

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/22/2023 2:48:13 PM

First name: John

Last name: Nelson

Organization:

Title:

Comments: 1. Camping issues in East Fork and Turkey Springs and declining trail and facility conditions across the district need more attention than Jackson Mountain and should be higher priority. We are losing trails and facilities in this area due to a lack of maintenance, and adding this extensive trail system to the mix will likely only make things worse due to budget shortfalls. We should use our short FS and state grant funding to take care of what we now have before we expand our trail system this way. Additionally, other local trails entities are working with the FS to help maintain the declining current trail system through volunteer work and grant acquisitions, and if IMBA and DUST2 were to succeed in building this system and then look to CPW and other sources for grant funding to help maintain or expand the Jackson Mountain system, this competes with others and thereby lessens the ability to maintain the system we currently have (fewer grant dollars available to go around), which would be very unfortunate. 2. Mt. bike trails, racecourses and downhill thrill trails already exist at Reservoir Hill, Turkey Springs, Continental Divide/East Fork, Durango/Purgatory, etc., and the proponents should be urged to use those areas. If we want such an improvement as a racecourse, we should consider already-impacted high-end development areas like Wolf Creek Ski Area. 3. I would like to see the Pagosa RD maintained at the more primitive end of recreation opportunities since Columbine and Dolores have already gone more toward developed/mechanized/bike recreation and away from primitive recreation focus. 4. No organized racing events should be permitted at Jackson Mountain; this provision should be included in any alternative that is developed during the environmental analysis for this project, and because competitive events are not part of the stated purpose of this proposal but would logically and predictably be a likely outcome if the cycling trail system at Jackson Mountain were to be constructed as proposed, even with reduced miles of loop trails. 5. With a permit system in Wilderness inevitable (already being discussed casually by the FS) in order to control numbers of people and impacts in Wilderness to meet Wilderness management standards, we should keep more areas outside of Wilderness (including 'front country') available for displaced general recreation use instead of tying up a swath of country across the heart of the Pagosa RD for mountain biking, and considering that other recreation uses frequently do not mix well with mountain biking, especially in thrill-seeking or racing venues. If you look at the map of the Pagosa RD, the belt of country in the center between Wolf Creek/CDT and Turkey Springs/Devil Mountain would be tied up with mountain bike trails if this project was implemented. Mt. bikes are fine, but that's too much. 6. The FS says it wants to focus on "sustainable recreation" in the future; I don't feel devoting large areas like Jackson Mountain to what some see as tantamount to single use (mt biking) as being a good, sustainable approach to rec management. We need to rethink the approach being taken with general recreation planning on the district, we need more balance, with fewer grandiose plans like Jackson Mountain biking trails and toward the non-mechanized end of things. 7. I would like to see a slightly expanded trailhead and a new toilet at Turkey Springs Trailhead. 8. I would like to see the FS discourage illegal mt bike trail building where it occurs across the district instead of recognizing it and then accommodating it and ultimately expanding the use - what other rec user group is treated this way when they do something like that? 9. I understand some people in town are wanting to see "Moab in the pines" for mountain bikes in the Pagosa Springs area - a place in the high country where mountain bikers can go when it is too hot in Moab, Utah. This is not at all the future I hope to see for the Pagosa area, and I would offer that the observed overuse, impacts on public lands, and poor recreation experiences now found in the Moab area due to "building it and they came", intensive marketing by commercial interests, subsequent overcrowding, etc. all detract from the natural quality and desirability of the area, and are some of the many reasons the Pagosa area should not be looked at in this way. While the Columbine and Delores ranger districts of the San Juan National Forest have committed to major increases in accommodating mountain bikes and ATVs, the Pagosa Ranger District should retain its primitive focus and should be managed with such goals and direction. 10. The Forest Service recognizes mountain bikers and off-road vehicles as being "underserved user groups" in the Pagosa area. This is wrong, as there are significant opportunities for both groups across the area, including from the Continental Divide to Devil Mountain and on Reservoir Hill in town. Over the years, the two mechanized use groups (bikes and OHV's) have displaced non-mechanized

