

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 10/9/2021 4:53:50 PM

First name: Matthew

Last name: Whiting

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the USFS forest plan revision. I am the owner of the Pioneer Guest Cabins operating under a USFS permit. We have an intimate view into visitors to our forest and have lived on USFS land for over 20 years. By and large I believe we should largely stick to the Alternative B which represents close to the current picture on the ground. The public has largely adjusted to the existing uses on the ground since the 2010 travel management record of decision and I don't see any strong reasons for making any elaborate changes.

The one consistent theme that we have seen since the travel management changes, are that areas that were changed to non-motorized from motorized have seen much greater maintenance and care. Nearly every trail that was changed to non-motorized has seen a huge community commitment to improve and maintain these trails. On the other hand while the USFS has made notable progress on improving motorized trails there are still many many trails in a state of disrepair. Since the existing motorized network is not up to a point where it can be effectively maintained without notable resource damage it seems illogical to add more impacts when the USFS is struggling to maintain the existing inventory. Until the existing motorized trails are realigned sustainably, and maintained effectively the capacity limits suggest that adding more impact would be ill-advised. The mountain biking community has realigned virtually all the trails that were designated non-motorized. The mountain bikers also developed a trail crew to maintain the existing inventory and the trail network has never been better cared for. Since the existing non-motorized trail network is largely sustainably designed and has committed volunteers and a paid backcountry trail maintenance they have reached the point where we can consider expanding the trail network. I think the idea that you have to prove you have the exiting network well taken care of before you expand makes sense. The mechanized trail community has proven that they are at that point and can therefore justify increasing the non-motorized trail capacity. The OHV community deserves credit for the improvements that have been made but there is a long way to go before justifying increasing that use, since the current use is not yet at a sustainable level.

In regards to individual areas, there are areas of note that I would like to comment on. In all of the Alternatives the area between 409 and 409.5 area popularly known as Point Lookout is labeled motorized. In 2010 the 409 trail and the old 405 (Now Point Lookout Trail) were designated non-motorized. The formerly motorized area went from abandoned trails with zero maintainance to a very well maintained, non-motorized area. It took a great effort by the non-motorized users to realign and build the trails and decommission old braided motorized trails. Since the non-motorized community has put so much effort into this area I feel it should be included as a semi-primitive non-motorized zone. This area includes critical habitat for big game and is a popular hunting area. We have seen what the area looks like from past experience as a motorized versus non-motorized area. When it was motorized there was considerable resource damage and virtually no maintenance and when it has been non-motorized it has been thoughtfully cared for and receives yearly maintainance. I therefore feel keeping this area as a quiet non-motorized zone makes sense.

In regards to the Carbon Creek Area, it looks like the USFS is setting the stage to remove motorized access to the Carbon Creek Trail. With few immediate single track trail motorized opportunities close to the town of Crested Butte it seems like there is not a strong justification for eliminating this opportunity. The USFS has used significant OHV funds to improve the Carbon Creek and Wildcat trails. There are very limited motorized opportunities in that zone, so taking that one away does not seem advisable. Furthermore if we eliminate this opportunity it will put more pressure on already overused motorized areas like Brush and Cement Creek.

The other area where there appears to be a mistake on the map is the Cement Mountain Trail from Jack's Cabin to Rosebud in alternative D. It seems logical to maintain that trail as motorized with the seasonal closure that

currently exists. Eliminating that trail will only further concentrate motorized use up Spring Creek.

In regards to the winter map, there are a few areas that I believe need to be considered. In the winter map the Ferris Creek/409/409.5/Point Lookout area has been designated open to motorized. This area has always been open to over the snow vehicles and rarely gets used due to inaccessibility and shallow often rotten snow. Since this area is not popular with motorized users, this would be a great area for non-motorized winter trail development or winter conservation. On the other hand there has been a fair amount of desire for motorized users to access the Teocalli drainage. This area is designated as non-motorized in a few of the alternatives. This area with access to great backcountry skiing and a deeper snowpack should be open to OHVs. It seems illogical to make the lower elevation west facing area that is on the elk migration pattern and often has elk herds well into January motorized and the area with deeper snow and less wildlife non-motorized. It should be the other way around. Please consider making the Ferris Creek area non-motorized and the Teocalli area motorized.

In closing, our community has adjusted fairly well to the existing map on the ground. There are big issues to tackle moving forward. As we address critical big issues like climate change, wildlife fragmentation, recreation capacity issues I urge you not to expand motorized recreation. The capacity limits and the trends indicate that increasing or further concentrating motorized recreation (by eliminating exigent uses) would create more problems than it would solve.