

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/8/2021 10:25:22 PM

First name: David

Last name: Clapp

Organization: Motorcycle Trial Riding Association

Title: President

Comments: Hello GMUG Forest Management Team

My name is Dave Clapp. I am a retired engineer and avid outdoor recreationist, living in Fruita, CO. I, my family and friends recreate in the GMUG on an almost daily basis, participating in activities such as hiking, fishing, mountain biking, dirt biking, camping and rafting. So, my primary interest in the new GMUG Management plan is to ensure that it adequately addresses multi-faceted recreational opportunities, and plans for reasonable future development with an equitable balance of motorized and non-motorized recreation.

In addition, I am the current president of Motorcycle Trail Riding Association, a dirt bike club in Grand Junction, Colorado. We work closely with the local Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management offices to maintain existing and develop new singletrack riding trails in Western Colorado.

Of the 4 alternatives in the draft Plan, I support Alternative C for the following reasons:

- It is the best alternative for motorized recreation because it appears to be the closest thing to current management, is the most flexible with less zoning restrictions, and allows better management of the forest in the event of natural forces (fire, floods, landslides, etc.) and future recreation development.

I would like to see the following modifications to the current verbiage for Alternative C:

- The addition of verbiage from Alternative B that protects motorized access to the Continental Divide Trail and areas around the trail. Current motorized access should remain as is.

- The addition of specific protection to any route that has already been approved as a motorized route in site-specific Travel Management by the FS. In particular, any of these routes that are being proposed to be encompassed by a Primitive or Semi Primitive Non-Motorized ROS category. Keeping these routes open to motorized travel is critical to the quality of the recreation experience for these users.

- Consistency between Wildlife Management Area trail densities and best available science that are based on wildlife population counts published by CPW.

I am also concerned about the large increase in the number of Suitable Timber Acres in all Alternatives. Given that the No Action Alternative estimates only 35,900 CCF harvested for the first 5 years, yet the actual CCF harvested reached over 90,000 CCF in 2018/2019, leads me to question the validity of the estimates. It does not seem reasonable that we often spend years quibbling about development of a new singletrack in a given area, if that same area is later included in a Timber Production sale that would create orders of magnitude greater impact on the forest, watersheds, and wildlife.

I am happy to discuss any of these comments in greater detail if you have any questions.