

Date submitted (UTC): 7/5/2016 3:07:02 PM
First name: Anon
Last name: Bowie
Organization: Eldorado Dust Devils 4x4 Jeep Club
Title: Land Matters
Official Representative/Member Indicator:
Address1:
Address2:
City: Puyallup
State: WA
Province/Region:
Zip/Postal Code:
Country: United States
Email: BrandenBowie@gmail.com
Phone:
Comments:

As a representative for the Eldorado Dust Devils 4x4 Jeep Club, I would like to provide the following comments regarding the Okanogan- Wenatchee National Forest Travel Management Plan Draft.

Our club has spent 30+ years enjoying the off road trail systems in these areas. Not only do we enjoy using the trails, we also donate many hours to cleaning and helping maintain the current system we have. As a group, we feel that none of the alternatives proposed should be considered as they stand in the current draft.

We feel very strongly that eliminating cross-country travel in ALL forests is a very good idea! We already live by the Tread Lightly policy in our forests and do our best to stay on designated trails and roads. We 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 group, we 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. We 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, we did notice that some trails were not shown on them. We 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. We 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.

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