

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/3/2021 11:00:00 AM

First name: Richard

Last name: Hasbrouck

Organization:

Title:

Comments: The following are my comments on the GMUG Draft Forest Plan:

I have been a Colorado resident for 25 years, living in Creede for the past 5 years, and have spent a lot of time hiking and backpacking in the neighboring Rio Grande National Forest. I have visited the GMUG a few times for hiking and sight-seeing. I enjoy hiking and backcountry skiing, and the wildlife, natural beauty and quiet and remoteness of our National Forests.

The plan doesn't provide strong enough direction for protection of important resources and should include additional standards, that is, mandatory limits on action.

I support Alternative D, which provides the most wilderness, including in the Community Conservation Proposal and Gunnison Public Lands Initiative. Alternative D would provide the most acreage for conservation and non-disruptive non-motorized recreation.

I oppose Alternative B, in that it reduces the the area of primitive and semi-primitive non-motorized recreation, and as such reduces opportunities for quiet backcountry experiences.

As climate change has become a critical issue, I believe that the National Forests should take positive steps toward limiting the use of petroleum-powered vehicles. Alternative D would best serve this purpose, preserving the most land for wilderness and non-motorized use.

I support the inclusion of much-needed standards for management of day-use areas and dispersed camping, and hope that damaged sites will be rehabilitated.

The size and remoteness classifications in the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum are too restrictive, excluding some areas with primitive character. For example, I think skiers should have access to non-motorized areas adjacent to roads and trailheads.

I found a typo in the EIS volume 1, page 23: The last two sentences (below) repeat "semi-primitive non-motorized[hellip]", when the last sentence should read "semi-primitive motorized", I believe.

"The area managed as semi-primitive non-motorized would more than double to 39 percent, as compared to 18 percent in the no-action alternative. The area managed as semi-primitive non-motorized would accordingly more than halve down to 20 percent (as compared to 51 percent in the no-action alternative)."

I think the winter Recreation Opportunity Spectrum should require a minimum snow depth of 18" for oversnow vehicle use, instead of putting off this decision.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment and for your consideration.

Richard C. Hasbrouck

[attachment is verbatim to text in letter]

[attachment is verbatim to text in letter]