

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 4/1/2024 2:38:52 AM

First name: Dylan

Last name: Davis

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As someone that participates in nearly every user group within our public lands, I want to voice my concern for the large amount of acreage proposed to shift from winter motorized use to non-motorized. I backcountry ski 20-30 days a year, and in most places that are proposed to become non-motorized, I've never seen a snowmobile or had a bad interaction/conflict. Areas like Cooke City manage to have skiers and snowmobiles coexist without issue. Some areas we ride snowmobiles in to ski, and I do not want to lose that opportunity. My bigger concern is the amount of actual rideable terrain proposed to be closed off to snowmobiles. This is only going to concentrate riders in areas and serve one user group.

I would also like to voice my opinion in allowing mountain bikes in the Stateline Trail area and throughout the Superior/Hoodoo portion of Lolo National Forest. This was once an epic high mountain ride that has been shut down to mountain biking, yet Nez Pierce NF allows it on their side? I'd like to see some consistency between National Forests.

My concern going forward with Lolo National forest is an emphasis on non-motorized winter travel and losing access to once great riding areas, as well as concentrating riders and users into areas, only accelerating any degradation or impacts to an area.

I would like to see the Great Burn removed from Wilderness Study Designation and have some areas set aside as roadless/non-motorized use, and some other areas allow motorized/biking use. A moderate approach that represents all user groups to our public lands.

Lastly, the inaccuracies in the mapping provided is disappointing. How are we to comment on specific areas if we don't know if that's the true intent? The revision process as a whole has been kind of sad, and having worked on the private side of permitting with the FS/BLM, there's no way this would be allowed, so the USFS should hold itself to that same standard.

Looking at the proposed maps, they look like an absolute nightmare to decipher, and I can't imagine any USFS Law Enforcement enforcing these boundaries? It's borderline hilarious.

I am advocate for balanced use, and what I am seeing is a large reduction in available winter motorized acreage, once great mountain biking routes being lost, and land not being managed for all user groups. I love Wilderness, and enjoy it probably more than any other land designation, but I also can't advocate for other user groups to lose their access to the opportunities they enjoy.