

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/6/2019 1:04:18 PM

First name: Daniel

Last name: Green

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I'm writing about the North Shenandoah Mtn Restoration proposal, most specifically about the proposed closures of Kephart Run and Raccoon Run/old 33. I have to say very honestly that I am not only against the closing of those two roads, it makes me very angry. For many years the trend I've seen within the forest has been to close off reasonable access to much of the land while turning what remains open into park like settings. My personal reasons for going to the forest is to enjoy the beautiful environment in solitude and quiet, not to drive to a parking lot at a trailhead, find a spot, walk a trail perpetually running into shouting college kids while hoping I don't get killed by a mountain biker with no respect for other people. Above that I am especially upset over Kephart and Raccoon run. For me personally, I grew up in those hollows. I heat my house from their dead trees, I hunt there, I enjoy being able to drive off of 33 to a place where you can no longer hear the road. They're sacred places to me and at 50 years old my days of being able to walk miles off of the highway are dwindling. Even more specific to those two roads is the fact that they are presently the ONLY two roads still open in Rawley Springs! Thirty years ago there was likely a 100 mile long network of available roads to drive on in Rawley Springs, connecting it to other areas of the forest which have systematically been closed. They are all that's left. The decommissioning of Dry Run and Hopkins Holler is simply paperwork, as noted in the SOPA, they're already inaccessible. Kephart and Raccoon Run are tangible places loved by many, especially in hunting season. I spoke to the biologist working on the project at Slate Lick towards the end of last year, while I want to remain respectful, I have to say that I feel she acted incredibly self-absorbed, unhelpful and tone deaf, if not simply disrespectful. Which sadly I have to say has become the norm in my dealings with the forest service. There is something very wrong when the forest service simply becomes a playground for biologists and ceases to serve the people.

I will also say very adamantly that the forest service is not considering the disabled and aging well in their planning. These roads for generations have been a source of recreation for the aging who don't have the ability to hike many miles, especially given the decision to change the requirement needed to gain access to the disabled hunting gates. Which I might add I feel is a great misappropriation of resources, having 3 disabled areas within a 20 mile radius that essentially are not being used. Having a lifetime disabled hunting license was a very reasonable requirement in my opinion, changing it to its current format using the DGIF permit that is basically only available to the paralyzed serves no one, not even them.

If the forest service does indeed decide to close those two roads I will peruse the objection process, if for no other reason than I feel they did not do a sufficient job informing the public of the proposal. I believe that at a minimum the forest service should have mimicked local policies in posting notice at the roads and publishing notice of that specific proposal in publication where they'd likely be seen by those who use the roads. I've talked to many people about the proposal and I have yet to find the first person who knew it was even being proposed.

Thank you very much!

Daniel Green