

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 2/7/2025 9:16:25 PM

First name: onno

Last name: wieringa

Organization:

Title:

Comments: Comments on the Information presented as a Proposed Action

Thank you for the chance to give some input . Many of the ORV's are related to capacity . I will focus my comments on commercial use on the recreational section of the Middle Fork for a start. If MU2 use is currently 71,889 and MU3 is 35,713 my first questions is how much of that use was approved during the process of updating the CRMP and if any of it was approved I don't understand why.

Now your material suggests expanding commercial use for MU2 roughly 20% to 86,000 and MU3 would grow roughly 30% to 50,000. Your info says numbers derived are from ' a sense of the amounts of use that are most likely sustainable ' . How did your team come up with these increase numbers and if you anticipate a similar growth in private use what is your rationale that drove these proposed increases backed up by besides a 'sense of what might be sustainable' . I will re-read everything and see if I am missing something but I can not support your proposed commercial use increase based on what you have provided.

I was glad to see you kept the potential BNSF train spill potential on the radar.

I think the statement that 'invasive plant species are at low abundance' is not accurate. Knapweed along the railroad and the Middle Fork certainly doesn't seem in low abundance to me.

I am going to do another submission for the UMF and North Fork.