Comments: Having read through many of the comments, it appears that most ATV/UTV users believe the forests belong to them and seem to ignore the fact that it belongs to everyone. I have been visiting the ASNF for over forty years, and have found no need to drive on every possible two-track out there. I have actually found that to really enjoy the forest, one needs to leave the roads behind.

You folks have the unenviable task of trying to placate everyone, from the off-roaders that want to be able to drive to every feature in the forest, to the folks that would love to see only the highways and county roads left open with other access by human or animal powered means only. Off-roaders have dedicated areas where they can 'tear it up' when they want to, human/animal powered folks have (at least for now) primitive and wilderness areas where they can chill out.

The ASNF needs to have a balance between the two. As it is right now, there are more than enough roads, and still some roadless, and non-motorized areas that are, for the most part, ATV/UTV free. Too many "closed" roads have been opened by rogues and this causes animosity between the two groups. It would be wonderful if funds were made available to physically close the 'closed' roads and rogue roads, as I believe is being done with the West Escudilla project.

So, which Alternative is best in my opinion? The camping issue is a problem with #2, the heavy closures of existing roads is a problem with #3. Too much left open in #1. My preference would be a mixture of #1 and #2. But, since this is a fluid plan, and changes can be made in the future, #1 or #2 would work, subject to future modifications.

Understanding that this is a federally mandated project that the local forest supervisor has to comply with, all you folks out there just need to chill. Nobody is closing your (our) forest. They are just trying to make it a good experience for EVERYBODY!! Try doing that sometime, it ain't easy!