

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/27/2019 6:06:13 PM

First name: Jonathan

Last name: Granoff

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to supplement my previous comments objecting to the proposed action. Your proposal is an unnecessary restriction on the public's continued right to the use and enjoyment of one of its greatest treasures, our public land.

Your justification for restricting access to motorized dispersed camping by 65 percent is without merit.

You indicate the proposal is justified because it would reduce mortality of animals from colliding with vehicles. You fail to cite any evidence or scientific study that supports this position. How many collisions with animals occur on the backroads of the forests? No evidence supports your position. These back roads make for slow travel and are difficult to traverse with a vehicle. It is hard to even imagine a collision with an animal at these slow speeds.

You also indicate proposal 2 would reduce adverse modification of animal behavior. Again, where is the scientific evidence that the small percentage of the population who use the forest to travel these back roads has "an adverse effect" on animal behavior? You have cited to no such study or evidence that supports your position. Your position is a mere conclusion without any scientific support or reasonable connection to your objective, that is to not "negatively impact" animal behavior. Again, your severe restriction does not justify your stated benefit because there no support for your theory.

You also state your proposal would decrease a reduction in habitat quality and quantity. Again you have failed to demonstrate how the current system has significantly effected either of these stated objectives.. If people follow the current rules and you enforce those rules your stated objectives would be furthered. We don't need the unnecessary restrictions you propose.

Your other stated objectives are also flawed as you have not demonstrated again that active enforcement of the rules already in place would not further your stated objectives. Please don't go forward with your proposed action. We already have wilderness areas that are completely closed to any motorized vehicles which is a good thing. We don't need any further restrictions in addition to those already on the books. Again, the answer is active enforcement and not taking away 65 percent of our current road system away from the public for dispersed motorized camping.