

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/14/2024 8:38:11 PM

First name: Tyler

Last name: O

Organization:

Title:

Comments: 1. While I mostly agrees with the draft map, the use of colors is causing confusion. The same color is applied to both closed areas and the planning area boundary, which needs to be corrected.

2. The longstanding history of conflict-free winter recreation in the Forest should serve as the baseline for any analysis.

3. I appreciate the Proposal's allowance for flexibility in snow depth measurements and the timing of permissible use. Snow compaction, a natural occurrence, should be the foundation of this analysis.

4. Concerns about limiting access to protect the Canadian Lynx appear in the Proposal, likely a response to lawsuits following the 2019 RMP from the Rio Grande. The snowmobile community has supported the USFS's decisions in the RMP and has defended these in court. These concerns are at odds with new USFWS tools that no longer view motorized usage as a threat to the Lynx and only require counting them in motorized areas.

5. The Proposal seems to call for exclusion zones around the Continental Divide Trail and others, restricting motorized use and fragmenting the forest into large sections with specific use boundaries. This was previously contested by the motorized community during the RMP development. I request that the CDNST and other trails be managed according to the USFS's recent Supreme Court stance, which protected motorized use. The Supreme Court rejected the idea of single-use recreation for Congressionally designated trails based solely on their designation.

6. There is concern that the Proposal does not address nonmotorized groomed routes in the Rio Grande NF, which cover several miles, in terms of minimizing impacts. Although these areas are and should remain closed to snowmobiles, they offer recreational opportunities that should be considered in impact minimization efforts.

7. The Proposal's designation of Colorado Roadless areas as primarily for nonmotorized users is troubling. These areas are also suitable for motorized use, which is a recognized characteristic of Roadless Areas. We request the application of the Colorado Roadless Rule as per the 2012 Colorado Proposal, which does not favor any particular use and addresses only road construction and maintenance, while specifically protecting trails.

8. The Proposal's intention to protect non-motorized use next to Wilderness areas is illegal under the Colorado Wilderness Act, which forbids buffer zones around designated Wilderness. I am not seeking permission to ride in Wilderness areas, but I do want full access to ride in areas adjacent to Wilderness.