

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/17/2021 1:55:18 PM

First name: Rob

Last name: Strickland

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Thank you for offering public comments on your (our) plan.

I have seen extreme increases in user numbers on the trails and supporting resources over the past few years. Therefore I support a plan that will improve infrastructure at trailheads to offset the impacts (such as toilets, parking fees, and stacked networks of trails to mitigate user conflicts close to these trailheads). I even support user fees for parking to pay for these amenities.

I support the comments provided to the USFS by the Crested Butte Mountain Bike Association, The Gunnison Public Lands Initiative, and Gunnison Trails.

I applaud the work done by CPW to define a plan for trail building with wildlife in mind. However, the maps of production areas and migratory paths seem incomplete which makes planning trails difficult at best, so I would like to request that this plan work proactively with trail advocacy groups to increase communications, and identify opportunities for new trails and or realignments where needed. I only support the idea of seasonal closures on trails that do not have them currently, if we can identify new trails or alignments that are in addition to any proposed closures (good substitutes may vary from new trails or alignments as needed needed).

E-mtb... I believe non-motorized trails should remain non-motorized to preserve quiet use, reduced impacts, and maintain funding of trail maintenance for non-motor trails, etc. This user segment will grow quickly, placing more people further from trailheads than ever before. This use will dramatically change the nature of recreation. I support CBMBA's comments in addition to my unequivocal support of non-moto trails remaining non-moto! With the increased uses, trailheads and trails will need to anticipate greater numbers of riders, because it's easier to get out, so logic follows there will be more users. Therefore trailhead designs need to accommodate for user optimal flows of traffic.

I know the USFS also presides over some water resources... and I believe where possible we should fight for in-stream recreational water rights where ever possible. As draught in the west continues to threaten our upper basin water rights, fisheries, and wildlife will depend on maintaining minimum in stream levels that support wildlife and aquatic life.

In closing I feel like combining Alternatives D and B would be a close match to how I would like the USFS to manage the forest.

Thank you!