

## Comments on DRAFT Forest Assessments: Benefits to People: Multiple uses, Ecosystem Services, and Socioeconomic Sustainability

My comments refer to Chapter 4, pg. 20, **Outdoor Recreation and Human Enjoyment of Fish and Wildlife Species**.

1. The economic analyses under the **Hunting** and **Fishing** sections on page 21 appear to be based on sound data and provide some insight into the economic benefits of these recreational uses.
2. In general, I feel this section of the assessment was biased toward motorized recreation and excluded the importance of non-motorized recreation. Specifically:
  - a. The last paragraph introduces sections that follow as highlights of a few of the “major aspects of recreation opportunities”. Yet, **Motorized Recreation** is the first topic highlighted. Per the USDA Forest Service, 2016 reference, motorized recreation, especially OHV use, is minor compared to non-motorized activities in the GMUG. However, the assessment highlights motorized recreation as a “major aspect of recreation opportunities” while not addressing non-motorized activities. It appears the assessment wrongly minimizes non-motorized recreation, which comprises the majority of recreation activities in the GMUG. Please include a section highlighting the human enjoyment and economic contributions of **Non-Motorized Recreation**.
  - b. Under **Motorized Recreation**, the second to last sentence, “Although OHV use is not...”, implies that the amounts of direct sales and taxes are due to OHV’s. The direct sales and taxes are from ALL MOTORIZED recreation, not just OHV’s. The way the sentence is worded gives the false impression that OHV’s provide a larger economic contribution than they actually do as reported by the USDA Forest Service, 2016 reference. I recommend removing the parenthetical “Although OHV use is not one of the top activities on the Forest”.
  - c. Under **Motorized Recreation**, the amounts listed as sales and taxes attributable to motorized recreation provide no basis for the statement “...motorized recreation plays an important role for Colorado’s economy as a whole.” Compared to Colorado’s GDP which was \$231.9 billion in 2016, the direct sales contribution from motorized recreation of \$914 million is less than one half of one percent. This leads to the conclusion that motorized recreation contributes very little to Colorado’s economy as a whole. I recommend deleting the statement referred to above since it is not valid.