

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/17/2022 7:00:00 AM

First name: Scott

Last name: Taylor

Organization:

Title:

Comments: To: FS-Comments Intermtn Ashley ForestPlanRevision Subject: I Support a Recreation Alternative for the Ashely NF Date: Thursday, February 17, 2022 1:39:16 PMDear Ms. Eickhoff:I enjoy recreating and accessing public lands. I am concerned that the USFS is favoring a conservation alternative without giving an appropriate counter alternative that adequately shows a range of options as NEPA requires.Although Alternative D is the best option, I still would like to see a stronger recreation alternative proposed in order to comply with NEPA. If Alternative D was truly a recreation alternative it wouldn't just "consider" additional routes and expanding campgrounds but propose the construction of new routes and campground to accommodate the increase demand.Alternative C is completely unacceptable and restricts too much access for users. Per the Wilderness Act of 1964, the apparent buffer zones the USFS is proposing through management designations to the High Uintas Wilderness are NOT allowed.The USFS can manage for all types of recreation within this area. Motorized and non-motorized users can co-exist and one should not be restricted to accommodate another UNLESS the USFS is prepared to provide EQUAL solo use recreation opportunities for all trail recreationists.In order to prevent and avoid adverse resource impacts, the USFS should be actively managing the area and routes. Through different management strategies and proper education, impacts can be properly mitigated without closures. As popularity for outdoor recreation grows, the USFS should be looking at ways to provide reasonable access that will sustain the growing numbers of visitation. Restricting use and concentrating use will only increase impact. The USFS should not just consider, but add "additional loops and routes for motorized activities" to accommodate the increase of use to mitigate negative impact.Trails, roads and campgrounds are FACILITIES - not resources. Facilities are constructed by humans and can be maintained, repaired and reconstructed if adversely impacted by use. Failure to properly maintain facilities is not a justification for closing them.The Clinton Forest Plan (1990's) promised a new recreation based economy for those rural communities devastated by the reduction in logging. The USFS has failed to adopt management plans to make good on that promise. By limiting or decommissioning trails the USFS will be harming the local economy AGAIN.Dispersed camping is a popular recreational activity that also needs to be enhanced through these plans. Restricting use to designated sites or a specific number of sites is arbitrary. Even the proposals for routes and number of sites in Alternative D are arbitrary and could potentially limit the USFS from actively managing use.The USFS should construct additional FACILITIES as needs increase. Alleged user conflicts or potential resource impacts can be solved through management solutions other than closure and the USFS needs to implement these practices first. These management solutions must start from the position that addressing alleged user conflict should be limited to managing incidents of alleged conflict and not be interpreted to restrict access to public land for some users based on the subjective and arbitrary complaints of other users. The overwhelming majority of alleged user conflict "incidents" are the result of a state of mind rather than actual incident on the trail.In order to advance equity of access on public land for those with mobility impairment disabilities, it is important to recognize that it is common for motorized recreation to take a backseat to conservation and protection. Motorized recreation is often times the only way those with impairments are able to enjoy high value recreation experiences on public lands. Current policies actively discriminate against this group and I would like to see this plan help connect all users with public lands.I support the proposed vegetation projects. The forest needs to be maintained in order to stay healthy and viable. If vegetation projects do not move forward, this poses the greatest risk for wildfire. Wildfire is the greatest risk to all forest users, facilities, habitat and resources. The USFS should be using non-fire techniques as often as possible such as mechanical thinning in order to prevent these events and support local economies.Sincerely, Scott Taylor