

Date submitted (UTC): 1/31/2015 1:10:12 AM
First name: Tina
Last name: Fay
Organization: self
Title:
Official Representative/Member Indicator: Member
Address1: PO Box 20047
Address2:
City: Colorado City
State: CO
Province/Region:
Zip/Postal Code: 81019
Country: United States
Email: yafanit16@gmail.com
Phone: 7196762183
Comments:

I am an avid dirt bike rider and enjoy single track as well as the beauty of our forests. Most organizations that are against motorized travel do not realize that we would like to preserve it as much as everyone else, just as the hunters preserve wetlands, etc. These anti-motorized vehicle groups do not look past their beliefs to find out what we are about. I am writing in response to your recent Rico-West Dolores Roads and Trails Proposed Action. After reviewing the Rico-West Dolores Roads and Trails Proposed Action I adamantly disagree with many of the proposed actions within this document. I suspect the changes in the Proposed Action are the result of pressure from a small, vocal and well-funded minority. It is no secret that members of a few organizations are bent on wiping-out motorized recreation on public lands. I would also like you to know that I empathize with Federal land managers. I know your valuable time is spent in the office handling paper work created by these small, vocal organizations instead of being in the field doing what you love. In short I disagree with many of the considerations in the Proposed Action on the following points.

1. The Colorado Park and Wildlife has reported that elk populations are "at or above management objectives" for this area. Implementing seasonal motorized travel restrictions (for elk calving and elk restrictions) is not justified through any recent studies or research.
2. Shutting of motorized access to national forest because of the request of a vocal-few undermines the fact that these are "public" lands. Eliminating motorized access to Burnett Creek TR641 is unacceptable, lacks solid reasoning, and sets a dangerous precedent. I would like to know if the request for a non-motorized buffer around Rico has been formalized by town officials. It is well known that the Alpine Society of Rico is an active organization that has an aversion to motorized recreation. I would hope that their influence did not figure into your published proposed action. It is the town's responsibility to pass ordinances and pass laws from within their jurisdiction. Anti-access groups should not have the right to prohibit a long standing history of motorized access to National Forest. Our access to motorized single track is significantly limited and eliminating more single track mileage will not satisfy the anti-access advocates.
3. Proposed closure of winter Trail 202, West fall 240, and east fall 646 to motorized use: If existing easements call for "quiet use" then re-routes should be immediately studied, planned and constructed. There are countless acres of land that are available for hikers and equestrians to experience quiet recreation. We would like to stress that if anti-access advocates want a quiet experience then encourage them to visit nearby non-motorized trails, which are plentiful.
4. I would like to recommend that Spring Creek 627, Morrison 610, and Loading Pen 738 be designated as motorized single track. All single track routes, regardless of mileage are highly valued by motorized single-track enthusiasts. It is important that any loss in motorized trail mileage be promptly replaced.
5. I believe Wildcat 207 should be kept as motorized single-track AND extended southward to the railroad right-of-way. I think on section of the Ryman Trail should be single-track motorized and connect Calico South 211 and Priest Gulch 645. I also feel the Burnett Creek 641 should be designated as motorized single-track. Again, making the effort to add more motorized single-track, signals that the Forest Service values providing the public with a wide-range of motorized recreational opportunities.
6. Sock rider 6 should remain a motorized section of Calico 208.
7. I believe that lower Bear Creek should be designated as non-motorized.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important matter and for taking care of our national forests.

