

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/14/2024 2:56:01 PM

First name: Trent

Last name: Reiersen

Organization:

Title:

Comments: As a snowmobile enthusiast, industry professional, and an advocate for a seasonally-snow dependent industry, I must write to you today to share some concerns with the current plan. Thank you for giving me the opportunity and thank you for providing resources to improve the industry resources.

1) There should be no restrictions to motorized travel in areas adjacent to Wilderness areas. The Colorado Wilderness Act specifically does not allow this. As motorists, it is understood that travel in these areas is illegal. We support marking them clearly but there is no reason adjacent areas should be protected to only non-motorized use.

2) With the current proposal identifying Colorado Roadless areas as desirable areas for non-motorized users, it is also desirable for motorized users. The clear reason for this is that motorized usage specifically depends on the characteristics of Roadless Areas. I request that it be applied as it was in the 2012 Colorado Proposal, which does not limit usage of any type. Additionally, it only addresses road maintenance/construction; specifically protecting trails.

3) In regards to non-motorized groomed routes on the Rio Grande NF that are not addressed in minimization of impacts but should be to balance opportunity and minimize impact equally. It is understood these areas are closed to snowmobile use and should remain closed.

4) The proposal may require exclusionary corridors around the Continental Divide Trail and several other exclusionary corridors in several more places. This idea would divide the forest into large sections with multiple boundaries for different usages. This idea has already been successfully objected to by motorists within the RMP development. I am asking that the Continental Divide Trail and the several more places alike in the proposal, be managed in the same manner that the United States Forest Service argued for in the recent Supreme Court effort that protected motorized usage. The idea of single use recreation on Congressionally designated trails did not stand with the Supreme Court.

5) It is noted that the proposal raises concerns about the requirement to restrict access to protect Canadian Lynx. If this is a response to lawsuits brought against Rio Grande after the release of their 2019 RMP, it should be noted that the snowmobile community has supported the United States Forest Service's decisions made in the 2019 RMP and have involved themselves in the litigation. The snowmobile community has defended these claims with the USFS. The USFWS planning tools have removed motorized usage as a threat to the Lynx and requires only that Lynx be counted in motorized recreation areas.

6) In the proposal where flexibility is had regarding snow depth measurements and allowed usage, I support. Snow compaction is a natural process in itself but this must be a starting point for analysis.

7) Another good starting point for analysis is noting that there has been no conflict in the long history of winter recreation on the Forest.

8) Generally, I am in support of the draft map, however, the colors used for planning documents and maps creates confusion as areas that are closed and areas that are the planning area boundary are too much the same color.

Thank you.