

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/1/2024 2:38:43 AM

First name: Hank

Last name: Adams

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Hello-

Since the 1986 Forest Plan, there has been continued closure and loss of motorized access. It makes me sad to think about all of the roads, motorized trails and snowmobile areas I have explored that are now illegal to share with my kids. Over the years, projects have closed an area here and a trail over there. All of this has had a cumulative effect and a substantive decline in motorized access across the forest over the years. The cumulative loss in motorized access since the last Forest Plan in 1986 should be analyzed.

The remaining current motorized access needs to be protected. Early on, I shared this in one of the Common Ground sessions for this Forest Plan. This Forest Plan should include written elements to preserve motorized access. First, remaining motorized access needs to be preserved and protected as much as possible. Second, a proactive effort to create loops and new motorized opportunities needs to be written in the plan. Third, if something absolutely needs to be closed to motorized use, an alternative should be opened to minimize impacts to the motorized community. Connectivity is important for motorized users too. Finding ways to link existing motorized trails and snowmobile areas should be a goal. The 2006 Forest Plan included proposals for opening trails 701 and 340 to motorized use. The new Forest Plan contains objectives to create loops for existing non-motorized trails; there should be similar motorized objectives as well.

The Backcountry layer seems redundant and adds unnecessary complexity to areas that are already designated Inventoried Roadless Areas. Regarding the Backcountry suitability description, the wording "no new motorized trails" needs to be removed. There will be motorized trails in Backcountry areas, so it is obviously suitable and appropriate for motorized use. Motorized single-track trails are no different than non-motorized trails. There needs to be the ability to reroute a trail if necessary or make changes that could be needed in the future. For example, the Forest Service's Wilkes Cherry project is proposing a new motorized single-track trail, which is refreshing and welcome to see. This trail is proposed in an area that is also proposed as Backcountry and non-motorized on the ROS. This highlights the need for the ROS to not be so heavily fragmented between motorized and non-motorized areas. Motorized areas need proper buffers around motorized trails and roads, per the ROS guidelines. The ROS should be looking at suitability and there are lots of areas outside of currently open routes that are suitable for motorized use. This new motorized single-track trail in the Wilkes Cherry project highlights one example of an area suitable for motorized use that is being proposed Backcountry and non-motorized on the ROS.

It is my understanding that there is not a local Forest Service recreation point person involved in this Forest Plan. For a Forest Plan that is proposing many recreation changes, it seems imperative that local Forest Service recreation personnel be an integral part to this Forest Plan. Having a local Forest Service recreation point person could have avoided the significant ROS mapping errors that have already been encountered. Any proposed recreation changes need to be vetted in the field to ensure any changes make sense on the ground and mistakes are avoided.

As discussed, there are major issues with the ROS mapping. The ROS maps need to be redone but also done in a way the public can clearly see locations. ROS maps with layers for MVUM/OSVUM, USGS topo and satellite imagery would help, as this would allow roads/trails and terrain to be identified. Better maps are needed along with an explanation of the ROS methodology, and an explanation of any proposed recreation changes. This needs to be communicated to the public before the public can provide meaningful comments on this part of the Forest Plan. MVUM and OSVUM maps should be minimum starting points for Summer/Winter ROS. Then additional areas that are suitable for motorized use need to be added. There are more areas suitable for

motorized use than only what is currently open. An example would be areas with historical motorized use, such as snowmobiling in the Hoodoo area.

The verbiage in the plan regarding recreational shooting should be removed. The public's ability to shoot on public land should not be linked to whether or not private shooting options are available. If there is an issue with a recreational shooting area, the situation should be managed. Closing and blocking the area should not be the only answer.

Thank you for your consideration on my comment.