Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/13/2021 6:51:27 PM
First name: Doug
Last name: Hatch
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Re: Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison Forests (GMUG) - Plan Revision #51806; in support of GMA Alternative "C" with modifications.

Dear US Forest Service GMUG Forest Plan Committee:

Please accept these comments concerning the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests (GMUG) Forest Plan Revision #51806; in support of GMA Alternative "C" with modifications.

My wife and I (one voice among many) are proud landowners, recreational users, and stewards of this precious resource within the GMUG area that contribute to the CPW OHV funding annually with the purchase of OHV stickers and bring valuable dollars into local economies as a result of the recreation opportunities afforded in the GMUG.

To name a few, we enjoy motorcycle riding, 4-wheeling, hunting, fishing, hiking and snowmobiling activities within the GMUG forest.

We support multi-use trail use within the GMUG Travel Management Area and we strongly support that these existing trails remain open. Designated routes for motorized use are a small portion of public land and there are millions of acres designated as wilderness for other non-motorized use and as mentioned OHV use contributes millions of dollars annually to the economy. The GMUG community would certainly be adversely impacted by closing or restricting access to motorized trails in this TMA.

We support comments submitted by the Trails Preservation Alliance (TPA), Colorado Off-Road Enterprise (CORE) and the Colorado Off-Highway Vehicle Coalition (COHVCO) in supporting GMA Alternative "C" with modifications and we have reviewed and support their site-specific recommendations to the US Forest Service.

Specifically, we support Alternative "C" with the following modifications: 1) The addition of verbiage from Alternative B protecting motorized access to the Continental Divide Trail and areas around the trail. 2) 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 have been proposed to be encompassed by a Primitive or Semi Primitive Non- Motorized ROS category. 3) Consistency between Wildlife Management Area trail densities and best available science that are based on wildlife population counts published by CPW.

Sincerely,

Doug Hatch