

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 7/29/2019 7:39:48 PM

First name: Lisa

Last name: Potter

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for sharing the working draft in advance of the NEPA.

While I wasn't able to attend a public session, I did review the slides on the Forest website.

My family has enjoyed the Colorado forests for five generations. We camp, fish, horseback ride, hike, hunt, ride atv's, and Jeep and Off-Highway trail use. We hope that the plans will not impact our families traditions and fun. We volunteer with several off-highway groups to conduct official and unofficial trail clean-ups to help keep the trails clean and open. We will continue to do so in the future since we love being able to frequent them as much as possible.

On the afternoon session slides - there was one on Forest Plan - with Trail decisions box. The travel management and trail plans should be done with more specifics. And may need to be done on a more localized level instead of in the big picture. There is a link to the working draft plan map. The new areas to be analyzed as Wilderness (1.2) and 1.2/3.1 Area to be analyzed as Wilderness/CO Roadless Area - can we get better detail maps? I would like to see if we can get 150' to 300' (optimal) boundary between the new proposed wilderness areas and existing forest service road, legal approved motor vehicle use roads. This will help prevent trail closures in the future if and when activist groups try to get our public recreational motorized routes shut down again. I know the note says that this plan is not to close or open existing roads or trails, but it would be nice to confirm that there is a significant distance between existing recreational areas/roads and the new proposed wilderness areas.

Also - the proposed map is nice, but clearer ones in PDF formatting with darker trail system lines/dots would help us be able to review and comment on them more objectively. The ROS needs to account for and note ALL trails (motorized) and hiking/biking/horseback trails too. We all know that some will get missed so by stating ALL existing trails would cover it better. We want to prevent additional closures now and in the future. Closing more roads just puts more pressure on remaining roads and then they get too heavily used and abused from the sheer numbers. Road closures also impact the local economies of the surrounding towns which often rely on our purchases, stays in the area.

Wildlife habitat comments - closing for migration and calving is understandable. However, is there a way to better determine habitat needs. One size does not fit all! I know this doesn't fit into this plan per say - but introducing wolves into the national forests is just another concern issue that doesn't need to be done. Unfortunately, the wolves are naturally coming down from Wyoming's re-introductions. The devastation to other wildlife is concerning.

Continental Divide Trail management needs to note that not all recreational travel is to be considered (motorized and non-motorized). Per the National Trails system Act- multiple use routes.

I honestly can't speak to the winter ROS system and motorized use. Other than ski areas and occasionally cross country skiing and ice fishing. I don't frequent the areas in question in the winter. I don't snowmobile and seldom take the Jeeps or atv's out in the winter when snow is on the ground.

Thank you for reviewing and considering our opinions.

Lisa Potter

Colorado Native actively using Colorado Forests!

