

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/13/2024 1:42:46 AM

First name: Lisa

Last name: Gamber

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Designating specific areas for varied user groups is the best way to avoid conflicts. The users vying for access have the same goal-to enjoy the beautiful outdoors-but the groups do not mix well. Our experiences are very different. Motorized machines are noisy and move fast. Nordic skiers are quiet and move slowly. There are inherent safety issues. It only takes one snowmobile to destroy a groomed trail. It makes it infinitely harder to ski and creates a safety issue when it gets rutted out.

It is of concern that the proposed plan allocates 74% of the accessible terrain to motorized use. This is not in line with the actual percentage of motorized vs. non-motorized users. Please consider this glaring inequity as you move forward. As a Nordic skier, it seems like right now, motorized users have everything and we have nothing. This skewed percentage just invites continued conflict.

What happened to the OSV's "closed unless designated open" requirement? Clearly that is not being used as the baseline in the proposed action.

I would urge the Rio Grande NF process to be aligned with the San Juan NF process. Some of the Rio Grande NF's heaviest use areas are adjacent to the San Juan NF. Why would you not work on a similar timeline?

Differing designations in such close proximity will only confuse users and cause more conflict.

I believe that all users should be able to enjoy these areas. Please move forward with a plan that better minimizes conflicts.