

Date submitted (UTC): 7/5/2016 2:50:27 PM

First name: Branden

Last name: Bowie

Organization:

Title:

Official Representative/Member Indicator:

Address1: 21009 129th St Ct E

Address2:

City: Bonney Lake

State: WA

Province/Region:

Zip/Postal Code: 98391

Country: United States

Email: BrandenBowie@gmail.com

Phone: 253-334-5163

Comments:

The Okanogan- Wenatchee National Forest has been a cherished place for my family, friends and I for many years. We have spent time in this forest since I was a little boy hunting, camping, riding motorcycle trails, and enjoying the off road trail systems that all allow us to truly enjoy the area and see sites we couldn't see any other way. I do understand that the Forest Service must adjust their Travel Management Plans every so often to keep up with the ever changing world we live in. I feel that the alternatives proposed are lacking in some areas. With this being said, I feel that none of the alternatives should be considered as they stand in this current draft.

I feel very strongly that eliminating cross-country travel in ALL forests is a very good idea! Personally I know that most people, including myself and everyone I know, already live by the Tread Lightly policy in our forests and do their best to stay on designated trails and roads. I feel that cross-country travel will definitely hurt the forest and create a lot of trouble between the public and Forest Service down the road. Keeping the Funny and Moon Rocks open for cross-country travel is a great middle ground in this aspect.

Being an avid 4x4 and WATV enthusiast, I do not feel that 350 miles of road being open to the WATVs is nearly enough. This still restricts access to many areas and makes it hard for the individual to really understand where he/she can or cannot ride or drive legally. I feel that this option in ALL of the alternatives should be changed to allow WATV access to ALL of the open FS roads. This would prevent confusion, attract more users, keep the Law Enforcement Officers from having to scramble around trying to enforce the laws, and make for an all-around more enjoyable experience. As it stands now, with the way most campgrounds are placed in the forest, users are forced to tow their vehicles from their campsite to the trail heads and then unload and go from there. The trailheads are not set up for this type of traffic and it causes more problems than allowing WATVs to be able to drive from their campsite to the trails. Making sure the local LEOs understand this will also need to be taken care of.

After looking through the maps provided, I did notice that some trails were not shown on them. I would like to ask that the Forest Service NOT go any further with this plan until ALL of the trails and roads are shown accurately on the maps. If the FS is not completely transparent in this process it will cause a lot of problems with relations between the FS and the public user groups. I also feel that a few corridors should be added along main routes of travel. For example, Little Naches Road, South Fork of Teiton River, and Bumping Lake Road should be added to the list of corridors. If dispersed camping gets shut down as much as proposed, it will push more people in to fewer campgrounds causing more harm and much more maintenance of said campgrounds. The majority of the current campgrounds aren't able to sustain the number of people who already camp in them. An influx of campers would exacerbate the problem.

I would also like to see an environmental impact study done to see the actual effects of camping and having motorized vehicles within 100' of water in these areas. By closing access to these areas you are eliminating one of the attractions to the area. River camping is something many people can't experience anywhere else and families enjoy being close to water on those hot summer days when the areas are annually open.

Does the Forest Service have some sort of road and trail maintenance plan for these alternatives? Or will this be left to each district to solve? I feel strongly that this needs to be made apparent and put forth clearly in the proposal. We need to know where the money is coming from and who will be putting for the efforts to maintain

the roads and trails.

If these alternatives are not adjusted, the forest will lose much of its users. Most of these areas rely on the users to keep the local economy intact. Users rely on these local shops and stores when recreating in the areas and without the users these stores would not be able to sustain themselves, putting more people out of jobs.

Because of the concerns I have expressed, I would like to see them addressed in some fashion before a final decision is made. Thank you for considering our comments and I sincerely hope that the Forest Service will work with the public and direct users when considering an avenue to pursue.