recreationists. Examples: the East Fork of the San Juan valley and Elwood Pass areas, Reservoir Hill, and the Turkey Springs areas. Any further expansion for mountain bikers should be done conservatively and in harmony with natural resource needs and other recreation user types. 11. If the Jackson Mountain project was built, and if mountain bike use increased exponentially (making this the national destination some people envision), the result would likely be a shift away from current uses of the local forest area. This would likely cause a cultural change in the community - people and families who currently use and make their livings through non-mechanized means from national forest lands would be displaced by the new mountain bike culture of the community. This is happening in other towns in the West and does not need to happen everywhere, including in Pagosa Springs.

12. Mountain biking is a good, legitimate use of public lands, but like other recreational activities, there must be limitations on expanding use across what is seen by some as an open and available-for-use landscape. The days of seeing unlimited opportunity for unrestricted recreation development and use on the public lands landscape are at least very limited if not over, and this pertains to all recreation types. The large numbers of people moving into this area, their demand for public land access, and our collective adverse impacts on the land, wildlife, water and overall recreational experience dictate a limit on development and improvement for recreation purposes, including for such projects as Jackson Mountain mountain biking. 13. Occasional "thrill" experiences are, of course, routinely expected by many recreational users of public lands anywhere they go, but that is not the sole goal and expectation for most public land users, who often simply appreciate the beauty and solitude of nature, and the sometimes challenging trails. Because of what it takes to provide thrill opportunities for mountain bikers on public lands, and the predictable adverse impacts from those activities along with the displacement of other users, thrill trails and experiences should be limited and mostly directed to more appropriate locations such as at ski areas, city parks, etc. Additionally, thrill trails previously constructed by this project's proponents (e.g. Reservoir Hill) are not routinely maintained and are in poor condition in a number of locations and are causing resource damage and user interaction issues. 14. The Forest Service and community partners should encourage all public land users of all ages to better understand the value of national forest lands, including support for activities that are more harmonious with nature and less thrill-based and less impacting on natural resources, including wildlife and watersheds. If the Jackson Mountain project was primarily aimed at providing several miles of touring trails for mountain bikers through the area, including through trails to link with Pagosa Springs and surrounding areas, the proposal would be much more understandable and supportable. As it sits, though, even if fewer miles of loop trails in the proposal are considered, the project is unacceptable. A loop or two, yes, but multiple loops that are obviously for competition are not acceptable. 15. It appears from the Forest Service 'Turkey Springs Mountain Bike Trail System' map that there are approximately 60 to 70 miles of improved trails in the greater Turkey Springs area - mostly developed in the last decade. I have observed increasing biking use there, and the concurrent displacement of other users like horseback riders and hikers in some parts of the system. An acquaintance who is a mountain biking competitor and who bikes the Turkey Springs area told me that a Jackson Mountain biking area is needed because, while "Turkey Springs is OK, Jackson Mountain will offer more challenging trails." Ironically and unfortunately, this person recently broke his collarbone in a biking accident on one the Turkey Springs trails, so there must be at least a few exciting trails in that area. 16. This should not be so much about providing business opportunities for Pagosa Springs, as some people have explained the value of this bike racing course project to be (again, "Moab in the Pines" is the vision). Instead, I understand that business opportunities relying on national forest lands surrounding our area already exist and will continue to expand and grow as our population and use grows whether or not Jackson Mountain bike trails are built. People come here for the beauty, and businesses can grow and profit from the many other ways people want to enjoy the public lands in this area. Of course, business success in this town can include mountain biking, but careful balance is needed, and having much of the land through the middle of the district devoted to mountain biking is too much and will detract from other less-impacting business opportunities such as guided hiking, horseback riding, nature tours, etc. 17. The Forest Service has turned down proposals from other user groups for venues such as shooting ranges, equestrian venues, motorized racecourses, and others, but is apparently OK with constructing what appears to be a mountain bike racing venue at Jackson Mountain. Why is this and how is it consistent with national FS goals and directives or fair for all national forest users? 18. I support the vegetation management goals for this project. 19. Thank you.