Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/25/2019 4:04:08 PM
First name: Valerie
Last name: Douglas
Organization:
Title:
Comments: After thorough review of the alternatives for the TMP, I would insist that the Forest Service select Alternative 2 with several modifications, otherwise choose Alternative 1 for No Change. While there are motorized routes that may be dead ends and removed on Alternative 2, some of those were created for destinations by forest users as there was not a need met elsewhere for the reason the dead end route was created. Some may be parking areas for hunting. Some may be campfire areas or camping areas. Others may just be a dead end for no logical reason and multiple people drove it to see where it went. Regardless, the majority of these routes being removed by Alternative 2 or Alternative 3 are not getting replaced, and the public, the forest users (not the non-users that will cry wolf at the drop of a feather) are utilizing them for a reason. The 506 miles of level 2 road lost between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 will cause displacement of forest users. Those 506 miles of lost road will increase usage elsewhere... and only 19 miles additional route is proposed as the solution??? Basic math shows you will have a displacement issue, and it has happened in the past when the Forest Service closes routes, and will happen again. Do your job and avoid the issue by leaving the road system as is, or adding milage to the system. May of these roads predate the forest plan and fall under RS2477, plus in review of the Forest Plan, motorized recreation is allowed in many of these areas.
I strongly oppose Alternative 3. That is unjustified in multiple ways, including eliminating access to Veterans and Special Needs.