

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/26/2021 1:17:12 AM

First name: Aaron

Last name: Holten

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello, I would like to offer my comments about the Draft Forest Plan and DEIS for the GMUG. In summary, of all the alternatives proposed in the Draft Forest Plan, only Alternative C makes any sense from a recreationist's perspective. Alternative C is the only option presented that comes close to offering enough flexibility in options for management of recreation and resources. The USFS needs flexibility to manage these lands for the public benefit in regards to fire danger as well as flooding and other issues. Alternatives A,B and D do not provide the USFS options for managing these issues into the future. Alternatives A, B and D appear to be 'hands off' approaches to 'management', which are not in turn management at all. Alternative C clearly is a better approach to active forest management.

In particular, I am very confused about how the route inventory presented in Alternative A came to be. It appears that this alternative is presenting a huge reduction in existing routes for motorized access as "current" when it is clearly not. If a management plan is going to be presented as an alternative for the public to consider, it should reflect CURRENT designations and CURRENT management, not a far-flung proposal purporting to be "actual" which it is not. It also appears that various roads and trails which have historically been designated as "motorized" are not shown as being "motorized" yet the plan is billed as "current"? This alternative should not even be considered due to the lack of accurate data presented within.

Additionally, it does not appear to me that either Alt A, B or D accurately take into account CPW's elk population estimates. Currently, to the best of my knowledge, CPW estimates the elk populations in the greater GMUG are >30% above "target". This lends itself to the notion that recreational activities in the GMUG, motorized in particular, are not having a substantial effect on elk populations in the area.

In particular, Alt B designates approximately 700,000 acres as "wildlife habitat" but it offers no factual basis for these designations. They appear to have been simply "penciled in" and have no explanation for the "why" of what is driving the notion these areas should be designated as "wildlife habitat". My primary objection to this designation is it limits the route density to only one mile per square mile and this affects ALL recreational trail users, not just the motorized users.

Additionally, imposing some of the route density standards as they are discussed in the DEIS appears to have been created under the assumption, with no factual basis presented, that recreational trails are the only thing that impacts wildlife and wildlife habitat. This is, intuitively, incorrect. There needs to be more information presented about WHY the route density standards need to be implemented in the first place if in fact there is actual data that shows trail routing is of primary negative impact to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

Over all, Alternative C provides the most sensible alternative for responsible recreation and management in the GMUG. I have been an avid hiker and dirt biker in the Taylor Park, Sargents and Marshall Pass area for the past 15 years, both as a Colorado Resident and on occasion as an out of state visitor as well. I have participated in many trail clearing activities with various non-profit groups in Colorado on many occasions, and I intend to keep those efforts up in the future. I hope to see Alternative C implemented as it provides all stakeholders within the forest the best option to continue enjoying the GMUG for the next generation to come.

Please support Alternative C, thank you for accepting my comments.