway river trails like Gedney and Rackliff have also been great. Please make sure this forest plan is reasonable for all trail and forest users. The forest has been charged with a balanced approach and our forest already has a heavy amount of land restricted from almost all uses. Please make sure to include mountain bikes and other mechanized forms of travel into current and new Recommended Wilderness. Please do not exclude more users from this forest. Alternative Z amended to include appropriate singletrack motorized corridors would do all the things I want out of our forest. I look forward to your decision and I have been so pleased to work with the forest revision team and fellow employees of this forest. I look forward to continuing raising my son in a forest that allows us to recreate in a responsible way, a way we enjoy, a mechanized travel way. Colin Priebe