

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/20/2021 4:42:14 PM

First name: Andrew

Last name: Buergin

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Dear GMUG forest service,

I am writing this comment in regards to the revision of the OSV management plan. I have been a hybrid recreationist in the Gunnison valley for the last 16 years. I have always been respectful of wilderness, private property, and non motorized areas. I have always carried a forest service issued winter recreation map with me to make sure I am obeying the law. I am in **EXTREME OPPOSITION** to alternative D. Alternative D seems to be a blatant disregard for certain user groups right to access public lands in the Gunnison valley. I believe that if alternative D is passed that you will see numerous negative impacts.

I love snowmobiling for the aspects of exploration, solitude and safety. I love being able to explore new areas of our public land and escape the ever increasing crowds of people. It's one of the things that keeps me grounded and connected to nature, which is why so many of us live here. By closing large swaths of land you will be denying us this right, While at the same time packing us all into a confined zone. This will create a dangerous environment where conflict between user groups will be more likely, collisions will be more likely. It will also be congesting different user groups into avalanche terrain together, increasing the chances for avalanche burials and deaths.

Avalanche safety is very important to me and is one of the main reasons why I love snowmobiling. **YOU DO NOT NEED A SLOPE TO RIDE A SNOWMOBILE.** When the avalanche danger is high you can spend all day riding in the flat trees and meadows and never expose yourself to avalanche terrain. By taking away nearly all of our snowmobile access land you are taking away our choice to avoid avalanche terrain all together. And for the hybrid aspect it also Denys us the right to explore for safer, less crowded, and more desirable terrain for skiing/snowboarding.

You still have human powered access to these areas you say?

Unfortunately so many of these zones are much too far away to be accessed by human power unless you are planning on winter camping and spending multiple days to reach your objective, which few people actually do. As a result, these zones that could potentially provide safer terrain will essentially be going to waste. No one will be utilizing them. Again, as a result this will only further congest increasingly crowded areas such as Kebler Pass trailhead.

Economic impact.

I believe alternative D will have a negative economic impact not just on local economy but the entire state. Starting with snowmobile retailers which there are dozens of in the GMUG areas. Will certainly feel a negative impact from this. Why would a person buy a snowmobile if there is no place to ride it. Same goes for tourism. Why would recreationists come to visit if there is no place to recreate. Small businesses like mechanics who depend on maintaining snowmobiles during the winter months will suffer greatly. Lastly It has always been my understanding that a large percentage of revenue generated by forest services was from snowmobile registrations. You can expect to see that number greatly decrease if alternative D passes.

We are already seeing a huge surge in winter backcountry recreation. The answer to this problem is **NOT** to take accessible land away from us. If anything we need to increase the amount of snowmobile accessible terrain to spread us out so we can all have a safe place to recreate. Which is why I support alternatives A and C.

I hope this letter has helped to persuade you away from choosing alternatives D or B. Thank you for your time

and consideration

Andrew B