

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 6/15/2024 4:27:29 AM

First name: Melissa

Last name: Bradshaw

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Color Confusion: The draft map has support from CSA, but the use of identical colors for closed areas and planning boundaries is causing confusion. This issue needs to be addressed.

History of Winter Recreation: Winter recreation on the Forest has a long-standing history without conflicts between different uses. This historical context should guide our analysis.

Flexibility in Snow Depth Measurement: We endorse the Proposal's flexibility regarding snow depth measurement and usage timing. Snow compaction, a natural process, should be our starting point for analysis.

Canadian Lynx Protection: The Proposal raises concerns about restricting access to protect Canadian Lynx. This response is likely influenced by lawsuits against the Rio Grande after their 2019 RMP release. The snowmobile community supports USFS decisions and has intervened in litigation to defend these claims. However, there's a conflict with new USFWS planning tools that no longer consider motorized usage a threat to the Lynx.

Exclusionary Corridors: The Proposal suggests exclusionary corridors around the Continental Divide Trail and other areas. These corridors would prohibit motorized usage and divide the forest into distinct sections. We propose managing the CDNST and other trails as the USFS argued in their recent Supreme Court effort, where motorized usage was protected. The concept of single-use recreation based solely on designation was presented to the Supreme Court but not applied.

Nonmotorized Groomed Routes: Nonmotorized groomed routes on the Rio Grande NF (despite being closed to snowmobiles) offer recreational opportunities. These areas should be considered when balancing opportunities and minimizing impacts.

Colorado Roadless Areas: While Colorado Roadless areas are desirable for nonmotorized users, they are also suitable for motorized usage. The 2012 Colorado Proposal, which addresses road construction and maintenance and specifically protects trails, should guide our approach.

Non-Motorized Uses Adjacent to Wilderness Areas: Protecting non-motorized uses near Wilderness areas is illegal due to the Colorado Wilderness Act's prohibition on buffers around Congressionally designated Wilderness. Although we don't seek to ride within Wilderness areas (as it's illegal), we advocate for full riding opportunities outside Wilderness boundaries.

What is the current status of this proposal? Thank you.