

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/29/2019 5:53:13 AM

First name: Gaylan

Last name: Hellyer

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To whom it may concern,

First I'd like to say that I'm an avid backcountry user between motorized and non-motorized access. On the motorized side I feel like we are constantly defending and fighting for our continued and historical use in areas around the state. OSV travel should be a no brainer since we don't need trails and leave no trace.

Second, when I went to one of the meeting you all hosted I noticed discrepancies between maps. One map showed proposed wilderness and another showed the same area as semi-primitive motorized. I fully support the semi-primitive MOTORIZED designation. PLEASE define the use areas since they are different and there are concerns about the map differences. And even though Wilderness seems like an easy option, it is just too restrictive.

The FS and other agencies have done a fine job with trails on our statewide public lands and would like to see the current level of access maintained. We don't need a bunch of new trails and an OSV travel plan wouldn't affect this either way so if the idea is to preserve these areas by revisiting their access then I fully support the Semi-Primitive MOTORIZED which limits future development but still grants everyone access.

We(Snowmobilers/4x4/ATV) are tired of consistently losing riding areas as a user group. We DO ride the Paonia/Black Bear area and want it kept open to motorized, it is a historic use IMO. Closures here are inconsistent with the use prescribed by the San Juan forest just across the highway.

The one area I am most concerned about is the 10,000 acres on Red Mtn Pass between Ophir and Black Bear, west side of Hwy 550. There are proposed losses near Paonia at the base of the West Elks, on Grand Mesa out on the west end and on the Uncompahgre plateau.

In addition to the concerns and thoughts mentioned above, here are a few more concerns I share with my fellow Snowmobilers:

Travel management should occur on a more localized level than a forest plan;

There needs to be flexibility in the ROS management standards for both motorized and non-motorized areas as routes will be missed in the inventory and the inflexibility of current management is a major challenge for planners;

The Winter ROS needs extensive review and revision as it proposes massive closures compared to the existing travel management that has been effective for decades;

Lynx habitat needs to be managed in accordance with the 2013 LCAS and best available science such as creating separate categories of habitat rather than a single habitat standard for management as all habitat is not created equally; and

Continental Divide Trail management must comply with National Trails System Act mandates and the Continental Divide Trail Plan, which specifically states these routes are multiple use routes and not restricted to hiking and horseback only.

The volume of OSV travel and access that is at risk with this plan is just not acceptable. When we are one of the lowest impacting groups out there so why are we possibly losing the most with this proposal.

PLEASE stop the brutal non-motorized designations. We deserve to have continued access as a user group on PUBLIC LANDS in addition to the fact that the motorized user groups contribute more financially to an area and additional funds through the RTP sticker sales.

Thank you for your time,

Gaylan Hellyer