

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/1/2021 11:22:35 PM

First name: Brian

Last name: Hudson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: I am writing to share feedback regarding the GMUG Management Plan on behalf of myself and my children. My wife and I own a house in silverton and with 3 children aged 7 and under, and one of them being a special needs child with her disability impacting her balance and ability to walk, motorized access is the only practical way my family can enjoy the public lands of southwest Colorado. My children, my wife and I love summers in Colorado and we spend most days throughout the summer jeeping on public lands, many of which are part of this management plan. I enjoy recreating on public land and want to express my support for keeping access open in the GMUG Forests for all types of recreation uses. I believe through proper management and education trails and roads can remain open without negative impacts. Spanning through Colorado, this forest is a large area where various types of recreation activities occur. The management plan proposes designating 5 types of areas with varying degrees of restrictions within the forest. These areas have roads and trail systems that should remain open to users and not be closed through these different designations. OHV & OSV use, dispersed camping, dirt biking, mountain biking, sight seeing, and many other forms of recreation are popular activities on the GMUG and proper access will help mitigate damage by preventing concentration of use and impacts.

Wildlife is an area of concern within the management plan. Many species were identified and measures were proposed to ensure protection for these animals. The USFS needs to use best available science in setting boundaries and making decisions. Currently elk and deer populations are being managed appropriately therefore the need to designate more wildlife habitat or enact more restrictions in the name of preservation seems inconsistent and unnecessary.

These forests are surrounded by national monuments, national parks and wilderness areas. In other words, there is already very restrictive management in the areas bordering the forest and Forest Service lands should be managed for the greatest good for the greatest number of people. The planning process also shouldn't be used to identify more lands with wilderness characteristics - especially if identifying lands with wilderness qualities requires road closures and restrictions on motorized travel. If lands have roads and are currently receiving motorized use, then these lands don't have wilderness characteristics.

The USFS should finally begin to reverse its decades-long systematic discrimination against those with mobility impairment-related disabilities. Travel management policies focused on "minimizing" the environmental impacts of motorized recreation have resulted in a dramatic increase of lands that are closed to those who can only access public lands with motorized assistance. Trail densities need to follow best available science and not arbitrary proposals and numbers.

Taylor Pass Road, Spirit Gulch/Greyhound mine, Black Bear Pass, Imogene Pass, Ophir Pass, Poughkeepsie Gulch, Schofield Pass, Hancock Pass, Napoleon Pass, Tincup Pass, Williams Pass, Tomichi Pass, Italian Creek/Reno Divide area all routes that need to be left open and not considered as part of semi-primitive non-motorized areas. Furthermore I agree with the several organized OHV groups that the Alternative that allegedly reflects current management doesn't create an accurate baseline for current management. As such, this planning process started off on the wrong foot by not recognizing at all many trails that people use and enjoy.

I support a combination of Alternatives B and C. The ROS zones in Alternative C are stronger for year-round recreation - especially winter use. Alternative B is a stronger choice for protecting recreation access in the summer. If I had to choose one, B with its stronger protections for summer use would be the best of the alternatives as presented.

Alternative D proposes massive closures, and I am strongly opposed to this alternative. An alternative needs to be considered that supports all current roads and trails as well as proposes the creation of more routes to improve access. If the USFS is going to expend resources developing a conservation alternative that is inconsistent with its multiple use mission, the agency should also develop an alternative that maximizes recreation access. Access to nature is proving to be a critical need in humankind for many different health benefits. The desire for outdoor recreation has increased tremendously in the last few years and there needs to be an alternative allowing for future growth and management so that all can enjoy this land.

In conclusion, I believe in shared use and that there is enough public land for all to enjoy as long as agencies use best practices. Please refrain from closures as roads and trails are critical to the forest.