

Data Submitted (UTC 11): 11/5/2021 6:00:00 AM

First name: Marcus

Last name: Trusty

Organization: CORE

Title: President/Founder

Comments: Please see attached comments.

I. IntroductionI am an offroad enthusiast from Buena Vista, Colorado. I am the founder and president of Colorado Offroad Enterprise (CORE). CORE was created to partner with land managers to engage in trail adoption, trail work, stewardship, and offroad ethics. We have 15 adopted trails in Central Colorado. We work closely with BLM and The Forest Service in Colorado to keep our prized offroad and backcountry roads and trails open for the continued enjoyment of multi-use backcountry recreation. I have personally enjoyed National Forest Managed Lands in New Mexico.I am submitting these comments on behalf of our 200 members from around the country who regularly visit the Moab area. We present these comments to request that the National Forest Plan Update or this area preserve the existing ROS for motorized use and expand those ROS zones to maximize the opportunities for motorized recreation. Additionally, we also support the comments and recommendations made by Blue Ribbon Coalition.II. General CommentsA. The existing ROS Zones for semi-primitive and other forms of motorized recreation should continue to be maintained through this Forest Plan Update. Those zones are highly valuable for potential motorized expansion to allow looping routes and connectors to existing routes. These options could include future routes to keep users off graded county roads, using these county roads to access singletrack and other motorized trails further into the forest. Keeping these existing zones would improve current management and allow future development to enhance management further. Looping routes offering a full day of motorized recreational experience help influence positive motorized behavior while also allowing users to fill up an entire day with the motorized experience they are seeking. Shrinking the current Motorized ROS Zones will have the opposite effect and yield a negative outcome.B. A range of alternatives is presented as part of any Forest Service Project to weigh different options and contrast various perspectives before making a final decision. Why is there no Alternative offered as a [lsquo]Recreation Alternative,[rsquo] which would allow for an increase in recreation above current management? Alternative E is the closest alternative to active management. Without analyzing an option that would increase motorized use beyond current management, the process automatically dictates some level of motorized reduction. This does not allow for objectivity and does not account for the increase in recreation since the last Forest Plan. There has been a quantifiable and substantial increase in recreation; why is there not an alternative reflecting the option to increase all forms of recreation?C. Generally, we favor Alternative E at this point. However, roads and trails many times need re-routed entirely or for a small section. If that road/trail is in a semi-primitive motorized ROS zone, the project is much easier. Also, new trails and a connector making for a looping trail are allowable in a semi-primitive motorized ROS zone. Still, if everything outside of an existing road/trail corridor is now non-motorized, this makes any new development impossible. By taking a [lsquo]snapshot[rsquo] view of how the Lincoln NF looks today and planning via corridors or restricting motorized access further, that approach does not include flexibility for the future. Planning, in general, implies understanding things will not always stay the same. The Lincoln planning team is setting the motorized community up to lose recreational assets if environmental events change the landscape and alter the path of a road/trail in a small or substantial capacity. Additionally, suppose a road/trail is deemed [lsquo]unsustainable[rsquo] in a future travel management project and decommissioned. In that case, we cannot develop a new, replacement road/trail if a semi-primitive motorized ROS zone is not maintained.D. [lsquo]User Conflict[rsquo] should not preclude one user over another in this updated Forest Plan. This idea that users are incompatible across the board and that people simply can[rsquo]t recreate together is not substantiated by the on-ground recreation integrations, which take place daily. Users from all over the county somehow travel to the Lincoln NF for recreation and can get through numerous modes of travel and come from all different backgrounds, yet when they are on the ground recreating in The Forest, they somehow no longer can be around others? This, of course, is nonsense and should not be a justifiable way of taking from one recreational group and giving to another.Thank you for your consideration.Marcus TrustyPresident, Colorado Offroad Enterprise

(CORE)